



# REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION City of Sacramento

# 3

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2671

PUBLIC HEARING  
July 28, 2011

To: Members of the Planning Commission

**Subject: 24<sup>th</sup> & T Street Residences (P10-089)**

A request to a five-unit apartment complex on approximately 0.19 acres in the Multi-Family (R-3A) zone.

- A. Environmental Determination: Exempt (CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 for Infill Development);
- B. Plan Review to develop a five-unit apartment complex in the Multi-Family (R-3A) zone;
- C. Special Permit to reduce the required street side setback from five feet to two feet for an accessory structure; and
- D. Variance to waive the required trash enclosure for a multi-family development.

**Location/Council District:**

Northwest Corner of T Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Sacramento, CA

Assessor's Parcel Number 010-0036-021-0000

Council District 4


**Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Commission approve the request based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in Attachment 1. **The current proposal is a result of extensive neighborhood negotiations to address concerns surrounding the density and design of the project. Staff will forward the recommendation of the Design Commission under a separate cover.** The Commission has final approval authority over items A-D above, and its decision is appealable to City Council.

**Contact:** David Hung, Associate Planner, (916) 808-5530; Sandra Yope, Senior Planner, (916) 808-7158; Gregory Bitter, Principal Planner, (916) 808-7816

**Applicant:** Rosen Development LLC, Attn: Andrea Rosen, (916) 508-6721, 2226 Portola Way, Sacramento, CA 95818

**Owner:** Rosen Development LLC, Attn: Andrea Rosen, (916) 508-6721, 2226 Portola Way, Sacramento, CA 95818; Benjamin Rosen (916) 761-1912

Vicinity Map



**Summary:** At the March 10, 2011 Planning Commission meeting, the Courtyard Condominiums project, for the development of six condominium units, was brought before the commission. After the close of public testimonies, the Planning Commission deliberated and voted to continue the project to allow time for the applicant and neighbors to engage in further discussions on the issues surrounding the project. After several subsequent continuances at the Planning Commission and lengthy negotiations between the applicant and neighbors, the applicant submitted revised plans to develop five apartment units on the subject site. Major changes include: 1) Reduction from six units to five units; 2) Apartments instead of condominiums and elimination of the Tentative Map; 3) Elimination of Special Permit to waive one parking space; 4) New building design to be Craftsman style with front porches and pitched roof; and 5) Addition of office suite in each of the units in the South Building. A private agreement (see Attachment 2) was signed between the applicant and the neighbors who were involved in the negotiations; these neighbors have agreed to support the project as long as stipulations contained in the agreement are met. Staff has notified all property owners within 500 feet of the site for this public hearing as well as others who spoke at the March hearing. Under the Zoning Code, design review for an apartment project is a recommendation of the Design Director or Design Commission to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission includes the design conditions as part of the plan review approval.

<b>Table 1: Project Information</b>
<b>General Plan designation:</b> Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density (8 to 21 units)
<b>Existing zoning of site:</b> R-3A
<b>Existing use of site:</b> Vacant (previously residential)
<b>Property area:</b> 0.193 acres (8,428 square foot)

**Background Information:** The site was previously developed with one single-family home which was approved for demolition by the Preservation Director on June 21, 2010 (file IR10-196). The building was demolished in September of 2010 and the site is now vacant. The applicant has previously submitted a Zoning Administrator application for the development of six apartment units (Z10-142) on September 9, 2010. Due to intense opposition by neighbors at a community meeting on November 18, 2010, staff decided to elevate the project from the Zoning Administrator level to the Planning Commission level and from Design Director level to the Design Commission level.

On December 17, 2010, the applicant submitted a new Planning Commission application to develop six condominium units in place of the withdrawn Zoning Administrator file; the application, entitled Courtyard Condominiums, would also be subject to approval by the Design Commission. The project was brought before the Planning Commission on March 10, 2011; more than 30 speakers addressed the commission, some in favor and some in opposition to the project. After the close of public testimonies, the Planning Commission deliberated and voted to continue the referenced project to the March 24, 2011 meeting to allow time for the applicant and neighbors to engage in further discussions on the issues surrounding the project. At the March 24, 2011 Planning

Commission meeting, the applicant asked for a continuance of the project to the April 14, 2011 meeting to allow more time for on-going discussions with neighbors. At the April 14, 2011 meeting, the applicant asked for a continuance to the June 9, 2011 meeting to allow additional time to work on redesigning the plans and circulating them to neighbors. At the June 9, 2011 meeting, the applicant asked for a continuance to the July 14, 2011 meeting to allow additional time for the mediation process. The current application request is for the necessary entitlements to develop five apartment units, which is the result of the negotiations between the applicant and neighbors. A private agreement (see Attachment 2) was signed between the applicant and the neighbors who were involved in the negotiations; these neighbors have agreed to support the project as long as stipulations contained in the agreement are met.

**Public/Neighborhood Outreach and Comments:** The project was routed to various advisory groups including the Newton Booth Neighborhood Association, the Southside Neighborhood Association, the Richmond Grove Neighborhood Association, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA) and WalkSacramento. During the processing of the condominium project, staff received support letters from SABA, WALKSacramento, Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), Midtown Business Association, Regional Transit, Friends of Light Rail & Transit, Policy in Motion, Design Sacramento 4 Health and Smart Growth Leadership Recognition Program as well as various community members. Some of the reasons for the support include: 1) The project will help reduce vehicle trips due to its proximity to light rail; 2) The project promotes walking and bicycling due to its proximity to nearby shops and offices; 3) The project is consistent with the General Plan goals for density goals and diversity in housing; 4) The project is a quality infill development with buildings that help activate the street frontages. Support letters are attached to the staff report.

Staff had received a number of letters of opposition to the six-unit condominium project which are attached to the staff report. It was due to the overwhelming opposition that staff has elevated the project to the Planning Commission and Design Commission. Neighbors who opposed the project expressed concerns of the addition of new units in a densely populated neighborhood, that the project will overburden the on-street parking in the neighborhood, and that the proposed architectural design does not blend with the surrounding buildings. Some neighbors were concerned that they weren't notified of the demolition of the previous home on the lot; however, the demolition was not subject to notification to neighbors. The applicant has also met with many of the neighbors at various times to discuss the project.

Staff received two separate petitions to oppose the project. The first petition (in Attachment 4), submitted on October 18, 2010, by a group of 21 neighbors, stated the following concerns:

1. There are already multiple apartment complexes in the neighborhood.
2. Parking in the neighborhood is already a problem.
3. The architectural design is out of character with the neighborhood.
4. The project will disrupt the existing condition of the neighborhood.

A second petition (in Attachment 4) came from a group of 40 neighbors and described the following concerns:

1. The overall historic and aesthetic profile of a neighborhood that is already challenged by inappropriate and haphazard design approvals from prior decades.
2. The already overwhelming density of on-street parking.
3. The delicate and tenuous balance that presently exists between single family residences and large multi-unit complexes.

The Concerned Neighbors of Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge has suggested the following stipulations to the project:

1. A reasonable increase of density from that of the previous single-dweller, one-story home on .19325 acres, to three housing units.
2. An architectural style of good faith integrity that is appropriate to the immediate surrounding neighborhood within a 300 square foot radius--an area that includes, albeit not exclusively, Tudor cottages, Craftsman bungalows, and Depression-era brick duplexes.
3. Pitched roofs with a height not markedly greater than that of the Mirabella Apartments immediately adjacent to the site on T Street.
4. Setbacks that adhere to city requirements.
5. Porches that evoke an "eyes on the neighborhood" affect while still adhering to the aforementioned setback requirements.
6. Off-street parking accommodations provided for all units.

Through extensive negotiations with neighbors during the last few months, the applicant has agreed to: 1) Reduce dwelling units from six to five; 2) Develop apartments instead of condominiums; 3) Provide one one-site parking for each of the five units; 4) Construct Craftsman style buildings with front porches and pitched roof; and 5) Add an office suite in each of the units in the South Building. The applicant has also agreed to the following design stipulations for the revised project as outlined in the private agreement:

1. Vary exterior color for each of the three units in the North Building.
2. South Building with two units no larger than 2,550 square feet interior space.
3. Install adequate safety lighting near alley and sidewalk and for pedestrian access on sidewalk adjacent to buildings. Install convex mirror on garage structure.
4. Craftsman style porch railings.
5. Trellis with vines on west wall of South Building.
6. Drainage spouts to be painted to complement stucco color.
7. Windows to optimize fit with traditional architecture.
8. Landscape plan to meet City requirements.

Some neighbors have agreed to support the project as long as the above design stipulations, along with other stipulations in the agreement, shall be met by the applicant. The agreement, along with signatures by these neighbors, is found in Attachment 2.

Staff has also received new comments from certain neighbors regarding the current proposal (see Attachment 3). Included are letters of support for the project; some remaining concerns are also brought up by other neighbors. A summary of these concerns are:

1. The project appears to carry the density of the block above the maximum 50 units allowed per the General Plan designation of Tradition Medium Density.  
Response: Staff has performed extensive research, including surveying the block, studying historical maps of the area and reviewing building permit and planning application data, and concluded that five additional units can be supported on the subject site. Staff recognizes that a survey of the block results in 48 units, however not all of these units were documented through the extensive research. Staff is supporting the proposed five unit project based on all the information available. With the addition of five units, the block will be at 49 units, which is just under 50 units. Therefore, in considering the entire block, the development does not cause the overall density for the block to be exceeded.
2. The location of the accessory structure next to the alley and T Street is detrimental to the health and safety of the residents. Neighbors suggest that a retaining wall be erected on the north side of the alley as part of the project.  
Response: The project is requesting a street side setback reduction for the garage adjacent to T Street; it is also providing standard six-foot setback at the garage adjacent to the alley. The project meets the maneuvering requirements of the zoning code and at the alley and staff does not believe the building setback reduction will be detrimental to the health and safety of residents. Staff is not recommending that a wall be built on the north side of the alley since the maneuvering width is being met.
3. Concerns regarding nuisance factors such as broken glass, trash and graffiti at the S/T alley adjacent to the site.  
Response: The built project will provide more eyes on the street and activity by the alley which should help reduce the proliferation of broken glass, trash and graffiti by the alley.
4. Concerns regarding the number of trash and recycling containers required for the project.  
Response: The 5-unit apartment project requires a weekly capacity of one yard for trash and another one yard recycling. This will be satisfied with the provision of three shared trash cans and three shared recycling cans. Per Solid Waste Division, two each of trash and recycling cans shall be provided for the North Building and one each of trash and recycling cans shall be provided for the South Building. The project proposed a combined total of 6 cans for trash and recycling. No yard waste cans for individual units are required.
5. The project will exacerbate on-street parking shortage.  
Response: The project is meeting the parking requirement for five apartment units and is adding additional room for street parking by the elimination of a driveway cut at 24<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Environmental Considerations:** The Community Development Department, Environmental Planning Services Division has reviewed this project and determined that this is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15332, In-Fill Development Projects. The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designations and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designations and regulations, occurs within city limits on a project site that is no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses, site has no

habitat value for endangered, rare or threatened species, site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services, and would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, air quality, noise or water quality.

### **Policy Considerations:**

Following is how the proposed project adhere to policies within the 2030 General Plan, the Central City Community Plan, Zoning, Smart Growth principles and Multi-Family Design Principles.

### ***General Plan/Zoning***

The 2030 General Plan Update was adopted by City Council on March 3, 2009. The 2030 General Plan's goals, policies, and implementation programs define a roadmap to achieving Sacramento's vision to be the most livable city in America. The 2030 General Plan Update designation of the subject site is Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density which provides for provides for higher intensity medium-density housing and neighborhood-support uses and allows a density from 8 units per acre to 21 units per acre. The 2030 General Plan has identified goals and policies under the Land Use and Urban Design Element and the Housing Element. Some of the goals and policies supported by this project are:

1. *Land Use and Urban Design Element (Goal LU 4.1) Neighborhoods.* Promote the development and preservation of neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing types, densities, and designs and a mix of uses and services that address the diverse needs of Sacramento residents of all ages, socio-economic groups, and abilities.
2. *Replacement of Non-Conforming Densities in Traditional Neighborhoods. (Policy LU 4.3.2)* The City shall preserve the existing diversity of housing types and densities on each block of Traditional Neighborhoods. Where proposed residential development on a parcel within a Traditional Neighborhood block would exceed the maximum allowed density, the City may allow the development if it would not cause the overall density for the block to be exceeded. Where the density of existing development on a Traditional Neighborhood block falls outside the applicable density range of its land use designation, the City shall allow replacement development on the parcel that maintains the same density.
3. *Housing Element (Policy H-2.2.1)* The City shall promote quality residential infill development through the creation/adoption of flexible development standards and with funding resources.
4. *Central City Community Plan. Land Use and Urban Design (CC.LU 1.3)* Interrelated Land Uses. The City shall provide for organized development of the Central City whereby the many interrelated land use components of the area support and reinforce each other and the vitality of the community.

Based on the General Plan land use designation (Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density), the site may be developed to a density from 8 units per acre to 21 units per acre. The size of the subject parcel is 0.193 acres (8,428 square feet), which would allow the site to be developed with one (1) to four (4) units.

The General Plan does provide policy direction for the replacement of non-conforming densities in Traditional neighborhoods. Within a Traditional Neighborhood, Land Use policy 4.3.2 (see above), allows the density on a particular parcel to exceed the maximum General Plan density if it would not cause the overall density for the Traditional Neighborhood block to be exceeded. The proposed project is situated on a block approximately 2.4 acres in size. Based on the maximum density of 21 units per acre, a total of 50 units could be allowed on this block. Staff has performed extensive research, including surveying the block, studying historical maps of the area and reviewing building permit and planning application data, and concluded that five additional units can be supported on the subject site. Staff recognizes that a survey of the block results in 48 units, however not all of these units were documented through the extensive research. Staff is supporting the proposed five unit project based on all the information available. With the addition of five units, the block will be at 49 units, which is just under 50 units. Therefore, in considering the entire block, the development does not cause the overall density for the block to be exceeded.

Development on the subject site is restricted to seven (7) units based on the parcel's zoning designation of Multi-Family (R-3A). The R-3A zone allows a maximum density of 36 units and a minimum lot size of 1,200 square feet per residential unit. The proposed project is located on 8,430 square feet and can therefore, accommodate a maximum of seven (7) units.

Overall, the proposed project meets the 2030 General Plan goals and policies related to Citywide Land Use and Urban Design for development within the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation.

***Smart Growth Planning Principles:***

“Smart Growth” is a term coined by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as an umbrella term for the many initiatives intended to address some of the negative consequences of urban sprawl. Smart Growth generally occurs when development patterns are sustainable and balanced in terms of economic objective, social goals, and use of environmental/natural resources. The following Smart Growth principles apply to the proposed project:

- Higher-density, cluster development.
- Multi-modal transportation and land use patterns that support walking, cycling and public transit.
- Streets designed to accommodate a variety of activities.
- Planned and coordinated projects between jurisdictions and stakeholders.

The proposed project has been designed to incorporate many of the Smart Growth Principles listed above.

***Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines:***

The Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines were approved by the City Council on August 5, 2000 (Resolution CC2000-487). This document articulates design principles for multi-family residences to assist the Planning Commission, City Council, City staff and project planners and designers by identifying the City's design criteria for multi-family development. The intent is to achieve well-designed projects to enhance the community's overall value and appearance. The project is generally consistent with the Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines as identified in the building design section of this staff report.

**Project Design:**

The following discusses project in relation to Plan Review, Special Permit and Variance.

**Land Use*****Plan Review***

The applicant proposes to develop five apartment units on approximately 0.19 acres in the R-3A zone. Chapter 17.24 of the zoning code permits the development of apartments in the R-3A zone with the issuance of a Plan Review. In evaluating Plan Review proposals of this type, the Commission is required to make the following findings:

1. The proposed development, including but not limited to the density of a proposed residential development, is consistent with the general plan and any applicable community or specific plan.

The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan designation for Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density and applicable goals and policies.

2. Facilities, including utilities, access roads, sanitation and drainage are adequate and consistent with city standards, and the proposed improvements are properly related to existing and proposed streets and highways.

Staff have reviewed the proposal and found it to comply with all applicable city policies related to facilities and infrastructure, and have included conditions to ensure adequate drainage capacity and street frontage improvements.

3. The property involved is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the proposed use and required yard, building coverage, setback, parking area and other requirements of this title.

The design of the project is generally consistent with applicable setback, lot coverage, density, height and parking regulations; where development and setback standards are not met, variance and special permit are requested.

4. Approval of the plan review will not be contrary to the public health or safety or injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties.

The proposal will comply with safety standards as required by code and conditioned as part of this project and will not pose a threat to the public health nor be injurious to the surrounding area.

Staff supports the Plan Review for five apartment units; as discussed in the General Plan policy section above, in considering the entire block, the development does not cause the overall density for the block to be exceeded. Staff has found the project to comply with all applicable city policies related to facilities and infrastructure. The design of the project is generally consistent with applicable setback, lot coverage, density, height and parking regulations with the exception of side setback at the accessory structure. Furthermore, the project site is suitable for the proposed density since it's close to transit and commercial developments and promotes walking and bicycling opportunities. Design Review conditions will be incorporated with the Plan Review conditions.

**Access, Circulation and Parking**

Vehicular access to the project site is provided at the alley to the north of the site. Following is a summary of the vehicular parking.

<b>Table 3: Parking</b>			
<b>Type of Parking</b>	<b>Required Parking</b>	<b>Proposed Parking</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Vehicular	5 (one per unit)	5	0

According to the Sacramento City Code, a minimum of 1 parking space per unit is required. Therefore, the proposal is required to provide a minimum of five parking spaces. The applicant is proposing five spaces in the garage accessory structure facing the alley and meets code requirement. The project will result in the closing of curb cut on 24<sup>th</sup> Street which in turn will add additional room on the street towards parking.

**Height, Bulk and Setbacks**

Following is a summary of the height and area standards:

<b>Table 4: Height and area standards</b>			
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Allowed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Deviation?</b>
Height	35'-0" maximum	Maximum 19'-0" to top plate (maximum 24'-0"	No

		to ridge line)	
Front Setback	Average of adjacent	9'-0" (same setback as adjacent building)	No
Rear/Accessory Structure Setback	6'-0"	6'-0"	No
Street Side Setback (condo buildings)	5'-0"	5'-0"	No
Interior Side Setback (condo buildings)	5'-0"	5'-0"	No
Street Side Setback (accessory structure)	5'-0"	2'-0"	Yes
Interior Side Setback (accessory structure)	No requirement	0'-6"	No
Lot Coverage	60% maximum	56%	No

As indicated above, the project meets or exceeds all applicable height and area requirements except street side setback for the accessory garage structure. Applicant is requesting the Special Permit to reduce that setback and the entitlement is discussed later in the report.

**Building design, signage and landscaping: The design component of the project is subject to recommendation by the Design Commission.**

The site is divided into three structures as detailed below:

<b>Table 5: Building Summary</b>			
<b>Building Name:</b>	<b>Description:</b>	<b>Height:</b>	<b>Area (square feet):</b>
South Building	Units 1 and 2	Two-story (18'-6" to top plate)	2,516 (not including patio)
North Building	Units 3, 4 and 5	Two-story (19'-0" to top plate)	3,260 (not including patio)
Garages	5 parking spaces	One-story (8'-6" to top plate)	998

The south building has street frontages on T Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Street. The north building has frontage on 24<sup>th</sup> Street. The garages fronts on the alley to the north. An open space area with walkway and landscape strip is shown between the south building and the north building; this area is enclosed by a solid wall facing 24<sup>th</sup> Street to provide privacy. The building exterior is finished with cement plaster, wood fascia and wood railings. Windows are aluminum clad with wood accent trim. Roofing is dimensional asphalt

shingles. Lighting fixtures shall be unobtrusive and complementary to the architectural design of the building.

Through extensive negotiations with neighbors, the applicant has agreed to the following design elements for the project as outlined in the private agreement:

1. Minimize variance setback for garage side setback.
2. Depth and dimensions in design.
3. Porch for each unit.
4. Pitched roofs for all buildings.
5. Vary exterior color for each of the three units in the North Building.
6. South Building with two units no larger than 2,550 square feet interior space.
7. Install adequate safety lighting near alley and sidewalk and for pedestrian access on sidewalk adjacent to buildings. Install convex mirror on garage structure.
8. Craftsman style porch railings.
9. Trellis with vines on west wall of South Building.
10. Drainage spouts to be painted to complement stucco color.
11. Windows to optimize fit with traditional architecture.
12. Landscape plan to meet City requirements.

Following is a breakdown of the five apartment units:

<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Number of Levels:</b>	<b>Living Area (square feet):</b>	<b>Patio Area (square feet):</b>	<b>Number of Bedroom/Baths:</b>
1	Two Levels	1,274	127	2 / 2-1/2 (and Ground Floor Office)
2	Two Levels	1,242	127	2 / 2-1/2 (and Ground Floor Office)
3	Two Levels	1,098	135	2 / 2
4	Two Levels	1,064	120	2 / 2
5	Two Levels	1,098	135	2 / 2

The residential buildings are consistent with the Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines, in that: the buildings are arranged to provide functional public and private outdoor spaces; pedestrian orientation is encouraged in the allocation of space, building size and placement, and open space design; the building provides windows and active spaces to provide for additional security and visual interest; the buildings vary roof form, mass, shape and material changes to create variations in plans; and material textures and colors are used to help articulate the building designs.

No signage has been proposed at this project. The applicant has submitted a revised landscape plan to address comments by Urban Forest Services and is attached to this report.

### **Design Commission Recommendation**

Under the Zoning Code, design review for an apartment project is a recommendation of the Design Director or Design Commission to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission includes the design conditions as part of the plan review approval. The project was scheduled for the July 20, 2011 Design Commission meeting and staff will forward the recommendation of the Design Commission on a separate correspondence prior to the public hearing. The recommended Design Review conditions are included under the Plan Review conditions for approval by the Planning Commission.

### ***Special Permit for Reduced Setback at Accessory Structure***

The applicant is proposing two-foot street side setback at the garage structure instead of the required five feet for an accessory structure. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a special permit to reduce required street side setback at the accessory garage structure. In evaluating special permit proposals of this type, the Commission is required to make the following findings:

- A. A special permit shall be granted upon sound principles of land use.  
The proposed setback reduction allows the project to provide one parking space for each of the proposed five units.
- B. A special permit shall not be granted if it will be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or if it results in the creation of a nuisance.  
The setback reduction is not detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, nor does it result in the creation of a nuisance since the accessory structure does not encroach into public right-of-way and will provide adequate maneuvering. The project provides on-site parking at a single-story structure that helps activate the alley.
- C. A special permit use must comply with the objectives of the general or specific plan for the area in which it is to be located.  
The proposed setback reduction at the accessory structure does not contradict the residential land use policies and density requirements of the General Plan and Central City Community Plan.

Staff supports the setback reduction at the accessory structure since it will provide an additional covered parking for the site and it will not be a nuisance to the public in that adequate maneuvering is provided.

### ***Variance to waive a trash enclosure***

Per Chapter 17.72 of the Zoning Code, a trash enclosure is required for multi-family developments with five or more units. The applicant is requesting the Variance to waive the requirement for a trash enclosure for the proposed apartment complex. The applicant cited that there is no space for a trash enclosure adjacent to the alley or street because the five garages on the alley are needed for parking and because the existing curb cut on 24th is being eliminated to increase parking on 24th Street and to make the project more pedestrian friendly. In lieu of the trash enclosure, the occupants will be

provided recycling and trash cans for their use; the site plan shows an area adjacent to both the North and South buildings for storing the cans. The City's Solid Waste Division has reviewed the proposal and has no objections to the use of recycling and trash cans subject to conditions. The following findings must be made in order to grant a variance:

1. The project will not be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare nor result in a nuisance.

Granting the variance will not be injurious to public welfare, nor to property in the vicinity of the applicant in that alternate trash and recycling containment will be employed for the project and the individual cans have a specified location on site for storage.


2. The project will provide adequate capacity, number, and distribution of recycling and trash enclosures and receptacles to serve the new or existing development.

The project is conditioned to provide adequate capacity, number, and distribution as required by the recycling and solid waste disposal regulations (Chapter 17.72 of the Zoning Code).

Staff supports the variance to waive the trash enclosure as described above since the occupants will be using individual cans to collect trash and recycling and there are locations on the site to store the cans. Solid Waste Division has reviewed the proposal and has no objections to the proposal as long as attached conditions are met. Due to the above findings, staff has no objections to the variance.

**Conclusion:** Staff recommends the Commission approved the requested entitlement with conditions of approval shown on Attachment 1. Staff finds that the proposed plans comply with all applicable General Plan and Zoning Ordinance requirements, and that they meet the intent of the Multi-Family Residential Design Principles and Smart Growth Principles.

Respectfully submitted by:   
DAVID HUNG  
Associate Planner

Approved by:   
SANDRA YOPE  
Senior Planner

Recommendation Approved:

  
GREGORY BITTER  
Principal Planner

Table of Contents:

Page 1	Report
Page 16	Attachment 1 – Proposed Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval
Page 29	Exhibit 1A: Site Plan
Page 30	Exhibit 1B: Building Elevations (1)
Page 31	Exhibit 1C: Building Elevations (2)
Page 32	Exhibit 1D: South Building Floor Plans
Page 33	Exhibit 1E: North Building Floor Plans
Page 34	Exhibit 1F: Materials Board
Page 35	Exhibit 1G: Streetscape Elevations
Page 36	Exhibit 1H: Photos
Page 37	Exhibit 1I: Landscape Plan
Page 38	Attachment 2: Private Agreement
Page 42	Attachment 3: Comments on Current Proposal
Page 65	Attachment 4: Support Letters
Page 95	Attachment 5: Opposition Letters
Page 171	Attachment 6: Land Use & Zoning Map

**Attachment 1**  
**Proposed Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval**  
**24<sup>th</sup> & T Street Residences (P10-089)**  
**Northwest Corner of 24th Street and T Street**

**Findings of Fact**

**A. Environmental Determination: Exemption-Infill**

Based on the determination and recommendation of the City's Environmental Planning Services Manager and the oral and documentary evidence received at the hearing on the Project, the Planning Commission finds that the Project is exempt from review under Section 15332 (Infill) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines as follows:

- a. The project complies with all applicable policies of the General Plan, as well as with the applicable zoning regulations;
- b. The proposed development occurs within City limits on a project site of no more than five (5) acres substantially surrounded by urban uses;
- c. The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species;
- d. Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and
- e. The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

**B. The Plan Review** to develop five apartment units in the Multi-Family (R-3A) zone is approved subject to the following Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval:

1. The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan designation for Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density and applicable goals and policies.
2. Staff has reviewed the proposal and found it to comply with all applicable city policies related to facilities and infrastructure, and have included conditions to ensure adequate drainage capacity and street frontage improvements.
3. The design of the project is generally consistent with applicable setback, lot coverage, density, height and parking regulations; where development

and setback standards are not met, variance and special permit are requested.

