

1 COMBINED MEETING OF THE SOUTH PASADENA CITY PLANNING  
2 COMMISSION, CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION, AND DESIGN  
3 REVIEW BOARD

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 REPORTER'S ROUGH DRAFT OF PROCEEDINGS

15

16 DATE: TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2018

17 LOCATION: LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM  
18 1115 EL CENTRO STREET  
SOUTH PASADENA, CALIFORNIA

19 TIME: 7:03 P.M. TO 9:26 P.M.

20

21

22 REPORTED BY: DIANE CARVER MANN, CSR 6008

23

24

25

26

1 SOUTH PASADENA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2018

2 -000-

3 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

4

5 MR. WATKINS: Before we turn it over to Kaizer,  
6 we have formalities to take care of. I'm going to ask  
7 the chair of each commission or vice-chair or whoever  
8 else is here from the commission to do roll call and  
9 declare if we're not going to have a quorum. We'll  
10 start with Steve Dahl of Planning Commission.

11 COMMISSIONER DAHL: Steve Dahl from Planning  
12 Commission. I'm here, and we also have Kelly Koldus,  
13 and we have Richard Tom so we have a quorum. We are  
14 missing, excused absence, Janet Braun is not here  
15 tonight. She told us ahead of time she's not going to  
16 be here. And we have one vacancy, so if you live in  
17 South Pasadena and you want to sign up and you're well  
18 qualified and you have a sense of humor, apply to city  
19 hall, and you can join us. But we have a quorum. Mark?

20 MR. Gallatin: Thank you, Dave. I'm mark gal  
21 tin vice-chair of Cultural Heritage Commission. I'll  
22 officially call our special meeting of February 13 to  
23 order. In addition to myself I see we have commissioner  
24 Becky Thompson here, and excused tonight is commissioner  
25 Steve Friedman, who is under the weather. We now have a

1 quorum commissioner John Lesak.

2 Commissioner Gallatin: And absent is  
3 commissioner Victor Holtz.

4 Mr. Lopez: My name is conrado lopez. I'm the  
5 chair of the Design Review Board. And tonight we have  
6 mark Smeaton, and we have Leer (inaudible), so she's a  
7 new member, so I apologize. And two other members jAMES  
8 FENSKE, and -- who am I missing? -- Michael Lejeune  
9 are not present, but three of us make a quorum.

10 DIRECTOR WATKINS: After the meeting I'll ask  
11 you to formally adjourn your regular meeting. We'll  
12 start with Kaizer, who will be running us through basic  
13 form-based code and open the discussion for everyone.

14 MR. RANGWALA: Before I get started, I know I  
15 was watching my members who made this announcement. If  
16 you cannot hear me, please come closer, because I'll try  
17 to raise my voice as much as I can.

18 David, do you know if the Mic is working?

19 DIRECTOR WATKINS: Or the one next to it.

20 MR. RANGWALA: Can you hear me in the back?  
21 I'm more comfortable without it. Thank you. If you  
22 cannot, please raise your hand. I'll raise my voice.  
23 This is going to be a different meeting. If you've been  
24 in meetings in the past the ones you've conducted before  
25 in that this is a participatory meeting. It's not for

1 my benefit. This meeting is for your benefit so you get  
2 more if you ask questions, so I'm not going to go  
3 through this all by myself. If you have a question,  
4 somebody can raise your hand, ask and we'll get through  
5 as much as we can. There's no set agenda. But I want  
6 to give you as much information as is available on this  
7 format of coding and on the draft form-based code that  
8 we currently have, and it's available on our website.

9           Why code? Planning commissioners or design  
10 review, why have codes at all? What's the purpose of  
11 codes?

12           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: They provide  
13 certainty.

14           MR. RANGWALA: What else?

15           COMMISSIONER DAHL: Guidance.

16           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Direction. Consistency.  
17 Framework for staff.

18           MR. RANGWALA: If you are a designer, what does  
19 code do for you?

20           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Makes my life hell.

21           MR. RANGWALA: I was expecting that. So you  
22 see it as something constraining. That's a good word.  
23 I see it slightly differently, and this is a paradigm  
24 shift. You don't have to agree with me. Feel free to  
25 disagree. From my office I got on freeway, and I go

1 safely. Why? Because we have codes. It's actually if  
2 I drive in my lane, I know somebody else will drive in  
3 their lane and they will signal, and hopefully they will  
4 signal.

5 I drop my three daughters to school every  
6 morning. I know there are regulations are in place that  
7 they will be treated well and get a good sound  
8 education. So codes for me are liberating. If you  
9 think about it in that perspective if they are written  
10 well, they provide both the developer certainty that, if  
11 I go and I comply through this process he or she will  
12 see a light at the end of the tunnel.

13 But from the residents' perspective it offers  
14 predictable if written well saying this is going to give  
15 me predictable outcomes. We'll talk about those and how  
16 they get messed up oftentimes.

17 Before we do that, just roughly the format we  
18 have in place. Again we'll get to as much as we can.  
19 We don't have to go through the end so at some point if  
20 you're tired just stop and we'll all go home. So I  
21 intend to give you a little bit about fundamentals of  
22 form-based code, what's in it, what are criteria, what  
23 are foundational elements and talk about spatial review.  
24 It's different than a conventional Zoning Code, which is  
25 two-dimensional. This deals with spatial review and

1 requires different tools.

2           That's where some of the guys sitting in the  
3 front, you are the gatekeepers in the community.

4 Designers, developers. So what does expertise require  
5 in the process? We'll talk about different review

6 formats. There is a variety of formats that are

7 available, and we'll talk about what fits and what makes  
8 sense for South Pasadena. We'll do that collectively.

9 There are some recommendations made, but we'll see where  
10 that goes.

11           Then I'll tell this up front: There is no such  
12 thing as a perfect code. Perfect code is a myth.

13 Right? We take a best guess and try to utilize vision  
14 in the codes. Then we test one, and by that I mean we

15 try it on projects; right? And we use it for a year.

16 We get 85 percent of it right, great. 15 percent is

17 still a work in progress. We fix it. We learn by

18 testing it. We learn by using it, and to the extent we

19 can use from now onwards until the time it is adopted to

20 test products, or it could be testing what your staff is

21 doing right now in their offices, projects that will

22 prove saying how does this code perform with those

23 projects? Does it allow for good judgment? So that's

24 the format. The fundamentals.

25           Anybody read Phillip Howard? He's a lawyer by

1 profession and is also an author. He wrote a book  
2 called "death of common sense." In the book he talks  
3 about -- I'll give you an example that will set the  
4 context more. Silicon in this country can only be sold  
5 in bags that have a stamp on it that says hazardous  
6 material. Should not be consumed. I mean, you see toys  
7 all the time, don't swallow this or it can choke you.  
8 You see those labels all the time on products. What is  
9 silicone?

10 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Sand.

11 MR. Rangwala: Beaches are filled with it. So  
12 he's talking about again, as I was saying, it's  
13 liberating to have codes because it provides assurance  
14 that, if I invest in my property and build this  
15 million-dollar home and the person around me is not  
16 going to build something that will devalue my property,  
17 so that's the confidence that I have.

18 Laws that aspire FOR completeness sayING, let's  
19 code everything, LET'S code this, code that and have a  
20 comprehensive document that's a hundred pages long, it  
21 doesn't leave much room for judgment, and judgment is  
22 incredibly important when you are designing a city and  
23 when you're building a city that's going to last  
24 hundreds of years.

25 And then Winston church hill right after 1944

1 or '45, he was protesting against -- advocate of free  
2 market protesting against regulations people were  
3 putting that would STYMIE businesses from doing  
4 competitive open market trade. And he said if you make  
5 10,000 regulations, you lose all respect for the law.  
6 So the point I'm making is that the code is not perfect,  
7 it needs to be flexible between two extremes to ALLOW  
8 creativity, but it also needs to be predictable and  
9 produce predictable outcomes for people who live in the  
10 community so it allows flexibility for designers,  
11 flexibility for applicational judgment, also produces  
12 predictable outcomes. It's the stress between the two,  
13 and happy is somewhere between.

14           You find me oftentimes saying, "that makes  
15 sense. That makes sense too." There are contradictory  
16 viewpoints; right? But somewhere in the middle is a  
17 balance, and that's what we need to search this evening  
18 and in the next few months. The vision that the  
19 community came together and put in place at the  
20 charrette is based on the ground realities. We went  
21 through to find a process. We worked in general and  
22 goal was to strive in balance in being flexible at the  
23 same time producing predictable outcomes.

24           I'm sorry if this is too small, but here are  
25 the tools we currently use. We have a General Plan, and

1 the plan essentially uses colors. So you see colors.  
2 The yellows on the map are what? Anybody want to take a  
3 guess? Residential. What would be the red?  
4 Commercial. What other colors do you see? Do you see  
5 some pink for office? Does it give you any idea about  
6 whether the residential is a gated subdivision, a single  
7 family subdivision or a complete neighborhood? In terms  
8 of pink or salmon, does it give you any sense if it's  
9 office park or a downtown setting? In terms of  
10 commercial does it give you any clue about whether it's  
11 asking and aspiring to have shopping centers or shops?

12 We also have in General Plan total plan. Total  
13 takes all of the growth and says, okay, in the next 20  
14 years we are projecting 500 units which is going to  
15 produce 5,000 -- increase 5,000 in the next years on our  
16 streets. Then streets need to be recalibrated, wider  
17 whatever it is. And they base on capacity and volume  
18 and speed. But does it give any clue about whether it's  
19 a Main Street, a highway, primary Avenue? So it's  
20 silent on the type of places that you want to create.

21 And all that gets codified with the zoning, so  
22 the same crayola colors get codified with the zoning  
23 regardless of type of place. You're all silent. You're  
24 getting what I'm saying, or you're bored. Which is it?  
25 Questions? Does this make sense? Okay. Joanne, make

1 sense?

2 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Yeah.

3 MR. Rangwala: Okay. More to come. I'm making  
4 sure you're not bored. Okay. So when you talk about  
5 form-based code -- yes.

6 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: You mentioned awhile  
7 back regular code was two-dimensional, but you have  
8 setbacks, high density, FAR's, so that's kind of  
9 three-dimensional.

10 MR. Rangwala: It is, but it's blunt. Let me  
11 give you two examples. You mentioned setbacks. Now,  
12 typical code has typical setback of minimum ten foot.  
13 Where can I place with that setback? Minimum ten foot,  
14 ten feet? Okay. Where else can I place it with a  
15 minimum setback, front setback ten foot where can I  
16 place my building on the lot?

17 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: 15, 20, 30.

18 COMMISSIONER DAHL: A hundred feet.

19 MR. RANGWALA: 150 feet. So you can get  
20 buildings on Mission Street or shopping centers on  
21 Fair Oaks. It's a blunt tool, not precise. You can get  
22 all the variations in between. Let me give you another  
23 example. F.A.R., that's your controlling code right  
24 now. You mentioned that. An F.A.R. of one, a variation  
25 which essentially says this is my lot, this table, and

1 that's one acre, and if the F.A.R. is one, I can exclude  
2 this like a cube of butter, one story tall right? If my  
3 F.A.R. is two high how -- how high can I go?

