

D. General Plan Community Forums Notes and
Comment Form Results

North Lake & East Washington

Lake “Transit Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area north of the Lake Gold Line Station. Please indicate your level of agreement.

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
1. Properties north of the station should be intensified with office, retail, and housing development to promote transit use and walking and reduce car use.	35.0%	55.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9
2. Buildings and sidewalks north of the station should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	65.0%	30.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5
3. Higher density developments should be required to provide urban open spaces and amenities on site that are accessible to the public.	40.0%	35.0%	10.0%	5.6%	10.0%	0.0%	2.1
4. Buildings should be no taller than (select one of the following options):							
75.0%	Three to four stories (Concept Plan recommendation), to allow housing to be built above ground level retail and services. Buildings would be required to be located and designed to assure adequate transitions in height, building mass, and landscaped setbacks with adjoining developments						
10.0%	One to two stories, with no housing on upper floors						
15.0%	Five to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors						

Lake Avenue & Washington “Neighborhood Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area around the Lake Avenue and Washington Boulevard intersection. Please indicate your level of agreement.

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
5. Properties should be intensified with local-serving commercial uses and housing in a walkable “village-like” environment. New development and public spaces should foster the neighborhood’s identity, create gathering places, and encourage residents to walk to these from their residences rather than drive.	68.4%	15.8%	10.5%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5
6. Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	68.4%	21.1%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5

7. Buildings should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

61.1%	Three stories (Concept Plan recommendation), to allow housing to be built above ground level retail and services. Buildings would be required to be located and designed to assure adequate transitions in height, building mass, and landscaped setbacks with adjoining developments
22.2%	One to two stories, with no housing on upper floors
16.7%	Four to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

East Washington “Neighborhood Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area along East Washington Boulevard generally between Hill and Allen Avenues. Please indicate your level of agreement.

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
8. Properties should be developed with local-serving commercial uses in a walkable “village-like” environment. New development should foster the neighborhood’s identity, create gathering places, and encourage people to walk there instead of drive.	52.6%	36.8%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6
9. Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	63.2%	31.6%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5

10. Buildings should not be taller than (select one of the following options):

66.7%	One to two stories (Concept Plan recommendation), consistent with the scale of existing development
11.1%	Three stories, to enable housing to be built above ground level retail and services.
22.2%	Four to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

Overall Concept for Area

Indicate your overall agreement with the concept plan for the following areas:

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
11. Lake Transit Village	36.8%	52.6%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8
12. Lake & Washington Neighborhood Village	42.1%	42.1%	5.3%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8
13. East Washington Neighborhood Village	31.6%	63.2%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8

14. Select the two most important factors that influenced your agreement or disagreement with the draft Concept Plan for the North Lake and East Washington areas.

4 Provides housing	1 Too much traffic	12 Compatible with the community character
1 Not enough housing	1 Provides jobs	0 Loss of community character
2 Too much housing	1 Not enough jobs	2 Increased revenue to the City
7 Opportunity to reduce trips	0 Too many jobs	2 Costs to the City

General Comments

15. In the space below, please write any general comments you have about your likes and dislikes for the Concept Plan for the North Lake and East Washington areas.

- Question 15, Generally good. Would like more amenities, after school things etc. in Washington Park.
- Question 15, Would like to see more middle class families in North Lake area - this requires better public schools with a better image (not something that city can do directly) otherwise prospective new residents will prefer South Pasadena>Arcadia>Glendale and Pasadena least. More walkable shopping complexes along North Lake good.
- Question 15, Strongly support addition of eighth Guiding Principle focused on public education. No comment card available at Education Policy Station!
- Question 15, Sounds livable. South Pasadena has done some of this successfully. A good model.
- Question 8, With no additional parking. Question 10, Only one story. Question 15, Keep density low and consistent with neighborhood. Please don't make it look like Irvine!
- Question 15, Parking for small businesses along corridors is an issue. How to provide? Residential streets (eg. N and S of Washington) are very narrow.
- Question 15, This comment card does not include questions for Lake and Orange Grove, however, I agree with what is proposed. Please do not make any further changes.
- Question 5, No housing. Question 15, Do not add housing - too much traffic and people now. City has water shortage for people here now - why add more people.
- Question 15, Consider avoiding too much regulation - you may wind up with empty storefronts if there are too many requirements. Create parking for Allen Station. Encourage and support home-based businesses - in the internet era, they are invisible and avoid car trips.
- Question 1, We have plenty of retail their already. Question 6, Benches, trash containers, signs - to where? Question 7, Bad question. Question 9, It's already been done. Question 14, Bad choice of answers! Question 15, I believe at many of the past meetings on the General Plan the people wanted growth to the East. Your plan just adds congestion and lower quality of life in the City. Your plan continues to mass everything in one corridor of the City.

- Question 15, My primary concern is walkability, particularly along Washington between Lake and El Molino. Any investment which provides employment or an environment that allows street people a dignified and non-intrusive presence would be welcome.
- Question 15, Washington between Hill and Allen needs more sidewalk oriented amenities/destinations/places to eat/gather. Historic buildings should be preserved.
- Question 15, The 4 nodes: N. Lake, Fair Oaks/Lincoln, Old Pasadena, and E. Colorado could be linked with a circulating trolley or ARTS type bus to expand shopping opportunities beyond one's own specific neighborhood.
- Question 4, Three to four stories or higher. Question 7, Four to six stories or higher.
- Question 4, Three stories. Question 7, Two to three stories.
- Question 15, This area needs to include Public Education as a focus. How does the Plan encourage or support public schools? Please include Support Public Education as 8th Guiding Principle!

