

NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 1, NOVEMBER 11
THEME #3 – Reduced Capacity

Large Group Discussion, prior to break out groups.

- Lower densities than ex. G.P. [General Plan]
- Reduce the C.D. [Central District]
- Reduce around SFR [single family residences] or transition areas
- Reduce in areas where there are less services/transit
- No buildings higher than 3 stories
- Purchase/use vacant lots for open space
- Increase historic districts
- Constrain mobility
- Expansion of existing uses

NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 1, NOVEMBER 11
THEME #3 – Reduced Capacity

- Expand historic districts – not easy to do changes
- Down zone
- Reduce densities
- No net new car trips citywide - balancing type of development – shaping type of use
- Limiting car capacity (not people)
- Infrastructure capacity
- Conversion of uses
- Reuse/re-adaptive
- Use of rooftops relative to height concerns
- Can grow some, but not as much as in general plan
- Capping growth in single-family areas – including second units
- Limiting growth to existing commercial corridors
- Infrastructure (water, electricity, sewer, car trips, etc.) no net new – need to establish baseline
- Central District off table for growth
- Increase caps in other specific plan area
- Scale of building/heights - way to control caps
- Parks as tool to reduce capacity and park over 710 freeway stub and over freeway east of Lake Ave.
- Lincoln Ave. – mixed use 2-3 story
- Emerald Horseshoe → Arroyo → AH → Eaton → South
- No development in single family area
 - Protect low density
 - Flexibility for large lot home (eg. Granny flats)
- Washington Blvd./Lake Ave. – greater density/2 stories
- Colorado Blvd. – keep as is – should Colorado be limited to 2 stories?
- Limit development on SF [single family] areas
- Development on corridors
- Limit type of development on corridors (capacity)
- Colorado Blvd. light industrial – 2 stories – on East Colorado
- Reducing heights on view corridors
- Protect view sheds

NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 2, NOVEMBER 12
THEME #3 – Reduced Capacity

CAP

- 6 million square feet remaining commercial capacity in Central District

Remaining

- 3.7 million square feet commercial space within cap NOT ENTITLED
- Housing: 764 within cap NOT ENTITLED
- Allocation to sites related to cap – reduce cap with reduced max FAR
→ find to zoning
- How to reduce?
- 3-story cap? Community Viz can calculate square footage
- Location of housing? Capacity to build out dwelling units in 2-stories? Or more/less sites needed?
- Zoning now allows for mix of uses
- Opportunities for adaptive re-use of historic structures?
- Possible incentives to increasing housing in Playhouse District
- Smaller, family-friendly housing
→ Earlier (pre-2004) policy had sub-area caps, no longer in place
- Do some sub-districts “want” housing?
- Concerns – height, historic, canyon effect, crowded sidewalks, BIG BUILDINGS DISLIKED
- Desires: Not more “imposing” than now, views, 3-story density.
- CRITICISM of 3-story
 - context of adjacent properties
 - courtyard/landscaping
 - lower coverage
 - variety
 - 4 or 5 may work
- Specific site characteristics relevant – parking, single story commercial may offer opportunities
- Not a lot of choices for development
- What to assume about surface parking? “Pasadena” quality
- “Postcard to the world”

Central District

Key Points for Community Viz:

- How much capacity would be logical to move from Central District to other corridors
- For what remains → 3 story building
- How do we incentivize uses in this district
- Win-win to have more residential

- How much?
- What form?
- What use?
- Reduce FAR
 - Reducing FAR for residential
- Less commercial
- Equal or more housing (Ken McCormack ex. Union & El Molino)
- Equality – small – family friendly
 - List of Qualities
 - Small family-friendly (e.g. McCormack Project Union & El Molino)
 - Scale of Old Pasadena
 - Restrictions on height-
- Height limit adjustments
- Density bonus
- Look at a number – choose that number and move it out to other corridors
- Community Viz test
 - Reduce large commercial office → pull
 - 1/2 (50%) reduction of large commercial
 - Keep medium high residential
 - Keep support services – stores/markets, mom & pop support to residential
 - No strip mall format
 - Walk-able retail

NW [Northwest]

- Need neighborhood serving commercial
- N. Fair Oaks – need neighborhood serving commercial
- Need amenities
- Housing opportunities
- Need to capture the Lincoln corridor
- 4 areas
 - Washington
 - Fair Oaks
 - Lincoln
 - Orange Grove & Los Robles
- Need parking
- Connector of bike lane from La Pintoresca up to NW – to Washington corridor
- Want housing in major corridors
- 2-story housing = (on shallow lots – where to put parking)
- Shared parking agreements
- Narrowing street – create diagonal parking on Washington
- Mixed use on Orange Grove – intensify
- Commercial corridors no higher than 2 stories – (this is from NW folks) preference
 - Streetcar up to NW up Fair Oaks/Lake – Washington