4 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: That's not part of the  
5 F.A.R. it's somewhere else in the code. I can build a  
6 one-story building that covers the entire lot.

7 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Or two-story building.

8 MR. Rangwala: What if four story and only  
9 cover half the lot then some of you have 625 Fair Oaks a  
10 four story building next to single-family residence so  
11 these are the challenges that we're trying to overcome  
12 and the conventional code's reliance on minimum setbacks  
13 and on F.A.R. have produced unpredictable response for  
14 communities, neighborhoods we're trying to solve that.

15 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: When the codes were  
16 created, the instructions were there already.

17 MR. Rangwala: I'm not taking a stab at them.  
18 I was 20 years ago writing these codes myself. This was  
19 the best information available then, and they're all  
20 good intention. We're all trying to do the right thing  
21 but we have realized the folly in doing that we're  
22 trying to correct this so we don't have situation like  
23 Fair Oaks.

24 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: You're always going to  
25 have existing buildings that don't follow these codes or

1 any new codes that you're going to do, so there's always  
2 going to be that contrast with existing and new  
3 buildings. So you have to move forward.

4 MR. Rangwala: Yes, precisely. Did I answer  
5 your question?

6 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Yes.

7 MR. Rangwala: Thank you. Okay. So form-based  
8 code fosters predictable results and a high public realm  
9 and using physical form as the organizing principle.  
10 What do I mean by that? This code, the draft that you  
11 have focuses on the space between the two buildings, so  
12 the space that's defined by the private realm, which  
13 right now the code that you have has zero standards,  
14 nothing, no clue about what happens between the two  
15 walls. Yet that is the public realm. That is what  
16 everybody enjoys. Everybody shares that.

17 And this code instead is private realm is  
18 important but more important is the public realm. That  
19 includes the street, the sidewalk, the frontage of the  
20 building, the private building. We're not saying we're  
21 not interested in uses. We're still interested in uses,  
22 but they will be more broadly to let market forces  
23 dictate, because -- I mean, think about buildings on the  
24 national historic district. They were designed for  
25 different use; right? Some of them were designed as

1 banks. They're now used as coffee places. Uses come  
2 and go. Markets come and go.

3           If the building is a lovely, endearing  
4 building, you'll want to preserve it. But if not,  
5 you'll want to replace it. And we want buildings in  
6 South Pasadena downtown that are not disposable but here  
7 for years to come. So the form-based code is more about  
8 the public realm, less about the private realm. And the  
9 public realm is the street, the frontages and open  
10 space. That's the key distinction.

11           The code is also vision based in that it's  
12 place based so it's directly tied to this vision, the  
13 community vision that the community came up at the  
14 charrette, so this is what we're coding. We presented  
15 some portions of the code at the charrette. We refined  
16 those. Essentially two streets, Mission Street and  
17 Fair Oaks.

18           For clarification, just I think I'm seeing a  
19 lot of familiar faces, but if you're not familiar, this  
20 plan is primarily for Mission Street. The new specific  
21 plan also includes Fair Oaks; right? So we are adding  
22 standards. We are adding more land to the specific plan  
23 than what was originally in place, so the code is based  
24 on this. It's based on a vision. And it uses precise  
25 tangents to produce predictable outcomes to deliver this

1 vision.

2           Here is a diagram. If you get this, you'll  
3 understand the intent of the form-based code. As I was  
4 telling you earlier, if there's F.A.R. on this lot the  
5 one on the top, and if the F.A.R. whatever the numbers  
6 R-40 or whatever classification is, if it's one you can  
7 build a one story building. Now, some of you may be  
8 thinking design, what are the design guidelines? What  
9 does it do? Dresses up a building.

10           So you can take that one floor and articulate  
11 the entrance and right design guidelines and essentially  
12 dress up the building. But it's still that underlying  
13 one-story mass that covers the entire block. Form-based  
14 code breaks that apart.

15           What you see at the bottom, does anybody  
16 recognize? You have this in your town. If you don't,  
17 I'll share with you where that is. But depending on the  
18 context, for example, Mission Street, Main Street  
19 different standards building types, frontages, open  
20 spaces are different than if it is a street versus an  
21 alley. It's not that butter. You've broken it now into  
22 building types that are contextual to what's around.  
23 And this is what I mean when I talk about creating  
24 three-dimensional.

25           So we're interested in regulations, not so much

1 in design guidelines, because they are -- at the end of  
2 the day they're guidelines. Somebody can come in and  
3 say, no, thank you. I mean, just the discussion stops  
4 it. You can twist the arm in the Planning Commission,  
5 and to a certain extent you can. You can get a  
6 reputation for being unfriendly developer, and you don't  
7 want to do that because most of the things that you want  
8 in your vision are not going to be built by the city.  
9 It's going to be built by the private sector, so you  
10 want to encourage them to come in and do the right  
11 things. And design guidelines continue that  
12 discretionary review.

13 I was having a discussion with somebody  
14 earlier. That's what we're trying to limit, trying to  
15 limit the dialogue you have on a few items, the design  
16 guidelines can carry on to the Planning Commission and  
17 review board. That discretionary review continues. One  
18 person's interpretation is different than the other.  
19 We're not talking about guidelines but standards and  
20 types of standards.

21 This is the regulating plan. I just want to --  
22 have people looked at this document?

23 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Oh, yeah.

24 MR. Rangwala: There's a plan -- a planner  
25 here, and he's already got a smile on his face. You

1 look at the plan. It doesn't jump out and tell me this  
2 plan is about two streets. Look at the colors here.  
3 Two colors, one for Mission, one for Fair Oaks. It's  
4 pretty explanatory. You don't have to deep dive into  
5 the codes and requirements to understand that. I think  
6 it needs to be clear. It needs to be precise so  
7 everybody understands, not just David and his planners  
8 or planning commissioners who are trained in this field.

9           So what we're talking about again to reiterate  
10 the vision on Mission primarily two story buildings with  
11 a third story component that is allowed tied to  
12 community benefits, public parking, park site or if  
13 you're providing affordable houses and the list is still  
14 open for discussion, so if you have some suggestions  
15 please let us know.

16           On Fair Oaks we're talking about three stories  
17 with possible fourth story. You understand all of this  
18 is limited by the 35-foot height. I was again having  
19 this discussion with somebody earlier that that 35-foot  
20 height is a limiting factor that at some point in the  
21 future the city council and community as a whole needs  
22 to discuss, because what you're doing by that is  
23 essentially for example, if you're building an office  
24 building, medical office building, and it wants to be  
25 two or three stories on Fair Oaks or on Mission Street,

1 a medical building has a height of 12 feet then ten feet  
2 then between it has duct space three-foot duct space so  
3 you add all of that up, so you have to get a market  
4 sector and say, you're not welcome here; right?

5 I understand the response you had on the 35, on  
6 Fair Oaks say, hey, in that, less is better. I  
7 understand that. But now you've gone through this  
8 process, and you have a finer understanding of the form,  
9 and you've taken a look at the vision particularly on  
10 Mission and Fair Oaks. It may be time to revisit that  
11 limit for 45 feet just for these two corridors again,  
12 not doing that in this process just a footnote for  
13 further consideration at another time.

14 There are subdivision standards, and if you get  
15 to the end, I'll show you an example. And this is  
16 important because the incremental scale of your downtown  
17 is 50 feet, and what I mean by that, if you look at the  
18 historic code, every 50 feet or so or even less you have  
19 a door. Some architects, when given a site that is this  
20 big, tend to extrude it as a cube of butter, say this is  
21 my building, that big one entrance. I'll share some  
22 images. You have some in your town. If you think  
23 that's not possible, we'll take a look at that.

24 But what this is saying is there's a way to  
25 subdivide a larger tract. And you have some larger

1 tracts in the city, pavilion site, school site and when  
2 they are subdivided, they need to be human scale block  
3 streets and open spaces, and you need to consider all of  
4 them and the buildings. It's a final plan that comes in  
5 your neighborhood, not a block scale building that big.  
6 Something that I think is missing at least on Fair Oaks  
7 is, and I know on Mission Street specific plan, there's  
8 some reference to open space, but discussion about open  
9 space particularly for sites that are over four acres,  
10 open space, and they can be different scaled all the way  
11 from large green, I don't think we have green in the  
12 downtown area, but all the way to community garden or  
13 playground. And I would say the building heights extend  
14 this dialogue.

15           If you are a four acre site, it needs to  
16 provide public open space. And I would say it needs to  
17 extend as a continual open space so it continues, the  
18 green, you're starting at green, Arroyo Seco, then it  
19 connects all the way into the private realm, balconies,  
20 terraces, so it's a whole spectrum of open spaces.

21           This graphic gets me every time I see it. This  
22 is what we've done to our streets, if you think about it  
23 from human perspective. There's a rich history even  
24 beyond imagination that we could use streets for  
25 anything besides just moving traffic, because if you

1 think about it a street that is a hundred feet wide has  
2 only 20 feet available for pedestrians. The rest of the  
3 stuff is just traffic.

4 Think about the success of that 626 street  
5 event has on the day when it opens up. And if it could  
6 do it one day and have that much success, why not think  
7 about how it can be where you have that success more.  
8 We're not saying pedestrian malls. No. The automobile  
9 is here, and it needs to be a respectful place.

10 But there are some streets, like mission street  
11 and fair oaks, where you might want to consider  
12 intention through how the pedestrian realm is designed  
13 so it's not really hostile and unfriendly.

14 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Isn't that, though, in  
15 direct conflict with our whole proposal to metro for  
16 Fair Oaks, because the whole purpose is to try to get in  
17 concert with two sister cities the commercial traffic  
18 that would have been flowing up north of Huntington on  
19 Fremont diverted over so traffic then goes on commercial  
20 street Fair Oaks so that in essence is taking the place  
21 of the tunnel and by doing what you were just showing by  
22 taking all of this, that counters exactly what we're  
23 trying to do, especially with lights, get the bulb outs  
24 out all of the things we think we can achieve between  
25 Alhambra and Pasadena. That's counter to what we're

1 proposing.

2           MR. RANGWALA: It would be counter if any lanes  
3 were unavailable in traffic. I'm not suggesting that.  
4 All of the lanes you have in place on Fair Oaks will  
5 remain as they are. You have two lanes in either  
6 direction with parking that remains. What we're  
7 suggesting is, take a look at the frontage and take a  
8 look at the sidewalk and pay some attention there,  
9 because if you do that, for example, when you're walking  
10 on certain stretches of Fair Oaks, you feel comfortable  
11 because there are still buildings lining the ends. Then  
12 other areas have huge parking spots. So you might want  
13 to think about how the frontage is designed.

14           I'm not talking about making changes to the  
15 amount of traffic, because that's a plus, the fact that  
16 you have those vehicles is a plus for the retail  
17 businesses. It could be a plus for offices. There are  
18 no changes at least in the plan.

19           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: (Inaudible) moving to.

20           MR. Rangwala: We are not moving any LANES, at  
21 least not in the vision in the General Plan or specific  
22 plan vision. The lanes are as they are. Let me go back  
23 to this sketch.

