<u>THEME 1</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.

Theme 1 – East Pasadena/Colorado

Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

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

1. The alternative should provide an opportunity for increased commercial recreation and entertainment activities in East Pasadena (i.e. skating rink, theaters, etc.).

   Mean = 2.2 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

   - *Family/Youth centers*
   - *Higher density for commercial within ½ mi of station*
   - *Yes more development, but not a regional draw; local-serving*
   - *No!!! No skating rink in this area! The other entertainment options are ok.*
   - *A track and field, maybe on top of a building*

2. The Edison right-of-way in East Pasadena (a piece of the regional open space network called the Emerald Necklace)

   - *Is being analyzed by the County—ensure coordination with their work*

   a. Should be designed to encourage passive recreation (i.e. hiking trails, etc.)

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

      - *Those can be built <u>around</u> active recreation.*

   b. Open space in East Pasadena should be designed to encourage active recreation (i.e. sports courts, playgrounds, ball fields, etc.)

      Mean = 2.6 *Median = 3* *Mode = 1*

      - *Need to use existing school facilities for programmed activities, keep natural open space natural!*
      - *Plenty of park already, use school grounds*

   c. Open space in East Pasadena should be designed to encourage both passive and active recreation.

      Mean = 1.8 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

- *With an emphasis and priority on "passive" recreation*
- *Already enough parks and school facilities*
- *Passive (not active) recreation*

3. The Emerald Necklace (Edison right-of-way) that runs north to south should be connected to allow for continuous open space and recreation areas.

   Mean = 1.8 *Median = 1* *Mode = 1*

   - *Can be a foot/bike path—doesn't need to be parklike*
   - *Talk to County!*

4. New open space in East Pasadena should be funded/created from:
   a. Re-designing the existing public right of way (streets, sidewalks, etc.)

      Mean = 1.9 *Median = 2* *Mode = 2*

   b. Landowners giving easements that allow access

      Mean = 2.2 *Median = 2* *Mode = 2*

      - *Would be nice, but shouldn't rely on this alone*

   c. Collection of fees on new development to assist the city in purchasing property

      Mean = 2.1 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

5. Building heights along East Colorado should be designed to minimize obstruction of views.

   Mean = 1.8 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

   - *Nice idea but not conducive to density needed to support dedicated street car.*
   - *With attention also paid to lower heights in transition areas adjacent to single-family areas*
   - *It already is obstructed!*
   - *Not higher than 3-4 stories*

General Comments

- *Increase the allowable park for office 4 ½ / 1000 in the TOD*
- *Not sure we need more pocket parks—existing pocket parks in East Pasadena are not used to any great extent.*
- *This is a completely unacceptable alternative as is.*
- *Note: No question about proposed Lake to Rosemead dedicated street car loop. Not enough density to support. Will still sap downtown vitality.*
- *Development in East Pasadena should be slow growth. Why does Pasadena keep developing while Sierra Madre stays the same?*
- *Build communities around schools. Use school properties for public purposes—community centers, parks, etc.*

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

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 not 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 like 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*

- *Throughout Central District*
- *Need jobs/housing mix. We have surface parking lots on Coloardo! Colorado should have more retail/office.*
- *Need jobs and 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 only if the City acquires significant 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 not address this at all.*
- *I support an 8th principle that focuses on the importance of public education to all sectors of Pasadena. Principle 6 does not address this!*
- *Vital 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 most important to me in this regard is to develop a rich "necklace" of retail opportunities, low scale, that connects Northwest Pasadena to all the rest of Pasadena. It is way too isolated, and has a lot of potential for vibrant enrichment. 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 increase 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*

<u>THEMES 3</u>
NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 2, NOVEMBER 12

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?*
- *<u>Increase</u> 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 4
NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 2, NOVEMBER 12

Theme 4 – Sustainability

Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

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

1. Neighborhood-serving commercial uses (i.e. small grocery stores) should be allowed in single family areas.

   Mean = 1.9 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

- *On a case by case basis*
- *Adjacent/along ___/at nodes*
- *Where there is a need, this provides a desired service. Must be designed with context of neighborhood in mind to determine if this is even appropriate.*
- *No!*
- *On a carefully limited basis—define "in"*
- *Depends on where—perhaps at a vacant school in transition areas?*

2. In addition to transit stations, "mini" nodes should be developed to provide a mix of uses that promote walking and biking and services close to neighborhoods.