4. The proposal will comply with safety standards as required by code and conditioned as part of this project and will not pose a threat to the public health nor be injurious to the surrounding area.
  5. The project, as conditioned, complies with the policies within the Central City Neighborhood Design Guidelines, with a style and design that should contribute to the aesthetic vitality of the Central City.
  6. The proposed residential buildings are well-articulated and provide adequate building setback on all sides to adjacent properties.
  7. The proposed structures are compatible with their surroundings through 1) Rhythm of spaces between buildings, 2) Building scale, mass, and setbacks, 3) Building orientation and relation to the street.
- C. The **Special Permit** to reduce required street side setback from five feet to two feet for an accessory structure is approved subject to the following Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval:**
1. The proposed setback reduction is based on sound land use principle in that it allows the project to provide one parking space for each of the proposed five units.
  2. The setback reduction is not detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, nor does it result in the creation of a nuisance since the accessory structure does not encroach into public right-of-way and will provide adequate maneuvering. The project provides on-site parking at a single-story structure that helps activate the alley.
  3. The proposed setback reduction at the accessory structure does not contradict the residential land use policies and density requirements of the General Plan and Central City Community Plan.
- D. The **Variance** to waive a trash enclosure for a multi-family development is approved subject to the following Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval:**
1. Granting the variance will not be injurious to public welfare, nor to property in the vicinity of the applicant in that alternate trash and recycling containment will be employed for the project and the individual cans have a specified location on site for storage.

2. The project is conditioned to provide adequate capacity, number, and distribution as required by the recycling and solid waste disposal regulations (Chapter 17.72 of the Zoning Code).

### **Conditions of Approval**

- B. The **Plan Review** to develop a five-unit apartment complex in the Multi-Family (R-3A) zone is hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

#### Planning

- B1. This approval is for the construction of a five-unit apartment complex per attached exhibits. Any change in the design, materials, or colors from this approval shall be submitted to the Planning Division for review and determination for further actions.
- B2. Any subsequent conversion to condominium units shall be subject to the approval of additional Planning entitlements.
- B3. The applicant shall obtain all necessary building permits prior to commencement of construction; any modification to the project shall be subject to review and approval by Planning staff (and may require additional entitlements) prior to the issuance of building permits.
- B4. Landscaping & Walls and Fencing:
- a. All landscaping and planting shall conform to City standards for sight line requirements at intersections and driveways.
  - b. All mechanical equipment shall be located within enclosed cabinets or screened by landscaping and/or screening/fencing.
  - c. Walls and fences shall conform to City standards for sight line requirements at intersections and driveways.
- B5. Signage:
- a. One detached monument sign is permitted and may be located within the site but no closer than 10 feet from public right-of-way.
  - b. Attached signage shall consist of address numbers only.
  - c. All signage shall comply with the Sign Ordinance, City Code Section 15.148; a sign permit shall be obtained prior to construction of any sign.
- B6. Lighting:

- a. The type and location of the outdoor lighting (building, parking lot, walkway, etc.) must be approved by the Planning Director prior to issuance of a building permit. Lighting shall be provided in garage areas and each building address number shall be illuminated.
  - b. Project lighting shall be provided as follows: one foot-candle of minimum maintained illumination per square foot of parking space and exterior walkways/sidewalks during hours of darkness and 0.25 foot-candle of minimum maintained illumination per square foot of surface on any interior walkway, alcove, passageway, etc., from one-half hour before dusk to one-half hour after dawn. All light fixtures are to be vandal-resistant.
  - c. Per Section 17.68.030(B), exterior lighting, if provided, shall reflect away from residential areas and public streets.
  - d. Fixtures shall be unobtrusive and complementary to the architectural design of the building. Lighting shall be designed so as not to produce hazardous and annoying glare to motorists and building occupants, adjacent residents, or the general public.
- B7. The applicant shall paint electrical meters/cabinets, telephone connection boxes and other utility appurtenances to match the building to which they are attached.
- B8. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall provide the City with a copy of the certificate of payment of school fees for the applicable school district(s).
- B9. The project shall reasonably maintain the buildings and landscaping.
- B10. The owner/operator posts and maintains signage on the premises that provides the phone number to contact maintenance and management staff. Signage is subject to approval by the planning director.
- B11. The owner/operator conducts periodic inspections, not less than monthly, of the exterior of all buildings, trash enclosures and recreation facilities.
- B12. The owner/operator establishes and conducts a regular program of routine maintenance for the property. Such a program includes common areas and scheduled repainting, replanting and other similar activities that typically require attention at periodic intervals but not necessarily continuously. The owner/operator repaints or retreats all painted or treated areas at least once every eight years, provided that the planning director may approve less frequent repainting or retreatment upon a determination that less frequent treatment is appropriate, given the nature of the materials used or other factors. The program is subject to review and approval by the planning director.

- B13. The owner/operator maintains landscaping and irrigation in a healthy and serviceable condition.

#### Design Review

The design of the site (see plans attached) is hereby approved subject to the following conditions. These conditions must be met prior to the issuance of a building permit:

- B14. The buildings shall be sited as indicated in the report and exhibits.
- B15. The project shall have building setbacks as indicated in the exhibits.
- B16. The project shall have building entries as indicated in the exhibits.
- B17. The project shall include auto access and landscaping as indicated on the reports and exhibits.
- B18. The Applicant shall submit details and specifications of the various paving materials to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B19. The project shall include fences and walls with landscaping elements as indicated on the reports and exhibits, and final landscape plans shall be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B20. The Applicant shall submit final building and site lighting locations and cut sheets to be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.

The design of the new building (see plans attached) is hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

- B21. The design of the building shall be as indicated in the report and exhibits. The building elevations shall have a consistency of detail and quality as indicated on the plans
- B22. Smooth sand finish cement plaster shall be provided.
- B23. Windows shall be aluminum clad as shown on the plans. Smooth wood trim/sill shall be installed at windows and doors. Final window specifications shall be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B24. Window operation shall include single-hung, double-hung, awning, casement and fixed. Final review and approval of window operation by Design Review staff is required prior to Building Permit submittal.

- B25. The east elevation of the garage structure shall be articulated with decorative elements; revised elevation shall be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B26. Smooth wood railings shall be installed at locations shown on plans. Pickets shall be spaced per code requirement. Final stair and rails shall be reviewed by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B27. Final entry door specification shall be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B28. Garage doors shall be metal sectional with carriage door style; some glazing shall be incorporated into each door. Door and glazing material, along with color specifications, shall be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B29. All gutters shall be ogee style gutters.
- B30. The decorative vent above the porches on the south elevation of the south building shall be narrow vent to match others, subject to approval by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B31. Location of HVAC equipments shall be reviewed by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal. No roof mounted HVAC equipment is allowed. All HVAC equipment shall be screened from street view.
- B32. Final building lighting plans and fixture cut sheets shall be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B33. A physical color/material board shall be submitted for review and approval by the Design Commission at the hearing. Any final modifications shall be reviewed by staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B34. Any signage shall be subject to review and approval by Design Review.
- B35. All final details affecting the exterior building design that are not determined at the time of the Commission's final review shall be reviewed and approved by Design Review staff prior to Building Permit submittal.
- B36. All required new and revised plans shall be submitted for review and approval by Design Review staff prior to issuance of building permits. A set of the appropriate plans shall be submitted directly to Design Review Staff. All necessary planning entitlements shall have been approved by the Planning Commission prior to final Design Review sign-off of plans.
- B37. The approval shall be deemed automatically revoked unless required permits have been issued and construction begun within three years of the date of the

approval. Prior to expiration, an extension of time may be granted by the Design Commission upon written request of the applicant.

- B38. The Record of Decision shall be scanned and inserted into the final set as a general sheet to be submitted for building permit.
- B39. A signed copy of the Affidavit of Zoning Code Development Standards shall be scanned and inserted into the final set as a general sheet to be submitted for building permit.

#### Department of Transportation

- B40. Construct standard improvements as noted in these conditions pursuant to chapter 18 of the City Code. Improvements shall be designed and constructed to City standards in place at the time that the Building Permit is issued. All improvements shall be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation. Any public improvement not specifically noted in these conditions shall be designed and constructed to City Standards. **This shall include street lighting and the repair or replacement/reconstruction of any existing deteriorated curb, gutter and sidewalk fronting the property along "T" Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Street per City standards and to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.**
- B41. The applicant shall repair/reconstruct any deteriorated portions of the existing alley per City standards (In Concrete) and to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation. The limit of repair of the alley shall be along the parcel's frontage to 24<sup>th</sup> Street.
- B42. The applicant shall remove any existing driveways along the site's frontage and reclaim the existing planter and reconstruct the curb to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.
- B43. The site plan shall conform to A.D.A. requirements in all respects. This shall include the reconstruction/replacement of any curb ramp that does not meet current A.D.A. standards at the north-west corner of the intersection of T and 24<sup>th</sup> Streets to the satisfaction of the Department of Transportation.
- B44. The site plan shall conform to the parking requirements set forth in chapter 17 of City Code (Zoning Ordinance). All proposed parking off the alley shall be off-set by a minimum of 6-feet.
- B45. The design of walls fences and signage near intersections and driveways shall allow stopping sight distance per Caltrans standards and comply with City Code Section 12.28.010 (25' sight triangle). Walls shall be set back 3' behind the sight line needed for stopping sight distance to allow sufficient room for pilasters. Landscaping in the area required for adequate stopping sight distance shall be

limited 3.5' in height at maturity. The area of exclusion shall be determined by the Department of Transportation.

#### Transportation – Engineering Services – Electrical Section

B46. This project shall require ornamental street lighting. There is an existing street lighting system around this project area. Improvements of right-of-way may require modification to the existing system. Electrical equipment shall be protected and remain functional during construction.

#### Utilities Department

B47. Any new domestic water services shall be metered. Only one domestic water service is allowed per parcel. Excess services shall be abandoned to the satisfaction of the DOU. All water connections shall comply with the City of Sacramento's Cross Connection Control Policy.

B48. Building pad elevations shall be approved by the DOU and shall be a minimum of 1.5 feet above the local controlling overland release elevation or a minimum of 1.2 feet above the highest adjoining back of sidewalk elevation, whichever is higher, unless otherwise approved by the Department of Utilities.

B49. The applicant must comply with the City of Sacramento's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. This ordinance requires the applicant to show erosion and sediment control methods on the subdivision improvement plans. These plans shall also show the methods to control urban runoff pollution from the project site during construction.

B50. A grading plan showing existing and proposed elevations is required. Adjacent off-site topography shall also be shown to the extent necessary to determine impacts to existing surface drainage paths. No grading shall occur until the grading plan has been reviewed and approved by the DOU.

B51. This project is served by the Combined Sewer System (CSS). Therefore, the developer/property owner will be required to pay the Combined System Development Fee prior to the issuance of a building permit. The impact to the CSS is estimated to be 5 ESD's. The Combined Sewer System fee is estimated to be \$339.81 plus any increases to the fee due to inflation.

#### Solid Waste Services

B52. Project must meet the requirements outlined in Sacramento City Code Chapter 17.72.

B53. Solid waste trucks must be able to safely move about the property, with minimum backing, and be able to empty the bins and cans safely.

- B54. Properties must accommodate trucks, as well as cans or bins that are roughly the dimensions outlined in the attached file, "Truck, Bin, Can Dimensions".
- B55. City Code Chapter 17.72.030 requires a weekly capacity of 1 yard of trash, and another for recycling. This can be met with shared cans: three for trash, and three for recycling.
- B56. Cans must be placed out of public view, concealed with a structure, landscaping or fencing, per City Code Chapter 17.72.040A. The submitted site plans show the cans placed in walkways adjacent to each building, with the gates at the street end of the walkways, which, with landscaping, will keep the cans out of public view.
- B57. North Building trash and recycling cans are to be set out for collection at the curb on 24th Street. South Building trash and recycling cans are to be set out for collection on T Street.

#### Fire Department

- B58. Provide the required fire hydrants in accordance with CFC 507 and Appendix C, Section C105.
- B59. Timing and Installation. When fire protection, including fire apparatus access roads and water supplies for fire protection, is required to be installed, such protection shall be installed and made serviceable prior to and during the time of construction. CFC 501.4
- B60. Provide a water flow test. (Make arrangements at the Permit Center walk-in counter: 300 Richards Blvd, Sacramento, CA 95814). CFC 508.4
- B61. Provide appropriate Knox access for site. CFC Section 506
- B62. An automatic fire sprinkler system shall be installed in any portion of a building when the floor area of the building exceeds 3,599 square feet. This shall apply to the Triplex.
- B63. Locate and identify Fire Department Connections (FDCs) on address side of building no further than 50 feet and no closer than 15 feet from a fire hydrant. This shall apply to the Triplex.
- B64. An approved fire control room shall be provided for all buildings protected by an automatic fire extinguishing system. Fire control rooms shall be located within the building at a location approved by the Chief, and shall be provided with a means to access the room directly from the exterior. Durable signage shall be provided on the exterior side of the access door to identify the fire control room. CFC 903.8 This shall apply to the Triplex.

- B65. Per the newly adopted 2010 California Residential Code, all new residential construction including 1 and 2 family dwellings and townhouses will be required to be sprinklered effective January 1, 2011. The duplex will be required to be provided with an approved NFPA 13 D sprinkler system.

#### Building Division

- B66. Provide fire sprinklers per CBC 903.2.7.

#### Parks and Recreation Department

- B67. **Maintenance District:** The applicant shall initiate and complete the formation of a parks maintenance district (assessment or Mello-Roos special tax district), or annex the project into an existing parks maintenance district. The applicant shall pay all city fees for formation of or annexation to a parks maintenance district. (Contact Public Improvement Financing, Special Districts Project Manager. In assessment districts, the cost of neighborhood park maintenance is equitably spread on the basis of special benefit. In special tax districts, the cost of neighborhood park maintenance is spread based upon the hearing report, which specifies the tax rate and method of apportionment.)

#### Urban Forest Services

- B68. Prior to issuance of building permits, submit final landscape plan to Urban Forest Services to demonstrate the allowance of sufficient planter or canopy space for all new trees that will not cause infrastructure conflict and pedestrian safety problems.
- B69. The applicant will need to obtain an Urban Forest Services permit before removing or pruning street trees.
- B70. Installation of 6' high 7' x 10' chain link fence enclosure around each street tree will be required prior to construction activity.
- B71. Existing street trees must receive regular irrigation during all phases of construction per City code (12.56.050).

#### PG&E

- B72. Prior to any excavation near the gas transmission facilities:
- a) Excavator to call USA when requesting PG&E to locate and mark gas pipe. Request field meeting with PG&E Locator (via the USA comment section) to discuss the proposed work and to confirm PG&E contact number for standby.
  - b) A PG&E standby person is required to be on site whenever excavation is within 5-foot from the edge of the pipe. Excavator to call PG&E at (916) 386-5153, 48-hours in advance to request inspector to standby.

- c) Prior to using any power operated equipment, the approximate location of the pipe must first be determined by hand excavation or careful probing. Probe at right angles to the pipe at a depth of 24 inches and at spacing no greater than 5 inches. If it is determined that the depth of the pipeline is greater than the initial probing or hand excavation, then excavation by power-operated equipment will be permitted to a depth 12 inches less than the actual probing or hand dug depth. Hand digging is required within 12 inches from the pipe.

#### Sacramento Area Sewer District

- B73. The subject property is outside the boundaries of the SASD but within the Urban Service Boundary and SRCSD shown on the Sacramento County General Plan. SRCSD will provide ultimate conveyance and treatment of the sewer generated from this site, but the Sacramento City Utilities Department's approval will be required for local sewage service.
- B74. Developing this property will require the payment of SRCSD sewer impact fees. Impact fees shall be paid prior to issuance of Building Permits. Applicant should contact the Fee Quote Desk at 876-6100 for sewer impact fee information.

#### Regional Transit

- B75. Transit information shall be displayed in a prominent location in the residential sales/rental office, through a homeowner's association, or with real estate transactions.

#### Advisory Notes

##### Building Division

1. All building permit applications applied for on or after January 1, 2011 shall be designed, reviewed, built and inspected under the 2010 California Building Code (commercial applications), 2010 California Residential Code (residential applications – one and two family dwellings).

##### Utilities Department

2. Many projects within the City of Sacramento require on-site booster pumps for the fire suppression and domestic water system. Prior to design of the subject project, the Department of Utilities suggests that the applicant request a water supply test to determine what pressure and flows the surrounding public water distribution system can provide to the site. This information can then be used to assist the engineers in the design of the fire suppression systems.
3. The proposed project is located in the Flood zone designated as **Shaded X** zone on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Federal Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) that have been revised by a Letter of Map Revision effective

February 18, 2005. Within the Shaded X zone, there are no requirements to elevate or flood proof.

4. The only public water main fronting this property is in S/T Alley. All water taps will need to come off the alley unless a public main extension is done in 24<sup>th</sup> St. to the satisfaction of the DOU. Per the City's cross connection control policy, all fire and irrigation service taps will require backflow prevention devices to be installed within five feet of the point of service, which in this case is the edge of alley.

#### Parks and Recreation Department

5. As per City Code, the applicant will be responsible to meet his/her obligations regarding:
  - a) Title 18, 18.44 Park Development Impact Fee, due at the time of issuance of building permit. The Park Development Impact Fee due for this project is estimated at \$7,415. This is based on 5 multi-family units at the Central City infill rate of \$1,483 per unit. Any change in these factors will change the amount of the PIF due. The fee is calculated using factors at the time that the project is submitted for building permit. The fees quoted herein are in effect during FY2011/2012.
  - b) Community Facilities District 2002-02, Neighborhood Park Maintenance CFD Annexation.
- C. The **Special Permit** to reduce the required street side setback from five feet to two feet for an accessory structure is hereby approved subject to the following conditions
  - C1. The garage structure shall provide a minimum of two feet, landscaped, setback adjacent to the right-of-way at 24<sup>th</sup> Street.
- D. The **Variance** to waive the required trash enclosure at a multi-family development is hereby approved subject to the following conditions
  - D1. Project must meet the requirements outlined in Sacramento City Code Chapter 17.72.
  - D2. Solid waste trucks must be able to safely move about the property, with minimum backing, and be able to empty the bins and cans safely.
  - D3. Properties must accommodate trucks, as well as cans or bins that are roughly the dimensions outlined in the attached file, "Truck, Bin, Can Dimensions".
  - D4. City Code Chapter 17.72.030 requires a weekly capacity of 1 yard of trash, and another for recycling. This can be met with shared cans: three for trash, and three for recycling.

- D5. Cans must be placed out of public view, concealed with a structure, landscaping or fencing, per City Code Chapter 17.72.040A. The submitted site plans show the cans placed in walkways adjacent to each building, with the gates at the street end of the walkways, which, with landscaping, will keep the cans out of public view.
- D6. North Building trash and recycling cans are to be set out for collection at the curb on 24th Street. South Building trash and recycling cans are to be set out for collection on T Street.

Exhibit 1A: Site Plan

DATE: 06/27/11  
 2331 T Street, Sacramento  
 WILKINS

the 24th & T Street - Residences  
 2331 T Street, Sacramento

DATE  
 06/27/11

the 24th & T Street Residences

	First Floor (SF)	Second Floor (SF)	Private Patio (SF)	Project Totals (SF)
South Bldg.				Bldg (excl of not included)
Unit 1	640	634	127	1274
Unit 2	633	609	127	1242
North Bldg.				Bldg (excl of not included)
Unit 3	522	576	135	1098
Unit 4	516	548	120	1064
Unit 5	522	576	135	1098
Garages (G)	-	-	-	998
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2833</b>	<b>2943</b>	<b>644</b>	


  

South Building:	2,516 sf
North Building:	3,260 sf
<b>Total Building:</b>	<b>5,776 sf</b>
Total Garage:	998 sf
<b>Total Patio:</b>	<b>644 sf</b>

PROJECT DATA




VICINITY MAP



2 SITE PLAN  
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"


Exhibit 1B: Building Elevations (1)




1 EAST ELEVATION - 24th STREET  
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

PROPOSED FINISH SCHEDULE

FINISH	MATERIAL	MFR / COLOR
ROOFING:	DIMENSIONAL ASPHALT SHINGLES	TBD
SIDING 1:	CEMENT PLASTER SYSTEM, SMOOTH SAND FINISH	WESTERN BLENDED PRODUCTS / PAINT, TBD
WOOD TRIM & ACCENTS:	FASCIA, WINDOW TRIM, PORCH RAILINGS	TBD
WINDOWS OPTION 1:	ALUMINUM CLAD (OR SIM.) WINDOW & DOORS	LINCOLN OR EQ., COLOR TBD
GUTTERS & DOWNSPOUTS:	SHEET METAL	PAINT, TBD




3 NORTH ELEVATION - GARAGES AT ALLEY  
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"



2 SOUTH ELEVATION - T STREET  
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

PROJECT: 24th & T STREET RESIDENCES (P10-089)  
 DRAWING: 3/10/11  
 DATE: 08/27/11

Exhibit 1C: Building Elevations (2)




② NORTH BUILDING - SOUTH ELEVATION  
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"



① SOUTH BUILDING - NORTH ELEVATION  
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

PROPOSED FINISH SCHEDULE


FINISH	MATERIAL	MFR / COLOR
ROOFING:	DIMENSIONAL ASPHALT SHINGLES	TBD
SIDING 1:	CEMENT PLASTER SYSTEM, SMOOTH SAND FINISH	WESTERN BLENDED PRODUCTS / PAINT, TBD
WOOD TRIM & ACCENTS:	FASCIA, WINDOW TRIM, PORCH RAILINGS	TBD
WINDOWS OPTION 1:	ALUMINUM CLAD (OR SIM.) WINDOW & DOORS	LINCOLN OR EQ.; COLOR TBD
GUTTERS & DOWNSPOUTS	SHEET METAL	PAINT, TBD



③ WEST ELEVATION  
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

PROJECT: 24th & T STREET RESIDENCES, PHASE 1, 2010  
 ARCHITECT: WILLIAMS SYLVESTER  
 24th & T Street, Sacramento  
 DATE: 08.27.11

Exhibit 1D: South Building Floor Plans



THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY.  
 PROJECT: 24th & T Street Residences  
 DATE: 06.27.11

Exhibit 1E: North Building Floor Plans

the 24th & T Street - Residences  
 2331 T Street, Sacramento  
 DATE 08.27.11




Exhibit 1F: Materials Board

the 24<sup>th</sup> & T Street - Residences  
 Kelly Moore Architecture, Inc. 11/11/11  
 11/11/11



South Building - T street - Color Palette



North Building - 24th street - Color Palette



1A MAIN BODY: 'KEYSTONE' 186 LRV 48  
KELLY MOORE



1B SECONDARY: 'WOOD MOSS' 197 LRV 29  
KELLY MOORE



COMMON TRIM: 'DOVE WHITE' 34 LRV 85  
KELLY MOORE



ACCENT 4a - 'SALTILLO' 212 LRV 19  
ACCENT 4b - 'PALE POLLEN' 349.2 LRV 64  
for varied use at entry doors, typ.



2A MAIN BODY: 'MIRADOR' 3797-2 LRV 27  
KELLY MOORE



2B SECONDARY: 'ROMANTIC MOOD' 3799-3 LRV 18  
KELLY MOORE

Exhibit 1G: Streetscape Elevations



1 Streetscape Elevation: T St  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



2 Streetscape Elevation: 24th St  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

the 24th & T Street - Residences  
2331 T Street, Sacramento  
DATE 08.27.11

Exhibit 1H: Photos


the 24th & T Street - Residences  
 1331 T Street, Sacramento  
 DATE 08.27.11



① Project Site North - View to Alley



② Project Site South from 24th St.



① Site Context Plan  
 SCALE: 1" = 30'



③ North View of T St. (Adjacent to Site)



④ South View of T St. (Across from Site)



⑤ West View of 24th Street (Adjacent to Site)



⑥ East View of 24th St. (Across from Site)

Exhibit 11: Landscape Plan

WILLIAMS CONSULTANTS  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE



the 24th & T Street - Residences  
2331 T Street, Sacramento

DATE  
08.27.11

**Preliminary Landscape Notes**

1. Refer to Architectural Site Plan for building layout, setbacks, and site information.
2. All construction shall comply with the Standard Specifications of the City of Sacramento, unless otherwise noted in the Supplemental Specifications.
3. Existing street trees to be retained are as shown on plan. Refer to Urban Forest Services recommendations for tree protection.
4. **Landscape design concepts:**  
The landscape within and around the 24th & T Streets - Residences has been designed to fit in with and respond to desirable patterns found in the surrounding neighborhood. The design relies on informal groupings of low and medium height shrubs and groundcovers to provide visual interest at the pedestrian scale along the street facing fronts of the buildings.  
Plant selection will emphasize the use of native and/or climate adapted plants to promote water efficiency and habitat value in addition to creating a pleasing visual effect.  
Trees and screening shrubs have been carefully considered to provide both aesthetic value and privacy.
5. **Irrigation design concepts:**  
Irrigation for planting around each residence and for planting in the parkway strip will be provided by a common system connected to a separate water meter. The irrigation system will have an ET-based automatic irrigation controller, and will primarily utilize drip irrigation to provide water to each plant.  
The irrigation system will be designed to meet the requirements of the City of Sacramento Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.  
Supplemental irrigation for street trees will be provided by corner strip sprays on 12" x 30"-dia located at the corners of the planting area around each street tree (sidewalk side only to prevent accidental runoff) as recommended by Urban Forest Services.
6. **Calculations (on-site):**  
Planting area: 1,354 sqft  
Decomposed granite mulch: 304 sqft  
On-site walkway/paving: 1,354 sqft  
Total landscape area: 3,012 sqft  
\* Excludes patios and front porches/stairs
7. \* Preliminary plant legend is intended to provide a guideline for plant species proposed. Additional plant selections may be included in the final design, in keeping with the overall design intent.