24           So you see the two lanes in either direction.  
25 They are where they are. There's no change to that.

1 There's on-street parking, and the final proposal for  
2 Fair Oaks long-term and we have some interim proposals  
3 in here we're recommending so you can get started now.  
4 It's to have directed bike lanes on either side, and  
5 we're doing that without changing the dynamics of the  
6 flow of traffic. You're not convinced.

7 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I'm not seeing how  
8 this is going to work for us necessarily with what we're  
9 proposing and what we're going to need for parking.

10 MR. Rangwala: You don't understand what I'm  
11 saying. The number of lanes not changing.

12 Commissioner Gallatin: This assumes that  
13 you're removing the center medians on Fair Oaks;  
14 correct?

15 MR. Rangwala: No. And we need to correct  
16 this. We are not. Let me see.

17 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I don't think it  
18 will --

19 MR. Rangwala: No, I don't think we're  
20 proposing changes from the -- to the median. So this  
21 needs to be revised. Thank you.

22 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Up near the freeway  
23 between Hope and freeway you need a center lane to get  
24 out of Shakers and in and out of the market.

25 MR. Rangwala: It will all remain.

1           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: That doesn't carry  
2 farther south. That picture doesn't allow for that.

3           MR. Rangwala: Yeah. I think I would be  
4 careful about using this image. This is a very early  
5 sketch that was made as part of the charrette.

6           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Or left turn pockets.

7           MR. Rangwala: We're not making changes to the  
8 left-turn pockets. We are not making changes to the  
9 median, not any changes to the number of lanes. All we  
10 are considering doing is adding (inaudible) so you have  
11 continuous row of trees on Fair Oaks on either side and  
12 then for the final proposal look at putting bike lanes  
13 on either side of Fair Oaks because you have extra wide  
14 in Fair Oaks without affecting the lines.

15          MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I think we'll have a  
16 problem where we've got 110 interchange because we're  
17 proposing the hook ramp then talking about reconfiguring  
18 that whole onramp offramp configuration so we're going  
19 to end up having issues.

20          MR. Rangwala: You're absolutely right. This  
21 may not work at that intersection, but it may work south  
22 all the way from Mission to further down towards the  
23 school. So these are concepts. These are not  
24 suggesting you go out and do them. Obviously  
25 engineering, testing that what you're suggesting.

1           But the concept at this point also helping with  
2 the metro plan is that no change to the number of lanes  
3 or any of the lanes that you have on Fair Oaks.

4           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I just want to make a  
5 suggestion, because we're talking about Fair Oaks here.  
6 There's a long history of what's gone on there. What  
7 was rejected by the community in the Charrette and --  
8 charrette and what got built was altered without anybody  
9 knowing about it. I would suggest this is a hot button  
10 issue in town that maybe there should be, and I didn't  
11 see anybody from the transportation commission or  
12 whatever here when we were discussing streets.

13           There somewhere along the line needs to be  
14 community discussion of Fair Oaks and Mission et cetera  
15 because there's been a lot of it before, and I think it  
16 would be good to focus on that before you get to the  
17 final design.

18           MR. Rangwala: Precisely, precisely. The  
19 reason we are talking about this is because we are going  
20 to talk about frontages. And to the extent you're not  
21 going to realize the full potential of having the public  
22 realm that provides both for mobility and access but  
23 also sustains -- in seamless fashion. Clearly we need  
24 to be cognizant of some plans and provide opportunities  
25 for the public input and absorb it.

1           Even after the code is adopted, there will be  
2 series of other meetings that will follow that will lead  
3 up to construction, design documents and construction  
4 documents. Certainly we will recommend that in the  
5 plan.

6           Oh, the other point, so the conventional  
7 streets that highly focus on classification and  
8 classification is based on the amount of traffic volume  
9 and the speed that you can move in traffic. That's  
10 conventional format. And what we're trying to do here  
11 is to shift, certainly have traffic volume and speed but  
12 also have a discussion about vision. What is the  
13 community's vision for that street? What is the context  
14 for that street and how can it support both.

15           What we're trying to get at here is complete  
16 street setup. This is not a complete street. So we're  
17 trying to shift from this model primarily at the same  
18 time also creating a rich fabric. I'm going to walk  
19 through a series of images. This is where I want you to  
20 tell me your observations. What do you see in terms of  
21 frontages? What's right and what's wrong? What do you  
22 like? I think it's Kollie Street. You see a  
23 single-family residence right next to multi-  
24 residential. And multi-residential has a big blank  
25 wall.

1 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Light fixtures.

2 MR. Rangwala: This was easy. What about this?  
3 I'm not talking about the use. The use is genetic --  
4 you have automobile facility. You know that operations  
5 of that are going to Peter out into the lot. There will  
6 be outside repairs and all of that. What about  
7 frontage?

8 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: A gap.

9 MR. Rangwala: How does it compare to what the  
10 context is?

11 COMMISSIONER KOLDUS: Really big driveway.

12 MR. Rangwala: How do you feel about having  
13 this as a neighbor?

14 MR. LOPEZ: I mean, if somebody would build a  
15 new building, there would be new regulations and that  
16 wouldn't be approved, so what's the point of this? I  
17 don't get what the point is. We know what these things  
18 are. The regulation would take care of that issue. But  
19 I don't get what you're getting at.

20 MR. Rangwala: One more slide, and I'll get to  
21 the point.

22 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: How would this be  
23 appropriately situated in your plan?

24 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Automotive repair  
25 still very important business. Where would this, by the

1 Ostrich Farm area where are you seeing this type of  
2 business?

3 MR. Rangwala: It's not my plan. It's yours.  
4 So you tell me. And that's the point. So in terms of  
5 use, does the community feel that on Mission Street this  
6 is an appropriate use?

7 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: No.

8 MR. Rangwala: But she's suggesting that this  
9 is a valuable use.

10 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: It's a tax business as  
11 opposed to some that are not. Where are they going to  
12 go in the city? And you want to keep as much business  
13 in the city as possible. So it is one segment of  
14 business that is of need and that we could have locally.

15 MR. Rangwala: So is there a place for this  
16 type of business in the city. If not on mission and  
17 Fair Oaks, where?

18 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: A lot of places, other  
19 places.

20 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: El Centro.

21 MR. Rangwala: If you're getting close to  
22 residential, yes, is this something you want to have in  
23 residential?

24 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: There's already a car  
25 repair on El Centro.

1           MR. Rangwala: We're talking about Mission  
2 right now also General Plan. So this is good discussion  
3 to have about citywide versus what are the appropriate  
4 uses in the Mission Street? What I'm hearing is this  
5 may not be something that we want to allow on Mission  
6 Street. If this goes away, we're not suggesting this be  
7 occupied by another auto repair. There's a higher and  
8 better use. That's what I'm getting at.

9           How about this? Why do you react to this?  
10 What do you think is not right or what do you think is  
11 right? Yes, Joanne.

12           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: When this went in, I  
13 thought, because it's the type of business not  
14 necessarily the building, because there's not enough  
15 parking or because there's a lot of in and out, because  
16 it's a school basically, and there's not enough parking  
17 and it's not a commercial business on Mission. Used to  
18 be a printing shop.

19           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Designed like the  
20 automobile, the apron spans the entire width of the lot.

21           MR. Rangwala: If you're a pedestrian, you have  
22 a break in walking experience. Can you imagine walking  
23 the street during the night at this hour. What does it  
24 do in terms of safety? Three things we're trying to  
25 strive at in regulations: Comfort, safety and

1 attractiveness.

2           How about this? This is landscaping.

3 Everybody agrees.

4           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: It could be improved.

5           COMMISSIONER KOLDUS: I had a skunk jump out of  
6 those bushes at me.

7           MR. Rangwala: Okay. So what is wrong with  
8 this? Why is landscaping not appropriate?

9           COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: The scale is wrong. It  
10 goes on forever.

11           MR. RANGWALA: So do you feel secure walking  
12 there?

13           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: No.

14           MR. RANGWALA: That's the point. How about  
15 this?

16           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Very nice.

17           MR. RANGWALA: How about this? I mean, some of  
18 this was actually approved. This is recent by your  
19 planning division. This was approved and part of  
20 downtown.

21           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: It depends on where it  
22 is. That's the point, isn't it?

23           MR. Rangwala: Okay. But does it have the same  
24 issues you're talking about earlier? You're trying to  
25 have a walking experience.

1           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: This will work in  
2 certain areas but not on Mission.

3           MR. Rangwala: How about this one?

4           COMMISSIONER KOLDUS: Better without the red.

5           MR. Rangwala: Conrado, if this was before your  
6 Design Review Board, and you got this project. What do  
7 you see? What's wrong with it? It's not about color.  
8 I'm talking about frontages.

9           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: The thing is, if you  
10 look at Clark county, they have transparency. Parts of  
11 their code where they want light wells, so there's give  
12 and take, but they do also coming up to the face so  
13 there's interaction with the sidewalk.

14          MR. Rangwala: Interaction with sidewalk. What  
15 else is important. Planning commission, if this is  
16 before you, somebody proposes this, what are your  
17 comments and feedback?

18          MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Material, height of  
19 fence.

20          MR. Rangwala: How about privacy? I think  
21 interaction was an important one. But look. This is  
22 the same as the street. So the frontages are incredibly  
23 important. The reason I'm belaboring this point is  
24 because, if you get the frontages right, a lot of other  
25 things can be forgiven. This is that important. This

1 is that important. The form-based code is primarily  
2 focused in the private realm on frontages. How about  
3 this?

4 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: City of Beverly Hills  
5 asks you to do --

6 MR. Rangwala: In contrast with this, they're  
7 both residential. This is residential. This is senior  
8 residential. This is another residential project. What  
9 is this doing that's different? There's a raising  
10 because the building is close to the street so as to  
11 remove the eye level from looking into the window and  
12 down into somebody's living area; right? So different  
13 uses and different conditions have different provisions.

14 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Is this adaptive reuse  
15 or designed originally?

16 MR. Rangwala: What do you think? Adaptive.

17 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: All I can think of on  
18 that red one is how in the hell are we going to get  
19 handicapped in there?

20 MR. Rangwala: Ramps. There are other entries.

21 What about this? This is not a single family  
22 project.

23 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: It becomes one.

24 MR. Rangwala: So if I'm not mistaken, six or  
25 eight units in that building. But the setback, raised,

1 allows interaction, a --

2 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: A barrier but not a  
3 barrier.

4 MR. Rangwala: How about this?

5 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Same architect.

6 MR. Rangwala: Exactly. We learn from our  
7 mistakes. Really, we do. He blames it on his partner.

8 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: We should blame it on  
9 the city.

10 MR. Rangwala: But there are still a lot of  
11 things to do with this. What is some of the issues with  
12 this, because in the charrette and in the discussions  
13 and interviews at the focus group is you feel  
14 comfortable at the station area, and you feel  
15 comfortable at Fair Oaks and Mission. But it's the  
16 in-between that is uncomfortable, unsafe.

