

Attachment 11: Terrace Park Neighborhood Association Comments

Terrace Park Neighborhood Association  
340 Greg Thatch Circle  
Sacramento, CA 95835  
[TPHomeOwners@aol.com](mailto:TPHomeOwners@aol.com)



David Hung

February 15, 2008

City of Sacramento

Development Services Department

New City Hall

9151 I Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Arena Seniors project

Dear Mr. Hung;

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. I have several comments and suggestions on this project, which also relate to other previously constructed "senior projects".

First of all, at least this project has considered that there is a **need** for elevators when you are building more than a one (1) story senior project. Two others in this area, one on Arena Blvd. between I-5 and Truxel and the other on El Centro between Del Paso and Arena, are two story "senior" rental projects with no elevators. Yes, elevators are not required for two story apartment complexes, but did the developers forget who their targeted market was? The majority of seniors, by the time they reach 60 DO NOT want to climb stairs to get into their units. It is amazing that they were approved and built for the senior population!

Secondly, why are only affordable "rental" units being built for seniors? Providing affordable housing should give seniors living on fixed income (also handicapped and lower income households) a chance to "own" not just rent. Is it a given that these populations will only be renters and do not have the desire

to be homeowners? Many cities have been able to provide opportunities for the senior populations, handicapped populations and lower income households and to become homeowners, not just renters. I have yet to see Sacramento take steps to provide these opportunities. Why not make these units a home purchasing opportunity for seniors, who cannot otherwise afford the price of a regular home nor have the ability to do outside lawn upkeep. There seems to already be enough new "senior" apartments that have been built (without elevators) for renters and appear to be still mostly vacant.

Also if this does get approved as presented, only four (4) trash and recycling enclosures does not seem reasonable for a senior population. Please keep in mind that many seniors have difficulty carrying their trash out and trying to carrying it a longer distance will create an obstacle for many of them. Adding more enclosures will alleviate this problem for those experiencing mobility issues.

Covered parking seems to assume that no one will have more than one car. This will be true for some of the population, but not all. Many seniors still rely on two cars because many seniors (who are still physically capable) still have to work to supplement their incomes in order to survive. Providing 1 ½, instead of only one, spaces per unit will allow for the extra vehicles to accommodate this unfortunate necessity of part time jobs for many of our aging seniors. I realize that light rail, when it finally gets built, may (or may not) provide an alternate way for seniors to get to desired destinations, but this is a long way off and even then may not reduce the need for cars because of the distance or location of doctors, etc. that are not readily accessible for a senior population, who do not always have the stamina to walk many blocks. Buses also are not always the answer many destinations do many of the same issues mentioned above plus the many transfers required sometimes to get to certain places including medical services.

Please reconsider this not proceeding with this project until some of these issues are addressed. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.



Carlene DeMarco

Chairperson, Terrace Park Neighborhood Association

Attachment 12: Applicant Response to Terrace Park Neighborhood 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 Terrace Park Neighborhood Association comments on Arena Seniors

- 
1. ***There is a need for elevators for multi-story senior projects.*** As you have noted all units will have elevator access.
  2. ***Why only affordable rental units and not for sale units. There seems to already be enough new senior apartments that appear to be still mostly vacant.*** Our market analysis shows a growing need for affordable senior rental 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. Most tenants who will be moving into these units will have already downsized out of homes and unfortunately can no longer afford a mortgage payment or to purchase a home outright.
  3. ***Only four trash and recycling enclosures does not seem reasonable for a senior population.*** We have recently revised our site layout to account for comments from city staff and neighborhood groups and now have 6 trash and recycling enclosures.
  4. ***Covered parking seems to assume that no one will have more than one car. Many seniors still rely on two cars because many seniors still have to work to supplement their income.*** The vast majority of the tenants who reside in this facility will be single and therefore have just one car. In fact a significant portion of the tenants will no longer drive or own a vehicle at all. 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 to accommodate tenants and guests. 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.

## Attachment 13: WalkSacramento Comments



May 22, 2008

David Hung, Associate Planner  
Current Planning Division  
Development Services Department  
300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**RE: Arena Seniors (P08-013)**

Dear Mr. Hung:

*WALKSacramento* encourages people to walk and bicycle in their communities. The benefits include improved physical fitness, less motor vehicle traffic congestion, better air quality and a stronger sense of cohesion and safety in local neighborhoods. *WALKSacramento* is a member of the Partnership for Active Communities, funded in part by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The Partnership is working to support increased physical activity such as walking and bicycling in local neighborhoods as well as helping to create community environments that support walking and bicycling. One of the ways we are doing this is through the review of proposed development projects in the Natomas community.