**Paving Legend**



**Preliminary Planting Legend**

Proposed trees	Size	Water Use	Proposed screening shrubs	Size	Water Use	Proposed shrubs & perennials	Size	Water Use
Pistacia chinensis	24" Box	M	Bamboo (in raised planters only)	5 gallon	L	Arctostaphylos 'Emerald Carpet'	1 gallon	L
Lagerstroemia x.	15 gallon	L	Dodonaea viscosa	5 gallon	L	Festuca californica 'San Rafael Blue'	1 gallon	L
Arbutus x. 'Compacta' (multi-stemmed upright)	15 gallon	L	Pittosporum tenuifolium	15 gallon	M	Lavandula spp.	1 gallon	L
			Prunus caroliniana 'Bright n Tight'	15 gallon	M	Muhlenbergia rigens	1 gallon	L
			Taxus x media 'Hicksii'	15 gallon	L	Myoporum parvifolium 'Prostratum'	1 gallon	L
						Myrsine surculosus	1 gallon	L
						Nassella tenuissima	1 gallon	L
						Rosmarinus 'Hills Hardy'	1 gallon	L
						Rosmarinus o. 'Huntington Carpet'	1 gallon	L
						Salvia greggii 'Truemann Red'	1 gallon	L
						Salvia leucantha	1 gallon	L

1 LANDSCAPE PLAN  
SCALE: 1" = 1'-0"



Loft Gardens | Landscape Architecture  
Bonnie H. Charney II, CRA 1387, LEED AP  
918 220 Street, Sacramento, CA 95811  
916.805.1442 www.loftgardens.com

## Attachment 2: Private Agreement

AGREEMENT

In the interests of reaching agreement on certain terms pertaining to entitlement requests made to the City of Sacramento Planning and Design Commissions contained in application P10-089 24<sup>th</sup>/ T Residences submitted by Rosen Development LLC, (Rosen) and the neighborhood representatives (Neighbors), agree on behalf of their neighborhood as follows:

- 1) Two buildings are proposed on the site zoned R-3A: 24<sup>th</sup> St. building ( 24<sup>th</sup> St.) will contain 3 multi-family units and T St. Building ( T St.) will contain two multi-family units.
- 2) Sizes, heights and broad design elements that have been agreed upon are reflected on p. 2 of this Agreement and when applicable will be reflected on drawings submitted to the City.
- 3) All units will be two bedroom units with the addition of offices to the T St. units. Property will remain zoned residential. A single garage structure on the alley will include 5 individual garages.
- 4) Application will be for apartments, not condominiums. Neighbors understand Rosen may convert to condos when condo market is more stable.
- 5) Neighbors agree to support the project as revised by Rosen and subject to the terms contained on p. 2 of this Agreement at the City's Planning and Design Commissions, including support for the variance for a commercial trash enclosure and side setback variance for the accessory structure.
- 6) Neighbors agree to encourage acceptance of this agreement by the neighborhood including seeking formal support from the NBNA but Rosen understands that Neighbors lack authority to limit any individuals from exercising their legal rights.
- 7) Rosen understands that support for the project is subject to Neighbors inspection of the final plans/ drawing submitted to City staff and such support will only be withheld if drawings materially fail to conform to the terms of this agreement, Subject to specifications of this agreement, the most recent set of preliminary drawings made available for neighborhood inspection during mediation are indicative of materiality. Parties acknowledge that preliminary drawings were incomplete.
- 8) Rosen agrees to provide additional project information on a go-forward basis to Neighbors concerning the items in p. 2 and any other issues that might be of concern to the neighborhood.
- 9) Each party reserves the right to reference the experience with this development to raise future policy issues before the city, including but not limited to, permitting the demolition of existing structures and the method of counting units for purposes of implementing the general plan..

**Design Elements, Materials Decisions and Consultation Process Agreement between  
Newton Booth / Poverty Ridge Neighborhood (“Neighbors”) and Andrea Rosen/ Ben Rosen  
 (“Rosen”)**

**I. Substantive Design Element Commitments**

1. Garage side setback: Will attempt to re-design garage to minimize variance setback needed.
2. Depth and dimensions in design re: building heights, setbacks etc. as shown in earlier drawings unless specified differently in this attachment. (subject to refinement of drawings).
3. Porch for each unit.
4. Pitched roofs for all buildings.
5. Vary exterior color for each of three units in 24<sup>th</sup> St. building.
6. T St. building with two units no larger than 2550 square feet interior space.
7. Install adequate safety lighting near alley and sidewalk and for pedestrian access on sidewalk adjacent to buildings. Installation of convex mirror on garage structure.
8. Craftsmen-style porch railings. ( no wrought iron or closed walls).
9. Trellis with vines on west wall of T St. Bldg.
10. Drainage spouts- painted metal to complement stucco color.
11. Windows: Optimize fit with traditional architecture.
12. Landscape plan to meet City requirements.

**II. Materials Decisions Subject to Future Bids and Discussion with Neighbors Prior to  
Final Purchase Decision**


1. Use of brick as secondary material including amount and placement.
2. Whether to add planters including timing and location.

**III. Process for Consultation with Neighborhood Representatives**


1. At time when contractor seeks bids from sub-contractors for items in Section II, Rosen seeks bids for each item in Section II in order to evaluate for inclusion.
2. Rosen will analyze and review bids in context of overall project cost to date and projected costs to complete the project to comply with permit and project requirements.
3. Parties will meet to discuss options and analyses.
4. Rosen will attempt to answer questions to the best of their ability.
5. Rosen will make good faith effort to accommodate reasonable requests by Neighbors.
6. Final decisions regarding construction and purchase of all items, including those in Section II, remain with Rosen.

SIGNATURE PAGE


  
Andrea Rosen on behalf of Rosen Development LLC


  
Alan LoFaso

  
Heather Scott

  
Bridget Whitted

  
William P. Robertson

  
Claire Pomeroy HO


  
Robert McCartney

  
Michael Pavisich


  
Karen Pavisich


Ellen Shinfuku


 Yuji P. SHINFUKU


  
Demise Henderson

Page 3 of 3


  
Alex Ives


  
JOHN IVES

  
Lynda Lazer

  
TIM LAZER

  
PAT MELARKEY

  
DOUG MORROW

  
CHRISTINA JEWETT

John Hagar  
Margyellen Burns  
Margyellen Burns

Attachment 3: Comments on Current Proposal

1. Susan Woodward
2. Danny Gomez
3. Reed Richerson
4. Stephany Fiore
5. Newton Booth Neighborhoods Association

July 20, 2011

Good morning, David Hung -

I wanted to take a moment to thank you and Greg Bitter for talking with me on Monday morning. You provided very good information that helped me talk with my 24th Street neighbors (between "S" and "U" Streets) and with my neighbors in the Mirabella apartments on "T" Street. Thank you also for including my letter of July 6 (see below) in the staff report that you are preparing for the Planning Commission.

I appreciate the clarification that you provided on the issue of the number of housing units for the 23-S-24-T block that will now be 53. These past nine months and particularly in May, we had been looking at the City's General Plan that would only allow 4 more housing units. We did not realize that the City's zoning codes override the General Plan and allows up to 7 more housing units for the 23-S-24-T block.

I am still concerned about the safety, liability, and nuisance issues with having all five garages, detached from the housing units, on the S/T alley. Would the Planning Commission consider requiring the developer to put a retaining wall on the north side of the S/T alley at 24th Street? I think this might help to alleviate the neighbor's continuing concerns about the safety, liability, and nuisances issues on 24th Street at the S/T alley.

I would like this letter to be included in the staff report that you are preparing for the Planning Commission. I am going to be at the Design Review this evening, and also at the Planning Commission hearing on July 28.

Again, I very much appreciate your help with clarifying matters on the proposed "24th & T Residences" project.

Cordially,

Susan Woodward ("Kelley")  
2006 24th Street

---

**From:** [2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net)  
**To:** "David Hung" <[DHung@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:DHung@cityofsacramento.org)>  
**Cc:** "Kelley Woodward" <[2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 6, 2011 2:15:03 PM  
**Subject:** Proposed 24th & T Street Residences project (P10-089) and Public Hearing scheduled for July 14

Hello, David Hung -

Thank you for sending the revised application and exhibits for P10-089 (24th & T Street Residences). I have reviewed them thoroughly.

I have also received the notification for the Public Hearing with the Planning Commissioners on July 14. I plan to attend the hearing.

I very much appreciate the many many hours of efforts of our Core Group of concerned neighbors for the past six months and more recently for our neighbor representatives in the mediation sessions with the developer during April and May, on behalf of the Newton Booth Neighborhoods. I also appreciate Mike McKeever, SACOG, who served as the mediator between the neighbor representatives and the developer on the proposed project for the neighbors' primary issues. He put many long hours into helping us find common ground for the proposed project.

I am pleased that the revised application and exhibits now show five housing units in an appropriate architectural style for our fine old neighborhood. Those documents show that the two major issues were mediated successfully.

I live at 2006 24th Street, less than 100 feet from site for the proposed project. I use 24th Street to get to the light rail. I use "S" and "T" Streets to walk to Rite Aid and Safeway. I grew up in the River Park, McKinley Park, and Mid-Town neighborhoods of Sacramento. I bought my home in these Newton Booth Neighborhoods for their overall historic and aesthetic profile and for the diverse eclectic neighbors. I am happy that it is a neighborhood of walkers, bikers, and porch-sitters. I am happy to have regional transportation nearby.

However, I am still unclear on the following issues on the proposed development project, "24th & T Street Residences" (P10-089):

1. The City's General Plan for developments allows up to 50 housing units per city block or up to 21 housing units per acre. The 23-S-24-T block is 2.4 acres. The 23-S-24-T block currently, visually, has 48 housing units. The application, if approved, would set a precedence by allowing 53 housing units on the 23-S-24-T block. I would be much appeased on this discrepancy if I had some clarification on this issue in the staff report or at the Planning Commission's Public Hearing on July 14.
2. I have seen and experienced safety and nuisance issues for pedestrians, vehicles, and structures at the S/T alley on 24th Street (between "S" and "T" Streets). I have voiced my concerns to the developer and City Hall these past eight months. I'm worried that approving a Special Permit (per the City's General Plan /Zoning policy) for a 2 foot setback from 24th Street for the long garage structure for five narrow garages is detrimental to safety and causes a nuisance for pedestrians, vehicles, and structures at the S/T alley and along 24th Street.
3. I am very concerned about neighbors in wheelchairs or elderly using the 24<sup>th</sup> Street sidewalk and the S/T alley as pedestrians or in vehicles. There is a chronic problem with safety and nuisance factors (glass; trash; graffiti). This may be more of an issue with the City about services that can no longer be provided, but I am reminded of it

several times a month. I am weary of sweeping up glass hazards and trash nuisances from the sidewalks along 24th Street, at the S/T alley, or in the street.

4. I am still unclear about the trash containers for five housing units. The exhibits (revised drawings) show only six trash containers in two locations on the property. I would be much appeased to see fifteen trash containers in non-nuisance locations on the application's drawing.

Thanks in advance for any clarifications or assurances to allay my concerns that you can provide. My e-mail address is: [2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net)

Sincerely,

Susan Woodward ("Kelley")  
2006 24th Street

July 12, 2011

David Hung  
Community Development Department  
City of Sacramento  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**Subject: Proposed Courtyard Apartments Project at 2331 "T" Street (24th & T)**

Dear Mr. Hung


As discussed, we have not changed our position with respect to the proposed Courtyard Apartments Project at 24<sup>th</sup> and T, and continue to remain strongly opposed. We are opposed for the following reasons:

1. General Plan Regarding Density  
Please refer to our attached letters dated October 18, 2010 and May 24, 2011 addressed to you. These issues have not be addressed or resolved. We have additional information regarding density that we did not have at the time of the letter written May 24, 2011. We stated..."there are currently 46 units." However, we have a new count (48) done by neighbors and City staff and want to ask the Planning Commissioners about the City's General Plan for developments that would allow up to 50 housing units per city block on the 2.4 acre parcel (based on the City's General Plan for a "maximum density of 21 housing units per acre"). The application, if approved, seems to contradict the General Plan and set precedence by allowing 53 housing units on the 23-S-24-T block. Several visual counts of the block in May by neighbors and City staff determined there are 48 housing units on the block. Again, we request some clarification on this issue.
2. Design: Location of the Accessory Structure  
Please see our letter dated May 24, 2011 – we are opposed to the location of the detached "accessory structure" on the alley. We are concerned for the health and safety of the residents at 1914 24<sup>th</sup> Street as noted in our letter. Also, the current design creates a nuisance to residents. If approved, the current design poses a high risk to residents and we support two units with attached garages, which follow the General Plan.

We do not feel that our questions have been answered or our concerns addressed. We remain deeply concerned about the scope of this project and the impact it has on the health and safety of our residents. Please refer to Attachments "A" and "B" of the letter to you dated May 24, 2011.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signatures of Danny Gomez and Mary Gomez. The signature for Danny Gomez is on the left and the signature for Mary Gomez is on the right, both written in cursive.

Danny Gomez and Mary Gomez

Cc: Councilman Robert Fong  
Sacramento City Design Commission  
City of Sacramento Planning Commission

May 24, 2011

Dave Hung  
Community Development Department  
City of Sacramento  
300 Richards Blvd., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Mr. Hung:

Subject: 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard Apartment Project

We would like to bring to your attention some unresolved issues and conflicting information as it relates to the project being proposed at 24<sup>th</sup> and T. We feel that these issues need to be addressed and/or clarified before the negotiations with the developer move forward. They are as follows:

1. In the ***City of Sacramento's Central City Community Plan***, it states "4. Based on the maximum density of 21 units per acre, a total of 50 units could be allowed on this block. The staff counted 37 units currently existing on the block containing the subject site..." The plan goes on to state that "Therefore, in considering the entire block, the development does not cause the overall density of the block to be exceeded." We have had two separate and independent counts done in the referenced area and there are currently 46 units. We believe, that medium density would allow for 1-4 units being developed on this site with attached garages.
2. In the ***City of Sacramento's Design and Procedure Manual, Section 15 – Street Design Standards***, "15.6.10. Alley Maneuvering Areas cites the following: "...A 6 foot setback from the public right-of-way is required in order to ensure adequate maneuvering room is available." The attached diagram identified as PLATE 15-14 illustrates a 6 foot setback on each side of the 20 foot alley. Please clarify this as one of the proposed setbacks is on our property.
3. Approval for a special permit, according to a ***Report to Planning Commission, Public Hearing, dated March 10, 2011***, is granted based on it not being detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or if it results in the creation of a nuisance. It is our opinion that this project – in its current proposed state – presents both nuisance and health and safety problems. In the attached letter (30-day notice) from our former tenants at 1914 24<sup>th</sup> Street, the property most affected by this project, they point out

the problem with density and the fact that the project clearly would create a nuisance. (Attachment A). We believe the letter speaks for itself.

4. In addition, we are opposed to the location of the detached parking structure (Accessory Structure) on the alley – on the basis of health and safety and a nuisance. In a letter dated May 3, 2011, (Attachment B) our insurance company representative points out our higher risk and of course we are concerned with our personal liability should we loose coverage.

We continue to be deeply concerned with this proposed project at 24<sup>th</sup> and T streets. We welcome further discussion with you regarding our concerns before any further negotiations take place. We would like to resolve this with the Community Development Department directly without seeking advice from Legal Counsel.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these very important issues and concerns.

Sincerely,

  
Danny Gomez and Mary Gomez

Cc: City Councilmen Rob Fong  
City of Sacramento  
916 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

"A"

Hi Danny,

April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011

This is a note to let you know that we will be moving out as of May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011. It's been great living here and we thank you for all you've done as a landlord.

Due to the proposed new construction next door, we feel that now is a good time for us to make our exit. Having both lived next to construction before, we know how messy it is and just don't want to deal with it again. Also, the driving factor for us living on this street was the minimal amount of apartments and the more of a neighborhood feel. Now that it sounds like apartments or condos are going in next door, along with the many garages that will be directly across from us, we feel this street is no longer a fit.

Thanks again for everything!

Nikki & Kris

"B"

**W. H. SWISTON & CO., INC.**  
**2400 22nd Street, Suite 100;**  
**Sacramento, CA 95818**  
**Phone: (916) 457-0444**  
**Fax: (916) 457-4538**

May 3, 2011

DANNY AND MARY GOMEZ  
1331 35TH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816


**RE: 1914 24TH STREET**  
**SACRAMENTO, CA**

DEAR MR. GOMEZ:

I HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THE NEW PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION PROJECT WE DISCUSSED BY YOUR PROPERTY LOCATED ON 24TH STREET. ONE OF YOUR MAIN CONCERNS IS DAMAGE TO YOUR PROPERTY BY VEHICLES THAT WILL ENTER AND EXIT THE ALLEY WAY TO ENTER THE GARAGES.

THE INSURANCE COMPANY LOOKS AT LOSSES FOR UNDERWRITING PURPOSES FOR PRICE AND RISK. IF THE RISK (YOUR PROPERTY) HAS A FREQUENCY OR A SEVERITY CLAIM PROBLEM, THE COMPANY WILL EITHER INCREASE THE PRICE FOR THE COVERAGE OR TERMINATE THE COVERAGE. IN EITHER CASE, YOUR PREMIUMS WOULD BE HIGHER, OR YOU MAY HAVE A PROBLEM OF SECURING COVERAGE ALTOGETHER FOR THE PROPERTY.

BEST REGARDS,

  
BILL SWISTON

" C "



Design and Procedures Manual  
Section 15 - Street Design Standards

12.40 City Code

July 2009

The landscape planter area cross slopes are to be designed to 5% minimum to ensure sidewalk drainage and 10% maximum for maintenance purposes. The preferred cross slope design is planter areas is 5%.

The median area cross slopes are to be designed to 2% minimum and the maximum 10% maximum. Median areas exceeding 10% are to be hardscaped. The preferred cross slope design in median areas is 2%.

#### **15.6.7 Lane Widths, Bike Lanes, and Sidewalk Widths**

Lane widths are to be no less than 11 feet unless otherwise approved by the City Traffic Engineer.

Bike lanes are required on all street segments as shown on Plates 15-5 thru 15-8 and are to be 6 feet in width. The minimum width of asphalt concrete shall be 3 feet adjacent to the curb and gutter. Bike lane placement is to be coordinated with the City's Bike/Pedestrian Coordinator, as designated in the City/County Bikeway Master Plan and approved by the City Traffic Engineer.

Sidewalk widths are to be a minimum 5 feet wide for all street classifications except arterials, where sidewalks are to be a minimum 6 feet wide. The width of the sidewalk contiguous to curb and gutter is measured from the back of curb to the back of sidewalk.

#### **15.6.8 Cross Gutters**

Concrete cross gutters at street or alley intersections are not acceptable for City street improvements, unless authorized by the City.

#### **15.6.9 Alley Entrance Design**


Alley entrances shall be constructed in accordance with Plate 15-14 (Typical Alley Entrance).

#### **15.6.10 Alley Maneuvering Areas**

A public alley may be used as a part of the maneuvering space requirements for adjacent parking facilities. Maneuvering width may not be in the public right-of-way except as provided in Chapter 12.40 of City Code. A 6 foot setback from the public right-of-way is required in order to ensure adequate maneuvering room is available.


#### **15.6.11 Street Cul-de-sacs**

Cul-de-sacs shall be constructed at the termini of permanent dead-end streets. Maximum cul-de-sac length shall be as defined in City Code section 16.40.080. Cul-de-sacs shall be allowed on local streets only. Typical dimensions are shown on Plate 15-15 in the Appendix to this section.



**Notes:**

- ① A public alley may be used as a part of the maneuvering space requirements for adjacent parking facilities. Maneuvering width may not be in the public right-of-way except as provided in Chapter 12.40 of City Code. A 6 ft. setback from the public right-of-way is required in order to ensure adequate maneuvering room is available.
- ② If an alley is to be used for site access it must be improved to City standards. The extent of the improvements shall be the entire alley frontage of the subject site to the nearest alley entrance. Alleys shall have 6 in. of PCC with an appropriate subgrade as determined by T1 and R-values for the area in which the alley is located.
- ③ Minimum longitudinal grades on alleys shall be 0.50 percent. In general, the cross slope shall be 2 percent from the property line to the center of the alley.



REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TYPICAL CROSS ALLEY  
ENTRANCE

APPROVED BY: N. Theodorides SCALE: NONE  
DATE: April 2009 PLATE 15-14

PETITION #1

October 18, 2010

City Councilman Rob Fong  
City of Sacramento  
916 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Subject: 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets Courtyard Apartments Project**

Dear Councilman Fong:

We are strongly opposed to the proposed Courtyard Apartments Project for the following reasons:

1. Currently, there are multiple apartment complexes located in the neighborhood where this project is being proposed, please see the attachment.
2. Parking in the neighborhood is already a problem. Currently, there are two four-unit apartment complexes directly across the street from the proposed site which do not provide parking and require on-street parking only.
3. We strongly oppose the design of the project. It doesn't fit in with the architectural design of the current neighborhood. Most of the current homes were built in the 1920's and 1930's. The flat top roofing, aluminum windows, and vertical wood siding and stained cedar siding, we believe would not only look out of character for our neighborhood but be an eye-sore.
4. We value the quiet neighborhood, single family homes from a specific era and feel there is no need to add additional multi-unit housing in these areas. We strongly oppose this multi-unit project.

We and most of our other neighbors are appalled that the home at this location was destroyed without any advance notice – at least within a block of the site. We are angry that we were not given an opportunity to express our concerns to preserve this home and maintain the character of our neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted,

Neighbors


24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets Courtyard Apartment Project – OPPOSITION

Name	Address	Phone or Email
Danny Gomez	1914 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	margomez1@srscglobal.net
Mary Gomez	1914 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	margomez1@srscglobal.net
Linda McManis	1911 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	amarood2@srscglobal.net
Paul Miller	2400 S St.	eamitrosteL@comcast.net
Kristine Celorio	2320 T Street.	Kristine.Celorio@yahoo.com
Jose O. Hualde	2305 T St	JHASKO@ATT.NET
Mabel Lee Robbins	2010 24 <sup>th</sup> Street	mrobbin@pacbell.net
Reed Richerson	1915 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	reed.richerson@gmail.com
Tim Gussner	1911 24 <sup>th</sup> St	
Terry Guilford	1921 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	tguil75_@hotmail.com
Aracelio Reyes	2116 24 <sup>th</sup> St	451-41691
Susan Woodward	2006 24 <sup>th</sup> St. S	2006SEW@comcast.net
Susan Maastucht	2325 T. Street	Apt E suzmaast@yahoo.com
Nicole Corbett	1914 24 <sup>th</sup> St	nikkicorbett@gmail.com
ALBERT MONCADA	2009 24 <sup>th</sup> ST	916-416-1786
Eulalia Moncada	" "	000-000-0000
Mrs. A. Moncada	2009-24 St.	
Charles Hopper	2020 24 <sup>th</sup> St	(916) 320-4084
Leonard M. Ortiz	2623 S St	(916) 617 6661
Nicole Pitts	1915 24 <sup>th</sup> St	chole531@gmail.com
Atencio Romeo	1908 24 <sup>th</sup> St	(916) 739-0576

**Attachment**

**See attached Land Use Map of 24<sup>th</sup> & T Streets:**

A survey was done of the areas between from 23<sup>rd</sup> and S to 25<sup>th</sup> and S Streets and from 23<sup>rd</sup> and T to 25<sup>th</sup> and T Streets and there were 156 multi-family units and 13 single family homes found, which has been highlighted on the attached map:



SF - Single family

Z10-142

Page 2 of 2

CALL 我們講中文 • Hablamos español • Мы говорим по-русски • ພວກເຮົາເວົ້າພາສາລາວ • Peb hais lus Hmoob • Chúng tôi nói tiếng Việt (916) 264-5011

**From:** [Reed Richerson](#)  
**To:** [David Hung](#)  
**Cc:** [Reed; Nichole Patter](#)  
**Subject:** 24th & T Development  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 28, 2011 1:14:27 PM

---

Mr Hung,

I was unable to attend the last neighborhood meeting regarding the proposed 6-unit development at the corner of 24th & T, so I wanted to send you a letter expressing my concerns and present attitude. First, I'd like to thank you and the city council for all the hard work (40+ hours of negotiations!!) and commitment toward community integrity you've all shown. I'm proud of the neighborhood approach and I'm excited to send you this letter as I know it will be read.

I am a first-time homebuyer who purchased my home (1915 24th St...directly across the street from the property in question) in September 2010. We love this part of Sacramento and hope to stay here for quite some time. I was shocked one morning when the home across the street was suddenly bulldozed down and the mature tree cover was ripped out. My first thought, especially in this economy, was about home values, neighborhood appeal, safety, and the apprehension of what plans are in store for this property. Will it be a nice large single family home? Community garden? Perhaps three smaller single family homes like the block across the alley? I was excited to learn more about the project and to see what great architecture would be planned to fit in with the brick designs of my neighbors, or the bungalow w/ columns of my home. All I know is that it better not be another apartment building because my feelings at the time were that each block has maximum units already.

As you know, the plans call out for 6 units crammed into a lot that can only fit 5 parking stalls. I've heard the developer mention parking and safety aren't a problem on this block. I have pictures to prove otherwise.

- Mid-day mid-week without a parking spot available (this is the time of day when there should be the least amount of vehicles)

- My vehicle was hit in the middle of the night during a hit & run by someone pulling out of the alley. This is troublesome considering that right now there is plenty visibility and the developers plans call for only a ~3 ft setback from the sidewalk, which would ABSOLUTELY make that a blind corner. This block has several blind residents as well as frequent dog walkers and children. Allowing a variance to create a blind corner would be dangerous and irresponsible.

It recently came to my attention that the block this property is on already has 48 units. Each of these units is separately metered for electricity and gas and have accounts with the city for water, sewage, and garbage. I am also aware the General Plan caps the allowable units at 50. I applaud the creation of this plan and would expect everyone in the community, residents or developers, to adhere to rules within. If we allow people to bend the rules to their favor why is there a plan in the first place? This property should, according to the Plan, be allowed to split from one unit to two distinct and separate units. The developer should have known this when purchasing the property and if this makes the project unfeasible then I expect the property to remain vacant or sold to another developer who is willing to adhere to

the Plan and build two units.

If this project gets approved it will feel like eminent domain has heisted my neighbor, neighborhood, property value, parking, view, and ultimately the reason why I purchased my home in the first place. Loopholes and politics should play no role in the development of a neighborhood. I ask you to please pass this letter on to whoever is negotiating this project so that it is understood how members of this neighborhood feel.

Thank you.

--

Reed Richerson  
1915 24th St.  
Sacramento, CA 95816

REC Solar, Inc.  
Commercial Project Developer  
[reed.richerson@gmail.com](mailto:reed.richerson@gmail.com)  
[rricherson@recsolar.com](mailto:rricherson@recsolar.com)  
(916) 704-2720

Dear Mr. Hung

I am the owner of the house at 2000 24th Street, directly across the street from Ms. Rosen's proposed project. I have not been an active voice in the opposition to this project because I do not share the opinions of my neighbors. Partly because I no longer live in the neighborhood (my house is a rental property) but mainly because I feel Ms. Rosen has offered up a very nice development for the neighborhood. I have listened to the arguments of the residents of Newton Booth and appreciate their concerns. I promised Bill Robertson that I would not interfere with their efforts to seek some compromises from Ms. Rosen. I know about the density issues, the miscalculations of the city, and the requests of the core group to reduce the project from six units to five, a difference that seems trivial to me. I feel Ms. Rosen has been overly accommodating in this process and has exercised great patience for a small group of very strong willed folks. I have read the agreement reach between Ms. Rosen and the core group and have no disputes with it. It has now come to my attention that there are still a couple of hold outs who still want to squash the project or seek more compromises. I say enough. It is impossible to please everyone in the neighborhood. I think its a great project that need to start moving forward.

Sincerely

Stephany Fiore  
2000 24th Street

(Dated July 18, 2011)



Wednesday, July 20, 2011

David Hung, Associate Planner  
 Community Development Department  
 300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
 Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Support of mediated agreement for application P10-089

Dear Mr. Hung:

On behalf of the Newton Booth Neighborhoods Association (NBNA) I am writing to support Commission approval of application P10-089, 24th and T Street Residences, as revised by the applicant, Rosen Development, LLC, per the mediated agreement reached with neighborhood representatives as a result of the continuance of the March 10, 2011, Planning Commission and March 16, 2011, Design Commission meetings.

NBNA has been actively involved in this matter since September 2010, and several neighborhood participants in the mediation are now members of the NBNA Board. After an arduous and lengthy process, our organization believes it is time to bring this matter to a conclusion.