Fair Oaks & Orange Grove Lincoln Avenue

Fair Oaks & Orange Grove “Neighborhood Village”

Below is a description of the vision for areas around the Fair Oaks Avenue and Orange Grove Boulevard intersection. **Please indicate your level of agreement.**

(Score)

	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
1. Properties should be intensified with local-serving commercial uses and housing in a walkable “village-like” environment. New development and public spaces should foster the neighborhood’s identity, create gathering places, and encourage residents to walk to these from their residences rather than drive.	87.5%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3
2. Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	73.3%	20.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4
3. Existing industrial and manufacturing areas should be retained and allowed to expand for more jobs in the community, in place of housing development.	12.5%	18.8%	25.0%	25.0%	18.8%	0.0%	3.2
4. Buildings should not be taller than (select one of the following options):							
71.4%	Three stories (Concept Plan recommendation), to allow housing to be built above ground level retail and services. Buildings would be required to be located and designed to assure adequate transitions in height, building mass, and landscaped setbacks with adjoining developments						
7.1%	One to two stories, with no housing on upper floors						
21.4%	Four to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors						

Lincoln Avenue “Neighborhood Village”

The draft Concept Plan retains the vision and land use designations defined in the recently completed draft of the Lincoln Avenue Specific Plan. The Plan was developed through an extensive process of community outreach and engagement, with broad support for its recommendations.

The following describes the Plan’s vision; please indicate your level of agreement.

(Score)

	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
5. Vision: To repurpose the Lincoln Avenue corridor from an industrial and limited commercial area into a vibrant neighborhood-oriented district, with new housing options and a complement of local-serving retail and service businesses, office spaces, and community uses, all tied together	60.0%	20.0%	13.3%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	1.7

with public improvements that create a vibrant and enjoyable pedestrian environment.

Overall Concept for Area

Indicate your overall agreement with the concept plan for the following areas:

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
6. Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan	21.4%	71.4%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9
7. Lincoln Avenue corridors	30.8%	53.8%	7.7%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9

8. Select the **two** most important factors that influenced your agreement or disagreement with the draft Concept Plan for the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove and Lincoln Boulevard areas.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| 4 Provides housing | 3 Too much traffic | 7 Compatible with the community character |
| 4 Not enough housing | 2 Provides jobs | 0 Loss of community character |
| 0 Too much housing | 2 Not enough jobs | 0 Increased revenue to the City |
| 5 Opportunity to reduce trips | 0 Too many jobs | 0 Costs to the City |

General Comments

9. In the space below, please write any general comments you have about your likes and dislikes for the Concept Plan for the Lincoln Avenue corridors and Fair Oaks/Orange Grove area.

- Question 9, Reduce “fast food” businesses. Prohibit any new liquor stores.
- Question 9, If we are an attractive place to live, the jobs will come. Idealab is a good example.
- Question 9, NW Pasadena is a high crime area liquor store foster crime, drug use, etc. Pintaresca Park and Library is first class - give it more hours/funding. Fair Oaks/Orange Grove better than in 2000 but too many low-level fast food places.
- Question 9, I like the concept of more shops, restaurants, walkability, and promotion of the opportunity to create outdoor gathering places.
- Question 9, Too many liquor stores along Fair Oaks and Lincoln – must make it very difficult to open new liquor stores. Summit Ave is highest crime area in Pasadena. Small industrial parks ok, more large apartment complexes, NOT.
- Question 9, Your plan congests these intersections with more traffic, especially at the Freeway and Fair Oaks. I don’t think this promotes a better city. I do think health problems have not been addressed in any of the General Plan (air)(children factors).

- Question 9, Improved transit options to these areas should be integrated if a significant reduction in auto trips is to be generated (in addition to better ped/bike access).
- Question 9, Need to provide opportunities to create jobs for all levels of education in city. Need ways to protect affordable housing. Allow more places that house and are for senior citizens.
- Question 9, All housing project should be required to incorporate more affordable housing.
- Question 2, Please more landscaping! Car-free zone times, outdoor seating, things to see/do while walking (involve businesses). Question 3, Why not regulate through growth and housing development (adhering to aesthetic considerations). Question 5, Yes! Question 8, Opportunity to reduce trips (both plans should do this). Compatible with community character (both should assist rebuilding community character). Question 9. Both plans look wonderful – Please make sure these neighborhood villages are as much of a priority as the villages in other parts of Pasadena. (Northwest has been less of a priority at times.)
- Question 9, These areas need public education as a focus in all efforts – please include Public Education as 8th Guiding Principle – communities are not just bricks and mortar – support public education.

East Pasadena/ East Colorado Boulevard

Sierra Madre Villa “Transit Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area north and south of the Sierra Madre Villa Gold Line Station. Please indicate your level of agreement.

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. score
1. The area near the station should be transformed into a more active place that promotes walking and transit use and reduces car use.	40.0%	30.0%	15.0%	0.0%	15.0%	0.0%	2.2
2. More multi-family housing opportunities should be provided in the area to allow people to live close to jobs and services, support local retail shops, and increase transit use.	40.0%	35.0%	5.0%	5.0%	15.0%	0.0%	2.2
3. The large commercial and office blocks north of the station should be subdivided with smaller parcels and new streets to create a “village environment” with improved walkability.	35.0%	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%	20.0%	0.0%	2.7
4. Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	60.0%	15.0%	0.0%	10.0%	15.0%	0.0%	2.1
5. Higher density developments should be required to provide urban open spaces and amenities on site that are accessible to the public.	35.0%	30.0%	25.0%	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%	2.2
6. Buildings should not be taller than (select one of the following options):							
84.2%	Five to six stories (Concept Plan recommendation), with the tallest buildings concentrated near the transit station and freeway. Heights would be reduced as buildings transition to adjoining lower density neighborhoods						
15.8%	Three to four stories, with housing or office uses on the upper floors						
0.0%	One to two stories, with no housing on the upper floors						

Pasadena City College “Neighborhood Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area along the Colorado Boulevard corridor between Hill and Allen Avenues. Please indicate your level of agreement.

	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. score
7. Properties should be intensified with student- and local-serving commercial uses and community facilities in a walkable “village-like” environment. New development should foster a neighborhood identity and allow students and other residents to walk there rather than drive.	63.2%	15.8%	10.5%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%	1.7
8. New multi-family housing should be developed in the area to allow students and faculty to live near the campus and reduce the need to commute.	47.4%	36.8%	5.3%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8
9. Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	54.1%	29.7%	0.0%	10.8%	5.4%	0.0%	1.8
10. Buildings should not be taller than (select one of the following options):							
61.1%	Three stories (Concept Plan recommendation), to allow housing to be built above ground level retail and services. Buildings would be required to be located and designed to assure adequate transitions in height, building mass, and landscaped setbacks with adjoining developments						
5.6%	One to two stories, with no housing on upper floors						
33.3%	Four to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors						

Colorado & Sierra Madre “Neighborhood Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area around the Colorado Boulevard and Sierra Madre Boulevard intersection. Please indicate your level of agreement.