17 I mean, try walking this during the night. And  
18 this is city hall. So all the signals that government  
19 should be giving are the wrong ones in this case.

20 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: You need spaces.  
21 There's a thing about transparency required with some  
22 codes, and this would definitely fail. So would we  
23 include transparency in this?

24 MR. Rangwala: Transparency, interaction on  
25 street frontage and in the office, it doesn't have to be

1 front, for example, in this case that building, that  
2 portion is the council chambers. But on this side you  
3 have offices, so opening up that and allowing that  
4 interaction or bringing a different program, and if it's  
5 not part of my program, providing a new program that's  
6 where you have some building types located within one  
7 building, one that allows the city function, to be  
8 private functions because they don't want that  
9 interaction.

10 But they could have a storefront presence.  
11 They lease out. Some of these things as years go by are  
12 things the city will have to reconsider and redesign.  
13 The code will be there to encourage them to do the right  
14 frontage.

15 So Conrad, sorry. This is the point. The  
16 point is that the code has all of these frontages that  
17 we talked about, some that are appropriate for use, some  
18 that are appropriate for multifamily, some for single  
19 family, for example, single family the code you want to  
20 have a setback and multifamily town home, you may want  
21 to have it close. But when you have it close, you want  
22 to lift up so you have privacy while still having  
23 interaction.

24 But all of that goes out of the door with  
25 commercial retail, which actually provides right at the

1 street and interactive, and that's what we are setting  
2 up. The code has these where we're listing particular  
3 standards for frontages.

4           Besides the frontages the code is also  
5 prescribing building types. These are time tested  
6 principles, not style based, so before the designers get  
7 agitated, there's no discussion about styling. But this  
8 is based on understanding of how a building is disposed  
9 on the lot, how it interacts with the street. And, for  
10 example, single-family residence has a private yard and  
11 a setback, which is different from a town home, which we  
12 have a stoop, for example, as you were suggesting, which  
13 is different than a commercial establishment that is  
14 right on the property line. So this is actually calling  
15 out those and suggesting that there's a range of  
16 building types found within the community.

17           By the way, this is not an exclusive list.  
18 This is a starting point. So it encourages people to  
19 come up with new ones. But to do that you have to have  
20 understanding of the importance of how you dispose that  
21 building on the lot and have the discussion so it's not  
22 about minimum ten foot setback so you can place it  
23 anywhere. No. This building has a certain interaction  
24 with the street.

25           And so this is one of the building types, calls

1 out the disposition of the lot, calls out types of open  
2 spaces. Again this is a starting point. It doesn't  
3 have to be exactly this. The sketches are suggesting  
4 some of the configurations that the open spaces can be  
5 provided and some of the standards about how that  
6 building is accessed by car versus by pedestrians.

7 MR. LESAK: So we've seen elevated -- we've  
8 seen underground. Does this encourage ground level,  
9 or --

10 MR. Rangwala: It does not discourage anything.  
11 If the community is obviously the underground being the  
12 most desired ones, in some cases it makes financial  
13 sense to provide in the code to allow the other as well.  
14 If you are the mindset and you feel in your community  
15 you have a market you want to dictate that all buildings  
16 must have underground parking, let us know and we can  
17 write that. But at this point it's flexible it allows  
18 all variations.

19 Any thoughts from designers what they would  
20 like to see here?

21 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Let's say some are  
22 appropriate, some aren't in certain contexts, and the  
23 code doesn't dictate that it's simply up to whatever  
24 commissioner or board is reviewing it representing the  
25 citizens; right? Or in the code we require a certain

1 amount of open space?

2 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I think what Becky is  
3 saying is that each of our commissions have to make  
4 certain findings in order to approve it. Often in those  
5 findings there's a finding of compatibility with  
6 surrounding neighborhood.

7 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Yeah, but this part of  
8 the code or this part of the sector, will we have that?  
9 Or will it be more subjective?

10 MR. Rangwala: That judgment provides  
11 flexibility, and that judgment provides Planning  
12 Commission to also review certain combinations that may  
13 not be envisioned by this code at this time. It allows  
14 that flexibility. But there are certain standards. If  
15 you have a code, that's just fundamental that you have  
16 that open space and a corridor, it does provide that  
17 minimum space, minimum width, but those are some basic  
18 standards.

19 And again if you have some observations or some  
20 thoughts on that, you're welcome to discuss those  
21 thoughts. You had a question about codes and open  
22 space. The answer is yes, it does. Primarily if you  
23 get away from the codes in this code. Okay.

24 So we're now stepping away from the public  
25 realm into the private realm. As I said earlier, it's

1 not ignoring what happens in the private realm but  
2 addressing it more broadly. So all of the precautions  
3 that you had in your conventional code of uses, there  
4 are certain uses that are acceptable. There are certain  
5 uses that require a slightly higher level of  
6 discretionary review, which means pay a visit to the  
7 planning commission if you have a gas station or you  
8 have a daycare facility because there are impacts  
9 associated with the operations and you need to review  
10 that on a case-by-case basis.

11           So rather than bringing it all in the code then  
12 for getting something the discretion is left up to  
13 Design Review Board and the Planning Commission. So all  
14 of the uses that you see here are called out here, but  
15 they're brought in, for example, personal services,  
16 barbershop, missing out one, similar uses. Then it  
17 defines what personal use is in the definition section.

18           The moment you put a use, somebody comes up  
19 with a use not anticipated; right? I'm still seeing  
20 zoning codes -- some of them we're rewriting -- that  
21 have Bob and moms (PHONETIC). We don't have bob and  
22 moms nowadays. These are public banks. And by the way,  
23 that's listed alphabetically, so it comes up again,  
24 under mom bobs, and it's pages and pages of listed  
25 language.

1           So this is a broad set of language parameters.  
2 Look at this, and this gets into discussion we had  
3 earlier had in this case the facilities, the gas  
4 station, for example, the conditional use, auto repair  
5 facilities are not allowed. If you want to change that,  
6 as a community you can certainly direct and we will make  
7 that change.

8           Okay. That ends the fundamentals. Any  
9 question, any concern about what was presented, why we  
10 are trying to do this differently than what we have on  
11 the books currently? Yes, Joanne.

12           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Back to that last  
13 slide. You mentioned auto repair businesses and the  
14 ones you showed of Mission Street, what if that property  
15 is owned by the business owner that's got the auto  
16 repair business? I mean, how do you legislate or deal  
17 with that issue? Same question if the owners of the  
18 property you have to wait for him to sell that property  
19 to a developer, because if he wants to sell that  
20 business to another repair shop, you get into regulatory  
21 taking trying to stop it.

22           MR. Rangwala: You guys are savvy. You're  
23 referring to non-conforming uses and what we would do  
24 there, there's a whole section of the process that talks  
25 about non-confirming. Again it's a dial. You can dial

1 it up say, hey, if you leave this business, it's gone or  
2 if you want to add to it you need to comply with new  
3 code, or you can dial it to a more reasonable level,  
4 say, if you want to add a small portion that's  
5 50 percent or less, we'll allow it. Or if you want to  
6 add that vision needs to be in compliance to the extent  
7 possible.

8           But if you're tearing down the building or if  
9 you sell the building, then whoever rebuilds on the lot  
10 has to comply but nothing in this corridor disallows any  
11 businesses currently operating legally, because all  
12 businesses that are legal, if they are not allowed, will  
13 be deemed non-confirming, and they could operate as a  
14 non-conforming use for the life, continue to operate as  
15 is without changes. The change only occurs if they're  
16 adding on a substantial portion or rebuilding that site.

17           Commissioner Gallatin: I have seen in other  
18 communities sometimes where they will adopt a new code  
19 or the specific plan or render existing use that was a  
20 legal conforming use non-conforming then set an  
21 amortization period for the cessation of non-conforming  
22 use. I've seen that from anywhere from five years to 30  
23 years. Does this plan contemplate anything like that?

24           MR. Rangwala: It does not but can if there's  
25 interest in the community. It's again that dial, how

1 fast you want to see the change of the corridor on  
2 Mission Street, particularly if you are not a big fan of  
3 auto repair facility, how fast you want to see the  
4 change. Besides the laws, ultimately you build in  
5 incentives. You can get higher better uses on that  
6 property.

7 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: --

8 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: I have a quick question  
9 if the city did want to allow over a period of time for  
10 this continued use, wouldn't it be subject to a claim  
11 for compensation by the property owner?

12 MR. Rangwala: If you render it completely  
13 unusable during a period of time. If the property can  
14 still be used for reasonable amount of listed uses, then  
15 no, you don't have to, there is no condemnation where  
16 you have to compensate.

17 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: As long as there's a  
18 reasonable use that remains. Okay.

19 MR. Rangwala: Let's say, for example, it's an  
20 open space. They only allow open spaces. I'm not going  
21 to buy it. They want you to dedicate it. It was  
22 condemnation. You have to pay fair market value.

23 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: The only thing might  
24 be if there was some sort of environmental regulation  
25 that would come down that would say, a car, exposure to

1 oil, whatever, X, Y, Z, there might be something in that  
2 nature where the businesses adhering to an environmental  
3 or health regulation, then you might have an out that  
4 way.

5 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Or condition of  
6 approval on a CUP.

7 MR. Rangwala: All have something, violations  
8 on property, all of those are provisions the city can  
9 invoke to encourage, but again it's up to the city just  
10 to see how fast they want to see the changes versus how  
11 accommodating they want to be to existing businesses.

12 I'm going to go through this quickly because  
13 you have a design review boards, and it seems to be  
14 working well but these are some options, design review  
15 focuses on-site and building design, applies informed  
16 judgment in application of standards so they allow  
17 flexibility, there's some judgment involved,  
18 discretionary review. So that's necessary, seeks to  
19 produce better places and really avoid the cost of poor  
20 design, because poor design costs the community.

21 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I have a question on  
22 that. What does it mean seeks to produce better places?  
23 Isn't that a -- I mean, what does that mean? I mean  
24 sometimes --

25 MR. Rangwala: Sure. The slide that I shared

1 with you earlier, the series of slides about frontages,  
2 better frontages in better places. Do you have a  
3 comment?

4 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: More welcoming.

5 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Looks like a  
6 rendering.

7 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: In reality there are  
8 problems with finding people that want to be on this  
9 board.

10 MR. RANGWALA: I'm sorry?

11 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: It's hard to find  
12 people with the time and desire or whatever first of all  
13 to be on commissions and boards. And so we're putting a  
14 lot of faith into that.

15 MR. Rangwala: I have a section that talks  
16 about that. Okay. So in any code there are three  
17 essential components, ingredients. Any code whether  
18 it's Mission Street or the Zoning Code that applies to  
19 the city, there are use codes, certain uses allowed, how  
20 high, Planning Commission approval, some might also take  
21 it up to city council. And then there are management  
22 issues associated with the use.

23 So I have this use and has a component that  
24 it's next to a residential use. How do we manage that,  
25 setbacks, so these are management issues associated with

1 the use. Parking is a management issue. How do you  
2 reduce the impact of overcrowding in the street by  
3 managing the parking need of that particular use?