The specifics of the agreement are contained in the staff reports, and NBNA will not restate their contents here, except to state that the architectural changes and the modest reduction in the mass and density of the proposed project were of vital importance to the neighborhood. Numerous design issues, such as exterior paint colors, porch style, secondary materials, landscaping elements, and architecturally appropriate windows are part of the agreement.

As a direct consequence of those hard-won changes, the NBNA board has voted to support this application. The association supports the agreement as written. However, NBNA's continued support will be contingent on each element of the agreement being completed properly and in good faith. Moreover, the association expects and looks forward to involvement in the consultation process described in part III of the page two of the agreement. NBNA intends to follow the implementation of the supported agreement through to final construction and to raise issues that come up as appropriate.

From the beginning, our neighborhood and our association have supported the city's goals of in-fill development and smart growth. It has been NBNA's recognition from the beginning that the parcel in question – once made vacant by demolition – would be developed. The question before our neighborhood – and the city at large – was whether the voice of neighbors would be heard and whether the neighbors' concerns would be fully considered in a fair and open process.

*The NBNA logo features a figure drawn from the public art work "Community" by sculptor Kristen Hoard. The work can be seen in its entirety on the traffic circle at S and 26th Street in Newton Booth.*

After much effort on behalf of our neighborhood, such a process has finally occurred. This result, to a great extent, is by virtue of the advice and guidance offered to our neighborhood by Council Member Robert K. Fong and District Director Lisa Nava. We offer our most heartfelt thanks to them.

Moreover, it is recognized that the agreement, which has resulted in NBNA's support of the application, would not have been accomplished without the generous time provided by Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Executive Director Michael McKeever. Mr. McKeever offered to mediate this dispute after it was continued on March 10, 2011. He gave approximately 50 hours of his own time in order to provide our neighborhood the opportunity to refine and incorporate the concerns that have resulted in the revised project application now before the city. Mr. McKeever deserves the highest tribute for this act of public service. His efforts have done much to secure our neighborhood's faith in his organization.

Additionally, and notwithstanding our support of this specific project, the NBNA would like to note two broader city policy concerns raised during this process and unaddressed in the mediated agreement, that remain vital concerns to the residents of our neighborhood:

1. **The Demolition Process:** Much of the rancorousness and contentiousness of this controversy arose from the unnoticed demolition of the previously existing structure on the parcel. City staff informed a large assembly of neighbors at a November 18, 2010 community meeting that the applicant had no legal obligation to notice neighbors of the demolition of the structure. At the March 10, 2011 Planning Commission meeting, city staff confirmed that Title 15 of the City Code was amended two years ago to remove the permitting requirements for these demolitions, and with that removal, the requirement to give neighbors proper notice. Our neighborhood requests restoration of that permitting requirement and the legal notice encompassed within it.
2. **Density Count:** Late in the mediation between neighborhood representatives and the developer, it was revealed that the city's count of units on the block at issue for application of Land Use (LU) Policy 4.3.2 was erroneous. The city counted 37 units as represented in previous staff reports associated with this application. Numerous individual neighbors counted 48 units, which under the policy, would have limited this application to four units.

City staff confirmed our neighbors' 48 unit count five times during the month of May 2011. However, there was a dispute regarding four of these units on grounds they were exempted from the count because city staff was unable to verify the legal permits for the four units based on historical maps and other records city staff consulted. Therefore, the city staff concluded that notwithstanding the 48 physical units existing on that block, the applicant could still propose to build up to six units.

For purposes of this project, the unit count issue was addressed by the five-unit compromise in the revised project per the mediation agreement contained in the staff report. However, this issue is of great concern to our neighborhood because we are concerned that future developments may rely on unreliable unit counts and flawed applications of the general plan. We urge the city to address the manner by which it counts units for application of the general plan's rules and requirements. NBNA will follow up on this matter in the future.

3

In conclusion, this application and the circumstances surrounding it have raised serious issues of concern for our neighborhood with regard to process – of seeking developer entitlements, of applying the general plan, and of providing opportunities for citizen input. As this phase of the process is concluded, we appreciate the opportunity to have been heard. Because of that opportunity, all parties have arrived at an agreed upon revision of the project that is supported by the majority of our neighbors.

We look forward to the NBNA's continued involvement in all future phases of this process until the project is finally constructed.

Sincerely,

William P. Robertson

President  
Newton Booth Neighborhoods Association

CC:

Councilman Robert K. Fong  
District Director Lisa Nava  
Michael McKeever

Attachment 4: Support Letters

1. WALKSacramento
2. Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA)
3. Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
4. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
5. Midtown Business Association
6. Regional Transit
7. Friends of Light Rail & Transit
8. Policy in Motion
9. Design Sacramento 4 Health
10. Smart Growth Leadership Recognition Program
11. Karen Jacques
12. Kay Kneprath
13. Michael Monasky
14. William Burg
15. Ruth Ann Bertsch, M.D., Ph.D., F.A.C.P.
16. J. Matthew Gerken, AICP
17. Dr. Jon B. Marshack
18. Dr. Nita Davidson
19. Sarah Underwood



January 18, 2011

David Hung  
City of Sacramento  
City Hall  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: 24<sup>th</sup> & T Street Courtyard Condominiums – R-3A Multi-Family Zoning

Dear Mr. Hung:

Our review of the project finds that it is an excellent example of a mini-infill project with features that will add to the walkability of the neighborhood. The location is very walkable with convenient pedestrian access to many nearby destinations as well as light rail. [www.walkscore.com](http://www.walkscore.com) gives this location an 84 or a "very walkable" score. Transit is good as well.

The orientation of the units to the street is very positive as is the elimination of a driveway and the extension of the planter space. Additionally, having housing units facing the street where there has been a vacant lot and vacant house is a positive for the pedestrian environment.

The layout of the buildings provides an internal pedestrian circulation system that supports neighborly interaction along the pathways and in the courtyard. The separation of the garages from the units will add both to the neighbor interaction as well as giving residents pause before they use their cars which could result in less auto usage in this pedestrian and transit friendly environment.

For these reasons, we urge that the City approve the project and allow it to move forward. If you have questions about these comments, please contact me at 916 – 446-9255.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne Geraghty".

Anne Geraghty  
Executive Director  
WALKSacramento  
909 - 12th Street #122  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Walt Seifert [bikesaba@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 02, 2010 2:15 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** andreaosen@sbcglobal.net  
**Subject:** Support for 24th and T Courtyard Housing

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

The Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA) supports urban infill projects and compact development. The 24th and T Courtyard Housing project as proposed meets SABA's criteria for the type of project that supports increased transit use and bicycle use in Sacramento.

Projects, such as this one, located near transit and bikeways encourage transit and bicycle use, decrease vehicle traffic, improve traffic safety, provide environmental benefits and improve community quality of life.

SABA is an award-winning nonprofit organization with more than 1400 members. We represent bicyclists. Our aim is more and safer trips by bike. We are working for a future in which bicycling for everyday transportation is common because it is safe, convenient, and desirable. Bicycling is the healthiest, cleanest, cheapest, quietest, most energy efficient, and least congesting form of transportation.

Walt Seifert  
Executive Director  
Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA)  
(916) 444-6600  
[saba@sacbike.org](mailto:saba@sacbike.org)  
[www.sacbike.org](http://www.sacbike.org)

"SABA represents bicyclists. Our aim is more and safer trips by bike."

Sacramento Area  
Council of  
Governments

1415 L Street,  
Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA  
95814

tel: 916.321.9000  
fax: 916.321.9551  
tdd: 916.321.9550  
www.sacog.org



December 2, 2010

Mr. David Kwong  
Planning Director  
City of Sacramento Community Development Dept.  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Mr. Kwong:

This letter is in response to your request for review of the proposed development at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Street in the midtown area of Sacramento. Thank you for the invitation to comment on this project as it relates to the Preferred Blueprint Scenario map and principles.

The proposed project was compared to the Preferred Blueprint Scenario. The Preferred Blueprint Scenario is a conceptual map based on the principles of smart growth. This Preferred Scenario is not intended to direct how a specific parcel should or should not be developed in a particular manner, but rather give some direction on how the region needs to develop generally to reap the benefits of the Preferred Scenario. For this reason, it is not possible to apply them at a parcel level. With that caveat, the proposed site plan is consistent with the Preferred Blueprint Scenario map.

SACOG staff evaluated the proposed project, which is a six-dwelling apartment on 0.19 acres. The land will be the result of two merged parcels at 2331 T Street and 1918 24<sup>th</sup> Street. The project site is located 1.5 blocks from the 24<sup>th</sup> Street light rail station. The project applicant states that this will be built in the tradition of courtyard apartments found throughout midtown Sacramento. The applicant also states that the project will construct two new 2-story buildings each with 3 two-bedroom units. A detached accessory structure including 5 garages will be built with garage doors facing the alley.

**Findings and Evaluation:**

- Infill projects in general offer the opportunity to reduce the amount of automobile traffic and reduce the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions. A commonly used planning measure to determine whether automotive transportation is reduced is vehicle miles traveled (VMT). VMT is the amount of mileage the average residential household and/or employee in an area will travel in one day. SACOG modeling and observed data show that residents of locations like this project – those with housing densities similar to midtown – will generate less than one-half the VMT of residents of typical suburban locations. The residents will also walk, bike, or use transit

Auburn  
Citrus Heights  
Colfax  
Davis  
El Dorado County  
Elk Grove  
Folsom  
Galt  
Isleton  
Lincoln  
Live Oak  
Loomis  
Marysville  
Placer County  
Placerville  
Rancho Cordova  
Rocklin  
Roseville  
Sacramento  
Sacramento County  
Sutter County  
West Sacramento  
Wheatland  
Winters  
Woodland  
Yolo County  
Yuba City  
Yuba County

Mr. David Kwong  
 Page 2  
 December 2, 2010

at two to four times the rate of residents of typical suburban locations. In addition to its location, these travel benefits are in part due to the higher density housing in the proposed plan. A comparison of this project to a more suburban project is shown in the table below:

Area Type	Land Use Characteristics <sup>1</sup>				Travel Characteristics <sup>2</sup>	
	Total Density <sup>3</sup>	Proximity to Transit <sup>4</sup>	Proximity to Frequent Transit <sup>5</sup>	Street Pattern <sup>6</sup>	Non-Auto Mode Share <sup>7</sup>	Weekday VMT per Household <sup>8</sup>
Typical Suburban Residential Area	5	1/4 to 1/2 mi	n/a	20	5 to 10%	40 to 50 miles
Low Density Suburban Residential Area	3	>1.5 mi	n/a	15	<5%	>50 miles
<b>24<sup>th</sup> &amp; T Location</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>&lt;1/4 mi</b>	<b>&lt;1/4 mi</b>	<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>12 to 22%</b>	<b>20 to 25 miles</b>

Source: SACOG, November 2010.  
 Notes:  
 1 Land use characteristics based on SACOG's parcel land use datasets  
 2 Travel characteristics based on household travel survey data  
 3 Total Density = Jobs + Dwellings Per Gross Acre within 1/2 mile of place of residence  
 4 Distance to nearest transit of any frequency  
 5 Distance to transit with peak headway of 15 minutes or less  
 6 Number of "good" intersections (3 or 4 leg) within 1/2 mile of place of residence  
 7 Non-Auto Mode Share = the % of trips made using bike, walk or transit modes by residence at location, on average  
 8 VMT = Vehicle miles traveled

- Infill development is a strategy essential to the success of the Blueprint and our Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The proposed project clearly supports this principle as it is on a vacant lot located in close proximity to transit in the midtown area. The Blueprint Preferred Scenario, the currently adopted MTP, and the latest scenarios developed for the MTP update achieve transportation, air quality, and other quality of life benefits by relying in part on infill projects, such as this one, to be developed at the densities allowed in local general plans and zoning codes. In some infill areas near major transit, our plans also include targeted increases in allowed densities. The benefits analyzed under these regional plans cannot be achieved if projects in these areas are built to a density that is lower than what the current zoning allows for, such as if the city permitted only a single family home on this site.
- Compact development and a variety of housing options are critical Blueprint planning principles. The proposed project supports both principles by locating housing near existing jobs and services and providing multi-family housing. The midtown/downtown area of Sacramento represents some of the most compact and diversified land uses in the region.

Mr. David Kwong  
Page 3  
December 2, 2010

This project fits the spirit and nature of the existing community while promoting the Blueprint principles.

- Quality of design, another key Blueprint Principle, is a strong determinant of whether or not developments create stronger communities. As with any proposed infill development, it will be essential that the City's design review process carefully examine the design of the proposed structures to ensure the attractiveness of the project and its enhancement of the surrounding area. However, the project's design team, led by Ron Vrilakis, has much experience in development similar to this in the urban core of Sacramento that have been used as model examples of Blueprint-style development by SACOG.

In conclusion, the proposed development plan, its location in a neighborhood that provides a surrounding mix of uses – retail, residential, office, and its close proximity to transit – make this opportunity an ideal Blueprint implementation project. SACOG has been actively trying to encourage this type of infill development throughout the region. Jurisdictions that can expedite the review process of smaller infill projects that are as clearly consistent as this project with intent of the Blueprint Preferred Alternative and the current zoning will serve to encourage the smart growth that the region is striving for under the Blueprint.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact myself or SACOG staff members Kacey Lizon (916) 340-6265 or Greg Chew (916) 340-6227.

Sincerely,



Mike McKeever  
Executive Director

S:\SECURED\Mike\24th and T BP Review Ltr. 120110.doc



Larry Greene  
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER

January 13, 2011

Councilmember Robert King Fong  
City of Sacramento  
915 I Street, 5th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Proposed development of Courtyard Housing at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Street

Dear Councilmember Fong,

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (District) is writing to express support for the proposed development of 6 courtyard condominiums at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Street. It is the District's position that the project's density, design, and location are consistent with smart growth principals that will reduce the per capita vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and associated emissions of air pollutants. The project is also consistent with goals of the SACOG Regional Blueprint, the City's General Plan designation of Traditional Neighborhood- Medium Density, and the existing zoning for the site. The project presents Sacramento City Council with an opportunity to approve a project that puts into practice essential policies from the General Plan.

Recognizing that 47 percent of our/the region's ozone precursor emissions come from on-road mobile sources<sup>1</sup>, it is essential that new residential units minimize the need for use of personal motor vehicles. The Courtyard Housing at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Street has a compact design, minimum parking, and a transit-supportive density proximate to a light rail station - features that have been linked to a reduction in personal motor vehicle use<sup>2</sup>.

There is a causal relationship between land use decisions and air quality. Consequently, California Health and Safety Code Section 40961 directs the District to "represent the citizens of the Sacramento District in influencing the decisions of other public and private agencies whose actions may have an adverse impact on air quality." The Code also states in Section 41015 that in exercising this duty, the District may not infringe upon the authority of local governments to plan or control land use. The District is always cognizant that it is up to the Sacramento City Council to shape the land use policies for the City, but it is our responsibility to attempt to bring air quality considerations to the forefront. These comments are consistent with the City's goals for Inter-governmental Coordination<sup>3</sup>, as outlined in the Administration and Implementation section of the General Plan.

The District encourages the City Council to consider the project's potential to benefit regional air quality when it is presented for approval.


Sincerely,

Larry Greene  
Executive Director

<sup>1</sup> Sacramento Region 2005 Ozone-Precursor Emissions Inventory, available online at: <http://www.airquality.org/>

<sup>2</sup> Online TDM encyclopedia, Victoria Transportation Institute; <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm81.htm>

<sup>3</sup> City of Sacramento General Plan, Part 4 Administration and Implementation, page 4-8  
777 12th Street, 3rd Floor ■ Sacramento, CA 95814-1908  
916/874-4800 ■ 916/874-4899 fax  
[www.airquality.org](http://www.airquality.org)



February 11, 2011

Ms. Andrea Rosen  
Project Proponent  
24<sup>th</sup> & T Courtyard Condominiums  
Delivered via email

Dear Ms. Rosen:

As the Executive Director of the Midtown Business Association, I am writing to offer our support for the project the 24<sup>th</sup> & T Courtyard Condominiums in Midtown.

The MBA Land Use Policy committee reviewed the plans for the project and unanimously agreed that it will make a valuable addition to the Midtown residential community. The committee members were particularly impressed with the design and features of the proposal, including the proposed density. They supported the inclusion of six units in the project.

At the MBA, we believe that the one of the key strengths of Midtown is the neighborhoods. Your project will make a meaningful addition to both the quality and diversity of the housing that Midtown has to offer.

In closing, let me thank you for undertaking this project and offer our support and assistance for its speedy approval and completion.

Sincerely,

Rob Kerth  
Executive Director

A small circular logo with a signature inside. To the right of the signature is a small block of text: "Digitally signed by Rob Kerth, DN: cn=Rob Kerth, o=Midtown Business Association, email=rob@mbasac.com, c=US, Date: 2011.02.11 12:42:07".



**Sacramento Regional Transit District**  
A Public Transit Agency  
and Equal Opportunity Employer

**Mailing Address:**  
P.O. Box 2110  
Sacramento, CA 95812-2110

**Administrative Office:**  
1400 29th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
(916) 321-2800  
29th St. Light Rail Station/  
Bus 36,38,50,67,68

**Light Rail Office:**  
2700 Academy Way  
Sacramento, CA 95815  
(916) 648-8400

Public Transit Since 1973

www.sacrt.com

Date

Name of project manager  
Title  
Org  
Address

NAME OF DEVELOPMENT: Courtyard Condominiums

CONTROL NUMBER: P10-089

TYPE OF DOCUMENT: Tentative Map, Special Permit

The Courtyard Condominiums project proposes six condominium units on .19 acres in an R-3A zone with reduced parking. The site is located on the northwest corner of T and 24<sup>th</sup> streets in the Central City.

The 23<sup>rd</sup> Street light rail station is within ¼ mile of the project site. Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) supports the overall project as a high-density residential project within the Central Business District that supports existing transit facilities. RT also supports reduced parking for the project, as that will encourage transit use. The project is also providing improved pedestrian connections to transit facilities.

RT staff has reviewed the proposed project and recommends the following:

**Conditions:**

- Transit information shall be displayed in a prominent location in the residential sales/rental office, through a homeowner's association, or with real estate transactions. Please use the attached Request Form (also available on [www.sacrt.com](http://www.sacrt.com)) to order transit information materials.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please send any subsequent documents and hearing notices that pertain to this project as they become available. If you have further questions regarding these recommendations, please contact me at (916) 556-0513 or [tcnfield@sacrt.com](mailto:tcnfield@sacrt.com).

Sincerely,

Traci Canfield  
Planner

c: RoseMary Covington, AGM Planning and Transit System Development, RT  
Andrea Rosen, Rosen Development

Attachment



Friends of Light Rail & Transit  
1818 L Street, Suite 615  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
916.447.1960

February 18, 2011

David Hung  
c/o City of Sacramento Planning Department  
300 Richards Blvd  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Hung:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of Friends of Light Rail & Transit (FLRT) we would like to express our support for the 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets Courtyard Condominiums project proposed by Rosen Development, LLC.

The FLRT Executive Committee received a project presentation from Andrea Rosen at our February 17, 2011 meeting and unanimously voted to support the project. It was clear to the committee that the major benefits of this infill project were the close proximity to the 24<sup>th</sup> and R Street light rail station (1.5 blocks), the high quality design, and the pedestrian elements.

After much discussion about the site plan, we believe that the addition of a seventh unit (as originally designed) reflects a better utilization of the available land and is not disruptive to the neighborhood (in terms of massing and scale).

FLRT is happy to support smart growth, transit-oriented development projects like the 24<sup>th</sup> and T Condos. Further, we applaud Ms. Rosen's extensive outreach efforts and her careful attention to detail. We look forward to hearing the commission's discussion and hope that you will approve this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dain Domich', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Dain Domich  
President

cc: Andrea Rosen, Rosen Development, LLC  
cc: Robert King Fong, City of Sacramento, Councilmember, Dist. 4  
cc: David Kwong, City of Sacramento, Planning Director

*(Support letter circulated by email)*

**David Hung**

**From:** Lauren Michele [lauren.michele@policyinmotion.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 5:37 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** 24th and T Courtyard Condominiums or P10-089  
**Attachments:** Letter of Support for 24th and T Courtyard Condos P10-089.pdf; Growing Beautiful Communities\_Policy in Motion.pdf

Dear Mr. Hung,

Please find attached a letter of support for the 24th and T Street Courtyard Condominiums. As a resident of Newton Booth neighborhood, I am writing in strong support of the City's approval of the six units proposed by this applicant. I also am a certified Small and Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprise owner in this neighborhood (Policy in Motion) and I believe this project *as proposed* would greatly enhance my neighborhood. I have spoken with my neighbors and fellow business owners in Newton Booth and they agree.

My letter outlines three major points:

- 1) The City of Sacramento has a responsibility to implement the community-approved General Plan, and this project is consistent with those goals and standards/codes
- 2) Abandoned lots NOT developed in Newton Booth are causing businesses and residents nuance and safety issues – with three businesses and myself as a resident often calling City Police
- 3) The City should support this project because it will increase economic development and competitiveness locally and puts the region in a better position to secure federal housing/transit funding
- 4) I work on sustainable community implementation and policy with the federal government, and they are using Sacramento as a nation model in promoting residential infill development near transit consistent with "Transit Priority Areas" in Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008)

In addition to being a proud Newton Booth resident and business owner, I am also have the following credentials:

- Board Member of WALK Sacramento Since 2007
- Car-free Sacramento Resident and Tenant Since 2006
- Transportation Planner/Engineer with Fehr & Peers during City of Sac General Plan Update
- B.S. from UC Davis in Environmental Policy Analysis and Planning
- M.S. from UC Davis in Transportation Policy under the Urban Land Use and Transportation Center
- Policy in Motion Work on Federal and State Legislation on Implementing Sustainable Developments in Communities

Please feel free to contact me with any questions,

~Lauren Michele~



Woman Business Enterprise | 530.848.4342 | [lauren.michele@policyinmotion.com](mailto:lauren.michele@policyinmotion.com)

HOW CAN TRANSPORTATION POLICY GROW BEAUTIFUL COMMUNITIES?  
[www.policyinmotion.com](http://www.policyinmotion.com)

Lauren Michele / 530.848.4342 / lauren.michele@policyinmotion.com / www.policyinmotion.com



Lauren Michele  
2715 V Street, Unit B  
Sacramento, CA

February 25, 2011

RE: 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard Condominiums P10-089

As a resident of Newton Booth neighborhood, I am writing in strong support of the City's approval of the six units proposed by this applicant. I also am a certified Small and Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprise owner in this neighborhood (Policy in Motion) and I believe this project *as proposed* would greatly enhance my neighborhood. I have spoken with my neighbors and fellow business owners in Newton Booth and they agree. Three other neighborhood supportive business owners include:

- Dr. Richard Detrano, Dentistry at 2714 V Street
- Dr. Lance Cassazza, Cassazza Chiropractic at 2716 V Street
- Gina Geneshla, Revolution Wines at S and 28<sup>th</sup>

Dr. Cassazza and Detrano both share similar concerns of mine regarding the problems associated with abandoned lots that are NOT developed – having encountered numerous problems with homelessness and nuisances on a lot at 27<sup>th</sup> and V Street which is similar in size to the lot at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Street. We all frequently call Sacramento City Police over the problems associated with this abandoned lot. Further, there are plans for a future school on V Street between 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> and it will not be safe for our children to have ANY abandoned lots in our neighborhood, including that at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Street. The City needs to recognize the SAFETY and NUISANCE problems associated with abandoned lots.

Residents and business owners benefit from neighborhood-scale, high-end residential development such as the proposed project because it would:

- 1) Remove the safety and nuance problems associated with abandoned lots;
- 2) Benefit the economic development of the surrounding property home values;
- 3) Bring additional economic development to local businesses

I am also proud to be a car-free resident of Newton Booth and this project, being so close to the 24<sup>th</sup> Street light rail station, will make it much easier for residents who live there to pursue car-free or less auto-dependent lifestyles. There are so many benefits from living close to transit and in a walk-friendly, bike-friendly location such as 24<sup>th</sup> and T, I welcome these new residents to our neighborhood who I would image to be very similar in socio-demographic characteristics to myself as a young professional. We are very fortunate that this applicant is willing to spend the considerable sums it will take to build such a well-designed project that is proposed.

It is commendable that this applicant has crafted a project for this parcel that perfectly matches the requirements of the current multi-family zoning and the Sacramento General Plan. This is exactly the type of project that the City planned for this location. Objections to a use that is consistent with existing zoning and the General Plan should be summarily rejected. Lower density suggestions are

Lauren Michele / 530.848.4342 / lauren.michele@policyinmotion.com / www.policyinmotion.com



not consistent with the General Plan's infill goals, transportation goals, air pollution and greenhouse gas reduction goals. Why miss an opportunity like this?

Midtown Sacramento must use one of its most precious resources- land near light rail- for the highest and best use. Land use decisions such as this one have very long-term impacts. This project is medium-density, modest-scale and traditionally laid out. Putting the garages on the alley follows the tradition of the apartments on this half-block and makes the 24<sup>th</sup> Street side much more pedestrian-friendly. The applicant requests minor non-substantive variances which should be granted. The applicant should be applauded for putting a parking space plus back onto 24<sup>th</sup> Street by eliminating the existing curb cut which also makes 24<sup>th</sup> Street more pedestrian-friendly.

As a professional transportation planner and policy analyst on implementing sustainable communities, I urge the City of Sacramento to expedite approval of this project. If Sacramento wants to be a sustainable community as it claims, it should be sending the right message to developers of Smart Growth projects. I work on federal policy which frequently highlights the efforts in the Sacramento region in supporting infill projects, and it would be an embarrassment to the City of Sacramento to report to the Federal Partnership for Sustainability that efforts locally in supporting economically, environmentally and socially responsibly development is getting emotionally hijacked by irrational concerns from other neighbors. The Sacramento Region recently received \$1.5 million from this Partnership to implement residential housing within half a mile of transit stations, in alignment with California's Senate Bill 375 (2008) stimulations to incentivize "Transit Priority Areas." NOT approving this project will decrease the region's economic competitiveness for future funding.

I have attached to this letter an illustration of how the City of Sacramento can choose to be a model in supporting the building of beautiful communities. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions, and I look forward to seeing you at the March 10<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission and any upcoming City Council meetings where I will be happy to point out the economic impacts of the City's choices.