	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. score
11. Properties should be intensified with local-serving commercial uses, housing, and community facilities in a walkable “village-like” environment. New development should foster a neighborhood identity and encourage people to walk there rather than drive.	42.1%	36.8%	5.3%	5.3%	10.5%	0.0%	2.1
12. Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	36.8%	47.4%	0.0%	5.3%	10.5%	0.0%	2.1

13. Buildings should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

68.4%	Three stories (Concept Plan recommendation), to allow housing to be built above ground level retail and services. Buildings would be required to be located and designed to assure adequate transitions in height, building mass, and landscaped setbacks with adjoining developments
10.5%	One or two stories , with no housing on upper floors
21.1%	Four to six stories , with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

Allen “Transit Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area south of the Allen Gold Line Station. Please indicate your level of agreement.

		(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. score
14.	Properties south of the station should be intensified with offices and housing to promote transit use and walking and reduce car use.	40.0%	33.3%	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9
15.	Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5
16.	Higher density developments should be required to provide urban open spaces and amenities on site that are accessible to the public.	46.7%	33.3%	13.3%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8

17. Buildings should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

71.4%	Three to four stories (Concept Plan recommendation), with the tallest buildings concentrated near the transit station and reduced in height with landscaped setbacks as they transition to lower density residential neighborhoods
7.1%	One to two stories , with no housing on upper floors
21.4%	Five to six stories , with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

Lamanda Park

Below is a description of the vision for the Lamanda Park area (generally along Foothill Boulevard and Walnut Street west of the 210 Freeway). Please indicate your level of agreement.

		(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. score
18.	Properties should accommodate new businesses that provide job opportunities for Pasadena’s residents including research and development incubators and similar uses.	66.7%	20.0%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5

Overall Concept for Area

Indicate your overall agreement with the concept plan for the following areas:

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	
19.	Sierra Madre Villa Transit Village	27.8%	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%	2.2
20.	Pasadena City College Neighborhood Village	29.4%	58.8%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8
21.	Colorado & Sierra Madre Neighborhood Village	27.8%	55.6%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1
22.	Allen Transit Village	29.4%	52.9%	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9
23.	Lamanda Park	47.1%	23.5%	23.5%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.98

24. Select the **two** most important factors that influenced your agreement or disagreement with the draft Concept Plan for the East Pasadena/East Colorado area.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| 6 Provides housing | 1 Too much traffic | 4 Compatible with the community character |
| 2 Not enough housing | 6 Provides jobs | 0 Loss of community character |
| 4 Too much housing | 1 Not enough jobs | 4 Increased revenue to the City |
| 3 Opportunity to reduce trips | 0 Too many jobs | 1 Costs to the City |

General Comments

25. In the space below, please write any general comments you have about your likes and dislikes for the Concept Plan for the East Pasadena/East Colorado area.

- Question 25, A housing shortage has never existed in Pasadena but a job shortage often does. To take away what little land is left along major corridors for additional housing is short sighted.
- Question 25, Projected housing increase for East Pasadena is too high. Want to keep job, commercial, office, light industrial unencumbered by housing.
- Question 6, 5-6 stories in the Sierra Madre Transit Village should only be allowed by the freeway. Question 14, The Allen Transit Village should extend north of the freeway, too. Plans should reflect the fact that the freeway is a planning element. It is over 60' high in some areas.
- Question 23, Provide entertainment. Question 25, Remove the parking cap at the Sierra Madre Villa TOD. Increase FARs at Sierra Madre Villa Station area.
- Question 25, Not enough emphasis on economic development, job creation and revenue generation. Doesn't address parking and infrastructure that can impede growth and development. Parking maximum for TOD's need to be removed. Areas near station need to be zoned mixed use to permit flexibility. Caps for office need to be higher in all districts.
- Question 6, Also, south of the station – even more so due to grade.
- Question 25, Remove parking and development caps.
- Question 25, Do not push out auto dealers/repair uses along Walnut/Foothill/Colorado – significant niche services not allowed in other cities. Pasadena needs to retain these businesses to have economic advantage while allowing for more start-up/incubator R+D uses
- Question 25, Increased parking in all areas? Much needed. Redevelopment funds, from where?
- Question 6, Or higher. Question 10, Or higher. As needed to be consistent with existing. Question 13, Or higher. Question 17, Or higher. Question 25, Need to maximize opportunity to provide a strong city budget in order to provide amenities as requested and expected.
- Question 3, Stop the village verbage. Question 5, Why? Question 9, It's already there. Question 12, Your question supports city jobs. We need more public/private jobs. Question 16, I don't like this question – leading question to promote one answer. Question 25, This is a 25 year plan, we are treating it as if it is a 5 to 10 year plan. Again the public I believe has asked for low density less traffic and less congestion. We need to time our traffic lights now to improve flow throughout the city. Pick 10 people off the street who drive and ask what improvements can take place.
- Question 6, Should be context based, not too prescriptive. Gold Line platforms on 210 should be improved (e.g. sound mitigation) and encourage greater use. Question 10, Context based is preferable. Question 17, Building placed adjacent to freeway should impose evidence-based best practices and protect residents from freeway particulate matter. Question 24, Public health impact. Question 25, Please consult the USC research regarding health impacts of residing near freeways. Before we encourage more high density residential along the 210 (even if it is most politically palatable), staff and city elected officials should determine what, if any, mitigating steps can be taken to protect residents, especially children, from high rates of particulate matter.