4           And then there are form issues typically in  
5 this case are the ones I talked about height, setback.  
6 Conventional zoning, this Zoning Code places its  
7 emphasis on use. And this one is better than many  
8 others. This one is far superior, I would say.

9           But there are other codes about 80, 90 percent  
10 of the codes in this country offers what uses are  
11 allowed, how they're going to be. They have management  
12 standards. There is focus on form and the focus is  
13 blunt, as I explained, in setbacks.

14           The form-based code switches that dynamic. The  
15 uses are more broadly. Management, all those lanes you  
16 worried about, parking, all in the same capacity, but it  
17 has increased emphasis on form. And form emphasis is on  
18 public not, so much private, what happens inside the  
19 building. What happens on the site.

20           So the review is different, and I'll walk you  
21 through an example of a project we worked on in Ventura.  
22 It begins with an analysis, and these are drawings  
23 prepared for the Planning Commission and design review.  
24 You have a site in the middle. Then it gives you the  
25 context of what's around the site, collection of

1 historic, collection of '60s apartment buildings and  
2 some that are some interesting character.

3           Then you transfer that in a drawing and begin  
4 to understand the relationship of public and private  
5 realm, and you understand what are the different  
6 building heights in the block? What are the different  
7 characteristics? What are the different building  
8 typologies. This will all be required as part of new  
9 process.

10           What I'm getting at is application forms that  
11 right now require site plan need to be changed to  
12 require these things. These are part of the spatial  
13 review I'm talking about site frontage, building  
14 frontage, building typology, open space typology.  
15 That's something we need to discuss with the  
16 application.

17           Here's the building I was telling you earlier  
18 the difference between design guidelines and form-based  
19 code. Remember the diagram. What you see the existing  
20 housing the block. In this case you didn't have a  
21 form-based code. You had a person who was understanding  
22 of the context, the application. So you take that block  
23 then break it to match the context. A different  
24 building on Mission, which is historic, and as you come  
25 away from that, there's a different category of

1 building. And as you get more into the street of what  
2 your context is.

3           So this is building height about three, maybe  
4 four building heights clustered within this one block.  
5 These are just what would be required as part of review  
6 process that would help Planning Commission and design  
7 review committee, context plan, photographs, rendered  
8 site plans, access to views, sun, in some cities. I  
9 don't know if that's a sensitive issue, but certainly we  
10 can discuss that, elevation, materials.

11           There might be a model that might be required  
12 to explain the context not just of the project but the  
13 context within the surrounding area. So in terms of  
14 review, simple steps begin with the public realm, what  
15 is a street? What is the category of the street? What  
16 is the category of the frontage, of the private  
17 frontage? Begin with the public realm. What is the  
18 type of open space we provide? Does this require  
19 subdivision then go in with requires review. Designers,  
20 architects, people who have passion about public art  
21 versus different fine arts, landscape architecture. So  
22 if you are concerned about traffic also, recommend  
23 changes should not cost more money.

24           So this is one of the fundamental things that  
25 the review, the design review should not increase the

1 cost. It should increase the value. I'll show you a  
2 couple of projects that we've tried to hit that without  
3 increasing cost, increase the value. Value for the  
4 owner and community. It sounds like a task, but we can  
5 do it. We might have to revise application forms and  
6 staff report and presentation format. It's going to  
7 require different type of review than the one that  
8 you're used to.

9           This is too small text. But form-based code  
10 with this map is available online. What I want to  
11 suggest is there are two types of review processes in  
12 this code, one that is ministerial. By that I mean if  
13 it meets all the standards, you don't have an option you  
14 must approve. Example, you don't have much discretion  
15 with building permits. If somebody meets the code, that  
16 project must be approved. You can't say, "I don't like  
17 the color or form." I meet all your codes. You must  
18 approve that. That's a ministerial action.

19           Subdivision, if it meets all requirements for  
20 infrastructure, you don't have much discretion. Even  
21 council doesn't have much discretion. You must approve  
22 it. So there's a whole lot of ministerial approvals.  
23 The site plan, minor site plan, I think, David, what we  
24 were talking about there is changes to the facade,  
25 signage, changes to the signing of the building. Those

1 would go to the Design Review Board.

2 Commissioner Gallatin: That assumes those are  
3 not historic buildings.

4 MR. Rangwala: Good. That is right here.  
5 Appropriate use. So if it's historic, all the historic  
6 that you have, if you have a property within a district,  
7 all the processes and standards that you have remain  
8 unchanged. That's remaining as is. Then there are site  
9 plan review. There's some bodies that recommend to the  
10 decision body, and in this case site plan might be if  
11 it's a historic property, might be cultural commission  
12 makes a recommendation to Planning Commission or Design  
13 Review Board and the final decision made by the  
14 commission. It's appealable.

15 So all of these steps have a process where you  
16 can appeal something to the city council. So this is at  
17 present the proposed process. We are again open for  
18 feedback. When you get a chance, please take a look.  
19 I'm going to talk about this right now and try to answer  
20 your question.

21 In any case, any review there's three layers,  
22 the staff making a professional judgment based on  
23 certain standards that they have, Public Works and other  
24 people, police, fire. Then there's the public that is  
25 involved. They want to know what's going on in the

1 community. And the third person is the commission. So  
2 all of these entities.

3           And the job of the reviewer as a gatekeeper is  
4 incredibly important. And here are some of the things  
5 that we would recommend that they have a familiarity  
6 with the range of building types, including design  
7 characteristics, they are familiar with real estate,  
8 transportation, zoning and related fields. These are  
9 important questions to consider. Whoever is making the  
10 appointments, these are some of the basic ones. Then  
11 the ability to convey some of the ideas both visually  
12 and verbally. To hold two opposing viewpoints. As a  
13 design review member or as a Planning Commissioner, your  
14 job is to make that project the best that it can be  
15 without enforcing your bias in the project.

16           I've had commissioners with pet peeves, I will  
17 only approve this type because I'm very fond of it. I  
18 will only approve this type of architecture. You  
19 probably need to be conscientious of that.

20           There are various formats. This gets to your  
21 point for review. Most oftentimes the review by  
22 Planning Commission you don't have a Design Review  
23 Board. If you have a Design Review Board that acts as a  
24 step in the process. They make a recommendation to  
25 Planning Commission. Sometimes you have great staff

1 when you don't -- for smaller cities where you don't  
2 have trained Planning Commission or trained design  
3 review, some of the approvals happen at the staff level.  
4 Some of the other cities, bigger cities, have urban  
5 specialists. Los Angeles, Dallas has one. These are  
6 people who are primarily trained urban designers,  
7 architects that look at proposals that help planning  
8 staff, provide comments and feedback.

9           Then there's this thing called town designers  
10 (?) And if you don't have some of those capabilities on  
11 staff or Planning Commission, then you are to consider  
12 this. This is working out well. This is paren maybe  
13 town designer paren. This is a process funded by the  
14 developer and the developer wants to work with, they  
15 interact with trained professionals. You have an  
16 architect or designer talking to another designer as  
17 opposed to talking to a planner who, no offense, who's  
18 never drawn a site plan in their life. So it's a  
19 different dynamic. And that designer works for the city  
20 but is paid for by the developer.

21           COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: Kaizer, are you  
22 recommending for South Pasadena?

23           MR. Rangwala: This is again for discussion  
24 amongst your commissions and committees if you think  
25 this is appropriate. If we have feedback now, please

1 let me know.

2           We have seen this work well. It tends to  
3 streamline the process. You have this advocate who can  
4 do the two things I mentioned, not increase the cost of  
5 the project and increase value, increase value for the  
6 developer and the designer, in conformance and alignment  
7 with the code. Some people say, you know what? That is  
8 just another step I have to go through. Besides the  
9 planner, now I have to go through this architect. I  
10 would rather not. I understand that.

11           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Paid by the developer  
12 aren't you just asking for a conflict of interest  
13 problem?

14           MR. Rangwala: Doesn't happen that way because  
15 that person is hired by the city. They're working on  
16 behalf of the city.

17           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: First it's going to be  
18 100 percent --

19           MR. Rangwala: You find somebody who is --

20           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Find out after the  
21 fact. What criteria do you have for how good a designer  
22 this person is to get the quality project that you want  
23 or to have them do the job that you want?

24           MR. Rangwala: They need to be established in  
25 the field. They need to be either an architect or

1 designer or a collection of all of those skill sets.  
2 They need to have experience in reviewing projects and  
3 designing projects, and they need to be passionate about  
4 the two things that I mentioned is to not increase costs  
5 for the developers and increase value.

6 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: That doesn't answer my  
7 question. There would be two people that meet those  
8 qualifications, and one is a really good designer and  
9 one isn't, and how do you know which one you get? Do  
10 you look at the work they've done before?

11 MR. Rangwala: Absolutely.

12 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Their portfolio.

13 MR. Rangwala: I can understand both sides of  
14 it.

15 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: We know somebody who  
16 dresses impeccably. He knows how to schmooze whoever  
17 all over the world. This guy couldn't design his way  
18 out of the paper bag, but he has all the original  
19 clothes, and he was one of these guys for a local city  
20 around here. Everybody goes, you're kidding, people who  
21 know him. He's a really nice guy, too, but he just  
22 can't design.

23 MR. Rangwala: There is a risk, and maybe you  
24 have two people.

25 Commissioner Gallatin: You know, I've been in

1 departments where we use that model. I think two  
2 critical lessons to take away is, you have to be really  
3 thoughtful and conscientious in designing your RFP when  
4 you go out for these services and really do a solid  
5 thorough job of vetting the candidates so you don't  
6 encounter the situation like some of the folks  
7 described.

8           Second thing I think is important is to angle  
9 evaluations on their work, you know, so it should be not  
10 just here at the en of the year, here's your evaluation.  
11 But it should be a constant dialogue throughout the year  
12 on how they're doing. Are they hitting the mark or  
13 missing it and what corrective action can be taken.

14           MR. Rangwala: We used to do performance  
15 evaluation. In every case we'd have evaluation from  
16 architects, designers, developers, did he or she add  
17 value?

18           COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: Because we're talking  
19 about design evaluation, I'm just going to be  
20 subjective. If you have a good, functional Design  
21 Review Board, as I think we have, and assuming that we  
22 continue to have residents who generously volunteer of  
23 their time to populate that, isn't the city benefited by  
24 having a panel of people so that they can bounce ideas  
25 off of what is really a fairly subjective exercise and

1 so you have, I think, more balance with more people  
2 looking at a particular design.

3 MR. Rangwala: You're absolutely right. But  
4 you should also know that oftentimes it takes me as a  
5 designer in many cities around Southern California at  
6 least a year or in some cases two years before I get a  
7 hearing before that commission. Essentially I'm  
8 spending time with a planner. So this is sort of a  
9 replacement for that planner to put somebody in place  
10 that has -- that has sensibility to design review that  
11 can when making recommendations look for those two  
12 things and be a broker.

13 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: So this is a middle  
14 review, then.

