



ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS
Library/Community Center Comprehensive
Site Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting
June 5, 2025, 7:00 p.m.

The attached documents include written public comments submitted no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the Site Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting. Correspondence received after this time will be distributed the following business day.

Item No.	Agenda Item Description	Distributor	Document
5.	PUBLIC COMMENT – JOSH ALBREKTSON	Cathy Billings	Emailed Comment
5.	PUBLIC COMMENT – LYNN TAVAROZZI	Cathy Billings	Emailed Comment
5.	PUBLIC COMMENT – JASON CLAYPOOL	Cathy Billings	Emailed Comment

From: [Josh Albrektson](#)
To: [Library Park Campus](#); [Janet Braun](#); [Sheila Rossi](#)
Subject: Item 5 public comment
Date: Thursday, June 5, 2025 12:23:06 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The report about the potential renovation of the library by Group 4 is pretty good. Up until I got to the page about parking options.

I am shocked beyond belief that they recommended underground parking for the library. This is absolutely horrible urban design and something that was done in the 80's and 90's and people learned that you shouldn't be building parking for stuff like this.

First off, the cost. Each parking underground parking spot costs \$80k to build. 80-100 parking spots means it would cost about \$6.4 to \$8 to build this parking garage.

This parking garage would be one of the biggest costs of the library and one of the ones that is used the least.

Right now, we do not have a single parking spot for our library. There is not a single problem for anybody who wants to use our library today. In fact, if you look at the demographics of how people go to our library (and most of our businesses on Mission) you will find that the vast majority walk.

You can even find examples of places in South Pasadena required parking to be built and the parking garage never gets used.

There is a public lot in the building just north of Mike and Annes. It is only open from 8 AM to 6 PM because no one uses it.

The line at Mission and Meridian is the lowest used of any parking lot on the A line. During the week it only reaches 41% capacity. On the weekends it is at 11% capacity. We have had to shut down the second floor and there are continual problems with homeless people sleeping in it.

There is plenty of parking on the streets surrounding the library and in the empty parking lots South Pasadena forced other buildings to build. We shouldn't be building parking that will never be used for \$6-8 million that could be spent in plenty of other places.

At UCLA and USC there are classes taught in their planning schools about how bad and costly these parking requirements are and how they shouldn't happen.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_High_Cost_of_Free_Parking

Please, talk to Jason Claypool or any person who has received a planning degree in the past 10

years.

--

Josh Albrektson MD
Neuroradiologist by night
Crime fighter by day

From: [Lynn Tavarozzi](#)
To: [Library Park Campus](#)
Subject: Tavarozzi Library Comments June 5, 2025
Date: Thursday, June 5, 2025 6:38:38 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Regarding the presentation for the June 5, 2025 public meeting on the Library Park project.

1. Clearly you're recommending Option B, page 36 demolish 1980's buildings and retain 1930's building; I generally agree
2. Your site development strategies 1 and 3 to support Option B create overwhelming mass close to the streets and break up the park area, making the park less welcoming and useful; the plan seems driven by the desire to preserve some sections of the building between the historically significant community room and the main building; these are only "contributing" to the historical preservation; **I strongly recommend that you preserve only the "primary significance" community room building (and the front entrance to the north) so that you can build the mass of the building closer to the center of the property - and create/preserve a more welcoming and useful park area surrounding the buildings**
3. The pages 36 and 40 are great summaries to compare the project options; the significance of comparing the Options 1, 2, and 3 (pages 42 to 47) are less clear; what's missing and greatly needed is a comparison between options of the cost and timeline to complete, and do we have this money available? I see the next steps include funding considerations, but presenting options with no price tags or tradeoffs isn't productive

Thank you for your work.

Lynn Tavarozzi

South Pasadena, CA 91030

From: [Jason Claypool](#)
To: [Library Park Campus](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: June 5th Agenda Item #5
Date: Thursday, June 5, 2025 10:43:00 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ad Hoc Committee,

I am writing to you regarding the Parking Options slide #49 in the Additional Documents file of the June 5th Agenda. Slide #49 from Group 4 Architecture lists 80-100 potential under building parking spaces per level. I want to make sure the appropriate district-wide studies are performed and shared before any recommendations are made by the consultant.

In addition, I believe the more parking we add the more driving we will promote. I was excited to learn from the surveys that only 43% of those surveyed drive to the library and senior center. I would love to see that number diminish. Parking costs a lot of money, taking money away from all of the resources, activities, etc. the community would love to see in the future.

Thank you,
Jason Claypool
Resident, Architect, and Urban Designer