- Question 25, Need to include Public Education as 8th Guiding Principle. We talk about the physical qualities that make a community rich – what about human infrastructure? Support public schools.
- Question 25, New housing near stations are often targeted at a wealthier demographic, which can often financially block out users more likely to take transit (i.e. students, young professionals). Additionally the areas around Allen Station, PCC are very important, but also extending pedestrian friendly facilities towards Caltech – on Colorado, north of campus. A large number of students live within a block from campus, but don't feel safe walking at night towards Old Town, PCC, Colorado area.
- Question 25, The area around PCC Village should be expanded or transitioned westward along Colorado to serve both the PCC and Caltech communities, with improved access to Colorado from Caltech for cyclists/pedestrians. New housing developments in Pasadena along transit stops are generally prohibitively expensive for most people who would want to live there.
- Question 25, More retail at Allen Station. Keep Lamanda Park non-residential.

Central District/ South Fair Oaks Avenue

Central District

Below is a description of the vision for areas in the vicinity of the Central District. Please indicate your level of agreement.

(Score)

	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
1. Provide additional housing opportunities in the Central District to maintain a mix of uses that allow people to live close to their jobs and commercial services, provide customers for local businesses, and increase opportunities for walking and transit use.	75.0%	13.6%	2.3%	6.8%	2.3%	0.0%	1.3
2. New development should be distributed throughout the Central District on vacant parcels, underused properties such as large surface parking lots, and around Gold Line stations. They should be located and designed to complement the scale and character of adjoining buildings.	65.9%	26.8%	0.0%	4.9%	2.4%	0.0%	1.3
3. New commercial, office, and residential development should be encouraged in the South Lake Avenue corridor to provide jobs and increase the residential population to support local businesses.	38.9%	44.4%	22.2%	11.1%	2.8%	0.0%	1.5
4. New development in the Central District should be regulated through a Form-Based Code (where building heights; property setbacks; relationships to the street; parking location and access; design; and other factors take into consideration the surrounding buildings).	69.2%	20.5%	7.7%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	1.2
5. Higher density developments should be required to provide urban open spaces and amenities on site that are accessible to the public.	44.2%	30.2%	7.0%	9.3%	9.3%	0.0%	1.7
6. The area north of Huntington Memorial Hospital (north of California and west of Fair Oaks) should be developed with (select all that apply) :							
31%	Medical offices, research facilities						
29%	Retail commercial and general offices						
25%	Housing						
15%	Light manufacturing						

7. Buildings along Colorado Boulevard east of Old Pasadena should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

74.4%	Five to six stories (Concept Plan recommendation), consistent with the scale and character of adjoining developments
23.2%	Three to four stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors
2.4%	One to two stories, with no housing on the upper floors

8. Buildings along Lake Avenue north of Green Street should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

87.5%	Five to six stories (Concept Plan recommendation), consistent with the scale and character of adjoining developments
10.0%	Three to four stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors
2.5%	One to two stories, with no housing on the upper floors

9. Buildings along Lake Avenue south of Green Street should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

42.1%	Three to four stories (Concept Plan recommendation), consistent with the scale and character of adjoining developments
5.3%	One to two stories, with no housing on the upper floors
52.6%	Five to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

10. Buildings along Arroyo Parkway south of California should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

5.0%	One to two stories, with no housing on the upper floors
45.0%	Three to four stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors
50.0%	Five to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

11. Buildings along other Central District streets should be no taller than (select one of the following options):

41.0%	Three to four stories (Concept Plan recommendation)
5.1%	One to two stories, with no housing on upper floors
53.8%	Five to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

South Fair Oaks/Fillmore “Transit Village”

Below is a description of the vision for the area around the Fillmore Gold Line Station. Please indicate your level of agreement.

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
12. Properties near the station should be intensified with offices, creative arts uses, housing, live/work, and supporting retail uses to promote transit use and walking, while reducing car use.	73.2%	19.5%	0.0%	4.9%	2.4%	0.0%	1.2
13. Buildings and sidewalks should be improved with more landscaping and attractive lighting, benches, trash containers, signs, and other amenities to promote walking.	73.2%	22.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%	1.1
14. Higher density developments should be required to provide urban open spaces and amenities on site that are accessible to the public.	42.9%	23.8%	14.3%	7.1%	11.9%	0.0%	1.7

15. Buildings should be permitted to be constructed to a maximum height of (select one of the following options):

44.7%	Three to four stories (Concept Plan recommendation), with the tallest buildings concentrated adjoining the transit station and reduced in height with landscaped setbacks as they transition to lower density residential neighborhoods
0.0%	One to two stories, with no housing on upper floors
55.3%	Five to six stories, with housing and/or office uses on the upper floors

Overall Concept for Area

Indicate your overall agreement with the concept plan for the following areas:

(Score)	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree	(0) Don't Know	Avg. Score
16. Central District - General	38.9%	52.8%	2.8%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3
17. Central District - Transit Stations	40.0%	51.4%	2.9%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3
18. Central District - South Lake Avenue	22.2%	47.2%	16.7%	13.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7
19. Central District - Arroyo Parkway	14.5%	65.2%	8.7%	8.7%	2.9%	0.0%	1.8
20. Central District - Playhouse District	37.1%	45.7%	8.6%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4
21. South Fair Oaks/Fillmore Transit Village	32.4%	52.9%	8.8%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%	1.4

22. Select the **two** most important factors that influenced your agreement or disagreement with the draft Concept Plan for the Central District and South Fair Oaks Transit Village areas.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| 11 Provides housing | 4 Too much traffic | 17 Compatible with the community character |
| 9 Not enough housing | 11 Provides jobs | 2 Loss of community character |
| 2 Too much housing | 5 Not enough jobs | 10 Increased revenue to the City |
| 8 Opportunity to reduce trips | 0 Too many jobs | 1 Costs to the City |

General Comments

23. In the space below, please **write any general comments** you have about your likes and dislikes for the Concept Plan for the Central District and South Fair Oaks Transit Village areas.