Sincerely,

~Lauren Michele~



Woman Business Enterprise | 530.848.4342 | lauren.michele@policyinmotion.com

HOW CAN TRANSPORTATION POLICY GROW BEAUTIFUL COMMUNITIES?  
[www.policyinmotion.com](http://www.policyinmotion.com)



David Hung, Planner  
City of Sacramento  
Sent by Email

January 13, 2011

Dear David Hung:

Design Sacramento 4 Health is a group of physicians and other health professionals who are committed to improving public health through changes in our built environment. Design Sacramento 4 Health supports community development that supports and promotes human health, such as urban infill, compact development, and mixed-use development that encourages walking, bicycling, and use of public transit. Our goals are:

- High-quality, compact development where people can live, work, shop and play without necessarily needing a car
- Communities that are safe for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Reduced generation of air pollution through replacement of vehicle trips with walking and bicycling

We have reviewed the information on the infill project proposed by Rosen Development LLC in midtown Sacramento at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets. Many features of the project will promote public health and physical activity, including that it's a short walk to the closest light rail station, its proximity to many retail outlets and services, the interior bicycle storage, and its pedestrian and bike-friendly orientation. The car is accommodated by the alley-loaded garage but it is not emphasized. We support the five proposed off-street parking spaces and see no need for any additional parking as this project will attract residents who do not rely exclusively on cars for transportation. The project would improve infrastructure for walking by eliminating a driveway, which results in one less conflict point with cars. These features motivate residents to walk, bicycle, or use public transit to arrive at nearby jobs, services, and shopping, providing them the benefits of increased physical activity and giving them a direct, personal opportunity to reduce air pollution by driving less. Also, as more residents walk, bicycle, and take public transit to their destinations, increased social interaction and "eyes on the street" form a safety net that promotes community connectedness, reduces incidence of depression and other mental health issues, and can reduce the incidence of crime and violence.

Design Sacramento 4 Health supports the proposed project at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets as currently proposed for its potential to contribute to improving public health in the city of Sacramento. Further, we support your compliance with the current Sacramento General Plan by building at least six dwelling units on this large parcel near light rail giving more central city residents a unique opportunity to live in newly- built high quality housing near light rail. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 916-874-5257, or [TDuarte@airquality.org](mailto:TDuarte@airquality.org).

Sincerely,

Teri H. Duarte, MPH, Chair  
Design Sacramento 4 Health

Cc: Councilman Robert King Fong  
Mayor Kevin Johnson  
David Kwong, City of Sacramento  
Andrea Rosen, Rosen Development LLC



**SMART GROWTH LEADERSHIP RECOGNITION PROGRAM**

October 28, 2010

Rosen Development, LLC.  
2226 Portola Way  
Sacramento, CA 95818

Andrea Rosen: (916) 457-6721, cell: (916) 508-6721  
[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)  
Ben Rosen: cell: (916) 761-1912 [bcrosen@gmail.com](mailto:bcrosen@gmail.com)

**Re: Letter of Endorsement for Courtyard Housing at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Project**

Dear Andrea Rosen:

On behalf of the Smart Growth Leadership Recognition Program, we are pleased to inform you that your project **Courtyard Housing at 24<sup>th</sup> and T**, on the basis of the application and exhibits you submitted and your presentation to the program review committee on October 7<sup>th</sup> 2010, the committee and Boards of Directors of the American Institute of Architects Central Valley (AIACV), and the Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), find that the project meets the guidelines of the Smart Growth Leadership Recognition Program and have awarded this Endorsement.

A copy of this endorsement letter will be posted on the websites of ECOS and the AIACV in a locked PDF format. Copies of endorsement letters will only be provided to third parties with your written consent.

We appreciate the value and sustainability that the proposed Courtyard Housing at 24<sup>th</sup> and T project will provide the community. We hope this Endorsement will help you advance your project. This endorsement must be re-evaluated if the project undergoes significant changes and this Endorsement letter is then no longer valid for use as a vehicle of support.

Endorsements are based on the overall quality of a project and made in an effort to be proactive without waiting for completion of legal and environmental review. Endorsement does not reflect an opinion as to project consistency with any requirements that may apply to governmental agency consideration or approval.

Any recognition regarding this Endorsement should be made in the name of the Smart Growth Leadership Recognition Program, a joint program of AIACV and ECOS.

We are looking forward to seeing the Courtyard Housing at 24<sup>th</sup> and T project completed and wish you success.

Sincerely,



---

President  
AIA Central Valley



---

President  
ECOS

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Karen Jacques [threegables@macnexus.org]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 26, 2010 9:04 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Rosen Andrea  
**Subject:** Z10-142

Dear Mr. Hung,

I am a long term Central City activist and also own property within the Newton Booth neighborhood. (My four properties are within approximately three blocks of the project.)

I have had the opportunity to review this project in detail and am writing in support of it. The house and garage that were formerly on the site (the only properties on the site) were both in extremely poor condition and it did not appear to be economically feasible to repair them. This project, which consists of six apartments and five garages, is both attractively designed and makes good use of the entire site. It is a modern take on two older courtyard apartments that are located in the same block. While modern in design, the project is attractive and is compatible with those earlier apartments in terms of height and massing. It will eliminate the blight of a building that has been vacant and deteriorating for the past several years and will be a pleasant addition to the neighborhood. I also appreciate that the project design will result in the elimination of a driveway that is currently on 24th Street and thus create an extra on street parking space on the block. In my view, that extra space provides mitigation for the fact that the project has six units and only five garages.

The project owner, Andrea Rosen, has indicated that she is considering building the apartments to condominium standards so that they could be converted to individual ownership at some future date. I hope she will do this as the units are attractive enough that owner occupants would be interested in them and the neighborhood, like all Central City neighborhoods, could benefit from more owner occupants.

I appreciate Ms. Rosen taking the time to meet with me about this project and I also appreciate the opportunity to comment on it.

Sincerely,

Karen Jacques  
[threegables@macnexus.org](mailto:threegables@macnexus.org)

cc: Andrea Rosen

**David Hung**

---

**From:** ANDREA ROSEN [andrearosen@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 11, 2010 9:46 AM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** Fw: Re: 24th and T Courtyard Housing

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Andrea Rosen**

(916) 457-6721  
[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)

--- On Sun, 10/10/10, Gene and Kay Knepprath <[kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu](mailto:kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu)> wrote:

From: Gene and Kay Knepprath <[kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu](mailto:kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu)>  
Subject: Re: 24th and T Courtyard Housing  
To: "ANDREA ROSEN" <[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Sunday, October 10, 2010, 10:07 PM

I sent it in Word X which is not the latest version.

KAY KNEPPRATH

2620 P STREET

Sacramento, CA, 95816

David Hung  
Planning Department  
City of Sacramento

RE: Z10-142

Dear Mr. Hung:

I am writing to support the proposed development of the 24<sup>th</sup> & T Street Courtyard Housing by Rosen Development, LLC. I have reviewed the plans for this site and believe that the proposed project will be an improvement to the area.

A known and reliable mother and son although a new corporation, form Rosen Development, LLC. Andrea Rosen is active in the community and in her neighborhood. Her son, Ben, works for a non-profit housing developer. Both are experienced in developing housing. They have contracted with Ron Vrilakas, one of

Sacramento's architects known for his sensitivity to neighborhood values. This team will build a project of which the Poverty Ridge neighborhood will be proud.

This proposal is innovative in its land use, merging two lots, one of which has lain fallow and the other that has had a vacant house on it for some time. Six units of superior rental housing will be added to the neighborhood, and a blighted corner will be transformed into an eye-catching building.

I urge that the special permit to waive one parking space be granted. On street parking is historically acceptable in the neighborhood. Few residences had parking when they were built in the early 1900's. Additionally, one curb cut will be filled, making on-street parking accessible. I also urge that the special permit to reduce the street side setback for the garage building be granted and that the Plan Review-New Site Plan be approved.

If you would like to contact me for more information, I'm at 916-457-3793.

Sincerely,

Kay Kneprath

On Oct 10, 2010, at 9:48 PM, ANDREA ROSEN wrote:

Thanks Kay. but I can't open it. what do you suggest?

Congrats to Paul on his BIG upcoming birthday. I remember mine!

**Andrea Rosen**  
(916) 457-6721  
[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)

--- On Sun, 10/10/10, Gene and Kay Kneprath <[kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu](mailto:kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu)> wrote:

From: Gene and Kay Kneprath <[kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu](mailto:kaygenek@saclink.csus.edu)>  
Subject: Re: 24th and T Courtyard Housing  
To: "ANDREA ROSEN" <[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Sunday, October 10, 2010, 4:15 PM

Andrea: Here's my letter. Glad to do it. Hope it helps.  
Kay

Michael Monasky  
9035 Plaza Park Drive  
Elk Grove, CA 95624  
916-832-5750  
Thursday, January 13, 2011

David Hung, Planner  
City of Sacramento

***RE: ROSEN PROJECT AT 24<sup>TH</sup> & T STREETS***

Dear Mr. Hung:

At the January 6, 2011 Design Sacramento For Health (DS4H) meeting, I listened to the project proposed by developer Andrea Rosen and I am in support of the concepts she communicated.

First, the project includes five garages for six units. This will require a variance from the city, but it will put cars in the alley instead of on the street or in the front yards.

The project includes six large units with individual patios.

There is a large, outdoor commons area in the center of the project, which includes bike racks for visitors.

The project will accommodate a flat or pitched roof, whichever the neighbors prefer.

The project is endorsed by: Michael McKeever and the Sacramento Area Congress of Governments which fits the Regional Blueprint as smart growth, and; the Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates, as the project allows for reduced automobile use and increased bicycle and pedestrian use.

The project is less than two blocks from light rail.

The project features upscale, moderately priced rentals that serve the midtown, government office, and hospital service sectors.

Ms. Rosen's project deserves special consideration by the Planning Department, the Planning Commission, and the Sacramento City Council. It reflects the best conversion of property to smart growth development. The city is fortunate to have such a thoughtfully designed project before it for consideration. I heartily endorse the concept as it builds community with its shared commons spaces, and is a pedestrian-friendly project in the interest of smart infill growth that will encourage healthy, aerobic activities such as walking, bicycling, and use of public transit.

Sincerely,

Michael Monasky

**David Hung**

---

**From:** b.burg@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Monday, February 14, 2011 2:24 PM  
**To:** David Hung; Robert King Fong; ANDREA ROSEN; Lisa Nava  
**Subject:** Letter of Support for Z10-142, Courtyard Condominiums at 24th and T

To whom it may concern:

I am a resident of the Winn Park neighborhood, four blocks from the project site. As a student of Sacramento's history and the history of urban planning, transport and development, I wish to address how the 24th & T project reflects and meets the historic patterns of the neighborhood where it is planned.

This letter is intended to express my support for Project Z10-142, the 24th & T Courtyard Condominiums project. The project is located between the Poverty Ridge and Newton Booth neighborhoods, whose development was driven by the presence of a streetcar line along T Street that allowed residents easy access to downtown Sacramento. Unlike postwar suburban neighborhoods, streetcar suburbs like this neighborhood included both single-family and multi-family housing on small lots, with the highest property values and highest densities adjacent to the transit line. The built environment of the neighborhood reflects this diversity of density, as a mixture of single-family homes and 1-3 story apartment buildings, apparent even after 70 years without a streetcar on T Street. The end of streetcar service, changes in development policy and other factors caused a shift in later neighborhoods to promote exclusive single-family neighborhoods over the mixed, diverse and walkable neighborhoods of previous eras, and dependence upon the automobile encouraged low-density neighborhoods that limited walkability and excluded public transit. Even in that era, this neighborhood maintained its walkability, reflected by the creation of high-density apartments on single lots.

As American cities like Sacramento rediscover the urban planning lessons learned a century ago, using terms like "transit-oriented development" and "walkable neighborhoods", development projects like this one represent a return to traditional neighborhood densities. The project site still has close proximity to transit and a street network well-suited to walking and cycling. The proposed density is effectively identical to the neighborhood's historic density in the era of its construction. The proposed units are lower in density than many of the mid-century apartment buildings in the neighborhood, with unit sizes more reflective of the neighborhood's historic homes. This project represents an excellent balance between unit size, affordability and density, within a walkable historic neighborhood.

While the project area is not within a currently listed city historic district, the neighborhood's architectural character is very similar to many of Sacramento's currently listed historic neighborhoods. The proposed buildings have a height and form that does not overpower or overshadow adjacent buildings, with roof height equal to or lower than neighboring buildings. Their architecture does not seek to mimic a particular historic architectural style, but is visually similar to earlier flat-roofed Art Deco and Prairie style buildings found within the neighborhood, constructed during the streetcar era. Since their function replicates the neighborhood's historic use as a mixed-density residential area, their architectural form expresses a return to that historic function.

The current project will add at least one on-street parking space by filling in a former curb cut, but I encourage the applicant and the city to include the condition that parking along 24th Street be converted to angled parking. This will provide additional parking spaces to address neighborhood

concerns about increased parking demand due to this project. I also encourage the city and the applicant to use a lighting plan that provides safe and well-lit routes from these residences along the sidewalks to the street, an amenity that will benefit the safety of both the project residents and those already in the neighborhood.

I strongly encourage the City of Sacramento to support this project.

William Burg

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Ruth Ann Bertsch [rbertsch@stanfordalumni.org]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 26, 2011 6:20 AM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** 'ANDREA ROSEN'  
**Subject:** Sacramento needs Andrea Rosen to build the courtyard houses at 24th and T  
**Attachments:** Andrea Rosen email for the Planning Commission b.doc

4237 J Street  
 Sacramento, CA 95819-3743  
 (916) 454-4021  
 Pager (916) 499-0239  
[rbertsch@stanfordalumni.org](mailto:rbertsch@stanfordalumni.org)

February 26, 2011

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Andrea Rosen's proposed six-unit housing development at 24<sup>th</sup> and T is a wonderful opportunity for Sacramento and should be approved. Speaking as a physician, her method of elegantly housing several families in this medium density plan will reduce pollution in Sacramento and improve its health. From a taxpayer's and amateur urban planner's perspective, locating up-scale housing so close to existing light rail supports the local economy and increases tax revenue to our city.

The residents of the 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard will be more likely to use public transit than most Sacramentans. T and 24<sup>th</sup> is only 1.5 blocks away from light rail. It is within the area of the city that is easily navigable by bicycle. The Courtyard project offers a single car garage, promoting families that prefer to rely heavily on alternative modes of transportation. The more middle and upper class denizens use public transportation, the more everyone uses it.

This translates into less pollution (and more revenue for public transit). If the handful of households of the 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard weren't living in the Courtyard, they would be living in the suburbs, driving cars more and polluting the air Sacramento breathes. It may seem hard to believe that a handful of homes can make a difference in public health. However, when Atlanta increased its bus services during the Olympic games, the number of pediatric visits to emergency rooms for asthma attacks dropped (*JAMA* 2001 285:897-905). Speaking as a hospital physician, Sacramento suffers from a disproportionately high level of respiratory disease that is worsened by pollution, including emphysema, COPD, and asthma.

Infill housing encourages more people to use active modes of transportation more often. This helps reduce obesity, depression, arthritis, diabetes, and hypertension. Obesity and its companion complications are the biggest growing public health problem of this century. Approximately half of Americans are overweight now. One third of the kids born in the last decade will develop diabetes. Diabetes shortens people's life spans approximately ten years, and the last year of life is frequently not fun – often full of painful neuropathies, amputations, and dialysis. Although *individuals* can often commit to losing weight and exercising more, a public health problem needs a public health solution. Encouraging people to walk or bike more and making it more difficult to drive is very effective. Just a few blocks of walking to a light rail station can reduce a population's weight by approximately five pounds over 1-1.5 years (*Am J Prev Med* 2010;39(2):105-112.)

From the perspective of a fellow resident of Sacramento, having more people outdoors walking and biking in the streets fosters strong communities, for which some studies show American consumers are willing to pay

more per house. Denser housing also increases spending within Sacramento, as opposed to more far-flung locales which are more accessible by car. People who use active modes of transit tend to spend within a very small radius around their home.

Sincerely,

Ruth Ann Bertsch, M.D., Ph.D., F.A.C.P.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Ruth Ann Bertsch, M.D., Ph.D., F.A.C.P.  
Assistant Clinical Professor, U.C. Davis School of Medicine  
pager (916) 499-0239  
email: [rbertsch@stanfordalumni.org](mailto:rbertsch@stanfordalumni.org)  
home: (916) 454-4021  
\*\*\*\*\*

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Matthew Gerken [jmatthewgerken@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 26, 2011 7:48 AM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** Support for 24th and T Street Courtyard Condominiums

Dear Mr. Hung,

This email indicates my support for approval of the 24th and T Street Courtyard Condominiums project.

This project would greatly enhance the neighborhood in which it is proposed, as well as provide a range of benefits for the City as a whole. Additional "rooftops" in this area will support existing businesses and could, along with other similar residential activity in the area, provide the criteria needed by future businesses to open in the area. Improvements to property and structures will increase the property tax base for the City. Activating this area with buildings that are oriented to the street and sidewalk, with additional "eyes on the street" will enhance safety and security. Establishing more compact housing choices near the 23rd Street light rail station will help support Regional Transit ridership and provide the opportunity for more workers to live near job centers downtown and in midtown and to access those jobs via light rail.

At times, private and localized concerns can derail thoughtful development plans and projects with broader benefits for the entire community. In those instances, it is the responsibility of urban planners to help our appointed and elected leaders understand the full range of issues and benefits. It is important to frame the discussion for projects such as this at the neighborhood and communitywide level, and to underscore the consistency between the project at hand and the recently adopted General Plan. I am confident that any objective analysis along these lines would lead staff and the Planning Commission to support the proposed project.

Thank you for considering my comments and for your public service.

Sincerely,  
J. Matthew Gerken, AICP  
Sacramento, CA 95819

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Jon Marshack [jon.marshack@att.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 26, 2011 3:20 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Andrea Rosen; Steve Cohn; Robert King Fong; Ron Vrilakas  
**Subject:** 24th and T - Courtyard Condominiums

Mr. Hung,

I am writing to express my support for the Courtyard Condominiums project proposed for the northwest corner of 24th and T Streets in Midtown. I have reviewed the plans and elevations for the project, have walked the neighborhood where this project is proposed to be built, and have met with the project proponent, Andrea Rosen. I believe that this project is a good fit for the neighborhood. Its scale, massing, style, and density of dwelling units is quite compatible with the context in which it is proposed to be built. It fits the 2030 General Plan goal of adding additional density to the Central City while also meeting the Central City Neighborhood Design Guidelines that govern this project. Drawing on art deco and art moderne stylistic elements of the 1920s and '30s, the Courtyard Condominiums project will complement its surrounding, somewhat eclectic neighborhood of high water bungalows, tudor courtyard apartments, and two story apartment buildings. (Note: I am ignoring the shingle-fronted four-plex immediately east of the project across 24th Street as an aberration from a time before neighborhood design guidelines were created.)

This project situation is nothing like that of the proposed 2207 C Street project that was recently called up to City Council by Councilman Cohn. That proposed single family project had both scale and design that were out of place in the immediate neighborhood of small, single family pre-WW II residential structures. While in my opinion not completely supportable by the Central City Neighborhood Design Guidelines, the City Council's decision to either accept the proposed project's scale or its design, but not both, was an appropriate compromise. No comparison should be made between 2207 C Street project and the proposed Courtyard Condominiums project.

Dr. Jon B. Marshack  
2308 H Street  
(916) 202-8331

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Nita Davidson [nadavidson@att.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 27, 2011 11:19 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Robert King Fong; Steve Cohn  
**Subject:** Courtyard Condominiums, T & 24th Streets

Dear Mr. Hung,

I'm writing in support of the infill project, the Courtyard Condominiums, proposed for 24th and T streets.

As both an environmentalist and preservationist—and resident of Midtown since 1988—I support sensible infill. I've seen the plans for the Courtyard Condominiums and am impressed by the well-designed Art Deco look of the project and the number of units for this double parcel. The size of each unit is perfect for people who want manageable, affordable space in a prime urban spot. The project's location—close to light rail, jobs, and Midtown attractions—characterizes it as smart, sustainable infill.

I opposed the project at 2207 C Street because it didn't represent good infill. Unlike the Courtyard Condominiums, the proposed C Street project was a three-story, single-family home that towered over the quaint, one-story C Street houses like a suburban eyesore. The neighbors who opposed that project did so because the house was architecturally discordant with their houses. Also, the house's location would have compromised the problematic sewer system. The C Street neighbors do not embrace NIMBYism. In 2004 they actively rallied behind a major infill project, the development of Courtyard School, despite the traffic and noise the school has generated in the area.

The Courtyard Condominiums project is ideally situated for its location, fits in well with the Sacramento General Plan, and exemplifies smart growth for Midtown.

Sincerely,

Dr. Nita Davidson  
714 21st Street  
Sacramento 95811

**David Hung**

---

**From:** sarah underwood [skunderwood@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 26, 2011 10:49 AM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** YES on 24th and T Street Courtyard Condos (P10-089)

I encourage you to support the T Street Courtyard Condos. I'm a mid-town resident, and in favor of this development.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Underwood

Attachment 5: Opposition Letters

1. Petition #1
2. Petition #2
3. Bill Robertson
4. Heather C. Scott
5. Mabel Lee Robbins
6. Christina Jewett and Floyd Marvin
7. Susan Woodward ("Kelley")
8. John Hagar
9. Alex Zabelin (President of Newton Booth Neighborhood Association)
10. Pat Melarkey
11. Pamela J. Wade
12. Bridget Whitted
13. Steve Whitted
14. Marlene Rice
15. Linda A. McNamara
16. Timothy Gussner
17. Alan LoFaso
18. Claire Pomeroy, MD, MBA
19. Letter sent to Claire Pomeroy
20. Michael Trostel

PETITION #1

October 18, 2010

City Councilman Rob Fong  
City of Sacramento  
916 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Subject: 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets Courtyard Apartments Project**

Dear Councilman Fong:

We are strongly opposed to the proposed Courtyard Apartments Project for the following reasons:

1. Currently, there are multiple apartment complexes located in the neighborhood where this project is being proposed, please see the attachment.
2. Parking in the neighborhood is already a problem. Currently, there are two four-unit apartment complexes directly across the street from the proposed site which do not provide parking and require on-street parking only.
3. We strongly oppose the design of the project. It doesn't fit in with the architectural design of the current neighborhood. Most of the current homes were built in the 1920's and 1930's. The flat top roofing, aluminum windows, and vertical wood siding and stained cedar siding, we believe would not only look out of character for our neighborhood but be an eye-sore.
4. We value the quiet neighborhood, single family homes from a specific era and feel there is no need to add additional multi-unit housing in these areas. We strongly oppose this multi-unit project.

We and most of our other neighbors are appalled that the home at this location was destroyed without any advance notice – at least within a block of the site. We are angry that we were not given an opportunity to express our concerns to preserve this home and maintain the character of our neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted,

Neighbors


24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets Courtyard Apartment Project – OPPOSITION

Name	Address	Phone or Email
Danny Gomez	1914 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	margomez1@srscglobal.net
Mary Gomez	1914 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	margomez1@srscglobal.net
Linda McManis	1911 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	amaroo2@srscglobal.net
Paul Miller	2400 S St.	tamitrosterL@comcast.net
Kristine Celorio	2320 T Street.	Kristine.Celorio@yahoo.com
Jose O. Hualde	2305 T St	JHASKO@ATT.NET
Mabel Lee Robbins	2010 24 <sup>th</sup> Street	mrobbin@pacbell.net
Reed Richerson	1915 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	reed.richerson@gmail.com
Tim Gussner	1911 24 <sup>th</sup> St	
Terry Guilford	1921 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	tguil75_@hotmail.com
Aracelio Reyes	2116 24 <sup>th</sup> St	451-41691
Susan Woodward	2006 24 <sup>th</sup> St. S	2006SEW@comcast.net
Susan Maastucht	2325 T. Street	Apt E suzmaast@yahoo.com
Nicole Corbett	1914 24 <sup>th</sup> St	nikkicorbett@gmail.com
ALBERT MONCADA	2009 24 <sup>th</sup> ST	916-416-1786
Eulalia Moncada	" "	000-000-0000
Mrs. A. Moncada	2009-24 St.	
Charles Hopper	2020 24 <sup>th</sup> St	(916) 320-4084
Conrad M. Ortiz	2623 S St	(916) 617 6661
Nicole Pitts	1915 24 <sup>th</sup> St	chole531@gmail.com
Atencio Romeo	1908 24 <sup>th</sup> St	(916) 739-0576

**Attachment**

**See attached Land Use Map of 24<sup>th</sup> & T Streets:**

A survey was done of the areas between from 23<sup>rd</sup> and S to 25<sup>th</sup> and S Streets and from 23<sup>rd</sup> and T to 25<sup>th</sup> and T Streets and there were 156 multi-family units and 13 single family homes found, which has been highlighted on the attached map:



SF - Single family

Z10-142

Page 2 of 2

CALL 916 264-5011 我們講中文 • Hablamos español • Мы говорим по-русски • ພວກເຮົາເວົ້າພາສາລາວ • Peb hais lus Hmoob • Chúng tôi nói tiếng Việt

PETITION #2

PETITION AGAINST THE APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL Z10-142  
(6-dwelling unit courthouse apartment building at 24th & T Street)




We the undersigned homeowners and residents of the Poverty Ridge and Newton Booth neighborhoods who live immediately around and near the intersection of T Street and 24th Street wish to express our opposition to the requested 6-dwelling unit apartment structure with the file number Z10-142 as it is currently proposed.

While we acknowledge that the developer and the architect of the proposed structure have contended a sensitivity to the concerns of the surrounding neighborhood, and while the proposal, for better or worse, may fall within the City of Sacramento's current zoning and development guidelines, we contend that the impact of the structure's scope and scale, as well as the waivers requested, will adversely affect the quality of life in the neighborhood with regard to:







- The overall historic and aesthetic profile of a neighborhood that is already challenged by inappropriate and haphazard design approvals from prior decades.
- The already overwhelming density of on-street parking.
- The delicate and tenuous balance that presently exists between single family residences and large multi-unit complexes.

Further, while acknowledging the courtesy and assistance of City planners when contacted, as a point of interest, we wish to express our displeasure with existing City guidelines:

- That allow for the demolition of a home and its vegetation in a residential neighborhood without fair notification to surrounding homeowners before approval of a replacement structure has been granted.
- That in so doing leverages debate in such a way that contesting neighbors must accept either a dirt lot with a chain-link fence or undesired construction.

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
William P. Robertson	2009 23 <sup>rd</sup> St.	
Bridget Wnitted	2314 T Street, 95816	
Jacqueline Spitalo	2050 24 <sup>th</sup> St	

PETITION AGAINST THE APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL Z10-142  
 (6-dwelling unit courthouse apartment building at 24th & T Street)

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
Nick Timothy	2110 24 <sup>th</sup> St	
JOHN HAGAR John Hagar	2417 U Street	
Biane Crawford	2413 U St.	
Bill Rader	2423 U ST	
Steve Whitted	2314 T Street	
DANNY RENTSCHLER	2021 24 <sup>th</sup> STREET	
Eddie Bulesteros	2325 T St. Apt. A	
Claire Pomeroy	2009 23 <sup>rd</sup> St.	
Pamela J. Wade	2020 24 <sup>th</sup> St	
" Landlord	2408 T Street	
Eric Knapp	2016 24 <sup>th</sup> St.	

