

Exhibit 6N: Building Perspective 4



Exhibit 6O: Building Perspective 5



## Attachment 7: Natomas Park Planning Committee Comments

**Date:** March 26, 2008  
**To:** David Hung  
 Project Manager  
 Development Services Department  
 City of Sacramento

**From:** Natomas Park Planning Committee (NPPC)  
**Subject:** Community Comments, Arena Seniors Project, P08-013

We have reviewed the Arena Seniors project, P08-013, and submit the following comments/concerns:

- We are opposed to the special permit request to exceed 25% residential housing in EC zone. There is no housing market demand to justify exceeding the requirement. EC needs to be preserved for future demand when 100-yr flood protection is established.
- Road infrastructure has been sized for retail & EC. It should be used for that.
- The project site is a busy, high-traffic location. It is not a fit for seniors who will need time to cross a street or want to walk in a nearby park.
  - Residences will be inundated with noise from all sides.
  - Residences will be too close to existing businesses creating conditions for constant resident complaints about business operations.
- We are opposed to the developer building affordable housing but nothing else. For viability, affordable housing needs to be a “mixed” portion of market rate housing. Where is the market rate housing?
  - Developers are using affordable housing tax credits and bond payment incentives to gain profit in a poor market. They build only the affordable housing and nothing else. (ref. Willow Glen apartments on Del Paso at Blackrock being built when the Pardee Home project has been mothballed).
  - We request this trend be stopped. 15% of *zero* market-rate housing is *zero* affordable housing.
- Light rail construction is at least 10 years away. The Arena area is currently overbuilt with numerous 3-story apartment complexes. We request no more residential development until the current housing is occupied and impacts assessed. Areas of large apartment complexes have a known history of becoming crime-ridden “projects”.
  - Senior residences would be vulnerable to crime at this busy location.
  - There is insufficient local park space within walking distance for the current residential occupancy.
- There is no need for more senior apartments (either affordable or market-rate) in North Natomas. There are many vacancies now. High vacancy rates lower occupancy standards.
  - Carefree Senior Apartments – currently in Natomas Park - >100 units
  - Hurley Creek on El Centro - @ 200 units
  - Vintage at Natomas Field – @ 200 units
  - Panhandle – potential 150 affordable units
- The project is too dense with 240 units on 8.5 acres. It looks like “the projects”.
- The elevations are massive complexes of 7 interconnected 3-story buildings. These are too dense and visually unappealing for this prominent community location.
  - Composite roofing is unacceptable and not a fit with surrounding elevations.
  - Elevations are sparse and need many more accents for visual appeal.
  - The blue colors do not appear to be a fit with surrounding buildings.

- All buildings look identical with the same porches. Which are the “garden-style” apartments?
- The 3,064 sf. community building is not large enough to support 240 units considering it includes 3 offices and laundry.
  - The exercise room is way too small at @ 15’ x15’ to support > 350 residents.
- Perimeter landscaping needs to be abundant with many varieties and high visual appeal for this prominent location. The current landscaping appears to be mostly parking lot trees.
- There needs to be more garden/green space in the project to support residents. This is especially needed given the busy location and insufficient local park space. The community “garden” is not located where it can be enjoyed.
- Poor site access. The site only offers one access point (excluding emergency access) due to its location along Truxel and Arco Arena's internal roadways.
- Inadequate parking. The parking is very limited, at 1.125 spaces per unit, barely over the minimum requirement. Also, many of the spaces are a long distance from the units, which is a concern with seniors (in terms of both physical abilities and safety). Experience at existing apartment complexes has shown parking to be a problem whenever inadequate space is provided.
- Conversion of EC to residential. We have always been concerned about the conversion of EC land to residential, in part because these sites are generally poorly located in relation to community facilities such as parks and schools.
- Location adjacent to Arco Arena and proposed light rail station. This project creates an additional issue by being located in between the light rail station and the arena. The light rail station will serve people going to Arco, and this will create regular, late-night foot traffic (some of which will be loud and/or intoxicated), traveling not only near the project, but *through* it as well (note the large entrance to the project next to the light-rail station, and the emergency access point on its north side).
- Until adequate fire and police services are provided, no more housing should be approved.
- Until 100-year flood protection is obtained, no more housing should be approved.
- Apartment complexes are a drain on North Natomas Finance Plan facility financing, which is severely underfunded. This location needs development that will help, not hinder, NNFP financing.