- Question 23, Don't understand why traffic is increased when concept is to promote walkability and mass transit. Like form based code with public input.
- Question 23, The Central District needs more people to energize it.
- Question 3, Playhouse District. Question 23, The Playhouse District needs more people and pocket parks.
- Questions 7 through 12, No housing.
- Question 23, Thanks for all your thoughtful work on this General Plan.
- Question 23, Parks are essential!
- Question 21, Decrease size of Colorado Blvd. Add bike - eliminate parking. Question, 23 Very much like placemaking concepts, decrease traffic, easier mobility and walkability and more vitality in Central District - esp. Playhouse District. Wider sidewalks! Focus on Fred Kent's inexpensive and simple recommendations that have proven effective!
- Question 5, N/A if follow form based codes. Questions 7 through 11, N/A if using form based codes. Question 11, Building heights should not be used as a criteria for capping development. Question 23, There shouldn't be caps. Please use form based codes. Please maintain an economically diverse population in the Central District. We need to maintain trajectory of the General Plan to continue to grow and develop Pasadena.
- Questions 7 and 8, Or higher. Question 23, Central District is historic core of growth and commerce. This should be maintained and nurtured. Open space needs to be designed to be a true people area not like Bank of America or AT&T.
- Question 8, Or taller. Question 21, Central District - Old Pasadena. Question 22, As areas are downsized. Question 23, I am dismayed to see areas north and south adjacent to Old Pasadena are "downsized" from current plan. Old Pasadena needs opportunities to develop in order to continue providing urgently needed revenue to our city.

- Question 8, Taller. Question 15, 12 stories on Lake north of Green. Question 23, Need a high rise corridor - Lake north of Green. Need walking access and sitting at development areas but not full parks at developments. Urban residential brings stability
Question 6, Moderate to high-density. No to light manufacturing. Question 7, 6-10 stories - Playhouse District has buildings at 8-10 stories why limit to 6? Question 8, 6-10, corporate buildings 6+ stories already existing. Question 23, Who decided that 6 stories would be the maximum building height in the city? The Playhouse District and Corporate-Lake Ave area currently have successful (including many lovely historic properties) building that are already 8-12 stories, and we shouldn't limit new construction to 6 stories where taller buildings might be appropriate. The Central District is an urban area where density and tall buildings are appropriate.
- Question 5, These public spaces need to be designed with people and pedestrians in mind and respecting the urban fabric. Questions 7-11,15, added "or higher." Pasadena has a history of buildings that are over 10 stories. Question 23, Don't limit height and development in the Central District. Pasadena's future economic success is vital to Pasadena's fiscal health. Buildings can be designed to be tall, compatible, and beautiful. A one or two story building won't guarantee compatibility or beauty. I have seen ugly one and two story buildings.
- Question 23, Walkability and good public transportation are important. Transportation needs to form a grid to get us everywhere. Must have great shopping and eating, arts and culture areas/sites. Need great public art.
- Question 2, Where is this new land you want to develop? Question 8, they are already built to that standard. Question 13, This will be necessary to build! Question 21, you have already asked for answers. Some things I like others I don't but filling in one answer here defeats the other questions. Question 23, The traffic on Fair Oaks, Del Mar can't be mitigated because of the Gold Line. I stay away from the Central District and Fair Oaks as much as I can.
- Question 23, Multi-unit housing would be better placed at higher densities near the non-freeway bound stations (i.e. Fillmore, Del Mar, Memorial Park) than directly abutting the 210 due to health (air quality), noise, and aesthetic reasons. The costs of chronic respiratory illness like asthma are borne by the entire community, not just the individual victims, in the form of high hospitalization rates, missed school/work, higher increase premiums, and lower productivity, to name a few.
- Question 23, Remove parking caps and development caps.
- Question 23, California is continuing to GROW and we must plan for GROWTH especially in transportation and housing.
- Question 7, Or higher where "form based" considerations indicate! Question 9, see above there are 8 and 9 story buildings near Cordova and Lake. Question 15, As appropriate. Question 23, This questionnaire, like much of the General Plan documentation, is misleading.

- Question 2, The city should encourage more high density housing throughout the Central District to further the success achieved so far. Question 16-21, High density housing should be encouraged. Question 23, Residents in the Central District have stated at public meetings that high density housing is working very well in that area and want to see more. The city should reconsider increasing current RM densities that are below 48 or 60 units per acre.
- Question 7, More stories. Question 23, Would like buildings along Colorado to be taller. Love form based planning with public input.
- Question 7, Could go 8-10 depending on adjacent. Question 8, Five to 8 stories with residential. Question 15, Up to 6.
- Question 5, Confused by “required” and “public”. Question 7, Or higher. Question 8, Or higher. Question 9, Or higher. Question 10, Consistent with existing. Question 11, Or higher if consistent with surrounding. Question 14, Confused by “required” and “public”. Question 15, Or higher if consistent with existing. Question 22 (added), Central District - Old Pasadena, need opportunity for continued growth. Question 23, Need to maximize opportunity to keep up city growth and development. Necessary to have a healthy city budget in order to compete with adjacent cities.
- Question 11, 2-3 stories, protect mountain views and space. Question 23, I believe the Form-Based Code promises the best chance that what is planned gets built. Stop making “exceptions”.
- Question 7, Or more if appropriate. Question 22 (added), Old Pasadena - has opportunity for significant development on some parcels. Question 23, I believe development should continue to be focused in the Central District. Old Pasadena seems to be a non-topic in this survey, which is incorrect - LOTS of opportunity remains. This area is CRUCIAL to the City’s economy, and density there is crucial to reducing trips/traffic.
- Question 23, Assess parking requirements on development to reduce car capacity to encourage alternate transportation. Integrate bike pathways along South Raymond to connect Gold Line stops
- Question 8, Up to 8-10 stories. Question 23, “High retail” land use policy on South Lake too limiting - should be MU 3-4 stories (or 1-2) to allow flexibility in future. South Lake as a “retail-only” corridor is an outdated image.
- Question 9, 2-3 stories. Question 11, 2-3 stories. Question 15, 2-3 stories.
- I want to register the following deep concerns about this survey. The results may be compromised by several faulty questions, two of which I address below. I voiced these concerns at the Central District discussion table at the June 26th evening workshop, but I do not think the essence of my comments were captured by the staff scribe. I request that you include these comments in the record of public input.
 - Question 2: This question allows only one response for two separate and independent propositions. For example, I strongly agree that “new development should be distributed throughout the Central District on vacant parcels, underused properties such as large surface parking lots, and around Gold Line stations.” But I

do not strongly agree that “they should be located and designed to complement the scale and character of adjoining buildings” because I find the statement vague and open to interpretation.