PETITION AGAINST THE APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL Z10-142  
(6-dwelling unit courthouse apartment building at 24th & T Street)

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
Dana Ngo	2016 24 <sup>th</sup> St Sacramento, 95818	Dana Ngo
Alan LoFaso	2001 24 <sup>th</sup> Street Sac 95818	Alan LoFaso
Christina Jewett	2424 T St. Sacramento 95816	Christina Jewett
Floyd C. Marvich	2424 T St. Sacramento, CA 95816	Floyd C. Marvich
Susan Woodward	2006 24 <sup>th</sup> St Sacramento, 95818	Susan E. Woodward
Cole Miller	2000 24 <sup>th</sup> St. Sacramento, 95818	Cole Miller
Huy Ngo	2016 24 <sup>th</sup> St Sac, 95818	Huy Ngo
Kathleen Strawser	2308 T St #1 SAC CA 95816	Kathleen Strawser
James J. Sims	1308 T St #5 SAC CA 95816	James J. Sims
Rene Strawser-Brusacoram	2308 T St. #1 Sac., CA. 95816	Rene Strawser-Brusacoram
Ellen Shinfuku	2015 23 <sup>rd</sup> St SAC CA 95818	Ellen Shinfuku

PETITION AGAINST THE APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL Z10-142  
(6-dwelling unit courthouse apartment building at 24th & T Street)

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
YUJI P. SHINFUKU	2015 23RD ST	Y.P. Shinfuku
Robert McCartney	2014 25 <sup>th</sup> St.	Robert McCartney
Karen A. Nelson	2014 25 <sup>th</sup> St.	Karen A. Nelson
Frick Whisenhunt	2408 T st	Frick Whisenhunt
Melissa Shinfuku	2015 23 <sup>rd</sup> St.	Melissa Shinfuku
Richard Haroun	2217 U St.	Richard Haroun
Carmie Camarena	2109 25 <sup>th</sup> St	Carmie Camarena
Doug MORROW	2319 T APT D	Doug Morrow
Susan Maastricht	2325 T. Street	Susan Maastricht
Amber Rankin	2325 T St. Apt P	Amber Rankin
Zenaida Gutierrez	2325 T St. Apt. B.	Zenaida Gutierrez

PETITION AGAINST THE APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL Z10-142  
(6-dwelling unit courthouse apartment building at 24th & T Street)

NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE

David Larsen 2319 T St. apt A 

Jennifer Lau 2319 T St #A 

(per email) owner: R Street Mkt Lofts X  
Paul Petrevich Whisky Hill Lofts

Cynthia Dore 2420 T St Svc Co (916) 838-1503  
95816

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**WILLIAM PRESTON ROBERTSON  
2009 23RD STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95818**

Email: [w.preston.robertson@gmail.com](mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com) | Phone: (916) 607-2405

David Hung, Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Opposition to P10-089

David:

Thank you for allowing me to condense several months worth of detailed correspondences into one final letter regarding the proposed 6-unit development at 24th & T Street (P10-089).

As a member of the core group of neighborhood representatives that formed in the wake of an emotional community meeting facilitated by Councilman Fong's office in November of 2010, I have been a key participant in communications between the developer, Andrea Rosen, and the concerned residents and property owners of Poverty Ridge and Newton Booth who are affected by this project.

Due to fundamentals of the project that by consensus the neighborhood feels are inappropriate to this specific site, and due to the developer's refusal to negotiate or even discuss those fundamentals in meetings, I must strongly oppose the project at this time.

The developer proposes a two-story, flat-roofed courtyard structure comprised of six two bedroom units with five garage spaces on a centrally located corner lot that previously held a 1940's one-story, single family home with garage until it was demolished this past fall to make way for the project.

The consensus of the neighborhood is that the scale, style and ultimately, the ambition of the project as proposed, if constructed, will represent an inappropriate encroachment into the heart of the neighborhood by the sort of high-density infill development more appropriate to the industrial R Street Corridor a block away.

Rather than fulfilling a nuanced transition from lower density historic residences to higher density urban structures, this project promises an abrupt and unsubtle shift in style and density that effectively redraws the R Street corridor to T Street and in so doing, erodes the integrity of a neighborhood that is bordered by rail lines and freeways and that, despite bearing the scars of decades-past missteps in city planning, is nevertheless still a definable neighborhood worthy of respect.

With nuanced transition in mind, the neighborhood proposed an increase of density to three units with garages rather than six, and in a pitched roof style that more appropriately referenced the neighborhood. This was understood to be our starting point for a negotiation that we hoped would work toward a compromise between the developer's goals and the neighborhood's. Sadly, our negotiations never advanced beyond this stage. The developer stated emphatically that the number of units was "not up for discussion," and the expected war of words followed.

2

The architect of this project has a reputation in Sacramento for noteworthy urban infill projects. Similarly, the developer has her own reputation within the culture of local urban planning buffs--and drawing on this, she invokes well-honed principles of Smart Growth to promote her project.

The principles of Smart Growth are laudable and embraced by our neighborhood's residents every day. We walk, we bike, we use light rail--property owner and renter alike. We welcome diversity. And we enjoy watching our portion of the city molt its tired industrial skin and yield to a more vibrant retail/residential city as evidenced by the R Street Market development, the Whisky Hill Lofts, the Tuli Bistro condo development and Tapestry Square.

This is not now nor has it ever been a debate on Smart Growth principles. This is a debate over how best to apply Smart Growth principles in a specific location.

No one wants a vacant lot. But nor does one want an inappropriately oversized structure in a high profile neighborhood location.

I, along with other neighborhood representatives, remain open to discussions with the developer over how best to apply Smart Growth in our neighborhood. Until then, I must oppose this project's approval.

Sincerely,

William P. Robertson

1. Initial communication from W.P. Robertson to A. Rosen regarding concerns.
2. A. Rosen responds to W.P. Robertson's initial email.
3. Neighborhood petition of opposition submitted to Rob Fong and David Hung.
4. Account of informal presentation on 12-11-10 by A. Rosen to invited neighbors.
5. A. Rosen informed of 12-14-10 neighborhood meeting: creation of consensus and formation of "core group" of representatives.
6. Account to R. Fong & D. Hung of 12-14-10 neighborhood meeting and initial "core group" meeting; official consensus and names of "core group" submitted; scheduled meeting with A. Rosen for 1-9-11 mentioned.
- 6-A. Neighborhood consensus document as presented to A. Rosen on 1-9-11.
7. Account to R. Fong & D. Hung of 1-9-11 meeting between "core group" and A. Rosen: presentation to her of official neighborhood consensus and discussion.
8. A. Rosen response to neighborhood consensus.
- 8-A. Account to R. Fong, L. Nava, & D. Hung re. "core group" follow-up request by H. Scott to A. Rosen for clarification of her consensus response & A. Rosen's reply; desire by "core group" for negotiation affirmed; request by "core group" to R. Fong for design & density workshop.
9. Request by A. LoFaso to R. Fong for design & density workshop.
10. Account to R. Fong & L. Nava re. A. Rosen email finding fault with "core group" for terminating communications; explanation to Fong & Nava of "core group" position; request for mediation by R. Fong.

1

**1. Initial communication from W.P. Robertson to A. Rosen regarding concerns.**

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2010 17:05:05 -0700  
Subject: 24th & T Courtyard Housing proposal Z10-142  
From: Bill Robertson <[w.preston.robertson@gmail.com](mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com)>  
To: Andrea Rosen <[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)>  
Cc: David Hung <[dhung@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:dhung@cityofsacramento.org)>

Hi, Andrea--

I'm Bill Robertson, the Poverty Ridge resident you called last Friday (but were unable to reach) to discuss your proposed courtyard apartment building at the corner of 24th & T Street. First off, thanks for your swift response after hearing from Associate Planner David Hung. I apologize for not returning the courtesy and getting back to you over the weekend. My wife Claire Pomeroy is vice chancellor and dean at the UC Davis Health System and a string of back-to-back events throughout the weekend that required my participation prevented me from contacting you telephonically. Hopefully this email address, which I pulled from the building proposal will reach you.

To set context, my wife and I live in the big Prairie Style house located at the corner of 23rd and T street, across the street and down the block from your proposed building. About 3 years ago, Claire and I undertook a major renovation of our side yard to replace the off-putting 6-foot wood fence, and rotting wood stairs and decks we inherited when we bought the home. Our new design incorporated a 4-foot stucco wall that matched the house, with 2 feet of wire lattice for vines accented by downward-shining lights on the wall's capped posts. In the yard's interior we built two stucco-and-iron railed porches with stairs, as well as a stamped concrete patio and a large architectural stucco fountain.

Our design intent was two-fold. We wanted to create something that looked architecturally consistent with our 1912 house, and also "communicate" somewhat with the neighborhood. We placed two illuminated corral maples in a recessed part of the exterior wall and we allowed some degree of street interaction with the yard through the vines and iron gates.

Our effort was pretty successful, I think. Neighbors walking home from work have told us that they've changed their route to and from the light rail so that they can pass by our yard. Mothers frequently bring their children and lift them up to peer at our fountain.

So that's where I'm coming from. I like having a nice home that makes my neighbor's feel good, too. My wife and I are big proponents of integrated gentrification.

With this in mind, let me say that I appreciate the design effort you've shown in creating a courtyard apartment. As you know, there are a number of rental structures from the 70's in the neighborhood that gravely lack architectural respect for the neighborhood's

2

historical flavor. One of the worse offenders abuts our property on T Street. The people living there are very nice folk. But the apartment building they live in is an eyesore. So thank you for respecting the neighborhood.

Having read your proposal, there are a couple of concerns I would like to raise and they are somewhat linked.

My first concern is with the parking waiver request.

Living on 23rd, I enjoy full, but reasonably uncompetitive parking. This is not the case along T Street or 24th Street. In the evening, those streets are pretty full--particularly when patrons of the Round Corner Bar at S and 24th are taken into account. A busy night there tips the scale. At its current parking capacity, I would say that the neighborhood is manageably saturated at night.

The addition of a 6-unit apartment risks further tipping the scale. The five units of the proposal that have garage parking provided may still yield extras cars on the street, depending on the occupants. Having an entire dwelling's worth of cars definitively added on top of that seems untenable.

My second concern, as well as my wife's, is one of street profile--or the overall roof line of the buildings of the T Street block--and I think it plays into the occupancy issue.

In the current proposal, one of the tallest and chunkiest sections of the structure stands dominantly right at the corner of T and 24th, fairly close to the sidewalk. The artist's depiction in the proposal suggests the height of the structure will be not much higher than the pitched roof of the 1-story Tudor apartment next door. I think the reality will be much different. The "weight" of the building at that corner, will, I fear, impact the overall architectural profile of T Street between 24th and 23rd.

It seems to me that the wish to house 6 dwellings total on the site is a strong influence in this design. I can't help but wonder that if the structure housed 5 dwellings as opposed to 6, a less dominant appearance might be accomplished, with no need for parking waivers.

So that's my spiel. Again, I applaud and thank you for your interest in communicating with the neighborhood, and in the goal to create something attractive. However, I do have concerns about having 6 units on the site both because of parking availability and because of the heavy design it dictates at the corner.

Thanks,

Bill Robertson  
2009 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916-607-2405

**2. A. Rosen responds to W.P. Robertson's initial email.**

Re: 24th & T Courtyard Housing proposal Z10-142

ANDREA ROSEN <[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)>

Wed, Oct 6, 2010 at 8:50 PM

To: Bill Robertson <[w.preston.robertson@gmail.com](mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com)>

Cc: ron vrilakas <[Ron@vrilakasarchitects.com](mailto:Ron@vrilakasarchitects.com)>, Ben Rosen <[bcrosen@gmail.com](mailto:bcrosen@gmail.com)>

Hi Bill

thanks for your email. I'm glad to hear from you. Claire Pomeroy is a local celeb and I know her name if not her likeness.

You'll be tickled to hear that my son ( my development partner) and I LOVE your house and its partner, and largely selected our design approach based on your house. We are also inspired by your side yard which graces T Street.

I think the best next step is to meet in person so we can go over the design and I'd like to include my architect so he can explain better the massing and scale.

I'm off to Ashland tomorrow for my annual Shakespeare and other theatre fix and will return late Sunday night.

Can I set something up for us early next week? if so, please give me some available times. Would you like to meet in the neighborhood, say at Temple Coffee or at the architect's office near Zocalo?

I'll bring some larger drawings and we can go over whatever you wish.

Many thanks,

best way to reach me is by cell phone 916 5086721.

Andrea Rosen  
(916) 457-6721  
[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)

**3. Neighborhood petition of opposition submitted to Rob Fong and David Hung.**

Date: Thu, Nov 18, 2010 at 12:28 AM  
Subject: Petition against Z10-142  
From: Bill Robertson <[w.preston.robertson@gmail.com](mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com)>  
To: "Robert K. Fong" <[rkfong@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:rkfong@cityofsacramento.org)>, Lisa Nava <[LNava@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:LNava@cityofsacramento.org)>  
Cc: David Hung <[dhung@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:dhung@cityofsacramento.org)>

Rob and Lisa:

Attached please find a petition (in .pdf format) opposing the 6-dwelling unit apartment building at T & 24th Street as it is currently proposed. The project is identified by the Zoning Administration with the file number of Z10-142.

The petition is signed by 39 homeowners, renters and property owners in the neighborhoods of Poverty Ridge and west Newton Booth. This petition is independent of the previously submitted petition, which was submitted by a different group of concerned neighbors. This petition has different wording and different signatures, with, I believe, only one repetition.

I will be hand-delivering the original copy to the Zoning Administration representatives at the community meeting on the 18th.

Thank you,

William P. Robertson  
2009 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA

916-607-2405

Z10-142 petition.pdf  
1758K

**4. Account of informal presentation on 12-11-10 by A. Rosen to invited neighbors.**

Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2010 1:02 PM  
Subject: Update on Dec. 11 informal meeting w/Andrea Rosen  
From: Bill Robertson [mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com]  
To: Robert King Fong; Lisa Nava  
Cc: David Hung

Rob and Lisa:

I want to catch you up to speed on two recent meetings pertaining to Andrea Rosen's proposed 6-unit apartment development at 24th & T Streets, and where things currently stand in my estimation. This email will concern itself with an informal meeting with the developer on Dec. 11. In a follow-up email, I'll report on the outcome of a Dec. 14 private neighborhood meeting that was held at my house.

Ms. Rosen organized a meeting at the Vizcaya mansion on Saturday, Dec. 11 with a small group of neighbors of her choosing. The neighbors were: me, Kelley Woodward, Heather Scott, Alan LoFaso, Steve Whitted, Stephanie Fiore, Alex Zabelin and Morris Lum. Alex Zabelin and Morris Lum are both board members of the Newton Booth Neighborhood Association, but their attendance was not in that capacity, I don't believe, rather as concerned neighbors. Also, Kelley Woodward and Steve Whitted were present at my urging, since both live near the proposed development site.

It was unclear why Ms. Rosen had called the meeting with this specific group of people, and there was concern among the larger neighborhood (as represented in an email list compiled from the Nov. 18 community meeting), as well as by the attendees themselves, that this group would be considered somehow officially representational of the larger neighborhood when that was not the case. A meeting to create just such a small representational group was scheduled for the following Tuesday, Dec. 14, at my home. Any meetings with the developer before that seemed premature, but the selected neighbors felt that demonstrating a willingness to communicate was also important. The neighbors affirmed their non-representational status throughout the meeting with the Dec. 11 meeting with her.

For context's sake, let me say that there's a certain collective paranoia in the neighborhood that was generated by the unannounced demolition of the house on the proposed project's location as well as by the speed with which the proposal seemed to be advancing in the beginning. This collective paranoia has caused a lot of second-guessing on the part of neighbors as they enter a dialogue with the developer. However, we're all aware of the phenomenon and are doing our best.

The December meeting with Andrea and her selected group was extremely amicable. I think the neighbors present were pleasantly surprised at her congeniality as compared to her more aggressive stance before the project was elevated to its current status with the City. Ms. Rosen presented a new drawing of the proposed 6-unit building's exterior that addressed, to her understanding, some of the concerns expressed by the

neighbors at the larger community meeting on Nov. 18. Also presented was a helpful list that summarized changes to her proposal she was willing to consider.

For clarity's sake, I am attaching to this email three .pdf files of what was in part presented by the developer to the attendees with the understanding that she may already have shown them to you.

The overall impression of the small group of neighbors present at the Dec. 11 meeting was that the drawing and listed changes represented an improvement over the drawing in the Z10-142 proposal currently being considered by the City. The building as represented in the new (and unofficial) drawing was far less visually incongruous in its modernness to the surrounding historic architecture, which neighbors have generally characterized as "modest bungalows." Rather than the sort of exterior one sees in buildings located in industrial or retail-heavy urban environments, the new drawing suggested a more "residential" and "traditional" look, with small decorative porches, smaller windows, a lowered courtyard wall and a modestly pitched roofline among other touches.

The developer noted that she was no longer requesting a waiver on setback and was putting in bike racks, among other touches. She also said that her intention now was to sell the units as condos at the outset rather than renting them for ten years and then selling them as condos as she had previously said, and that an application for this change was being filed.

At the end of the meeting, I stated to Ms. Rosen that while all present seemed to find the artist's drawing an improvement, the larger neighborhood, as I had expressed previously, had yet to meet and establish a consensus. After that had occurred, I explained, whatever representative body was formed might present a different set of concerns and represented opinions, and that she should expect to re-explain what she had shown that day.

After this socially congenial, informal and noncommittal meeting with Ms. Rosen, neighbors who attended the meeting spoke with each other in person and in subsequent communications, and a number of points were noted about the developer's presentation:

The developer stated categorically that she was not going to spend money on further redesigns until a specific redesign was agreed to by neighbors and developer. At least one neighbor at the meeting understood this to mean that a letter of neighborhood support for the project had to be issued to Councilman Fong's office before money was spent on a redesign. The neighbors informally agreed that this required an inequitable leap of faith on the part of the neighbors and a level of trust that had not yet been achieved.

While the artist's drawing was an improvement over the drawing presented in the existing proposal, it was also noted that scale was not significantly diminished. It was

also noted that photographic examples of similar apartment structures presented by the developer were, like the examples presented by architect Vrilakas at the community meeting of Nov. 18, not from the affected neighborhood specifically and, indeed, did not represent any structure near the site.

Finally, it was noted that while the developer emphasized her application to make the structures condominiums for sale sooner rather than later, she did say that if the economy did not improve the structures would still be rented. It was agreed that the application to sell as condos sooner rather than later was an unimportant factor, and that its relevance to the larger neighborhood was questionable in the first place since many of the concerned neighbors are themselves long-term renters and not homeowners.

In the end it was agreed by the neighbors in attendance that what was accomplished at the meeting with Andrea Rosen on Dec. 11 lay more in the realm of interpersonal dynamics among select individuals rather than anything substantive with regard to the proposed development. All agreed that the private neighborhood meeting on Dec. 14 at my house would mark the true beginning of any negotiation process with Ms. Rosen, and that this had been expressed to her.

In a follow-up email, I'll provide an account of the Dec. 14 meeting at my house.

Thanks,

Bill

--

William P. Robertson  
2009 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916-607-2405

**5. A. Rosen informed of 12-14-10 neighborhood meeting: creation of consensus and formation of "core group" of representatives.**

Date: Fri, 17 Dec 2010  
Subject: neighborhood update  
From: Bill Robertson <w.preston.robertson@gmail.com>  
To: Andrea Rosen <andrearosen@sbcglobal.net>  
Cc: "Robert K. Fong" <rkfong@cityofsacramento.org>, Lisa Nava <LNava@cityofsacramento.org>, David Hung <dhung@cityofsacramento.org>

Andrea--

As promised during the informal meeting at the Vizcaya on Saturday, Dec. 11, this is to let you know that a private neighborhood meeting was held at my house on Tuesday, Dec. 14 during which over 30 members of the neighborhood met to establish an unambiguous consensus regarding your proposed development at 24th & T Street, as well as to create a means by which this consensus could be communicated to you and through which future discussions with you might be held. It was an extremely productive and organized meeting, and included unofficial attendance by members of the NBNA board.

The purpose of this email is not to present any details about the neighborhood's collective stance, but rather to let you know the organizational structure that was created. A core group of approximately 8 neighbors was established to meet with you and represent the larger neighborhood. It will not have bylaws, and it will act wholly independently of the NBNA and not as a sub-committee of the neighborhood association. There are some members of the NBNA board represented in the core group, but they do so in their capacity as private citizens.

I know that your preference is for an ad hoc committee under the guidance of NBNA, but it was decided by all present that greater clarity could be accomplished this way and that an added layer of representation did little to convey the neighborhood's position. You can certainly continue to communicate with the NBNA if you so wish, but please do so with the understanding that with regard to your development, they do not represent an official voice of the neighborhood, nor, as I understand it, do they pretend to with any formal intent.

The informal secretary of our core group suffered a family loss and so we have been delayed pulling together our notes and contact information in a more timely manner, and for this I apologize. I would ask that you give us a few days to mobilize at which point we can set up a meeting with you. At that time, you can present the redesign you presented on Dec. 11, and you can hear from us the consensus that we have been charged with presenting to you. I'm fairly certain that I will be your contact person with this core group, if only due to precedent. But I expect the reigns of communication to be a bit tighter than previously, with less off-the-cuff opining on my part so as not to confuse the neighborhood's position.

Talk to you soon.

Bill Robertson

**6. Account to R. Fong & D. Hung of 12-14-10 neighborhood meeting and initial "core group" meeting; official consensus and names of "core group" submitted; scheduled meeting with A. Rosen for 1-9-11 mentioned.**

Date: Fri, 7 Jan 2011 18:52:30 -0800  
Subject: 24th & T Street development (Z10-142) - neighborhood update  
From: Bill Robertson <w.preston.robertson@gmail.com>  
To: "Robert K. Fong" <rkfong@cityofsacramento.org>, David Hung <dhung@cityofsacramento.org>, Lisa Nava <LNava@cityofsacramento.org>  
Cc: Alan LoFaso <alofaso@sbcglobal.net>, Christina Jewett <christina.jewett@gmail.com>, Doug Morrow <douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov>, Ed Randolph <efr3@yahoo.com>, Heather Scott <Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov>, Kelley Woodward <2006sew@comcast.net>

Rob and David:

I trust you both had pleasant holidays. I want to bring you up to date on where things stand regarding Andrea Rosen's 24th & T Street 6-unit building (Z10-142) and the position of concerned neighbors in the Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge areas who have organized over the issue.

As you may recall, after the fairly passionate community meeting arranged by Rob in November, Ms. Rosen arranged an informal private meeting on Dec. 11 with select members of the neighborhood chosen by her, during which she presented a revised drawing of the building. It was a less volatile meeting than the larger community event, and in fact I, along with everyone present, I believe, felt it was even cordial in tone. At the same time, however, the neighbors present asserted to Ms. Rosen that they didn't consider themselves representative of the neighborhood and given that, she should not misconstrue the importance of the Dec. 11 meeting insofar as outreach to the neighborhood was concerned. She was told there would be an organizational meeting of concerned neighbors at my home on Dec. 14, during which a clearly defined consensus regarding her project was hoped to be established along with a more formalized process by which the neighborhood's consensus could be conveyed to Ms. Rosen. After that Dec. 14 meeting, she was told, we would consider good faith communications between the neighborhood and developer to have begun.

The meeting at my house on Dec. 14 was well attended, with a group of more than 30 people present. I was surprised and pleased at how orderly the meeting ran, given the passions expressed at the November event--and I was further impressed, if not amazed, at the consistency of opinions expressed with regard to the preferences for the development. Consensus was pretty instantaneous.

A core group of 8 representatives, comprised of both renters and homeowners, was created to communicate the neighborhood's preferences to Ms. Rosen and pursue good faith communication with her thereafter. The decision was made not to act under the aegis of the Newton Booth Neighborhood Association in our dealings with Ms. Rosen--not for any contrarian reason, but rather for the sake of clarity and decisiveness.

2

There was some minor confusion between Ms. Rosen and myself in the days following the Dec. 14 meeting with regard to how soon a meeting with her could be arranged. Understandably, she was eager to move forward as soon as possible. And understandably the neighbors, despite their organizational accomplishment, were distracted with the usual activities of the holiday season. I believe you both received the exchange of emails I had with Ms. Rosen during this time, and a quick reading shows that the confusion was of no great consequence.

Now that we are into the New Year, I am pleased to relay that the core group of neighborhood representatives has been able to meet among themselves and that a meeting between that group and Ms. Rosen has been arranged for 2:00 pm this Sunday afternoon, Jan. 9, at the home of Heather Scott, a member of the group.

The core group of representatives was 8, but is now 7, as one of our members had to step down due to work conflicts. Here are the names:

Heather Scott <Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov>  
Christina Jewett <christina.jewett@gmail.com>  
Alan LoFaso <alofaso@sbcglobal.net>  
Doug Morrow <douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov>  
Kelley Woodward <2006sew@comcast.net>  
Ed Randolph <efr3@yahoo.com>  
Bill Robertson <w.preston.robertson@gmail.com>

The consensus of the neighborhood that we will be conveying to Ms. Rosen is as follows.

"We, the Concerned Neighbors of Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge, embrace and welcome the growth of a combined neighborhood that represents the very best of urban life--a neighborhood rich in diversity with regard to the culture and economic status of its residents, renter and homeowner alike, and with regard to the architectural history abundantly evidenced in its homes, whether grand or modest.

In the spirit of this, we would suggest that the development proposed for the joined parcels at 2331 T Street and 1918 24th Street at the northwest corner of 24th and T (known as Proposal Z10-142) would best serve the urban planning goals of both the City of Sacramento at large and the specifically affected neighborhoods of Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge, by adhering to the following stipulations:

1. A reasonable increase of density from that of the previous single-dweller, one-story home on .19325 acres, to three housing units.
2. An architectural style of good faith integrity that is appropriate to the immediate surrounding neighborhood within a 300 square foot radius--an area that includes, albeit not exclusively, Tudor cottages, Craftsman bungalows, and Depression-era brick duplexes.

3. Pitched roofs with a height not markedly greater than that of the Mirabella Apartments immediately adjacent to the site on T Street.
4. Setbacks that adhere to city requirements.
5. Porches that evoke an "eyes on the neighborhood" affect while still adhering to the aforementioned setback requirements.
6. Off-street parking accommodations provided for all units."

Rob and David--I realize that there is a striking disparity between Ms. Rosen's proposal and what is entailed above. But at the Dec. 14 meeting at my house, we calmly went around the room of 30-plus neighborhood residents in attendance and asked ourselves the question, "Ideally, what would you like to see?" The answers were consistent for renters and homeowners alike. Our simple goal in this first official meeting with Ms. Rosen is merely to present her with the neighborhood's ideal. It is not our intention to be unreasonable combative, only to represent.

At her informal gathering on Dec. 11, Ms. Rosen voluntarily stated to those of us invited that she was not willing to negotiate on the number of units. Since that gathering was not deemed by us to be a representational negotiation, we don't regard her remark as a fixed declaration of a consideration "not on the table," to use her vernacular. Still, she did say it and we are all aware that she said it.

I am hoping for a productive and reasonable exchange. I will let you know the outcome.

Sincerely,

Bill Robertson

--

William P. Robertson  
2009 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916-607-2405

**6-a. Neighborhood consensus document as presented to A. Rosen on 1-9-11.**

We, the Concerned Neighbors of Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge, embrace and welcome the growth of a combined neighborhood that represents the very best of urban life--a neighborhood rich in diversity with regard to the culture and economic status of its residents, renter and homeowner alike, and with regard to the architectural history abundantly evidenced in its homes, whether grand or modest.