*WALKSacramento* would like to submit the following comments to the City Planning Commission for their consideration at the commission meeting this evening. The staff report for the May 22, 2008 City Planning Commission public hearing includes a site plan that differs in several significant aspects from those distributed with the March 7, 2008 Neighborhood Project Notification. We are concerned with the following items in the staff report: the site plan (page 54) and conditions of approval A62 (pages 48-49) and A74 (page 50).

Pedestrian circulation is important for a residential project adjacent to an existing bus route and a proposed light rail station. Recognizing that the project parcel has no direct connection to public streets, the design of connections to public space is more challenging and requires more accommodations than is usual. Complicating the situation is the addition of fencing and gates for vehicles and pedestrians. The result is insufficient connections to surrounding land uses.

### Site Plan

1. Staff report, page 15, states there is a pedestrian connection at the north emergency vehicle access driveway. However, the site plan appears to show only vehicle access.  
**WALKSacramento recommends adding a separate pedestrian gate next to the north emergency vehicle access driveway.**
2. There is no connection direct connection from the northeast corner of the project to the intersection of Truxel Road and Sports Parkway/Terracina Drive.  
**WALKSacramento recommends adding a pedestrian walkway and gate at the northeast corner of the project near Building 3.**
3. The pedestrian gate at the south vehicle entrance does not have walkway connecting to the private street nor any of the buildings.  
**WALKSacramento recommends adding a 4' -minimum walkway from the south private access road to Building 2.**
4. Building 3, located in northeast corner of project, appears to have a setback from the multi-use trail of only a few feet, assuming the drawing includes the two-foot wide trail shoulders. Space for shade trees to provide visual screening and noise and particulate reduction should be provided.  
**WALKSacramento recommends that Building 3 be located at least 10 feet from the trail shoulder.**
5. The multi-use trail depicted on the site plan appears to pass through the fence line. It is unacceptable and infeasible to gate a trail in this context.  
**WALKSacramento recommends moving the fence located on the east side of the parcel next to the Future Light Rail Station to the west side of the IOD for the multi-use trail.**
6. The pedestrian to the Future Light Rail Station and the Truxel Road sidewalk does not appear to be required.  
**WALKSacramento recommends the pedestrian walkway from the community Building connect to the Truxel Road Sidewalk.**

### Conditions of Approval A62.

7. The date of construction is not stated in the conditions.  
**WALKSacramento recommends a time frame for construction of the multi-use trail be stated in COA A62.**
8. It is important that the trail IOD be aligned so the off-street trail on the west side of Truxel be continuous across parcel lines. The shopping center to the east of the project has an existing wide sidewalk that should not be used as part of the multi-use trail.  
**WALKSacramento recommends addition to COA A62 specifying alignment of the multi-use trail IOD with the multi-use trail IOD to the south.**

**Condition of Approval A74**

9. Is the dimension of 36 feet by 64 feet correct?

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and recommendations. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 709-9843 or [cholm@walksacramento.org](mailto:cholm@walksacramento.org).

Sincerely,

Chris Holm  
Project Analyst

WALKSacramento  
909 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite #122  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attachment 14: Comment Letter dated 6/10/08

Page 1 of 2

**David Hung - RE: [natomasparkplanningcommittee] Planning Commission result, Arena Seniors Inclusionary Apts, P08-013**

---

**From:** "C T" <cxt0000@excite.com>  
**To:** <dhung@cityofsacramento.org>  
**Date:** 06/10/2008 5:15 PM  
**Subject:** RE: [natomasparkplanningcommittee] Planning Commission result, Arena Seniors Inclusionary Apts, P08-013  
**CC:** <rtretheway@cityofsacramento.org>

---

Hi Mr. Hung,

My name is Chantha Trinh, my family and I have been living in North Natomas the last 5 years. I have seemed a lot of growth in the area, the last couple of years; I have seemed more crimes in this area. I understand as an area grows, so do crime. The concern I have is more housing are being built in the area without any opposition.

At recently planning meeting, I heard no city official oppose more affordable housing to be built in North Natomas. Has anyone ask the residents how we feel? Who is representing us?

I understand we need more affordable housing, how about the rest of the city, why just in North Natomas area?