- Questions 7 and 8: None of the “recommended” height decreases along Colorado Boulevard and North Lake Avenue were identified for participants in the workshop. The building height decreases are very subtly shown in minute print on the General Plan concept map. No corresponding height information was provided for the Existing General Plan map, which many people did not examine anyway.

The bottom line is that 99% of the workshop participants did not understand that the questions are framed to support decreased land use intensity and downzoning along portion of Colorado Boulevard and North Lake - even as such areas are being identified as significant growth “opportunity” areas.

Questions 7 and 8 offer 5-6 stories as the “recommended” upper limit, which is a decrease from the current limits. In fact, every possible response is a downzoning of a current condition, but was not identified as such. The questions should have provided an opportunity to choose the existing height limit in addition to the three choices on the survey. At the very least, the question should have indicated that none of the choices is representative of the current condition.

This problem with the survey instrument was clearly identified in public comments at the June 14th GPUAC meeting. Committee discussion ensued, and City staff and the General Plan consultant stated that the questions would be reviewed and revised. However, they were not revised or restated to provide a clearer picture of what is being “recommended” and reinforced by the survey questions. Thus, I think the questions 7 and 8 are “leading” questions that allow respondents only to support some degree of land use intensity downgrade.

I care about this issue because the draft General Plan concept is seeking to accommodate more jobs and housing near transit and walkable areas. This has the benefit of consuming fewer resources, generating more city revenue, and allowing more people to navigate the city without a car and its associated impacts.

Therefore:

- It doesn’t make sense to remove three or more floors of potential jobs and housing from corridors that are near Gold Line stations and well-served by buses and walkable environments.
- Rather than being similar in scale to adjoining buildings, future development topping out at 5-6 stories - or less - would actually be much lower and inconsistent with historic buildings and other existing structures that exceed 6 stories along Colorado and North Lake in the Playhouse District.

- By pushing new buildings along Colorado and North Lake in the Playhouse District down by two or more stories, the opportunities for ground level courtyards, open space, and other public amenities will decrease as project sponsors are forced to use available space to make their projects pencil out, given high land costs.
- Question 11: This question is so general, it is confusing/misleading. One size does not fit all.
- Question 20: I would strongly agree except for misleading/inappropriate height limits.
- Question 2, Last sentence important! Question 3, and Cal Tech campus yes. Question 5, Need for green space not just “courtyards.” Question 9. 1-2 stories consistent with historic Macy’s and colony centers. Question 10, Only 3 stories, no 4 story buildings until 2035 - reassess them. Question 11, 3-4 stories, fitting with average existing (Form-Based Code). Question 14, Need green spaces to abate heat islands here! Question 22, Create new identity for S. Fair Oaks as gateway from South Pasadena. Question 23, I disliked the limited view of Lake N of Green as permanent high rise offices - 2035 is far enough away we should allow for more adaptive use of the business corridor, especially with a mind to pulling together N Lake and South Lake communities into shopping, working, living, community hub. A serious plan for South Los Robles (between Colorado and Del Mar) should have been included as the large office blocks located there now provide little long term value to the neighborhood, and do not form a cohesive “streetscape”.
- Question 7, I actually don’t support a height limit.
- Question 5, Add community garden space. Question 10, Three stories only. Four is too high. Question 12-4, Yes! Good opportunity!
- Question 23, Need to include support of Public Education as 8th Guiding Principle - all of this work will bring more people...more kids...We need to support public education in all of this!
- Question 21, What about Old Pasadena? Question 23, Don’t limit development in Old Pasadena and nearby areas.
- Question 7, Five to six stories and more - consistent with current code. Question 8, Five to six stories or more - consistent with current code. Question 9, Five to six stories or more - consistent with current code. Questions 7 through 11, I’m confused! Aren’t there buildings 8-10 stories high already? Doesn’t form-based code promote context? Choices seem incomplete - arbitrarily eliminating our current options. Why? Question 22, Increase revenue and cost to city - need data to answer!
- Question 23, The plan should be bolder in incorporating the 7 Guiding Principles part. Walkability - may still not have enough density to really move towards pedestrian/cyclist/public transit lifestyle. Additional residential capability should be added in CD-6 area between Fillmore and Del Mart stations and perhaps other areas.

General Plan Community Forum

Group Notes

Saturday, June 23, 2012

Pasadena City College, Creveling Lounge

TABLE 2: Policies

Session 1

- Education – Connect to General Plan thru
 - Mobility
 - Air Quality
 - Open Space
 - Land Use
- Sustainability – Make sure that it is applied to different policies (with 3 E's – Economics, Environment, Equity)
- Neighborhood Village center – higher residential
 - Preserve and protect single family neighborhoods

Session 2

- Focus on school district
- Shared use of facilities
 - Develop/create ways to interface with PUSD; facilities' use by community
- Address PUSD specifically
 - Sharing of facilities between public and private schools – more integrated with the community
- PUSD is one of the biggest real estate owners
- 8th Guiding Principle – consistent with other Guiding Principles
 - Education – covers public education
- Form-based zoning in Central District
- How about positive change?
 - Some areas will eventually become historic areas – expansion of historic districts
 - Some school sites are potential historic resources (historic preservation)
 - Context of new development with neighboring areas
 - Building height
- 8th Guiding Principle – connect historic preservation and school sites/buildings
 - School district should also support the Guiding Principle
 - Neighborhood connection with the schools
 - Schools as part of neighborhoods
- Affordable housing at all levels

- Balance historic preservation and other concerns (new development, jobs, affordable housing, etc.)