15 MR. Rangwala: This is actually replacing some  
16 of the work that David -- it would actually assist David  
17 and his staff that are not trained in spatial review to  
18 conduct a spatial review to facilitate that process,  
19 because he still needs -- you still need him because  
20 he's going to process it, but that component of spatial  
21 review which oftentimes, if you are submitting with the  
22 city, every time you go to city hall, it's producing a  
23 new set of drawings that cost anywhere from five to  
24 \$10,000.

25 And I'm not telling you -- the amount that has

1 been taken from the bank that is essentially adding up  
2 every time that clock particulars. So this is intended  
3 to narrow and streamline the process so it gets to the  
4 decision fast with an informal review.

5 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: You're not suggesting  
6 replacing design review. This is at the front end.

7 MR. Rangwala: Not at all. Your design review  
8 is where it belongs. Needs to be there. If you're  
9 comfortable with that, you don't need this. But  
10 Ventura, for example, they have both design review and  
11 this as well. In West Covina they don't have a Design  
12 Review Board. They have essentially brokers between  
13 architects or design team and Planning Commission  
14 getting it to them faster, quicker.

15 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: I would like to hear  
16 from our Design Review Board members as to whether or  
17 not they think this would be --

18 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I think that for this  
19 skill of art, and you mentioned an example something  
20 that would take a year to go through Design Review  
21 Board, which here it takes two weeks or a month at the  
22 most. The next meeting is in a month at the latest. So  
23 you have to present a week in advance or week and a half  
24 in advance.

25 But it seems to me that the town designer on

1 the scale of our city and the way our city works would  
2 be problematic, because I think they would require a  
3 coordination between the Design Review Board and the  
4 town designer so that the town designer do not send the  
5 applicant in a way that not necessarily agrees with what  
6 the design review committee would say or do. So I don't  
7 know that I would see -- I think I would -- I would  
8 spend that time training the staff we have to and  
9 actually by coming to our Design Review Board meetings  
10 which we have, everybody has got, they already know, you  
11 come to our meetings three or four months enough and you  
12 see what we say, how we do things.

13 Now of course every Design Review Board has a  
14 personality and it's all based on the people that are  
15 there, and that's going to change when some people  
16 leave. But by the staff being present I think that's  
17 where that is happening. So I do not know, I'm not sure  
18 that the town designer would be something that we would  
19 need in our town.

20 Besides that I wouldn't mind getting paid. But  
21 that's, you know, paid for service, that would be nice.  
22 That also goes against encouraging development in our  
23 town, adding another fee, you know, will that discourage  
24 development.

25 MR. Rangwala: Okay.

1                   COMMISSONER LESAK:   So I work as a town  
2 architect.  I think I can agree with you the scale of  
3 the city our cost is reasonable -- process is quick.  
4 (Inaudible)  we get a lot of people who are amateurs or  
5 professionals that tend to be part of the problem.  But  
6 we have designers in the city.  It's unusually high  
7 percentage of our population is in design industry.

8                   So I think there tends to be a lot of people  
9 who are qualified to serve on commissions.  And  
10 obviously I tend to think we don't need one now maybe in  
11 the future.

12                  MR. Rangwala:  I just wanted to put it out as  
13 an option that's available.  Okay.  We look at this  
14 Dallas review.  Go ahead.

15                  MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE:  Before you get away  
16 from that, I just thought of something.  And I remember  
17 from years ago and then recently a project that was  
18 approved by design review, and when we had two design  
19 review boards, and one of the designers or the board  
20 members went by a project that he remembers, and it was  
21 not built to what they had approved.  And it was like  
22 somebody had stuck a balloon in and blown it up.  It was  
23 bigger.

24                  So whoever deals with, if it's a town designer  
25 or design review or the staff that's trained for this

1 sort of thing, somebody needs to follow through that  
2 what is approved is what gets built.

3 MR. Rangwala: That's coming up next. So this  
4 is the reason I added this is because I find it  
5 frustrating when you are at the Design Review Board on  
6 Planning Commission or city council people trying to  
7 design from the dais. I think it makes a lot of sense  
8 to just get off the dais and sit around a table, because  
9 imagine yourself on the dais, and then imagine yourself  
10 as an applicant. What do you prefer?

11 I think there are certain dynamics that need to  
12 occur at dais, like final decision. But when you're  
13 giving advice, it makes sense to sit down. So this is a  
14 dynamic, completely different dynamic, where people  
15 interact as peers rather than somebody sitting high and  
16 mighty saying, "this is what I want."

17 These are things you already know but just  
18 reminder, objective, multi-discipline, timely and  
19 proportionate. We'll get to this in a little bit, but  
20 just introduce the concept. If somebody were to bring  
21 you a pencil sketch and you asked them for a site plan  
22 packet, that's not timely, so your process needs to  
23 allow that. If somebody wants to bring in initial  
24 concept and get some feedback, they might get on the  
25 right track before spending \$20,000 engaging an

1 architect. They are to be facilitated because it allows  
2 trained designers to provide advice then building  
3 consistently on that advice.

4           So require construction drawings is not -- you  
5 want to find the sweet spot.

6           COMMISSONER LESAK: We actually do a lot of  
7 this. The problem is that -- this gets back to some of  
8 what you said -- things become isolated so we get two  
9 elevations, no photographs, and people expect a  
10 decision. So there needs to be a minimum, particularly  
11 public realm, in making sure that, you know, the concept  
12 at least includes more than just, here's an elevation.

13           MR. Rangwala: You still pull out those things.  
14 You need a plan, you need a site plan, you need some  
15 basic understanding of massing. You don't need to show  
16 me all of those images. That's not necessary now. So  
17 you can build confidence and be giving feedback in the  
18 process without spending a lot of money.

19           Every time I put doors and windows, it's  
20 costing clients in dollars, so you can spend the dollars  
21 in building in the community, some of the common  
22 mistakes, biased review is overarching, vague direction,  
23 this might either review or Planning Commission or  
24 planning chair is providing direction saying, "here are  
25 some of the things I want to see," as opposed to,

1 "you're not there. I just don't know what it is, but  
2 it's not there." That's vague as opposed to, "you can  
3 fix this. Move this around. Here are suggestions. Go  
4 look at it."

5           Staff documents it so next time they come and  
6 you start a discussion on those things. That's giving  
7 precise direction.

8           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: When I first brought  
9 things here in South Pasadena, it is -- I can't tell  
10 you -- it's like, "I have no idea what you're telling  
11 me," but I see the value of somebody saying, "I can't  
12 tell you how to design it." I make a living doing that  
13 I'm not doing to do it for free. We go through 18  
14 conceptuials. And finally we've done the whole thing for  
15 them.

16           But where is the sweet spot there? We can't  
17 really, or we shouldn't design for their architect.  
18 It's their job.

19           MR. Rangwala: No. But you can at least point  
20 out that, you know, here are some of the things, the  
21 massing, that are working for you. Here are some  
22 concerns that we have you need to address, and then give  
23 them the opportunity. And "here are some suggestions,"  
24 if you have some. It's the chair's job to essentially  
25 take all comments that are received during the dialogue

1 and summarize and then record by the staff so the next  
2 time around they have a list that they're operating  
3 from. And you start to say, "Hey, this is the feedback  
4 I received, and here's how I responded."

5 But when it works, it works wonderfully because  
6 you have a continued process as opposed to starting new  
7 every time.

8 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Just a couple of words  
9 on timeliness and completeness. In my experience on the  
10 cultural heritage commission there have been times when  
11 we get applications that are either incomplete or they  
12 come in, staff has taken them and gotten them to us,  
13 like, two days before the meeting and I don't know --  
14 well, I think I know maybe what needs to be done to  
15 empower the staff to say, "I'm sorry, but we have a  
16 deadline, and we're not going to be nice and take your  
17 application in late or take it in incomplete."

18 If it's not complete and it's not on time, did  
19 it us -- it doesn't go this month. I think that creates  
20 frustration for commissioners when that sort of thing  
21 happens.

22 MR. Rangwala: You're not obligated as  
23 commission to take something that's incomplete. When  
24 you see it, you say, "I make a motion to give direction  
25 to provide this information and meet next time." Those

1 give messages to, including staff. This is not  
2 something that will work. Extra time and expense, costs  
3 more, whatever recommendations you're making, and then  
4 conflict of interest. You may not have any, but I have  
5 lived and worked in cities where, oh, boy, a retired  
6 mayor is now lobbying for projects, a few examples. But  
7 obviously there's conflict of interest, and there could  
8 be that in design review board, for example, if you are  
9 sitting up then you have a project, you step down. It's  
10 a different role.

11           So just be mindful of that. What it does is  
12 really creates a hostile environment and mistrust in the  
13 community, saying those guys, we know what they're  
14 doing. Training, training for the commission. I can't  
15 emphasize this enough, council, I hope you have budgets  
16 for your planning commissioners and design review to go  
17 to conferences and have workshops as well as tours, kick  
18 around, see what projects have worked in other cities  
19 and do this on an annual basis.

20           One of the things we used to -- by the way,  
21 Ventura, people do come to the city and help us  
22 understand these concepts if you are being challenged so  
23 if your issue is parking find somebody who is an expert  
24 in parking.

25           COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: They're still growing,

1 and they've got the budget to be able to afford that.  
2 Plus that's fairly affluent. We don't have a budget.

3 MR. Rangwala: You don't need money. That's  
4 what I'm saying here. You just need to be creative  
5 because people are willing to come to your town.

6 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: For free?

7 MR. Rangwala: Yes. All of these people came  
8 free.

9 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: Do it. Okay.

10 MR. Rangwala: Just be creative. It's  
11 important that your commission and design review -- the  
12 other thing is if a project is built, do some post  
13 mortem, hey, what went right? What went wrong? Hey, we  
14 approved one thing, but look at this. How can we  
15 correct it? Learn from the mistakes as city hall. I  
16 mean, that's a great example.

17 This is getting to your point, Joanne. Again  
18 there's a dial. So you decide what works for  
19 South Pasadena. We've employed all of these things,  
20 pre-application meeting. This would be meeting with  
21 staff, and if you'd like you can pull in one member of  
22 design review, one member of Planning Commission. I say  
23 one because if you have more than two you have a quorum,  
24 but essentially providing some direction.

25 But at the pre-application meeting it can be

1 for example just pointing out land mines, hey, did you  
2 know there's an easement or setback requirements here or  
3 whatever it is. Then there's conceptual meeting as you  
4 were saying, mark, and you can have two or three before  
5 final approval for the site plan. The other steps are  
6 the dial. Oftentimes there's switch and bait or bait  
7 and switch, where you get drawings at the site plan  
8 approval and what gets built is reverse of the project  
9 because there were some things that the designer  
10 realized couldn't work when they were making drawings or  
11 whatever it is.

12           But what this suggests is if you have changes  
13 that's okay we understand. Just bring them back for  
14 confirmation and details. So for larger projects you  
15 might want to give approval of a site plan with a  
16 condition that, when you have details ready, bring them  
17 in because we will make sure they're exactly in  
18 conformance. Or if you have different products that  
19 you're using, different design features, then we want to  
20 approve those changes.

21           Oftentimes what happens is these things, DRC  
22 inspection, inspectors go out and only look at -- these  
23 are cities we work with -- things that affect health,  
24 safety and welfare. They don't look at design things.  
25 They don't care. That's not their job when they look

1 for completion.