In the spirit of this, we would suggest that the development proposed for the joined parcels at 2331 T Street and 1918 24th Street at the northwest corner of 24th and T (known as Proposal Z10-142) would best serve the urban planning goals of both the City of Sacramento at large and the specifically affected neighborhoods of Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge, by adhering to the following stipulations:

1. A reasonable increase of density from that of the previous *single-dweller, one-story home* on .19325 acres, to *three housing units*.
2. An architectural style of good faith integrity that is appropriate to the immediate surrounding neighborhood within a 300 square foot radius--an area that includes, albeit not exclusively, Tudor cottages, Craftsman bungalows, and Depression-era brick duplexes.
3. Pitched roofs with a height not markedly greater than that of the Mirabella Apartments immediately adjacent to the site on T Street.
4. Setbacks that adhere to city requirements.
5. Porches that evoke an "eyes on the neighborhood" affect while still adhering to the aforementioned setback requirements.
6. Off-street parking accommodations provided for all units.

Delivered to Andrea Rosen, developer, on January 9, 2011, per neighborhood consensus taken December 14, 2010.

Representing the neighborhood:

Christina Jewett  
Alan LoFaso  
Doug Morrow  
Ed Randolph  
Bill Robertson  
Heather Scott  
Kelley Woodward

**7. Account to R. Fong & D. Hung of 1-9-11 meeting between "core group" and A. Rosen: presentation to her of official neighborhood consensus and discussion.**

Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2011 16:39:55  
 Subject: Update on neighborhood meeting with 24th & T developer Jan. 9  
 From: Bill Robertson <[w.preston.robertson@gmail.com](mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com)>  
 To: "Robert K. Fong" <[rkfong@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:rkfong@cityofsacramento.org)>, Lisa Nava <[LNava@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:LNava@cityofsacramento.org)>, David Hung <[dhung@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:dhung@cityofsacramento.org)>  
 Cc: Alan LoFaso <[alofaso@sbcglobal.net](mailto:alofaso@sbcglobal.net)>, Christina Jewett <[christina.jewett@gmail.com](mailto:christina.jewett@gmail.com)>, Doug Morrow <[douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov](mailto:douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov)>, Ed Randolph <[efr3@yahoo.com](mailto:efr3@yahoo.com)>, Heather Scott <[Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov](mailto:Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov)>, Kelley Woodward <[2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net)>

Rob and David:

I wanted to check in with a report on the first meeting between the core group of neighborhood representatives from the Newton Booth-Poverty Ridge areas, whose assemblage I reported to you in an earlier email, and Andrea Rosen, the developer of the proposed 6-unit apartment building at the corner of 24th & T Streets. It goes without saying that this is our particular take on what transpired and was communicated, and that Ms. Rosen will have her own interpretation. It would be wonderful if there were at least some similarities between our two accounts, given that common ground is so crucial to the commencement of good faith negotiation.

The meeting was held at the home of Heather Scott on Sunday, Jan. 9. The core group representatives present were:

Heather Scott <[Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov](mailto:Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov)>  
 Christina Jewett <[christina.jewett@gmail.com](mailto:christina.jewett@gmail.com)>  
 Alan LoFaso <[alofaso@sbcglobal.net](mailto:alofaso@sbcglobal.net)>  
 Doug Morrow <[douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov](mailto:douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov)>  
 Kelley Woodward <[2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net)>  
 Bill Robertson <[w.preston.robertson@gmail.com](mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com)>

At the meeting, Ms. Rosen was presented with the document of neighborhood consensus I emailed to you both on Friday. That document remains unchanged, but for the sake of convenience, I am attaching it to this email as a .pdf file. Upon reading the document, Ms. Rosen said that she was "shocked" by the disparity between her position and ours. While this characterization of her emotional state was duly noted, we did not necessarily take the proclamation at face value given the neighborhood passions that were exhibited at the community meeting arranged by Rob in November, and given whatever psychological motivation one might intuit, rightly or wrongly, from her PRA request to the City.

That having been said, and to be fair, she did seem if not flummoxed, at least unprepared or simply unready to offer much in the way of a counter response. She focused on certain details of the document that she felt were "inaccurate" to a degree that required correction. One such detail was that the Zoning Administration ID of her proposal was not Z10-142, and that it had an entirely different ID in light of her

application for condominium status. Another detail she termed "inaccurate" was the document's assessment of previous lot density, given that the lot was comprised of two separate parcels. Neither of these points became subjects of debate, as the core group of representatives had discussed in advance a desire not to become mired in arguing minutiae, but rather to view the meeting as a starting point of basic positions and to try to stay focused on that objective.

One concern expressed by Ms. Rosen that seems reasonable is what the neighborhood meant by the term "three units." At first blush, we felt that "three units" should carry with it at least some general meaning from which a discussion might be launched, but given that issues like parking variances and garages are concerns for any developer, we conceded that clarity on this point was helpful to all. Of particular concern to Ms. Rosen was whether "three units" meant three free-standing structures or three units in a single building, and whether garages were understood inclusions with each unit or not, in which case, apparently, the neighborhood was expressing a preference for one house with two garages or two houses with one garage. We told Ms. Rosen that we would try to get a clearer definition of "three units" from the larger neighborhood and would report back to her.

At this point, Ms. Rosen said that she was not sure how to react to our proposal and would have to think about it. She made an off-the-cuff suggestion that Rob Fong should be brought in to mediate a negotiation between herself and the core group of neighborhood representatives, but the subject was not pursued. Ms. Rosen also referred, as she has in the past, to various Zoning Administration guidelines and urban planning principles that supported her desires for property that she rightfully noted she owned. She also referenced letters of support she had from urban planning organizations. And, as she had stated previously at the informal and non-representational get-together she held among a select group of neighbors chosen by her on Dec. 11, the financial reckoning of her project did not calculate to her benefit with "anything less" than what she was now proposing.

At this point, we attempted to clarify matters by giving our understanding of the process before us. We explained in various voices and with various articulations that we were not her business partners, nor were we zoning guideline experts or urban planning philosophers. The latter two subjects were of interest to us, of course, as they should be to any engaged citizen, but that our primary mission that day was to convey the consensus of the neighborhood as defined by the 30-plus people who had met privately on Dec. 14. (I used the phrase "we don't care" during my own remarks concerning her finances and the zoning legitimacy of her project. It was a histrionic and intentionally colloquial use of language, however, swiftly and rightfully refined by another member of the group.)

We expressed to Ms. Rosen our understanding of the type of situation we all found ourselves in and what we saw our roles to be. The "upside" of being a developer, we noted, was that she stood to make money from her project. However, it was noted, there were challenges to being a developer as well, and one of those was that while she

may own a property, and while city guidelines might allow development of that property, she must also work in good faith with an intangible known as "the neighborhood." And we were the neighborhood. The neighborhood we said, was comprised of residents who live in an area, who open their doors, and who then simply react to what they see. The developer must deal with the neighborhood's reaction or not at her peril. And the same, we noted, goes for the neighborhood, with respect to their dealings with the developer. This, we said, was called "negotiation." And that was what we hoped for.

At this point, the core group of representatives suggested a walk around the neighborhood to look at the architecture and the general neighborhood profile surrounding the proposed site of Ms. Rosen's development. We had discussed this in advance among ourselves because it seemed like a socially amiable, non-confrontational approach by which we might soft-sell our position to her with a firm reality. I can't say with any conviction that that our objective was successful and perhaps understandably so. We wanted to walk past single-family homes and low profile structures; she wanted to count utility meters and deduce density of multi-unit structures. We wanted to walk in residential areas; she preferred the more industrial landscape of S Street. None of this was contentious. It was mostly an issue of subtle steering of the group and visual and conversational focus. All-in-all, it seemed to produce nothing on which we could build future discussions.

Concluding our meeting, we emphasized to Ms. Rosen that the neighborhood's consensus had been presented that day in the spirit of negotiation, and that we hoped to hear a counter proposal from her. She asked whether such a counter might include "information," and by this we understood her to mean more information about zoning guidelines and urban planning principles. We told her that we didn't find that as useful to forward progress as we did more substantive changes in her proposal. We told her that we were not interested in being unreasonable, that we wanted to negotiate, and we expressed a general desire to "get to yes." We also again said we would try to extract from the neighbors what they meant by "three units."

All in all, I would characterize our meeting with Ms. Rosen as tense at moments, but overall not unfriendly. I should note, however, that no concession to us was given by her--even in the form of a noncommittal consent to negotiate. We did not schedule a second meeting with her--nor did either side suggest one. The only concrete step suggested by Ms. Rosen during our afternoon with her was idea that Rob might somehow act as a mediator between our two parties. I know from email exchanges with Lisa Nava that Ms. Rosen had made such a request previously--and even before our Jan. 9 meeting of Sunday. My recollection was that she was told she must first try to work things out with us herself. I don't think that has happened yet.

It is our hope that she will.

Cordially,

Bill Robertson

**8. A. Rosen response to neighborhood consensus.****Response to January 9, 2011 Stipulations Requested by the Concerned Neighbors of Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge from Andrea Rosen and Ben Rosen Regarding P10-089 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard Condominiums**

In the spirit of good faith negotiation, I offer the following for your consideration and for further discussion. I appreciate the neighbors' recognition of the importance of diversity in urban neighborhoods, such as this one, in both culture and economic status of its residents, multi-family mixed in with single family and in architectural designs.

**STIPULATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN MET OR DISCUSSED AS PART OF ALTERNATIVE DESIGNS**  
**2. Architectural style of good faith integrity that is appropriate to the surrounding neighborhood.**

The current filed design is a contemporary take on many, very nice buildings in the neighborhood including ones not far from our parcel. It repeats the key theme of the largest developments on this half-block- the courtyard- and expands and celebrates this feature. Your stipulation recognizes the architectural diversity of the neighborhood which includes art deco, Moderne and prairie-style designs in addition to Tudor and Craftsman. The materials proposed in the filed design are stucco and brick which are common in this neighborhood as are many of the design features such as stoops. This project will enrich the existing architectural diversity of this neighborhood, however it's worth noting that design is very personal and subjective.

**3. Pitched roofs of height not markedly greater than that of the Mirabella.**

The current filed design does not feature a pitched roof and is a two story building 23' in height. There are many two-story houses and apartment buildings in the vicinity of this parcel in all directions. Two- storey was selected over the allowed 3 stories in order to minimize massing. See the Sutter Brownstones at 26<sup>th</sup> and N. The neighbors there worked with the architect and agreed that the best way to reduce massing was to go with a flat roof. Two storey was chosen order to allow open green space in the form of a courtyard for residents and large patios. I can't tell if this stipulation is requesting single story; but if so, it's not an option here. The courtyard will be behind a 4 foot wall which will allow passersby to enjoy it and the fountain. A pitched roof alternative design was presented to neighbors on December 11, 2011. On January 9<sup>th</sup>, I was told that the alternative designs were discussed at the Dec. 14, 2011 neighborhood meeting.

**4. Setbacks that adhere to city requirements.**

City required front and side setbacks have been met. The only other setback is for the accessory structure (garage) and a 4' side setback variance is requested in order to allow for 10' wide garages which will accommodate both a vehicle and a few bicycles. This is a limited variance that will run only for the length of the garage -17' out of the 160' length of 24<sup>th</sup> St side of the parcel.

**5. Porches that evoke " eyes on the neighborhood".**

Multi-family developments in this neighborhood typically have patios or private backyard spaces like the Mirabella has. They don't typically have porches since porches in the neighborhood are typically raised several feet and set back and up from the sidewalk giving the porch-sitter some privacy and separation from the sidewalk. Adding porches to this project was proposed as integral to the alternative design (not yet discussed). Porches at grade will need to carefully balance and realistically consider the user's feeling of security in order to be worthwhile in practice. Townhome owners report that more real "eyes on the street" results from windows from living spaces on the corners of buildings looking out on the street.

**Development Options for this Parcel to Discuss:**

Based on the current zoning ordinance which defines the rules for R-3A zoning and Sacramento General Plan designation of Traditional Neighborhood- Medium Density and based on what I can afford to build on this site, here are options to discuss:

A. Single building, 3 stories( 35 ft at point where roof starts), seven 2- bedroom units, all City setbacks met, seven parking spaces onsite accessed via the alley(5) and via double driveway off 24<sup>th</sup> St (2) . Pitched roof, stucco with brick accents. No courtyard. Common patio and walkways. Vintage Traditional design.

B. Two triplex buildings. 7 units total. 3 2-story buildings. 3 2-bedroom units in each two buildings with one 1-bedroom apartment over garage. Accessory structure with 5 garages; plus two on slab at grade parking spaces accessed via double driveway off 24<sup>th</sup> St. No courtyard. Limited open space. All city setbacks met. All parking onsite. 24<sup>th</sup> St parking spaces might be under buildings and those units might be one bedrooms as a result.

C. Two triplex buildings with 3 2-bedroom units. Six at grade on slab parking spaces (no garage) accessed via alley. All City setbacks met. Current filed design. Retains Courtyard.

D. Two triplex buildings, six units total. Five garage parking spaces; One parking space accessed off 24<sup>th</sup> St under north building; May result in 2 2-bedrooms and 1 1-bedroom in north building. All City Setbacks met; Smaller courtyard due to onsite 24<sup>th</sup> St. parking space. Curb cut on 24<sup>th</sup>.

E. Two triplex buildings; six units; 5 spaces in garage off alley; one space under North Bldg. Two 2- bedroom units in North building and one apartment over garage. Courtyard smaller (due to onsite parking off 24<sup>th</sup> St).

I offer these development options as ones that we could afford to build, that would meet within the City's existing zoning ordinance and General Plan designation and may meet the requested Stipulations regarding pitched roofs, onsite parking and City setbacks.

One idea that I would propose for discussion is that we consider petitioning the City for angled parking on this stretch of 24<sup>th</sup> Street. A Newton Booth property owner suggested this idea and noted that it has been tried in other parts of Newton Booth and midtown with success. It was

---

3

suggested that the City traffic engineer be consulted as to which side of 24<sup>th</sup> St be converted as only one side is eligible. Angled parking increases the number of spaces possible and slows traffic. I am supportive of exploring this option.

I look forward to meeting soon to discuss these ideas and your concerns.  
Signed,

Andrea Rosen and Ben Rosen  
January 17, 2011

1

**8-A. Account to R. Fong, L. Nava, & D. Hung re. "core group" follow-up request by H. Scott to A. Rosen for clarification of her consensus response & A. Rosen's reply; desire by "core group" for negotiation affirmed; request by "core group" to R. Fong for design & density workshop.**

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 2011 20:02:57 -0800  
 Subject: Revised: Update on 24th & T Street development -- Jan. 25  
 From: Bill Robertson <w.preston.robertson@gmail.com>  
 To: David Hung <dhung@cityofsacramento.org>, Lisa Nava <LNava@cityofsacramento.org>, "Robert K. Fong" <rkfong@cityofsacramento.org>  
 Cc: Alan LoFaso <alofaso@sbcglobal.net>, Christina Jewett <christina.jewett@gmail.com>, Doug Morrow <douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov>, Heather Scott <Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov>, Kelley Woodward <2006sew@comcast.net>

Rob, Lisa, and David:

I believe this email exchange was CC'd to Lisa last night, but to be safe, I thought I would cut-and-paste the exchange and send it to David and Rob as well in the hope of creating an ongoing account of events.

As you may remember, a neighborhood letter of neighborhood consensus was presented to developer Rosen in the hope of engaging in good faith negotiations over her proposed 6-unit building. After meeting with her, she sent a response to our letter and I forwarded it on to you without commentary because our core group of neighborhood representatives had not yet met to discuss it and form an official position. We have now met.

The core group of neighborhood representatives was concerned that Ms. Rosen's official point-by-point numbered response to us began with **number 2** and did not pointedly address the neighborhood's number one issue, both numerically and literally, which was: "a reasonable increase of density from that of the previous single-dweller, one-story home on .19325 acres, to three housing units." While trying to juggle schedules to meet with Ms. Rosen, we sent an email via core group member Heather Scott, requesting her to directly address the issue in writing.

Below is that exchange. I will continue with my commentary following it.

>>>>>Hello Andrea-

Our group is happy to meet with you again to discuss issues related to the 24th and T proposed project, however, with respect to the process, we feel that you need to address one of our primary concerns that this document does not address before we can proceed.

You seem to have omitted a response to issue number one: a reasonable increase of density from that of the previous single-dweller, one-story home on .19325 acres, to three housing units.

Please amend your attached original document then we can reschedule a time to talk.

Thank you,  
Heather Scott<<

>>Heather

I thought that we were trying to have a dialogue- talking together in a group- and that's what I am committed to do. I offered a written response this time because I got a sense that the group at our first meeting that the group expected a written response. I believe the group, especially Doug, acknowledged early in the meeting that the number of units for the parcel is the toughest nut to crack. And I was expecting we would try to address this question head on

I apologize if my more lengthy section on Development Options for this Parcel to discuss: copied below was not sufficiently clear. This section was in response to Requested Stipulation #1; please see now bolded sentence from our response below.

As Bill mentioned either at the most recent meeting or earlier, I did explain at the December 11, 2010 meeting that my proposal is for six units as I cannot afford to build fewer than that number of units and build a high quality project which is my commitment to the neighborhood and myself and the community at large. It's very important to me to build buildings that I can be proud of and that make a positive contribution to the neighborhood and the City. For these and other reasons, our proposal remains at six units.

Six units on 8500 s.f. of land matches the Mirabella ( expanded most recently in the 1950's), the Tudor apartments and the other land use of parcels on this half- block. In other words, our proposed use of this double parcel is entirely consistently with the historic land use on this half-block. I have no explanation as to why there was a single house on one of the two parcels but the City has never adopted single family residential for that parcel in spite of the fact that someone chose to build a single family house on that parcel in 1940. The Mirabella apartments has already been built by 1940 at the time that the former house on this parcel was built.

Lastly, as I suggested earlier, I urge you to touch base with David Hung regarding the last possible date he has given my project to submit changes to the City. My hearing date is now set for March 10, 2011 and last Friday David informed me that he must have everything finalized by February 10 for my project. You don't have to take my word for it; contact him.

If these negotiations are going to produce anything in the way of changes to the project, we don't have much time left. I am committed to meeting to try to work something out, but we've got to keep moving forward.

From our written response to the group:

**Development Options for this Parcel to Discuss:**

Based on the current zoning ordinance which defines the rules for R-3A zoning and Sacramento General Plan designation of Traditional Neighborhood- Medium Density and **based on what I can afford to build on this site**, here are options to discuss:

3

A. Single building, 3 stories( 35 ft at point where roof starts), seven 2- bedroom units, all City setbacks met, seven parking spaces onsite accessed via the alley(5) and via double driveway off 24th St (2) . Pitched roof, stucco with brick accents. No courtyard. Common patio and walkways. Vintage Traditional design.

B. Two triplex buildings. 7 units total. 3 2-story buildings. 3 2-bedroom units in each two buildings with one 1-bedroom apartment over garage. Accessory structure with 5 garages; plus two on slab at grade parking spaces accessed via double driveway off 24th St. No courtyard. Limited open space. All city setbacks met. All parking onsite. 24th St parking spaces might be under buildings and those units might be one bedrooms as a result.

C. Two triplex buildings with 3 2-bedroom units. Six at grade on slab parking spaces (no garage) accessed via alley. All City setbacks met. Current filed design. Retains Courtyard.

D. Two triplex buildings, six units total. Five garage parking spaces; One parking space accessed off 24th St under north building; May result in 2 2-bedrooms and 1 1-bedroom in north building.

All City Setbacks met; Smaller courtyard due to onsite 24th St. parking space. Curb cut on 24th.

E. Two triplex buildings; six units; 5 spaces in garage off alley; one space under North Bldg. Two 2- bedroom units in North building and one apartment over garage. Courtyard smaller (due to onsite parking off 24th St).

**I offer these development options as ones that we could afford to build, that would meet within the City's existing zoning ordinance and General Plan designation and may meet the requested Stipulations regarding pitched roofs, onsite parking and City setbacks.**

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

**Andrea Rosen**  
 (916) 457-6721  
[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)<<<<<<

Rob, Lisa and David, we seem to be at an unfortunate impasse here in our negotiations with the developer of this project--if indeed what has transpired thus far could be considered "negotiation." My own understanding, and that of my fellow neighborhood representatives, is that negotiations are supposed to be an exchange of proposals and counter proposals that build to a common compromise. This was always our intention. "Three units" was our ideal, just as "six units" was developer Rosen's ideal. We accepted and embraced the idea that common ground had to be found--we still do.

But we have been unable to get developer Rosen to respect and consider our ideal of "three units," so that we can all proceed toward a just and reasonable resolution. Instead, what we have been subjected to is a continued assertion that she is right and we are wrong. When parties counter each other with the exact same position previously stated, offering nothing but variations and "new information" to support their points, this is not, to our understanding, "negotiation." It is simple debate. Debate is a competition

4

eventually decided on by panel of judges. Debate is not a process in which "both parties win," which is the true objective of negotiation as we understand it. We want both parties to win. We want to negotiate.

It is correct that developer Rosen, in an obvious proactive maneuver, told the group of hand-picked neighbors with whom she met with on Dec.11 at the Vizcaya House that "anything less than 6 units was not up for discussion," but as that meeting was not representational, but rather an informal gathering of neighborhood individuals chosen by her, we did not consider that statement the beginning of any sort of "negotiation." We told her to allow us to establish a process of communication and negotiation, and for her to respect that process. I think it is fair to say that she has not respected the process. Indeed, she has even taunted us with the absurd suggestion that we consider "7 units."

As I said, our meetings with developer Rosen have been structurally no more forward-moving than a debate. In our case, the aforementioned "panel of judges" who will determine the winner of this debate is in Ms. Rosen's mind apparently the City Planning Board--and if the debate continues beyond that, the City Council. I can't help but feel that in these very challenging times for government, the City has larger issues to manage than a combative situation between a development naif and the neighborhood on whose metaphorical foyer rug she has tracked something unwanted. So let me reiterate:

We want to negotiate.

As a neighborhood, the NewtonBooth/Poverty Ridge area has not had a lot of experience dealing with this sort of controversy. But there is one thing on which we all agree, particularly in light of the passions present at Rob's community meeting last November: We know that we do not want to be a shrill, unreasonable group who are stridently resistant of any and all change in their neighborhood. The "not in my backyard" psychopathology that is so frequently demonstrated in other communities is nothing we wish to emulate. We know that Newton Booth/Poverty Ridge is a city neighborhood and not a suburban one. We are aware that a city must grow and be ever-changing if it is to thrive. We understand and we welcome that reality. It's why we live here.

Common ground is a beautiful thing, I think. Both in a city and in negotiations.

Please consider this the first of what will no doubt be other requests, including one with a lot of signatures from the neighborhood, for a design and density workshop to handle this impasse with the developer of the 24th & T Street proposal.

Cordially,

Bill Robertson

1

**9. Request by A. LoFaso to R. Fong for design & density workshop.**

Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2011 14:05:15 -0800 (PST)  
Subject: 24th & T Street Project - Thank you - and request  
From: Alan LoFaso <alofaso@sbcglobal.net>  
To: rkfong@cityofsacramento.org  
Cc: LNava@cityofsacramento.org, dhung@cityofsacramento.org,  
Bill Robertson <w.preston.robertson@gmail.com>,  
Heather Scott <Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov>,  
Doug Morrow <douglas.s.morrow@gmail.com>,  
Kelly Woodward <2006sew@camcast.net>,  
Christina Jewett <christina.jewett@gmail.com>

Council Member Fong,

I would like to belatedly thank you for hosting the November 18th community meeting regarding the proposed 6-unit project at the north-western corner of the intersection of 24th and T Streets (No. P10-089). As I am sure you appreciated, there are strong feelings in our neighborhood regarding the historic integrity and architectural authenticity of the Newton Booth/Poverty Ridge area. Many residents have misgivings regarding poorly conceived developments from decades past, and many place great weight on the value of preserving period homes to the greatest extent possible. I associate myself with those views.

At the outset, I believe the community meeting allowed residents to voice their frustration with the unnoticed demolition of the historic home previously located on the corner lot. Although not entirely satisfying, the clear explanation by city staff, in my view, allowed neighbors to move on from that issue to what faces us now-- development of the now vacant lot. Moreover, I believe the meeting helped give focus to neighbors' anxiety regarding poorly communicated intentions of the developer by making the city planning process and resources more accessible to those not familiar with the workings of City Hall.

As I know you're also aware, my neighbors and I are not opposed to development on the now vacant lot. In fact, the neighbors have offered to discuss with the developer a proposal focusing on a 3-unit development with a mass and scale more consistent with the immediately surrounding architecture. While there are many differences in details and emphasis, there is close to consensus among the neighbors regarding the appropriate size of the development.

Efforts to work positively with the developer have not been successful, as the developer has shown no willingness to discuss the 6-unit mass/scale or any inclination to revise the project along those lines. Most neighbors understand that a fair negotiation between neighbors and developer is likely to result in a project that will not conform to our ideal 3-unit suggestion. However, if there is no dialogue, we cannot arrive at a fair and reasonable result for all.

2

My neighbors and I have recently become aware of the idea of a design and density workshop to enable neighbors to express their concerns and offer constructive suggestions to inform the city planning process of alternatives supported by the neighborhood. Given the lack of constructive engagement by the developer, I join my neighbors in requesting that the city conduct such a workshop for this particular project. I believe it would be a productive use of this process to give positive, focused input into the planning process regarding this project.

Again, thank you for your actions in support of the Newton Booth/Poverty Ridge neighborhood and, in advance, for your consideration of my request.

Regards,

Alan LoFaso  
2001 24th Street

1

**10. Account to R. Fong & L. Nava re. A. Rosen email finding fault with "core group" for terminating communications; explanation to Fong & Nava of "core group" position; request for mediation by R. Fong.**

Date: Wed, 9 Feb 2011 13:24:03 -0800  
Subject: 24th & T Street development - request for mediation  
From: Bill Robertson <[w.preston.robertson@gmail.com](mailto:w.preston.robertson@gmail.com)>  
To: "Robert K. Fong" <[rkfong@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:rkfong@cityofsacramento.org)>, Lisa Nava <[LNava@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:LNava@cityofsacramento.org)>  
Cc: David Hung <[dhung@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:dhung@cityofsacramento.org)>, Luis Sanchez <[lsanchez@cityofsacramento.org](mailto:lsanchez@cityofsacramento.org)>, "Alan LoFaso" <[alofaso@sbcglobal.net](mailto:alofaso@sbcglobal.net)>, "Christina Jewett" <[christina.jewett@gmail.com](mailto:christina.jewett@gmail.com)>, "Doug Morrow" <[douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov](mailto:douglas.morrow@asm.ca.gov)>, "Heather Scot" <[Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov](mailto:Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov)>, "Kelley Woodward" <[2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net)>

Rob and Lisa--

We have received the following email from Andrea Rosen. After it I will make comments.

>>Heather -

As the designated liaison for the neighborhood group, through this communication to you, I am asking the group if they would like to meet in the next week or two to discuss the design of the 24th and T Courtyard Condominiums. I have made some changes and am offering to meet with neighbors to present them and get feedback from you.