We paid more taxes and haven't seen any return. I heard some of the funds (somewhere around \$40 millions) were allocated for other expenses. Seems like we're short end of the stick on both end. Not to mentioned Natomas School District overpay land for school.

Let's share the burden; don't just stick it to North Natomas residents.

Regards,  
Chantha

Attachment 15: Parking Study

APARTMENT NAME	LOCATION	TOTAL UNITS	TOTAL PARKING SPACES	PARKING RATIO (spaces/unit)	VACANT SPACES @ ~12pm	PARKING RATIO @ ~12pm	VACANT SPACES @ ~8pm	PARKING RATIO @ ~8pm
Silver Ridge	Roseville, Ca	156	172	1.1	90	0.53	57	0.74
The Verandas	Sacramento, Ca	180	219	1.2	97	0.68	103	0.64
Villa Serena	Rocklin, Ca	236	276	1.2	140	0.58	84	0.81
Stanford Court	Rocklin, Ca	120	156	1.3	90	0.55	60	0.80
<b>Average</b>					<b>90</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>0.75</b>

**Arena Seniors Project Statistics:**

Total Units: 240  
 Proposed Total Parking Spaces: 241  
 Proposed Parking Ratio: 1.0  
 Projected Utilized Spaces @ 12pm: 140  
 Projected Utilized Parking @ 8pm: 180

(0.58 x 240 units = 139.2, therefore 101 vacant spaces)  
 (0.75 x 240 units = 180, therefore 61 vacant spaces)

Attachment 16: Addendum to an Adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration



Development Services Department

**CITY OF SACRAMENTO**  
CALIFORNIA

300 Richards Boulevard  
Sacramento, CA  
95811

Environmental Planning Services  
916-808-8419  
FAX 916-808-1077

**ADDENDUM TO AN ADOPTED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, make declare, and publish the Addendum to an adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the following described project:

**Arena Seniors (P08-013)** The proposed project consists of the entitlements to develop approximately 8.5 net acres with a 240-unit affordable senior housing complex in the Employment Center 40 and Employment Center 80 Planned Unit Development (EC-40-PUD, EC-80-PUD) zones in the Arena Corporate Center Planned Unit Development.

The City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, has reviewed the proposed project and on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project, as identified in the attached addendum, would have a significant effect on the environmental beyond that which was evaluated in the attached Mitigated Negative Declaration.

This addendum to an adopted Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to Title 14, Section 15164 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento.

A copy of this document, the previously-adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration and all supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, Planning Division, 300 Richards Boulevard, Sacramento, California 95811.

Environmental Services Manager, City of Sacramento,  
California, a municipal corporation

Date: May 1, 2008

By: 

**Arena Seniors  
Addendum to Mitigated Negative Declaration**

---

**File Number/Project Name:** P08-013/Arena Seniors

**Project Location:** The project site consists of approximately 8.5 net acres located at the southeast corner of the Arena Corporate Center Planned Unit Development on Sports Parkway and Truxel Road, and is identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 225-0070-098.

**Existing Plan Designations and Zoning:** The proposed project is located within the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) area. The Sacramento General Plan designation for the site is Mixed Use, and the North Natomas Community Plan designation is Employment Center- 40 and Employment Center 80. The project site is zoned as EC-40-PUD and EC-80-PUD.

**Project Background:** The project site is located in the southwest corner of Truxel Road and Sports Parkway within the Arena Corporate Center PUD. The proposed project site is located within the 98.0 gross acres of land designated as Employment Center 40 PUD and Employment Center 80 PUD zones.

**Project Description:** The proposed project consists of the entitlements to develop a 240-unit affordable senior housing complex on approximately 8.5 acres in the Employment Center 40 and Employment Center 80 Planned Unit Development (EC-40-PUD, EC-80-PUD) zones within the Arena Corporate Center PUD in the North Natomas Community Plan Area. The specific entitlements include:

1. **PUD Schematic Plan Amendment** to designate multi-family residential use in the Arena Corporate Center PUD;
2. **Plan Review** to construct a 240-unit apartment complex;
3. **Special Permit** to exceed the allowable 25% residential use within the Arena Corporate Center Planned Unit Development lying within the specific area delineated being bounded by the East Drain, I-5, Del Paso Road and Arena Boulevard.

**Discussion**

An Addendum to an adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are required, and none of the conditions identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 occurred. The following identifies the conditions set forth in section 15162 as they relate to the project.

1. **No substantial changes are proposed in the project which would require major revisions of the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.**