2           So if you have a site plan that shows certain  
3 types of landscape or certain type of fence and certain  
4 type of design feature, important in approving this  
5 project that's changed there's still a fence that likely  
6 might get approved, you might consider having money that  
7 needs to be funded by the builder, consider but the  
8 construction detail review allows for quality control of  
9 details. They allow for minor refinements and can be  
10 performed by Planning Commission, or if you feel it  
11 could be performed by the staff as well. As I  
12 mentioned, by developer, removes the weight from the  
13 city.

14           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I think it's great,  
15 but say it's not in compliance or what in the heck  
16 happened here? What recourse do you have?

17           MR. Rangwala: That's the next one. So you do  
18 it at three levels; right? So if it's very important  
19 that this detail is flush with the sidewalk, you can  
20 correct that. The building is not up yet, so you have  
21 inspection then. Then roofing. Before you put that  
22 roof on, the features that you had, you get inspected  
23 and approved.

24           Then the third one would be in finishes. So if  
25 you have finishes and they're not right, so you're

1 checking it at each level. Now that's overkill. Okay.  
2 That's overkill, and it may not be for this community.  
3 But there are communities that do this, and they're very  
4 particular, Santa Barbara, Ventura. Very particular  
5 about what they put in their city because these  
6 buildings after the designers left are inherited by the  
7 community for years and years to come. And if you're  
8 very passionate, like a museum piece, you wouldn't put  
9 anything. That's how we feel about downtown. We want  
10 each piece to be the best example.

11 Commissioner Gallatin: Not only that, Kaizer,  
12 but when you don't have that sort of quality control in  
13 place, it sets a precedent and then future designers and  
14 architects who maybe are less than scrupulous say, "you  
15 allowed it down the street. Why can't I do that too?"  
16 And that undercuts you.

17 MR. Rangwala: You may also want to have some  
18 thresholds so you're not turning a small project into  
19 this, but if you've got four acres and building this --

20 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I want them for every  
21 project.

22 MR. Rangwala: You decide the scale of the  
23 projects and how important it is. But this is a system  
24 that is used and is available and is compatible.

25 Okay. I'm just going to walk you through a

1 couple of projects real quick. These are projects that  
2 I think are in Ventura, Ventura downtown and plan and  
3 form-based code and we were excited, and we were waiting  
4 for documentation on that. But we decided to use it  
5 saying, let's try this through and use it as design  
6 guidelines. So any project in downtown requires a  
7 variance has to use this code and use it as design  
8 guidelines, which allows us to test drive.

9           So in California documentation takes nine  
10 months to a year. We're going to do it faster -- we can  
11 actually test drive and see if it works and see if it's  
12 a good fit for community. That's what we did here.  
13 First project that came out, this is loud. What did we  
14 do wrong? This is a garden apartment that's squished  
15 together. There's no semblance of buildings, no  
16 semblance of open space or relationship to the street.  
17 One product 400 times.

18           So we went through some work with the town  
19 architect and got them to put some light, building  
20 height with the sense of street, open space and block  
21 work and then what you see in black and white are the  
22 originals. What you see in the renderings is what we  
23 amended the code and we actually approved.

24           So as I was telling you earlier, the developer  
25 or designers get a block of land they essentially build

1 that, regardless of context. In this case the context  
2 we want to have in South Pasadena requires much more  
3 finer level of understanding when you see a door every  
4 25 feet, continue post adoption training and review,  
5 particularly for the counters, because that's where the  
6 code gets implemented. I don't know if there are any  
7 public counter planners here but that could happen as  
8 well. Certainly developers and residents. Then fine  
9 tune. Fine tune. We test it. We try it for a year,  
10 and we correct the visions and errors. If there are  
11 certain things that have changed, we amend the code and  
12 then why you have to hire a consultant for this code.  
13 If you have a trained staff, you can do it inhouse.

14           This is a project, it's too large, infill lots  
15 in downtown Ventura, historic buildings in the front,  
16 two historic single-family residences in the front. As  
17 you can see in the block it used to be all single family  
18 but over the life of two or three decades some of the  
19 single families were put together and you had apartment  
20 buildings that were built. So it had some interesting  
21 fabric. And this developer wanted to come in put  
22 buildings in the front and housing in the back.

23           What you see on the top -- I know you can't see  
24 very well. In the front is the two homes. What you see  
25 in the back is five homes with parking open to the

1 alley. So five homes and its access to that line which  
2 is a corridor, and they were calling it the corridor  
3 project. This is where I think having somebody who's as  
4 a marketer or designer what we're doing here is adding  
5 value without adding cost. In essence we've retained  
6 the historic walls in the front. We put eight units in  
7 the back so instead of four proposed there are now  
8 eight, more development, more value for both the  
9 community because they wanted to see something big here  
10 and they didn't like the open parking. They wanted eyes  
11 only populating the alley which was more urban than  
12 South Pasadena. They're more comfortable with density.  
13 This allows us to break that mass. What you see on the  
14 top is essentially two buildings. In this case there  
15 was a preference by the designer by the architects for  
16 structure, but there's no reason why this cannot be  
17 traditional architecture. But essentially it's units  
18 organized with a series of private spaces in the front  
19 and then private spaces in the back and views from the  
20 Court level which were not there, views from the level.  
21 We're looking for value for the designer for developer  
22 also for community. That's what we were able to  
23 appropriately work with the community on. That's the  
24 last slide. I'm going to stop there.

25 Any thoughts? Do you think this is a sound

1 approach, or we should go back to the drawing boards?

2 Let me start there because that's a game changer. Are  
3 we headed on the right path?

4 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Yeah, I think so. I  
5 see you are thinking of public space as a priority is  
6 something different from the code, like you expressed,  
7 and I think it's important we need to think of that  
8 prioritize public space especially Mission and Fair Oaks  
9 and how people pedestrians relate to not only buildings  
10 and landscape but the cars. And so I think that's  
11 definitely an improvement, I think. Prioritize the  
12 experience of the pedestrian, especially on that part is  
13 something I think is a good idea, yeah.

14 COMMISSIONER KOLDUS: I just coughed.

15 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: One thing specific  
16 plan is essentially kind of like spot zoning within a  
17 Zoning Code. How do you present spot zoning within a  
18 specific plan if you're going to be looking at form  
19 versus traditional planning guidelines?

20 MR. Rangwala: My understanding is when you  
21 have one or two parcels that are so distinct in  
22 character from their adjacent area. In this case we  
23 don't have one or two parcels. We are entirely coding  
24 the entire width of Mission and the entire width of  
25 Fair Oaks. It's a replacement of not just this but also

1 some additional parcels on Fair Oaks.

2           And another type is consistency with the  
3 General Plan. In this case it's a hundred percent  
4 consistent with the General Plan because they both  
5 proceed at the same time. So I wouldn't categorize it  
6 as spot zoning.

7           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I kind of looked at  
8 the plan of the draft to the before I came, and I was  
9 involved with the -- I was on General Plan committee and  
10 specific plan committee before and I found the whole  
11 thing kind of complicated. And it's not going to be  
12 user friendly for the average person in town if they  
13 need to go in and use this and. I mean if I had more  
14 time and I have to sit there and analyze everything, I  
15 suppose I could figure it out. But I felt it was kind  
16 of confusing.

17           Then, too, one specific slide that I didn't  
18 comment on the one about the discretionary permitted  
19 uses and everything, if that -- in South Pasadena we  
20 have a lot of gray, and I felt that slide was very black  
21 and white and it all comes down to interpretation. And  
22 I think that there is not enough thought given to the  
23 fact that we're kind of pretty much a built-out city.  
24 We have a mixture of historic properties, mid range and  
25 newer properties, and it's a little more complicated

1 than just permitted or not -- you know, or discretionary  
2 issue.

3           And in the past there's been problems with  
4 interpretation. Some people will interpret it one way,  
5 and the staff interprets it another. Then there's  
6 different interpretations with different staff, so  
7 that's my comments.

8           MR. Rangwala: Let me respond to the last one  
9 first. If there are specific examples you can point  
10 to -- and I think this is a great time to resolve those  
11 and make clear what the intent is because one of the  
12 goals that we have here is to be clear and precise about  
13 our intentions.

14           And where this is different from this is that  
15 this is very graphic, and our thought is because it's  
16 graphic, it's easy to understand than this one. I tend  
17 to find this more complicated. But I appreciate your  
18 comment. What I would like to focus on is if there are  
19 certain areas that are more complicated that are not  
20 easy to understand, let's make it easier. So if you  
21 could point out, "I don't understand this," let's start  
22 there and make it easier so that you understand it. And  
23 if you don't understand it, there are others that don't  
24 understand it, so we're open to that. But our goal is  
25 to make this more easy to understand with graphics and

1 clear language and precise language. So that's Mission  
2 unaccomplished. And I'm serious about sitting down with  
3 you and understanding what's complicated.

4 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: What are the deadlines  
5 for approval of this and everything, or what's the  
6 process going to be, the timing?

7 MR. Rangwala: I'm going to go out on a limb  
8 and had discussion with David and -- but what the entire  
9 plan in the code, the General Plan and downtown specific  
10 plan is anticipated for adoption roughly in the October  
11 timeframe. So that it's done by end of October. And  
12 between now and October what David is going to do is  
13 essentially work with the Planning Commission. He's  
14 going to have series of workshops, series of sessions  
15 with the Planning Commission, to discuss some of the  
16 nuances. It might involve cultural heritage but have  
17 some detailed discussion about the standards, land uses.  
18 And about the issue that you mentioned, if there's  
19 something that's unclear, let us know because we want to  
20 be clear.

21 So that will happen next month so March, April  
22 and possibly may a series of meetings with the Planning  
23 Commission where David will discuss code provisions and  
24 get feedback from the Planning Commission.

25 DIRECTOR WATKINS: If I could add to that, I

1 know that Kaizer will be putting out a second draft of  
2 this code in about two or three weeks after we give him  
3 some of our revisions. Each commission Design Review  
4 Board will have discussion of this code on their agenda  
5 as for two months. I think for March and April, for the  
6 cultural heritage and planning and April and may for  
7 Design Review Board, and it will be open to the public.  
8 And we're going to be accepting public comments and  
9 commission comments and discussion on the development  
10 code.

11           The other dimension is that what the council  
12 approved when they gave the green light to start this  
13 whole update process back in January of 17, the  
14 direction was to finish it by October of this year. And  
15 that's the timeline we're on.

16           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: It's kind of stupid,  
17 but there were little typos in the maps and stuff. Do  
18 you want us to --

19           MR. Rangwala: Yes. I'm solely to blame.  
20 Please. There is. I thought you liked that.

21           COMMISSONER LESAK: The signage.

22           MR. Rangwala: Yes, there would be the design  
23 guidelines are specific, and they are more aligned to  
24 the architecture and the form. So there's a typology of  
25 the designs, everything from marquee sign to model sign.