We recommend this project be denied. It is not needed, creates more services burden and is not a fit with the location.

Cordially,

*Chris Paros*

Chris Paros  
Chair, Natomas Park Planning Committee

Attachment 8: Applicant Response to Natomas Park Planning Committee

3007 Douglas Blvd., Suite 170  
 Roseville, CA 95661  
 Phone: 916-783-0330  
 Fax: 916-783-3739



# Memo

**To:**  
**From:** Zachary Stamas  
**CC:**  
**Date:** 5/1/08  
**Re:** Response to Natomas Park Planning Committee (NPPC) Comments on Arena Seniors

1. ***We are opposed to the special permit request to exceed 25% residential housing in the EC zone.*** This is inaccurate. The project may exceed the 25% residential within the smaller "EC zone", but it does not exceed 25% residential within the overall PUD for the area and is an acceptable use. This can be verified by the city, and I recommend contacting our planner David Hung for a more complete explanation.
2. ***Road infrastructure has been sized for retail & EC.*** Truxel Road is a major thoroughfare and has been sized to meet the demands of the community including feeding residential developments. The private road that will be used to reach the main entrance of the project has been sized to meet the needs of a number of developments including our proposed apartments.
3. ***Project site is busy and not fit for seniors. Residences inundated with noise from all sides and is to close to existing businesses, which will result in constant resident complaints.*** It is our experience that seniors today like to be where the action is. Positioning a senior project where there is easy access to retail and shopping is ideal. Today's seniors are active and vital members of our society and do not want to spend their days doddering around their homes.
4. ***Opposed to developer building all affordable housing and nothing else. 15% of zero market-rate housing is zero affordable housing.*** The inclusionary housing ordinance was passed to promote the building of affordable housing, not to prevent or hinder the amount of affordable housing. Our market analysis shows a need for affordable senior housing.
5. ***Light rail construction at least 10 years away. Arena area overbuilt with 3-story apartments. No more housing should be built until current housing is occupied and impacts assessed. Areas of large apartment complexes turn into crime ridden projects.*** Senior housing will have a lower impact to the surrounding community than other possible uses. Family apartment projects may be prone to higher crime rates but this is just not true of senior housing. Our budget will include room for on-site security if needed and to address the safety of the project we have revised the plans and are now fencing the entire site and providing gated access.
6. ***No need for more senior housing.*** Our market analysis shows a growing need for affordable senior housing. Our project will not begin renting until 2010, which allows ample time for the units currently on the market to be absorbed. The fact that no additional affordable senior housing will be built after our project for some time due to the moratorium actually helps this project. The expanding need for senior housing will not stop just because of the moratorium.

7. ***Project is too dense with 240 acres on 8.5 acres.*** This project is consistent with the density called for by the zoning. Regional Transit would like to see the density increased up to 40 units an acre and the City has said that they too would not be opposed to increasing the density. We are sensitive to the fact that there are conflicting views within the community on what an appropriate density should be. We have sized the project to meet the demand of the local market.
8. ***Elevations are massive complexes of 7 interconnected 3-story building. Too dense and visually unappealing. Comp roofing unacceptable, elevations need more accents, colors don't fit with surroundings, and building look identical with all the same porches.*** We have revised our elevations to incorporate a different complimentary coloring scheme for each apartment building and have a mix of architectural treatments to keep the buildings from looking "identical". The building will not appear as "massive" in real life. (I have some pictures of a similar structure we built in Roseville that help illustrate this).
9. ***Community building not large enough and exercise room to small.*** We actually have quite a large community building and it is consistent in size with other similar projects. In addition we have provided additional outside areas for tenant use including community gardens, common courtyards, and the pool and spa area. You may be correct about the exercise room. We will make the exercise room larger in the final design.
10. ***Perimeter landscaping needs to be abundant; looks like we just have parking lot trees.*** We are currently revising the landscape plan and will keep these comments in mind as we develop the plan.
11. ***Need more garden and green space for residents.*** We have revised our site layout and now have more green space. We also have planned for two community gardens and have room for a third should the need arise.
12. ***Poor site access.*** It is true that the site has only one access point designated for tenant use but it does have an additional emergency access driveway. Site access is one of the reasons that the piece remained undeveloped through the biggest housing boom in recent memory. It is just not a site that is very suitable for retail or commercial development. It also is one of the reasons that using the site for senior housing is one of the best uses. Access to the site from the private road and not having access directly to Truxel Road will not pose a problem for our project as it would for other types of developments.
13. ***Inadequate parking and spaces to remote in relation to units.*** We have recently completed a study at four of our local senior projects and found that a parking ratio of about 0.75 spaces per unit is actually what is needed. The City of Sacramento and RT requested that we reduce the parking and as a result we now have a parking ratio of 1:1 on the revised plan. Taking your comments into consideration on the revised plan we have rearranged the parking to provide spaces as close to the units as possible.
14. ***Against conversion of EC to residential because to remote in relation to community facilities such as parks and schools.*** This would be more of a problem on a project that is not age restricted. Our tenants will not be using the local schools and we have provided onsite gardens and green areas for the tenants use.
15. ***Bad location for apartments because in between light rail and Arco Arena. Will have regular late night foot traffic.*** As stated above we believe that seniors today like to be where the action is. Positioning a senior project near local retail and business establishments is ideal. We did feel you had a valid point about the late night foot traffic and appreciate you pointing it out. As a result of your comment we have decided to fence and gate the project.
16. ***In adequate fire and police services, no more housing should be approved.*** An age-restricted project will have less of an impact on these services than a family project would. The