   Mean = 1.8 *Median = 1* *Mode =1*

   - *Where the station (like Allen) connects to PCC, the nodes should expand to ½ mile radius and encourage mixed-use development and walkability from the station to Colorado shops/PCC*
   - *In <u>addition</u> to increased capacity in the Central District*

3. A density that allows for second units should be created around the Allen Avenue light rail station, north of the freeway.

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

   - *Planning should allow for much high density as time moves forward.*
   - *What does this mean?*
   - *Provided it stops there and does not bleed into other areas.*
   - *Senior units only.*

4. Development surrounding the Memorial Park and Del Mar transit stations should be lower in intensity and height from other transit stations due to their historic setting.

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

   - *Very intense but <u>never</u> more than 3 ½ stories*
   - *Need to be sensitively designed regardless of height, density*

- *Density in the Central District is working!*
- *There should not be any more development at these areas.*
- *Maybe—but we shouldn't stifle development to the point that we end up with milquetoast, boring, forgettable buildings whose only strength is that they aren't completely objectionable to historic.*

5. The proposed sustainability alternative should rely upon the Draft Bikeway Master Plan.

Mean = 1.9 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

- *It should complement it…*
- *Perhaps an enhanced version of DBMP*
- *This statement is misleading—the alternative should be the basic premise, bike plan should support needs of plan as needed.*
- *Still in draft form, but yes in principle.*
- *It will change.*
- *Walking, biking, public transit and jobs/housing balance are all part of sustainability*
- *I think results from bike usage are going to be of marginal benefit*
- *No, wrong question! The Bike Plan should fit the land use—does it?*

6. The alternative includes enough bikeway facilities.

Mean = 1.9 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

- *Why does Pasadena hate bicycles? Keep visual interest in mind.*
- *Bike storage safety at Del Mar—more and more people are taking their bicycles on the Gold Line—a real problem because theft is common at Del Mar Station*
- *More is better in this case but they are space-intensive. Maybe increase at a later date.*
- *Also need to address lockers, showers, racks, etc.*
- *Unable to determine. What alternative? How many?*
- *But may need more defending on public feedback.*
- *Don't see any in the Central District*
- *Don't know.*
- *Don't know.*

General Comments

- *We need an army of small buses and large vans free and available to all to reduce increased pressure on Gold Line parking structures—I drive to my Gold Line station because not safe to walk home in dark. Perhaps funded through a bond—the idea is analogous to "universal" design—grab a van no matter your age.*
- *Add an 8th principle—Public Education Principle. Affects housing, affects transportation, affects open space.*
- *These two proposals are excellent!*
- *The proposal to increase housing density within ½ km and 1 km of Metro light rail is a fantastic opportunity to increase livability and economic vibrancy.*
  1) *It supports Pasadena's sustainability goals and is a classic urban move with little cost to the City.*

2) *It upgrades urban life in Pasadena with key amenities that exist away from the urban core.*
3) *It provides a strong patronage for new nodes of density in East Pasadena—very compelling*
4) *Dovetails well with other "green" initiatives throughout the City*
5) *Provides for the activation and renewal of key stretches of Walnut Ave, bridging the connection to increased development along the proposed Colorado Corridor with increased housing and live/work.*

- *Workforce housing opportunities in Playhouse District.*
- *Proposed park on municipal lot at Union/El Molino would be an excellent bike-serving stop/service area. Add to Alt. 4 map.*
- *Union bikeway should be emphasized.*
- *"Smart growth" concept should include housing, jobs growth in Playhouse District, to create critical mass for walk/bike/transit. Urban village, with Park Once garages to support pedestrian environment*
- *Business necklace—connecting all of the business section to each other*
- *I support the addition of an 8th principle making clear the importance of support of city government for the public school system.*
- *Get rid of traffic calming curbs—dangerous for bicycles! Collaborate with new Huntington Ranch to design community food gardens—especially at schools*
- *Please look at putting a community garden (or gardens) in the schools or the areas owned by CalTrans (at the end of Waverly, just off Orange Grove)*
- *Plant native trees and plants in parkways—no more palm trees*
- *I would like to see included in all plans for open space and city land the use of not only drought-tolerant, but native California plants. There are many economic, environmental and other benefits to doing so, but most importantly it preserves our sense of place here in California. More Oak trees! Less fan palms and Gingko!*

THEME 5
NOVEMBER CHARRETTE – DAY 2, NOVEMBER 12

Theme 5 – Economic Vitality

Rate with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree

Northwest Area (along major street corridors)

a) The following land use should be considered for the Northwest Area:

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

	Mean	Median	Mode
Mixed use with residential uses above retail on ground floor	*1.7*	*1*	*1*
Neighborhood serving commercial	*1.7*	*1*	*1*
Professional services that provide local employment opportunities	*1.6*	*1*	*1*
Improved streetscape design and pedestrian activity	*1.3*	*1*	*1*

- *Don't know this area but will visit!*
- *(Neighborhood serving commercial): walkable, not strip mall*
- *(Neighborhood serving commercial): not sure what this means*
- *With good paying jobs*

b) For the types of new uses identified above, what height is appropriate for new development in the Northwest area?

