



December 17, 2020

Planning Commission
City of Pasadena
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91109

RE: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT #37 740-790 E. GREEN STREET, 118 S. OAK KNOLL AVENUE, AND 111 S. HUDSON AVENUE

Pasadena residents have been troubled by the amount of backed-up traffic surrounding our city for years. Before COVID, it had reached an absolute breaking point on many of our main arteries like Lake Street and South Los Robles. When local residents learned about the incredible number of unmitigated projects coming in along South Los Robles, we knew we had to do something more drastic to get the attention we needed since our efforts to raise the alarm with city planners seemed to be falling on deaf ears. We organized, raised the appropriate funds, and hired PRISM Engineering to help us understand traffic reports like 253 South Los Robles and to give voice to our deep concerns regarding the need for mitigation.

It became apparent these traffic reports produced by DOT needed serious studying and evaluating to ensure the outcomes were really telling the full story of what current residents were experiencing which was failed intersections, and frustrated drivers going through single family neighborhoods. Many residents are now concerned about the Planned Development proposed for a 2.33 acre site on the south side of E. Green Street between S. Oak Knoll Avenue and S. Hudson Avenue. What will the expected 1,187 vehicle trips do to our already jammed streets? Will we see more backup on Lake Street and South Los Robles which will result in traffic being pushed into single family neighborhoods? While city staff has proposed that the triggered VT threshold of 3.8 can be mitigated by unbundling parking and offering discounted METRO passes, ***more studies beyond these mitigations need to be conducted through a full EIR.*** In particular, should the project actually have less parking offered or reduced in population size? Residents want to know.

The current discussion surrounding traffic and new development needs perfect transparency, public engagement, and engineering discipline so that we can grow our city without creating a hopeless mess of congestion. An issue as important as this should have full transparency so that our community can really understand what a project of this size will do to our city streets. We need more time to have substantial conversations in order to respond to the mitigated negative declaration. Having staff away for the holiday and inaccessible during times when we should have full access is unacceptable. We are also dealing with a surge in COVID and it is unfair to assume our community is able to even focus on such a huge project when family

members can be sick. I ask you to please consider an extension so we have more time to evaluate the impacts this 263 unit project will have in an already congested community. I have seen many questionable aspects to the report that need investigating in order to properly respond to the draft.

Thank you for your consideration,

Erika Foy