building of this project will generate over 4.5 million dollars in building and other permit fees to help pay for community services. In addition after being built the project will continue to result in the collection of additional property and other taxes. Our tenants will infuse addition capital into the local economy just as other residents do.

17. ***No more housing until 100-year flood protection obtained.*** This issue is out of our hands. We are following the rules, as they exist now.
18. ***Apartment complexes are a drain on North Natomas Finance Plan facility financing which is under funded. Location needs development that will help, not hinder, NNFP financing.*** As stated in number 16 above the building of this project will generate more than 4.5 million dollars in fees as well as continuing to generate additional taxes on an on going basis. I suggest that this project and the senior residents who live there will be a net asset to the NNFP financing plan.

## Attachment 9: Natomas Community Association 3/11/08 Comments

Page 1 of 1

**David Hung - P08-013 Arena Seniors**

---

**From:** Ken Stevenson <kenstevenson@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** David Hung <dhung@cityofsacramento.org>  
**Date:** 03/11/2008 11:25 AM  
**Subject:** P08-013 Arena Seniors

---

David,

The Natomas Community Association planning committee offers the following comments on the subject proposal:

We have a number of serious concerns about this proposal.

- Poor site access. The site only offers one access point (excluding emergency access) due to its location along Truxel and Arco Arena's internal roadways. We realize this is an issue regardless of what gets built here, but it should be a use that minimizes traffic generation. This project is very dense at 25 units an acre.
- Inadequate parking. The parking is very limited, at 1.125 spaces per unit, barely over the minimum requirement. No garages are provided. Also, many of the spaces are a long distance from the units, which is a concern with seniors (in terms of both physical abilities and safety). Experience at existing apartment complexes has shown parking to be a problem whenever inadequate space is provided.
- Conversion of EC to residential. We have always been concerned about the conversion of EC land to residential, in part because these sites are generally poorly located in relation to community facilities such as parks and schools. But we understand the NNCP allows conversion of up to 25% of EC land in a PUD. However, this project would exceed that limit, and we strongly oppose the exception.
- Location adjacent to Arco Arena and proposed light rail station. We have generally opposed residential projects on the periphery of Arco Arena because we believe residential and sports arena uses are highly incompatible, due to traffic, noise, light, etc. These concerns apply to this project as well. However, this project creates an additional issue by being located inbetween the light rail station and the arena. The light rail station will serve people going to Arco, and this will create regular, late-night foot traffic (some of which will be loud and/or intoxicated), travelling not only next to the project, but possibly through it as well (note the large entrance to the project next to the light-rail station, and the emergency access point on its north side).

Thank you,  
Ken Stevenson  
Chair, NCA Planning Committee

## Natomas Community Association 6/2/08 Comments

Hi, David,

The NCA met with the project proponent at our last meeting, and we have some additional comments based on that. However, we are aware that the project has already gone to the Planning Commission, and I heard that the PC did not approve it. I don't know if the process has moved beyond where we can provide input, but I will provide the comments just in case.

Our original concerns generally still stand, but were partly alleviated after our meeting with the proponent. We were particularly pleased to see that the project is now proposed to be fully gated, which much reduces the concerns we had about Arco patrons and others becoming a nuisance to residents. We were also glad to hear the proponent state that they retain ownership of their projects, as this seems important to us in order to maintain the quality of multifamily projects, particularly low-income projects. Also on a positive note, we appreciate how the proponent has designed the project with numerous buildings with few units per building (allowing a lot of light and air into the units) but at the same time configured so that each building has access to an elevator.