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

	Mean	Median	Mode
One story	*2.0*	*1*	*1*
Two to three stories	*1.6*	*1*	*1*
Three to four stories	*2.4*	*2*	*2*
Four to five stories	*3.4*	*4*	*5*
Five or more stories	*3.6*	*5*	*5*

- *This is too vague! Depends on location!*
- *Lots are not deep enough to support larger developments.*
- *Look to surrounding historic development or SFH and make an appropriate transition*
- *It depends on location and use.*
- *Depends on location and use.*
- *Depends on what part of Northwest. Should be determined block by block.*
- *[4 to 5 stories] Near Lake*
- *[1 story] if feasible economically—may not be*

East Pasadena (east of Allen Avenue between Foothill and Colorado Boulevards)

c) The following land use should be considered for the East Pasadena Area:

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

	Mean	Median	Mode
Office	*2.2*	*2*	*1*
Research and development	*1.7*	*1*	*1*
Mixed Use	*1.8*	*1*	*1*
Commercial (retail and/or restaurant)	*1.8*	*1*	*1*

- *It would be good to develop a few "hang out" places near Allen Station. If you get off a train at night there are no good places to eat or to wait for someone to pick you up.*

d) For the types of new uses identified under c, what height is appropriate for new development for East Pasadena area?

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

	Mean	Median	Mode
One story	*1.8*	*1*	*1*
Two to three stories	*1.6*	*1*	*1*
Three to four stories	*2.4*	*2*	*2*
Four to five stories	*2.9*	*3*	*5*
Five or more stories	*3.3*	*4*	*5*

- *Workforce housing opportunities available in Playhouse District.*
- *Height should be governed by adjacent sensitive uses—SFH and historic buildings. If none, then appropriate height to preserve views to mountains or other scenic vistas*
- *It depends*
- *A mix [of heights]*
- *Again, depends on location*

Central District

e) What height is appropriate for new development for the Central District?

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

	Mean	Median	Mode
One story	*2.5*	*2*	*1*
Two to three stories	*2.1*	*2*	*1*
Three to four stories	*2.5*	*2*	*2*
Four to five stories	*2.6*	*2*	*5*
Five or more stories	*3.1*	*4*	*5*

- *(All 1s circled) All of these are appropriate, to be determined on a case by case basis. Higher density closer to Colorado, transit/bus routes and stations.*
- *Provide commercial/retail growth for Playhouse District portion of Central District. Underutilized parcels on major commercial thoroughfares.*
- *But this depends on location*
- *Depends on adjacent historic structures—height should be compatible with nearby structures!*
- *It depends on use, neighboring properties*
- *Depends upon adjacent buildings*
- *Depends on site and design*

f) The future residential capacity of the Central Corridor should be increased

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

Mean = 2.5 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

- *East of Lake*
- *(1 circled) Yes!*
- *(1 circled) Most definitely there are only 500 units left in the cap.*
- *(2 circled) Yes, but be careful of mass/scale/height near historic buildings and traffic/parking impacts.*
- *Increased—Yes!*
- *We need to include more affordable housing*
- *From where to where? Yes—Lake moving East. No West of Lake.*

South Arroyo/South Fair Oaks/ South Raymond Corridor

g) Residential uses shall be allowed in the Corridor

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

Mean = 2.2 *Median = 2* *Mode = 1*

- *(2 circled) Especially around Gold Line Stations, but this does not replace the need for more housing in the Central District which should be increased.*
- *Great Park Concept should not preclude smaller economy-serving parks within Central District, i.e. proposed parks over parking at El Molino/Union and Madison Municipal Lots. Show these on map too!*
- *Pure residential or mixed use? If these are to be retail corridors, then should be retail at ground, housing above*
- *More light industrial east of Altadena, south of Corson, north of Colorado and west of Sierra Madre Villa*
- *Need connectivity/transport between Sierra Madre Villa office space/R & D and Caltech/PCC corridor*
- *Connect all of the business sectors by public transportation "Business Necklace?"*
- *What kind? What happened to the "BioTech" Corridor??*