- Any transit S/B safe for kids with transit a corridor can become more vibrant
- Historic re-use
- New building for housing
- Concentrated new development Res & Comm. on corridors
- Connecting trolley from Washington to Allen Station corridor
- Making connections
- Increasing walk-ability
- Sidewalks are too narrow
- Safety for kids
- Our task was to redistribute development
- NW: increase N/S link age – NW
- Bike-ability
- Workforce housing at Huntington – is there an opportunity for this?
- Workforce Housing – for whom?
 - Nurses
 - employees from Huntington for staff
- Modest housing by Huntington
- -Address restrictions for housing in S. Fair Oaks specific plan
- -Light Industrial → R&D on S. Fair Oaks by Huntington → Flex Use → Excluding competing uses
- Corridor between PCC & Sierra Madre on Colorado needs upgrade → Lamanda Park
- Attractiveness
- Sidewalk quality/landscaping/cost-sharing
- Arts-lofts
- Preservation of mom & pops
- Spruce-up but not replace
- Appropriate land use – but improve attractiveness
- Trolley to connect to this area
- *Preserve use mix – with connectivity and improvements + improve parking
- (all areas – parking concerns)
- Want neighborhood serving commercial
- East Colorado – move R&D N. or Colorado
- East Pasadena – create village feel. Urban open space
- Eastern gateway – Regional → Arts & culture / urban open space – gathering place
- With transition zone
- Reducing capacity within Central District
- Growth will occur – next generation
- No growth still includes pocket parks, transit, parking for transit
- Possible 3 story height limit in the Central District
- Cut the 1994 CD capacity, redistribute to other areas
- Transfer of development rights

- Provide a range of housing options
 - How do we meet those housing needs
- A city with distinct district
- Incentives for reducing fees in other areas (Residential units)
 - (not a trio project)
 - Possibly target Playhouse District
- Concern of Manhattan-ization of Pasadena
- The concern is the development intensity of a parcel
- Reduce the cap and reduce intensity to FAR 2.0
- Is there a way to build residential in the CD that are low capacity (reduce the scale) (un-Trio like) (family friendly)
- How many parcels are left for adaptive reuse/historic
- Parking lots (surface) vs. parking structures

NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 3, NOVEMBER 13
THEME #3 – Reduced Capacity

Policies

- Move to form-based code, not FAR [floor area ratio] (site-specific), integrate form-based code with form-based derived FAR [floor area ratio]
- No net trips is a capacity constraint though it would/could allow more people
- Similarly infrastructure – no net “increase”
- Prohibit demolition of courtyard (low density) housing (“affordable”) with new units
- Downzone all higher density sites allowing density bonus to take density back up to full density – assume all will have density bonuses
- Focus housing funds on family housing projects
- Require inclusionary on site
- No net increase in resource consumption (e.g. water, trips)
- Tie to available or new park space – requirement
- Bona fide open space – not counting balconies, eg
- Every parking space is a destination (i.e. a trip) in traffic studies
- Unbundle parking (+ charge) for residential development
- No net loss of park or open space
- Can light rail service actually be increased? Impacts on streets?
- Reduce heights in CD to encourage growth in other areas
- Never even increase any cap anywhere
- Couple non residential growth to population change & limit population growth
- Allow certain job-based uses (eg flex space) in addition to neighborhood commercial
- Space for Cal Tech incubation.
- Couple commercial growth to local needs of residents and institutions.
- If limiting development we don’t have regional corporate offices, so be it.
- “Ugly factor,” size and mass.
- Use “median,” neighborhood compatibility for non-residential
- No variances
- No adjustment permits
- No tearing down trees.
- Establish and enforce absolute prohibitions (eg. Certain protected trees)
- Need citywide design guidelines similar to new corridor guidelines
- Zoning code is maximum, not minimum
- No 3 story adjacent to single family house
- Count affordable units against caps
- Out law motels (new)

Reduce caps

- CD [Central District] – reduce to .5 million from existing entitled

- EC [East Colorado] –
 - FOOG [Fair Oaks Orange Grove] – no change
 - EP [East Pasadena] – allow 2 story on available sites 3 on sites south of Foothill
 - SFO [South Fair Oaks] – 275,000
 - WG [West Gateway] – 0
 - NL [North Lake] – No change (beyond entitlement)
-
- CD [Central District] – 150 beyond entitlement number
 - EC [East Colorado] – No change
 - NL [North Lake] – 150
 - EP [East Pasadena] – No change
 - FOOG [Fair Oaks Orange Grove] –
 - SFO [South Fair Oaks] – 100 SR [senior] and student only
 - WG [West Gateway] – 0
 - Non SP [Specific Plan] Commercial – 1.25 M [million]