We were disappointed about one change made, according to the proponent, at the suggestion of city staff. This is relocating some of the buildings along the eastern edge of the project, where there had previously been a driveway and parking. We understand the city's wish to provide a pleasing appearance from the street, but this change will only make things less pleasant for the residents of those buildings, by subjecting them to more noise from the street, and if it should ever come, light rail. We strongly believe that residents' quality of life should take precedence over the streetscape enjoyed by people driving by on the street. It is baffling to us that city staff seems to reverse these priorities.

From some correspondence that I saw from you to Chris Paros, while I don't fully understand the rules, it appears that the proponent would be allowed to exceed the 25% high-density residential limit for a PUD due to a special exception for that area. While it might be permitted, we still don't think it is wise to allow this much EC land to be developed as residential (in fact, we believe the 25% allowed is excessive), and particularly in light of the fact that this area is not really suitable, in our opinion, for residential due to the conflicting arena uses.

Finally, we are still skeptical about the adequacy of the parking. It doesn't seem reasonable that 3/4 of a space per unit is at all adequate. Transit service in North Natomas is marginal at best, and one or two cars will be essential for most households. As you know, we consider the city minimum standard to be inadequate, and don't think the project should be permitted to not meet even this minimal standard.

Thanks, as always, for providing the opportunity for us to comment.

Ken

## Attachment 10: Applicant Response to Natomas Community Association

3007 Douglas Blvd., Suite 170  
Roseville, CA 95661  
Phone: 916-783-0330  
Fax: 916-783-3739

**Stamas Corporation**

# Memo

**To:**  
**From:** Zachary Stamas  
**CC:**  
**Date:** 5/1/08  
**Re:** Response to Natomas Community Association (NCA) Comments on Arena Seniors

1. **Poor site access; only one access point (excluding emergency access); whatever gets built here should minimize traffic generation; project is very dense.** It is true that the site has only one access point designated for tenant use but it does have an additional emergency access driveway. Site access is one of the reasons that the piece remained undeveloped through the biggest housing boom in recent memory. It is just not a site that is very suitable for retail or commercial development. It also is one of the reasons that using the site for senior housing is the best use. Access to the site from the private road and not having access directly to Truxel Road will not pose a problem for our project as it would for other types of developments. Senior housing generates less traffic than retail, commercial, or single-family use. It would be hard to find a use with less traffic impact other than another senior project with fewer units. This project is consistent with the density called for by the zoning. Regional Transit would like to see the density increased up to 40 units an acre and the City has said that they too would not be opposed to increasing the density. We are sensitive to the fact that there are conflicting views within the community on what an appropriate density should be. We have sized the project to meet the demand of the local market.
2. **Inadequate parking, no garages, and spaces to remote in relation to units.** We have recently completed a study at four of our local senior projects and found that a parking ratio of about 0.75 spaces per unit is actually what is needed. The City of Sacramento and RT requested that we reduce the parking and as a result we now have a parking ratio of 1:1 on the revised plan. No garages are offered but we do provide covered parking. We have recently revised our site plan and have rearranged the parking to provide spaces as close to the units as possible.
3. **Conversion of EC to residential; poorly located in relation to community facilities such as parks and schools; exceeds 25% residential housing in the EC zone.** As pointed out in number 1 above due to site access issues the location is not suitable for a retail or commercial use. In terms of the location in relation to community facilities this would be more of an issue with a project that is not age restricted. Our tenants will not be using the local schools and we have provided onsite gardens and green areas for the tenants use. It is not accurate to say that the project exceeds the 25% residential allotment. The project may exceed the 25% residential within the smaller "EC zone", but it does not exceed 25% residential within the overall PUD for the area and is an acceptable use. This can be verified by the city, and I recommend contacting our planner David Hung for a more complete explanation.

4. ***Bad location for apartments in between light rail and Arco Arena; incompatible use due to traffic, noise, light, etc; will have regular late night foot traffic.*** It is our belief that seniors today like to be where the action is. Positioning a senior project near local retail and business establishments is ideal. Today's seniors are active and vital members of our society and do not want to spend their days doddering around their homes. We did feel you had a valid point about the late night foot traffic and appreciate you pointing it out. As a result of your comment we have decided to fence and gate the project.