1                   MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: I want to talk  
2 about -- it's great. (People are eating. Inaudible.)  
3 Just quick question. Energy and water conservation  
4 efforts to be able to put in as far as requirements.  
5 Obviously we've got state building codes and such (her  
6 potato chip bag is crunching.) Gray water connections  
7 and things like that whether we should be looking at  
8 those in the codes now. I haven't seen a lot of that.

9                   COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: Can the city applied for  
10 a grant from SCAG to prepare a climate action plan and  
11 so I'm anticipating that the types of detail things  
12 you're discussing are going to be addressed in the  
13 climate action plan.

14                  MR. Rangwala: To add, you can certainly  
15 consider those things, but it makes sense to wait. And  
16 I would say this is a dynamic document. It should not  
17 be perceived as one crack at the apple. But it's  
18 something that you should look annually to review. And  
19 WHEN the climate action plan is worked out and has  
20 specific recommendations to adopt certain regulations,  
21 that might be a time to put that in. We can do it now,  
22 or we can reference it in the plan in the specific plan  
23 policies and we could put it in the General Plan so it  
24 LAYS the groundwork that this will be added later on.

25                  COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: My understanding is that

1 it's APPROPRIATE to include policy themes but then the  
2 actual implementation would then be contained in the  
3 climate action plan. But I definitely think with this  
4 community the policy themes, sustainability, et cetera,  
5 you will look for those.

6 MR. Rangwala: I think you want to dedicate the  
7 time that is necessary to that effort and make it right  
8 rather than making it conform with this. It's an area  
9 that needs to be discussed. It needs to be formalized  
10 with series of meetings and hearings in the best form  
11 that you can rather than rushing it in this. So my  
12 suggestion would be to put it, as she was saying, as  
13 policies and actions and the adoption of the ordinances,  
14 requirements a year from now.

15 COMMISSONER LESAK: I do think there's an  
16 overlay in sound -- (inaudible) and I do think that --  
17 without having to change (INAUDIBLE).

18 MR. LOPEZ: I think a lot of these concepts  
19 have been kind of naturally, probably others that I  
20 don't remember but Mission Meredian then down the  
21 street, those have been benefiting from a fair amount of  
22 active involvement of from the designers or the  
23 developers showing what they want and the city  
24 presenting to the city and the city being involved in  
25 it. So a lot of the things that you were talking about

1 happened that I think it's kind of a sign of the times.  
2 I mean I think it happened naturally because people have  
3 realized the model from, let's just say the '70s or one  
4 of the examples you showed is not the right way to go.  
5 And I think that's happened naturally those two examples  
6 not that everything is perfect.

7           But there's already been an effort to do that,  
8 so I think you're not proposing something that is  
9 against what's been already happening. Now, could we  
10 improve it? Of course. You know the zoning and all  
11 things could be improved and everything else, but I  
12 think that already has happened, and I don't -- I think  
13 the commissioners of the city are savvy enough to be  
14 able to be aware of those, and articulation of volumes  
15 and so I think that we are moving in the right  
16 direction.

17           We have the gray areas on the spots and  
18 actually the car garages I would be happy to be able to  
19 turn that volume up, like use it. I would, but that's  
20 much more of a legal thing, how much power do you have  
21 over grandfathered uses that are not appropriate that  
22 have been around for 20 years already and we're still  
23 doing and they're still there. You know, the  
24 (inaudible) bakery, but I would be happy to turn up the  
25 volume to try to move those away in a legal, of course,

1 way. And as a community is something that everybody  
2 would like to see happen, I would be more than happy to  
3 turn up the volume.

4 MR. Rangwala: While you're mentioning that  
5 this is a little controversial subject. There are  
6 projects that have gone through the city recently that  
7 have had mixed results, and I think they were denied.  
8 We were having this conversation earlier. And I think  
9 it's relevant because right before the conversation we  
10 had another conversation at city hall on another  
11 project. This is something that is not in here but it  
12 seems to be engrained in the community's DNA that this  
13 is a community that is an involved community and does  
14 not like to -- this is my opinion -- does not -- I  
15 shouldn't say "like" but appreciates being involved  
16 early on and being involved in the process like the  
17 charrette, for example, where you essentially come up  
18 with nothing okay I'm going to design this city and you  
19 sit together and you design it in the community working  
20 with the community as opposed to a model that we are  
21 used to right now where sharing the story where the  
22 developer comes with a set of site plan packets and a  
23 set of docs. He hands them over to Planning Commission.  
24 The design review and essentially saying this is wrong  
25 this is wrong.

1           What about twisting and turning that and having  
2 the participation up front, because the last thing you  
3 want is the community -- you want them involved early on  
4 in having feedback, but there's no process right now.  
5 That's not something necessarily provided in the code,  
6 but that's something that would be a cultural shift that  
7 Planning Commission and design review, that could be  
8 something that David, go meet with the neighborhood.  
9 Have a session with them. Get them involved.

10           MR. LOPEZ: I mean conceptually yes that's  
11 happened on bigger projects and happened when they're  
12 smart enough because -- because he know if you show up  
13 at a meeting and 20 people will complain about your  
14 project, you have a very good chance of it not  
15 happening. That's what we do. We put our two cents in  
16 and public and put it all together.

17           But I don't know that there's an easy way to go  
18 about like saying you have to go meet with the neighbor,  
19 because he has to -- not everybody has a good  
20 suggestion. And that's reality, you know. Not  
21 everybody has a good suggestion. I'm not sure what to  
22 do about that. Yeah, we want to get the feedback, and  
23 you want to sift through what you hear and use some of  
24 that, but other things you can't use.

25           MR. Rangwala: I'm not saying you please

1 everybody, but you make them part of the process early.

2 MR. LOPEZ: We have mentioned that to people  
3 who have come to us and said, "by the way, as you can  
4 say there is five people here. Next time you come, it  
5 wouldn't be a bad idea to meet with them. Now, I cannot  
6 make you do it because it's not part of the process or  
7 is not part of the checklist thing, but it would be good  
8 for you to do that because this is what happens."

9 And that's okay. It's perfect. This is what  
10 it's supposed to be. So we offer that. Have we always  
11 said by the way.

12 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: They'll talk outside.  
13 They'll talk it out. It's very interesting how it's a  
14 confrontational relationship. Very confrontational so  
15 you have to be able on getting everybody up to speed.  
16 But people have to go through it. It's part of the  
17 process.

18 MR. Rangwala: Can I ask somebody from the  
19 neighborhood to comment. Is the process right now one  
20 you feel you want?

21 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: No.

22 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: No.

23 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: No.

24 MR. Rangwala: So that's a problem. You want  
25 one where the people feel involved.

1           COMMISSIONER TOM:  What's the reason?  You can  
2 formalize processes, but what is it that makes you say  
3 no?

4           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE:  Cultural heritage  
5 commission has got a project.  Notices aren't sent out  
6 to the neighborhood, and if they're interested they'll  
7 show up.  If not they don't.  That's going on right now.  
8 That's down the line in the project.  Satisfies a legal  
9 requirement.

10          MR. Rangwala:  Once you are in this as a  
11 designer or developer, if I spend \$10,000 for site plan  
12 I better do that.  When I am first thinking about it, I  
13 share, this is my program, these are some of the things  
14 I'm trying to achieve.  And I think that's more sort  
15 of -- and I understand that there will be -- people will  
16 have "I want to see this as a park."  Wonderful.  That's  
17 not going to happen because you don't have money to buy  
18 it.

19          So there will be some good comments and  
20 whatever goes out I would want to know the process  
21 rather than at the end.  I would like to see if I can  
22 turn some of you to be my advocates because I've worked  
23 with you and listened to you in my design.

24          MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE:  Two years public  
25 hearings before Mission Meredian, I think, public on

1 this project. Parking lot. Not understood on some of  
2 these projects you ask the developer neighbors weren't  
3 involved. Then in one project they said it's because  
4 it's not affecting your neighborhood. We sent notices  
5 we send any north or south, but we thought we live in  
6 this neighborhood.

7 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Michael didn't do  
8 that. He pulled you in all the time. Yeah, same place.  
9 School yard. Across the street where weight lifting is.

10 MR. Rangwala: The point that you're making to  
11 cut to the chase on that point from what I'm hearing,  
12 the people who are interested in projects don't really  
13 fit in well with 300 foot notice requirement that the  
14 impacts and involvement are much wider than state  
15 mandated. And, "show up if you can," versus "please  
16 come. I extend you the invitation personally." It's  
17 completely different dynamic. We want your feedback.  
18 So the notices, it's intended to get you to public  
19 hearings and the Planning Commission and city council  
20 not so much at these meetings.

21 So this is something that would be incumbent  
22 upon developer to reach out to invite the audience. And  
23 the reason I bring this up not something that we can  
24 legislate in the code but could be part of the culture.  
25 So if you bring a project here and it's over four or

1 five acres, 300 feet doesn't apply. You need to involve  
2 people that would be something that staff can bring  
3 forth and design review can bring forth go meet with  
4 them and we'll be there or provide comments there as  
5 well.

6 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: The other distinction  
7 is I believe public notices for hearings are only  
8 required to go to the property owner, but these sort of  
9 more informal early on should go to renters as well as  
10 owners. Or I think it depends on, but maybe it should  
11 be in the newspaper or the E-neighbors newsletter in  
12 town. It has to be to the whole town. Website now or  
13 no? On the website? Different meetings are in the  
14 websites? The week before?

15 COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: They should be. Also  
16 something, and this doesn't help with the early stage of  
17 development, but once the projects actually go to design  
18 review, we are finally -- I have wanted this for three  
19 or four years, and I'm pleased to say with our new city  
20 manager it's finally happening. We're getting a large  
21 signs that the city of Pasadena employs to provide  
22 notices, which I think is so important because people  
23 don't read their mail, but they do see the signs, and so  
24 I think that's going to help.

25 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Along that line is

1 story poles, because there's a project in san Marino  
2 I've been driving by for a month about once every week  
3 or two weeks, and it looks really bad, you know, what  
4 they're going to do to this wonderful English Tudor  
5 house it's built on the front of it and it's too tall  
6 and all sorts of things going on.

7           And that's one thing I brought up before, and I  
8 don't think the city has ever used that, but it's really  
9 important because it's a visual thing, and then the  
10 neighbors can see it, along with the sign.

11           MR. Rangwala: Are you saying final rendering  
12 or drawing of what it's going to be be represented on  
13 the sign?

14           MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: No. I'm talking about  
15 the story poles that show the height, and then they have  
16 a flag in the front so you actually visually -- and a  
17 picture of the rendering also maybe on the sign that  
18 we're going to get, but I'm talking about the actual  
19 physical dimensions and height and everything.

20           COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: I like it, Joanne.

21           MR. Rangwala: All right. Do we have any other  
22 comments or thoughts on the code or the process? We'll  
23 keep marching away, and if there is any feedback, just  
24 forward to staff or myself. And let's continue  
25 dialogue. Thank you for the comments you had this

1 evening.

2

(Applause.)

3

4

COUNCILMEMBER MAHMUD: Thank you, all, for  
committees and residents we have. Thank you.

5

6

(The MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 9:26 p.m.)

7

8

---o0o---

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25