TABLE 4: Central District & South Fair Oaks

Session 1

- What is “infill” development?
 - “California law qualifies a site as infill if the site is in an urbanized area and has been ‘previously developed for qualified urban uses’ or is located adjacent to parcels that are developed with ‘qualified urban uses’ or has a minimum of seventy five percent of the surrounding land developed with ‘qualified urban uses (California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)).” (Source: Center for Creative Land Recycling)
- Historic buildings – 1920s+
 - Some 3+ stories
- C.D. – how does its projected growth compare to other areas?
- Locations for new open space?
- C.D. – why would VMTs per capita increase?
- Lack of parking (costs) for customers and visitors
- Concern about proposed decrease in FAR and height – Walnut, Fair Oaks, Chestnut, Raymond
 - Too restrictive for viable economic development opportunities S. Arroyo and Fair Oaks between Del Mar and Green
 - Stats block
- More subterranean parking desired; less parking on streets/surface
 - To facilitate pedestrian and bicycle transit
- More residential and office development desired at Playhouse and S. Lake – more people means vibrancy, vitality, and activity
- Nodes – more pocket parks, gathering spaces, public spaces (on private and public land)
- Height averaging 6 or 7 stories allowed on S. Lake Avenue?

Session 2

- Green/open space/landscaping needed at Lake and Colorado Blvd (how would it be applied?)
- Affordable housing
- C.D. – open space and design, less density, accessible open space by developers
- Health impact/air quality, need higher standards for residences along freeway
- More flexible to address future knowledge (studies)
- Nina C. – strongly supports form-based codes in the C.D. including parcel by parcel analysis
- Better feedback increase housing/reduce VMT

- More intensity along Fillmore & C.D.-6

TABLE 5: East Pasadena & East Colorado

Session 1

- Need to deal with TOD parking standards
- Entertainment and service uses are missing – needed for village
- Consider integrating density – less nodal and more consistent height
- Entertainment in Lamanda Park and connection to transit node needed (E. Pasadena)
- Isolated restaurants and services not successful
- Bicycles to link areas (Lamanda – E. Pasadena)
- Putting in more housing is short sighted (folks without jobs)
- Flexibility with mix of uses important
- Mobility biggest problem, need for parking for autos regardless
- Concern that transit village is large enough with enough connectivity to neighborhood
- Flexible hours of operation
- Allen Station a potential growth area
- Traffic impact at Sierra Madre/Foothill intersection

Session 2

- Height next to freeway okay
- Development should not wipe out trees
- Concerned about quality of landscaping
- Overflow parking from TOD standards into SFR neighborhoods
- Air quality – housing next to freeway and people is a health impact
- Bus terminal not pedestrian friendly, go through cactus garden to avoid street
- Traffic at Sierra Madre Villa/Foothill intersection bad
- Too much housing may worsen traffic
- Better mobility from Caltech to Colorado, need to consider bike mobility
- As density intensifies, need to maintain efficient traffic flow across freeway
- Consider requiring affordable housing to be built onsite
- Consider reducing number of auto travel lanes on Colorado Blvd to make room for bike lanes

TABLE 6: North Lake & Washington

Session 1

I. Round 1

- How do you link N. Lake and Washington on a more walkable basis?
 - Modify ARTS bus route, make it a figure 8?

- E. Washington parking – minimize spillage into neighborhoods, prevent teardowns, park once concept, diagonal parking (slows down traffic)
- How do you get businesses to revitalize and reinvest in E. Washington?
- State of Washington Theater – preserve or demolish?
- Make E. Washington a place where nearby SFR want to go
- Lake center median landscaping has beautified corridor
- Parking – combo sun shade solar?
 - What is being done to prevent urban heat sink?
- Preserve Lake viewshed – Incorporate form-based code

II. Round 2

- Is there density to support neighborhood-serving amenities and retail?
- Look at Lake holistically – prevent areas that are deserted, ground floor retail all along corridor will be better for SFR
 - Consistent density or less drastic change in density
 - What is the parking situation? Need a structure to avoid lots near homes
 - Focus on mobility, do away with parking lots, transitions from residential to Lake businesses, aesthetics
 - Likes the concept of Del Mar station

Session 2

I. Round 1

- Who pays for increased amenities?
- Home-based businesses – does not want negative impacts on people who work from home
- Could see greater reduction in electricity/water when policies included
- Cannot be too prescriptive (ex. E. Washington) – how does the plan change it?
- Area with a lot of home businesses, incubator areas at E. Washington?

II. Round 2

- Parking – underground? Behind businesses? There are tradeoffs with SFR
- Parking takes away from public space aspect
- No palm trees on Lake, need native trees that set character
- Continuity between jurisdictions, need to have conversation
- Consider increased density and its effects on traffic (Lake is already very congested)
 - Nodes and traffic
- Concern over what is going to be at these nodes
 - “Mom and Pop” shops vs. Ben & Jerry’s or Gap
- Who are the users in this area? Need businesses for SFR/residents
- Community garden at N. Lake
- Food 4 Less site, state of development
 - Cannot have recycle centers at these sites, does not fit into the concept of walkability
 - But need is there for poorer people

- Need diversity of businesses (SE corner of N. Lake and Washington)
- Signage (ex. Insurance business)

TABLE 7: Fair Oaks/Orange Grove & Lincoln

Session 1

I. Round 1

- Parking concerns
- Liquor store prohibition on Lincoln Avenue
- New school on 1200 block of Fair Oaks near E. Claremont
- Retention and rehabilitation of the YWCA
- Crosswalks and pedestrian walks near Kings Village and R&D (Fair Oaks)
- Pedestrian experience from Mountain to Washington on Fair Oaks
 - South side of Orange Grove between Lincoln and Fair Oaks
 - Vons/post office side – improve pedestrian experience
- Designation of R&D/industrial post office

II. Round 2

- Overdevelopment at intersection = traffic impacts
- Can the city take an active approach in implementation of the vision, work with property owners and developers
- Added development is not single family
- Post office
 - Minimize impact of trucks in the area
 - Recycle centers need to move, nuisance, bad aesthetics
- How do you encourage local development? Façade improvement?
- S. Raymond from Mountain to Washington – not walkable, bad aesthetics
- Post office at Fair Oaks and Villa

General Plan Community Forum

Group Notes

Tuesday, June 26, 2012

Pasadena Senior Center

TABLE 2: Policies

Session 1

I. Round 1

- Providing safe routes to public and private schools
- Support for an 8th Guiding Principle
 - Invest in PUSD kids – parents, community, teachers
 - A way to put priority or emphasis on how city can collaborate with the PUSD
 - City to collaborate with PUSD to share resources at 29 sites/school campuses
 - PUSD – strategic plans for community schools
 - City support for public schools
 - Put the school district on the map
- Public schools have cut funding for libraries – each school needs to raise funds to restore their library services
- City libraries can/should extend services to school libraries
- Support for contextual design
- Emphasize preservation
- Retain existing text of Guiding Principle #2
 - Existing text allows for a variety of new architecture
 - We don't want everything to be Craftsman or Spanish
- Preserve affordable housing
 - Too many high-end condos replacing affordable units
- Reconsider Policy 14.5 (1994) that says: No convalescent homes in the NW area (institutional uses)
 - Allow more flexibility

II. Round 2

- Support for 8th Guiding Principle for education – children & youth
 - After-school programs – intervention and prevention
 - Create a city of learning (cradle to grave) education
 - Guiding Principle #6 – needs to be broken out
- Bring other schools to the level of those that already excel

Session 2

- How do new building designs get built?
 - Concern over architectural excellence
- Form-based zoning
- Education
 - Support of 8th Guiding Principle on education – express the City’s interest in public education
 - Education is a fundamental issue in each community

TABLE 4: Central District & South Fair Oaks

Session 1

- Want more residents in Central District (CD) – believe actual demand is higher than forecasts
- Need residential uses to balance other uses – livable communities in C.D.
- Support mix of residential, job-generating, and entertainment uses in C.D. CD has been moving in this direction and need to continue.
- Concerned about preservation of view corridors
- Appropriate to have buildings taller than 6 stories in C.D.
- Zoning incentives to replace inappropriate uses
- Exclusive retail is too limiting along S. Lake
- Support form-based code
- Lake north of Colorado should not be downzoned

Session 2

- Downzoning of NW corner of Lake/Colorado not consistent with existing development
- Need great gathering spaces with great public art
- Caution against over supply of commercial, office, and retail uses versus the demand for these uses
- Need flexible future development to accommodate changing demand as nodes develop (land use flexibility)
- Quickly update specific plans to accommodate new development
- Support for development consistent with taller historic buildings especially in Playhouse District

TABLE 5: East Pasadena & East Colorado

Session 1

- Traffic calming should be put in place to protect bicyclists from faster traffic on Walnut and Colorado in E. Pasadena.
- Plans do not address parking – new parking structures should be built (related to Gold Line extension)
- Good idea to limit housing in Lamanda Park
- Area around Allen Station should include provision for retail
- If current zoning is office, will new mixed use zoning require residential?
- Who decides proximity of uses to promote alternate transportation?
- Change to R&D/flex space could negatively impact existing industrial uses/auto dealers
- What happens to existing uses in areas that are proposed to change land use designations?

Session 2

- Percentage of condos vs. apartments? Percentage of low income? There are more apartments in the city than condos. There should be a policy that addresses this issue.
- More people means more cars, even if the people are near transit
- Passageways between buildings on large blocks is a good idea
- Streetscape improvements will encourage walking
- Mixed use, new urbanist ideas are good
- Placing stores near where people live is a good idea
- Big box retail should be prohibited on E. Colorado
- Parking requirements should be reviewed in proposed neighborhood villages for potential reductions

TABLE 6: North Lake & Washington

Session 1

I. Round 1

- There are too many institutional uses on N. Lake – how do you ensure you get more neighborhood-serving uses?
- Are the inclusion of bioswales, placemaking elements, landscaping, etc. depicted in the renderings required by the city or for developers?
- Housing units concentrated at Lake Station and N. Lake/Washington
- Save view on Lake looking north from south of the freeway
- Covering freeway at Lake Station?
- Concern over buildings at Lake transitioning into SFR – setbacks at rear
- Parking – what are the zoning strategies for N. Lake? Under or above ground?
- Mobility connection between specific plan areas?

- ARTS bus route? Trolley?
- Need for a diversity of uses
- Looking for neighborhood-serving retail

II. Round 2

- Anything in General Plan to make “neighborhood village” work?
- Wish there was more continuity of “neighborhood village” feel at E. Washington
- Restaurants and sidewalk dining for E. Washington
- Historic preservation as economic development
- More trees on Washington
- Want more local restaurants that residents can walk to
- More flexibility about commercial parking in residential areas – it should be okay
- Are overall vehicle trips part of the General Plan?
- Encourage green bike lane on Colorado

Session 2

I. Round 1

- Do we think we will see increase in retail with the changes?
- How will we reduce car use in the area?
- Need a shuttle service connecting N. Lake/Washington to Gold Line station
- Lake is a commuter street, high number of cars traveling through to 210 Freeway
- Pasadena is a built-out city, need to build up
- Auto related stores are a problem in N. Lake

TABLE 7: Fair Oaks/Orange Grove & Lincoln

Session 1

- Blight
- Neighborhood-serving uses
- The Specific plan needs a little more steering (direction)
- Require more neighborhood commercial along Orange Grove
- Improve Mid Fair Oaks area
- Jackie Robinson Center good for redevelopment
- Scary feeling in the area
 - Crime
 - No amenities
 - Bad roads
- Provide links to the Rose Bowl
- R&D uses need to be actively pursued

- Expand transit capacity
- Parking issues for commercial component of mixed use
- Aging community – need services for this group

Session 2

- Walkability – hazard concerns
- Employ traffic calming measures
- Encourage family-oriented uses
 - Pocket park opportunities
 - Banks
 - Restaurants, services
 - Grocery
- Promote interesting architecture to redefine area
- Arterial aspect of Fair Oaks Avenue?
 - Empty promise, make priority
 - Aesthetics, livability
- Partnership with property owners to develop and implement
- Multimodal N. Fair Oaks
- Look at SFO for a good example to emulate