It is my impression that discussions were prematurely and unilaterally terminated by the group as I have not received any emails or phone calls since you told me that you were canceling our last scheduled meeting which had been set for 7:15pm on January 26, 2011.

Please let me know asap as I know how challenging it is to accommodate folks' schedules.

I believe it is important to keep the lines of communications open and have been endeavoring to do that.

Thanks.

Andrea Rosen  
(916) 457-6721  
[andrearosen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:andrearosen@sbcglobal.net)<<

Our neighborhood core group representative Heather Scott will respond and accept her offer to meet. We will do so despite our understanding that her application deadline is February 10 and no practical input is being sought from us.

It should be noted that Ms. Rosen's remark about our group "prematurely and unilaterally" terminating discussions is a fairly obvious and artless attempt on her part to cast our neighborhood as uncooperative. I should note that she uses the word "discussions" and not "negotiations". "Discussions" and "communications" are, of course noble things. "Negotiations", however are even nobler.

What Ms. Rosen calls "discussion" and "communication" in actuality has been little more than a repetition by her to us that a.) she is in the right and our neighborhood is in the wrong and b.) she will not discuss with us or communicate about those issues that are of the greatest concern to the neighborhood. A lack of interest in subjecting oneself to repeated condescension and insult can perhaps accurately be termed "unilateral" termination in a court of facts, but it is puerile on a human level. We are fully aware that developer Rosen wanted to continue her condescension and insult, we just felt it was...let me find a word here...unilateral in its benefit.

As previously stated, our neighborhood wanted to discuss and negotiate the number of units, which we felt had a direct relationship on the scale and design. She refused our overtures to even discuss the issue and indeed countered with suggestions in writing that she make the project larger and taller.

I spoke with the always very helpful David Hung this morning at some length and was told that the Zoning Administration has declined our neighborhood request for a Design and Density Workshop to facilitate between neighborhood and developer what we had hoped simple maturity and adult respect would have generated but did not. We are, it seems, left to lobby in advance and then present our positions to the Planning board and, beyond that, the City Council. We are more than willing to do this, but it seems needlessly contentious and a colossal waste of time on everyone's part. Mr. Hung suggested that we might request that Rob serve the function of mediator to a negotiation much in the way that Councilman Steve Cohn mediated a recent controversy in his neighborhood.

I am happy to make that request. Indeed developer Rosen mused about the prospect of such a process herself at one point.

That having been said, I wish to express my great disappointment that increasingly the City Council is being called upon to do a job that other areas of government have been budgeted to handle, but wish not to.

Part of this is, I must confess, is very personal to me, and here I am speaking solely for myself and not the other members of our core group.

As you know, my wife is Claire Pomeroy, Vice Chancellor of Human Health Science and Dean of the School of Medicine at UC Davis. She is following this development with great concern and is not happy about Ms. Rosen's behavior. She is more than willing to become involved as a resident of the neighborhood, but she is also very busy with enormous responsibilities barely imaginable to Ms. Rosen. I confess I resent having to

3

further waste my wife's precious time to deal with an issue that we pay taxes to have the City handle with greater competence than I have seen to this point.

Rob himself made a comment addressing this problem during the last City Council meeting--and I couldn't agree more. This should not be the role of the City Council, nor should unreasonable developers with small neighborhood-oriented projects along with the Zoning Administration conduct themselves as though it were. If the City of Sacramento is ever to have a quality of greatness to it, we should stop treating the City Council as though it were a neighborhood association.

Until such greatness arrives, however, I must humbly and regretfully request of Rob mediation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Bill Robertson

--

William P. Robertson  
2009 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916-607-2405

October 4, 2010

Mr. David Hung  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Mr. Hung:

As a resident of the Newton Booth neighborhood in Midtown Sacramento, I am writing to express my concerns with the Courtyard Housing project being considered for the corner of 24<sup>th</sup> Street at T Street.

My first concern is with increasing the number of apartment units in proportion to single family homes and the corresponding number of designated parking spaces for the apartments. When I learned of the plan to build more apartments in this neighborhood, I surveyed the number of units currently in existence in the immediate vicinity of the property under discussion. From what I could determine, the results are as follows:

- The 2300 block of T Street has 30 apartment units and 18 dedicated parking spaces or garages.
- The 2400 block of T Street has 48 apartment units and 23 dedicated parking spaces or garages.
- 24<sup>th</sup> Street between T Street and S Street has 13 apartment units and 6 dedicated parking spaces or garages.
- Thus, the total number of apartment units on just these three blocks is 91, with only 47 designated parking spaces and garages.
- On these same three blocks, there are currently 17 single family homes.

In looking at the plans for the 24<sup>th</sup> & T Courtyard Housing project, I see that a total of six apartment units are proposed with five corresponding detached garages. Given the square footage of the intended units, there is occupancy for easily ten to twelve residents with a potentially equal number of cars. As the plan only includes five garages, this development could put another five to seven cars on the street.

As a result of the already large number of apartments and roughly half as much parking, the streets are often full of the parked cars of residents and can not accommodate visitors. As I live on a corner lot, I can honestly say that most nights I have two cars parked in front of my house and three cars parked alongside of my house. Particularly on weekend nights, the cars come and go quite frequently, which is noisy and a nuisance to the peace of the neighborhood. Further, there are always vacancies in these apartments, as indicated by the constant presence of the "For Rent" signs. Parking would be even more challenging if every apartment were continuously occupied.

My next concern with the Courtyard Housing project is the design and architecture of the proposed units. Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge are neighborhoods dominated by early 20<sup>th</sup> century cottage style homes and bungalows; many with wide porches, basements, and peaked roofs. The style of the apartments is purported to be, "flat-roofed buildings...that echo the Art Deco era buildings of the neighborhood..." Yet, the drawings included with the Development Project Routing Form indicate that the buildings will more closely resemble the modern architecture reflected in the Whiskey Flats condos located at 22<sup>nd</sup> and S Street.

I am also troubled by the speed at which this project seems to be progressing. I walk by the property everyday on my way home from work, and I was surprised that over the course of three days the existing home was demolished, the basement and foundation dug out, the debris removed, and the chain link fence erected. While I do agree that the single family home that was demolished was neglected and the property unkempt, I do think it could have been rehabbed and resold. Many homes in the area have undergone such transformations, as evidenced by the recently remodeled property at 1915 24<sup>th</sup> Street that sold a short time after it was put up for sale.

Finally, I am concerned with tipping the balance of this neighborhood more in the direction of renters and away from property owner/residents. I am proud to know so many of my neighbors and call them friends. I can honestly say that the homeowners of this area are all familiar with each other and frequently stop to with each other. Not surprisingly, this project has been a considerable topic amongst many of us. The spirit of this community seems like it would be jeopardized by a greater influx of renters that are often temporary residents that have little or no stake in the long term health and development of Newton Booth. I believe the community would be better served by building one or two single family homes on this site, providing another anchoring property to this region and contributing to the neighborhoods' stability.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns regarding this project. I am happy to further discuss my concerns and suggestions with the City of Sacramento or the Planning Commission if they so desire. I would also ask that you include me as part of your distribution list for any changes to or development of this plan in the future.

Sincerely,

Heather C. Scott  
2430 T Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Scott, Heather [Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 12:22 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Lisa Nava; Robert King Fong  
**Subject:** Concerns with project P10-089

Dear Mr. Hung-

As a resident of the Newton Booth neighborhood in Midtown Sacramento, I am writing to express my concerns with the Courtyard Condominium project being considered for the corner of 24<sup>th</sup> Street at T Street (P10-089).

My first and primary concern with this project is the number of units. The merged lots that this project may be built upon initially had one single family home before the developer had it demolished. The plans for the 24<sup>th</sup> & T project propose six condominium units with five corresponding detached garages. Given the square footage of the intended units, there is occupancy for easily ten to twelve residents with a potentially equal number of cars. As the plan only includes five garages, this development could easily put another five to seven cars on the street.

To be clear, I do support building more housing in this space; but I would argue that a reasonable increase in density, say to that of three single family homes with a corresponding number of garages, keeps with the vibrant and mixed nature of the neighborhood.

My second concern is that proposed design of the condos is in too far contrast to the immediate surrounding structures and is not complementary. Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge are known for their high water bungalows, cottages, and Tudor style homes. These architectural styles also have components that make the neighborhood safer and more welcoming than the proposed structure. Porches and front yard space give neighbors more opportunity to interact with each other and create a more secure environment. The development instead closes off the residents from the rest of the neighborhood with its walled in courtyard and lack of porches.

My final concern is with the lack of meaningful discourse between the developer and the neighborhood. As a neighbor that has been involved with this project since September 2010, I feel that the many discussions have yielded little in the way of compromise from the developer. This is especially troubling given that the developer does not live, nor intend to live, in this neighborhood and that it is investment property instead. As residents and owners we do have to live with what the city decides is appropriate for this parcel and the consequences of those decisions.

As one of the core group of neighbors that has been working with Ms. Rosen, I feel that we have tried to be clear, rational, and flexible with our requests. I feel that we have been open and tried to work within the process that the city prescribes. I do not feel that we received reciprocal consideration from the developer about our concerns.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and for your work and helpfulness.

Sincerely,

Heather Scott  
2430 T Street

Sacramento, Ca 95816

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Mabel Lee Robbins [mlrobbin@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 07, 2010 2:17 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** Property: 2231 T Street & 1918 24th Street  
**Attachments:** mlrobbin.vcf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Mr. Hung,

How will the parking to be handled for this new apartment complex? I live at 2010 24th Street, and I am concern about the parking situation in this neighborhood already. It seems that with the inclusion of six additional apartment units, there will be a need for at least six additional parking spaces, and more than likely, a total of twelve spaces (2 per unit) to this neighborhood. It's getting very crowded, and I am very concern about the parking situation in this area.

How many spaces will be built into the apartment unit or will this be street parking only? We already have multiple apartment units in the immediate area, and with the addition of six more units, I feel that the apartment complex needs to include enough parking spaces for its tenants before approving the the building permit.

Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully,  
Mabel Lee Robbins  
916.453.0680

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Mabel Lee Robbins [mlrobbin@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2011 11:58 AM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Robert King Fong; Lisa Nava; 2006sew@comcast.net  
**Subject:** RE: PROPOSED PROPERTY, "24TH & T STREETS COURTYARD HOUSING PROJECT" (P10-089)  
**Attachments:** mlrobbin.vcf

Hi Mr. Hung,

My apology for the delay in submitting my email ... if possible, can this email be included.

I am Mabel Lee Robbins, located at 2010 24th Street (24th between T & U Streets), and I have some comments in regards to the staff report to the Planning Commission proposed "24th and T Streets Courtyard Housing Project" (P10-089). The project proposes a **six** two-story condominiums with **five** garages with a International/Moderne style of architecture in a predominantly single family home neighborhood.

I am concern that the new development will change the dynamics of the neighborhood. I have been living in this neighborhood for over 27 years and it has remained relatively the same, except for increased traffic. With the inclusion of an additional six unit condos, plus 12+ additional people with cars, it will heavily impact the parking situation; especially on our block that has a very narrow width for cars and bicyclists. Aside from the parking situation, six condo units crammed in to a small space will not be esthetically pleasing, much less reflective of the neighborhood.

Please reconsider the development of this proposed Courtyard Housing Project. I agree with the Neighborhood Core Group that the property will provide for a more appropriate placement of:

Three residential housing units with adequate size garages, pitched roofs, porches (insert # of sq ft divided by 3 times 80% density formula). There are a number of appropriate examples in the immediate neighborhood (1, 2, and 3 unit). There are no flat-roof examples that would be appropriate for this proposed project.

Architectural design (California Craftsman style bungalow; brick style; or Tudor style) There are a number of single family homes, duplex, and tri-plex structures in the immediate neighborhood. I can provide current photos of the structures in the immediate neighborhood if needed for design examples.

Height of structures: No more than 2 stories. There are no 3-story housing structures in the immediate neighborhood.

Please reconsider the proposed "24th & T Streets Courtyard Housing Project" (P10-089). Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Have a good day.  
Mabel Lee Robbins  
2010 24th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916.453.0680

David Hung  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Oct. 15, 2010

Dear David –

Greetings. My fiancé and I are new homeowners on the 2400 block of T Street. We made an offer on our home, a high-water bungalow, the first day it was offered for sale this spring. We loved the big, open mahogany porch that's perfect for a swing and rocking chairs. We were not excited about the amount of apartment units on the block because we knew from firsthand experience that renters have no incentive to protect and preserve the virtues of a neighborhood. However, we overlooked that concern and are proud owners of our home.

We are displeased to learn about the plans for courtyard housing at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets. For one, the configuration of the apartments is oriented away from the sidewalk and the street and toward the courtyard, as the name implies. The development is planned to be gated. Both of these attributes reduce the vitality, energy and vigilance on the street, thus reducing the crime deterrent effect that eyes on the street can have. The gates, like bars on a window, imply that there is a security threat in the neighborhood. As any student of the "broken windows" theory knows, such an implication can be a self-fulfilling prophecy and erode the safety and security of a neighborhood.

My concerns about crime are not without backing. There was a drug-motivated home-invasion robbery at 26<sup>th</sup> and T Street just weeks ago. A quick look at crime statistics shows that auto burglaries and vandalism are common. Plans for a gated, insular fortress will do little to enhance the security of the surrounding area.

My concern is also that the area directly surrounding the proposed project is at a tipping point where the number of apartment-filled lots is on the verge of eclipsing the family atmosphere of the area. I bought this home hoping to raise children here. I believed that the "story" of Midtown's historic areas was that too many apartments were built in the 70s. The ideal scenario is to preserve the historic charm of Arts and Crafts and Victorian homes that were picked up from trains on R Street by horse and buggy. I regret to see a project that packs too many units in too small of a space, further upsetting the delicate balance that separates a stable, historic neighborhood from a transient and forgettable one.

Despite these concerns, I want to be clear that I am in favor of multi-family development and housing in close proximity to light rail. I am keenly aware and pleased that the R Street corridor is zoned for multi-family units. I believe that there is no better place in the neighborhood for apartments and condos and stand behind plans for such development and investment along that corridor.

However, my position remains that T Street is the place for single-family homes or at minimum, development in the spirit of Metro Square that conforms and blends with a historic neighborhood like Newton Booth or Poverty Ridge. I think a development that keeps eyes on the street and preserves the character of the bungalow-style, Tudor and Victorian homes are best for the neighborhood.

I respectfully ask that no more than four units are approved for the site at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets. I think it would be in the best interest of the developer and the neighbors if the units are built to look like two single-family homes that are oriented to the street with a lawn or fountain or porch facing the neighbors. Orientation toward a private, gated courtyard turns a blind eye to the assets of the area and more resembles the ugly 'courtyard' building on the north side of T Street between 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> Streets.

Such a compromise would also maintain the appearance of a neighborhood with an equitable balance of single-family homes and apartments while still allowing the developer to reap the financial rewards of upscale multi-family units.

Sincerely,

Christina Jewett and Floyd Marvin

DRAFT – Started October 24, 2010

**“GOOD NEIGHBORS” vs. “EARLY NOTICE OF PLANNING APPLICATION (z10-142)”**

**CONCERNS:**

- 1. PRESERVATION OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD**
  - a. *“Good Neighbors” maintain their properties to reduce deterioration of good structures and landscaping.*
  - b. *“Good Neighbors” watch out for other neighbors.*
  - c. *“Good Neighbors” keep their properties clean and safe with no sidewalk/gutter hazards.*
  - d. *“Good Neighbors” follow the City of Sacramento’s regulations regarding parking, noise, loitering, litterbugging, etc.*
  - e. *“Good Neighbors” know the history of this historic neighborhood and fight to preserve it.*
  - f. *“Good Neighbors” reduce trash/glass and other hazards that have been deposited on the sidewalks and front yards by “commuters” in order to facilitate reasonable accommodation for the elderly and disabled in the neighborhood*
  - g. *“Good Neighbors” do not Graffiti or do other minor vandalations on neighbors’ properties.*
  - h. *“Good Neighbors” try to minimize the amounts of pet excrements deposited on other neighbors’ lawns.*
- 2. GENERAL SAFETY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD**
  - a. *During the weekdays*
  - b. *During the weekends*
  - c. *At night*
- 3. PEOPLE CONGESTION:**
  - a. *There are 156 multi-family units currently in the immediate neighborhood bounded by S/T STREETS AND 23<sup>RD</sup>/25<sup>TH</sup> STREETS*
    - i. *THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 50 “COMMUTERS” THAT ACTUALLY ROAM THE STREETS AND LIVE IN THE ALLEYS OR WHEREEVER THEY CAN FIND SHELTER.*
    - ii. *FOR APPROXIMATELY 400 NEIGHBORS IN THE 156 MULTI-FAMILY UNITS*
    - iii. *THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 100 ON-FOOT “COMMUTERS” THAT PASS THROUGH THE NEIGHBORHOOD DAILY*
    - iv. *THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 150 VEHICLES THAT PASS THROUGH THE NEIGHBORHOOD DAILY*
- 4. PARKING and TRAFFIC DISRUPTIONS**
  - a. *There are approximately 400 neighbors that live in the multi-family units.*

- b. *There are approximately 80 on-site parking spaces for the 156 multi-family units.*
  - c. *The lightrail station at 24<sup>th</sup> & R Streets does not provide adequate parking beside the tracks for commuters; there are no parking spaces designated for the disabled.*
  - d. *The City of Sacramento's garbage collectors and street sweepers/cleaners and garbage collectors use the alley and find it difficult to do a good job because of vehicle and "commuter" obstructions.*
  - e. *The City of Sacramento's garbage collectors and street sweepers find it difficult to do a complete job on the streets when vehicles are parked too close to and on top of trash piles.*
- 5. PROPOSED ARCHITECTURE**
- a. *The proposed architectural style is not compatible with this neighborhood of Arts & Crafts Style, Art Deco/Moderne style, brick cottage style, and other styles for the period 1900 – 1930. The "Application of Intent" does not agree with the plans (proposed architecture).*
  - b. *The proposed structures do not appear to be the most energy efficient (e.g. Flat roofs are not as energy efficient as sloped roofs.)*
  - c. *The proposed garages are not big enough for a standard sized vehicle. The proposed garages do not have storage considerations.*
- 6. SIDEWALK/GUTTER/STREET HAZARDS CURRENTLY TAKEN CARE OF BY "GOOD NEIGHBORS"**
- a. *Uncollected trash*
  - b. *Glass/trash deposits.*
  - c. *Graffiti*
  - d. *Other minor vandalations not reported or corrected by the City of Sacramento*
- 7. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION CONSIDERATIONS FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED NEIGHBORS**
- a. *Wheelchair hazards*
  - b. *Walking hazards*
  - c. *Transportation to hearings, etc.*
  - d. *Notifications regarding re-zoning, demolitions, etc.*
- 8. CITY OF SACRAMENTO'S RESPONSIBILITIES**
- a. **SAFETY**
  - b. **LIGHTRAIL (transportation and parking)**
  - c. **STREETS & ALLEYS; STREETLIGHTS**
  - d. **SEWAGE; GARBAGE; RECYCLING; YARD TRASH**
  - e. **STREET CLEANING; STREET TRASH**
- 9. DISTRICT 4'S RESPONSIBILITIES TO "GOOD NEIGHBORS"**
- a. **NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION**
  - b. **NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY**

- c. **NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES LIKE PARKING AND TRAFFIC**
- d. **NEIGHBORHOOD MAINTENANCE & UPKEEP**
- e. **NEIGHBORHOOD REPAIRS**

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. **Two single family units with angled roofs:**
  - a. **1918 24<sup>th</sup> Street – A two bedroom/two bath brick cottage-style home with a full garage (including storage space) on alley.**
  - b. **2331 24<sup>th</sup> Street – A three bedroom/two bath Art Deco/Moderne style home with a a two-car garage and driveway on 24<sup>th</sup> Street.**
2. **Four multi-family units with angled roofs:**
  - a. **Each unit with two bedrooms/two baths**
  - b. **Four full garages with storage space on alley**
  - c. **Arts & Crafts style; Art Deco/Moderne Style; or brick cottage style.**
3. **Sell the properties to “good neighbors” at no more than what was paid for it in June (?). “Good Neighbors” will do the right thing for the neighborhood.**

**ABOUT 2331 T STREET/1918 TWENTY FOURTH STREET (APN010-0036-011-0000 and 010-0036-012-0000)**

The unique Art Deco/Moderne home was built in the 1940s on a double lot (2331 T Street/1918 Twenty Fourth Street). The home had a detached garage and a very large back yard on 24<sup>th</sup> Street to the alley. A fence ran from the garage to and up the alley.

The first home owner (1944/45) was Chester Dong (meat cutter). The second (and final) homeowner was the Warren A. O'Brien family who moved into the home in 1956/57. Mr. O'Brien worked for Western Electric Co. and retired in 1980. Daughters, Rozanne and Carol, babysat many of the children in the neighborhood in the 1960s. Rozanne (O'Brien) McPhee lived in the home with her parents for many years after her parents had become disabled. A wheelchair ramp was installed in the 1990s to facilitate entry into the home for both Rozanne and her parents. Rozanne moved out of the home about 2001 when her parents had passed. Rozanne and Carol continued doing yard work as they could. The neighbors painted graffiti off the fence for them and swept up glass/trash that frequently ended up on their sidewalk, lawn, and in the gutters. Neighbors expressed interest in purchasing the home when the daughters (O'Brien Family Trust) were ready to sell. Unbeknownst to the neighbors, the home was sold about June 2010. Neighbors continued keeping an eye on the home for the glass/trash hazards that needed to be picked up immediately. The City of Sacramento

continued picking up trash, recycles, and yard refuse. However, the City of Sacramento has never removed yard trash that is under vehicles that have parked right on top of it. The home was demolished sometime between September 17 and September 30, 2010 (Demolition approved September 13, 2010 - # RES-1009306) with no advance notice to the neighbors. Neighbors never received notification regarding re-zoning and merging the double lot. In early October 2010, neighbors received the "Early Notice of Planning Application (Z10-142)" to develop six apartment dwelling units ("multi-family residential" on a "1.9 acre" parcel at 2331 T Street/1918 Twenty Fourth Street.

I'm finding out that no laws were broken when they demolished the home and took out the trees without reasonable notification to the neighbors in advance. Had it been a two-story structure, then the property owner would have been required to give us a two-week notice. Also, the review that the police and fire departments signed off on was just that the demolition could be done safely without impacting the physical safety of the immediate neighbors and their structures. A home that is habitable can just be demolished, unless it is protected in a historic heritage district (like my Poverty Ridge Historic District, right across the street). There does not appear to be a city code that protects and regulates reasonable accommodation and any adverse impacts on the elderly and disabled neighbors in the "hood". The City of Sacramento should have provided enough parking for Lightrail commuters by the lightrail station at 24<sup>th</sup> and R Streets. This causes parking overflow right onto the parking spaces along 24th Street as far as my bungalow.

Availability for comments and questions:

Susan Woodward ("Kelley")  
2006 Twenty Fourth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818

(916) 837-8991

[2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net)

**David Hung**

---

**From:** 2006sew@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Monday, February 21, 2011 4:19 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Robert King Fong; Lisa Nava; Kelley Woodward  
**Subject:** Proposed "24th & T Street Courtyard Housing Project" (P10-089)

21 February 2011

Hello, David Hung -

I am Susan Woodward ("Kelley"), and I have comments for the staff report to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed "24th & T Streets Courtyard Housing Project" (P10-089). This project proposes to have six two-story condominiums with five garages in an International/Moderne style of architecture in the heart of what is predominantly a single family home neighborhood with bungalow, brick, and Tudor styles of architecture appropriate to the time period 1900 - 1940's.

I am a concerned neighbor in the Newton Booth neighborhoods. I live at 2006 24th Street, across the street from the proposed project. I am submitting these comments on behalf of myself and other concerned 24th Street neighbors. I am a member of the Core Group of concerned neighbors that have had many communications with you, Council Member Fong, and Lisa Nava these past five months. I am a member of the Newton Booth Neighborhoods Association.

We believe in Smart Growth and understand infill, urban development, and other health and safety issue concerns of the City. We also believe in what is reasonable and appropriate, within the City's Guidelines, for our small, but fine old historic neighborhood.

For us, reasonable and appropriate is:

Three residential housing units with adequate size garages, pitched roofs, porches (insert # of sq ft divided by 3 times 80% density formula). There are a number of appropriate examples in the immediate neighborhood (1, 2, and 3 unit). There are no flat-roof examples that would be appropriate for this proposed project.

Architectural design (California Craftsman style bungalow; brick style; or Tudor style) There are a number of single family homes, duplex, and tri-plex structures in the immediate neighborhood. I can provide current photos of the structures in the immediate neighborhood if needed for design examples.

Height of structures: No more than 2 stories. There are no 3-story housing structures in the immediate neighborhood.

I understand that it is not necessary to resubmit the two petitions that we did in November, or to send copies of previous correspondence, September 2010 - January 2011 to your office.

I can be reached at this e-mail [2006sew@comcast.net](mailto:2006sew@comcast.net) or phone (916) 837-8991 if you have questions.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to address our concerns about the proposed "24th & T Streets Courtyard Housing Project" (P10-089).

Susan Woodward ("Kelley")

2006 24th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818

----- Original Message -----

From: "David Hung" <DHung@cityofsacramento.org>  
To: "lauren@scottadamson.net" <lauren@scottadamson.net>, "morris411@gmail.com" <morris411@gmail.com>, "pjwade@fcusd.org" <pjwade@fcusd.org>, "kiddv@csus.edu" <kiddv@csus.edu>, "mpavisich@juno.com" <mpavisich@juno.com>, "Alex Zabelin" <alexegon@gmail.com>, "Heather 'Scott'" <Heather.Scott@sen.ca.gov>, "bgwhitted@att.net" <bgwhitted@att.net>, "Stephen Whitted" <sbwhitted@att.net>, "marlenerice@sbcglobal.net" <marlenerice@sbcglobal.net>, "helmed@cw.com" <helmed@cw.com>, "alexives12@yahoo.com" <alexives12@yahoo.com>, "H2ngo@hotmail.com" <H2ngo@hotmail.com>, "j.konopka@sbcglobal.net" <j.konopka@sbcglobal.net>, "carrie camarena" <cdcamarena@yahoo.com>, "Alan LoFaso" <alofaso@sbcglobal.net>, "nomar98@yahoo.com" <nomar98@yahoo.com>, "ed@loftgardens.com" <ed@loftgardens.com>, "whitenightc@live.com" <whitenightc@live.com>, "Christina Jewett" <christina.jewett@gmail.com>, "2006sew@comcast.net" <2006sew@comcast.net>, "Bill Robertson" <w.preston.robertson@gmail.com>, "baxmag@sbcglobal.net" <baxmag@sbcglobal.net>, "amaroo2@sbcglobal.net" <amaroo2@sbcglobal.net>, "Tim and Lynne Gussner" <TimGussner@sbcglobal.net>, "fiore@saccounty.net" <fiore@saccounty.net>, "mlrobbin@pacbell.net" <mlrobbin@pacbell.net>, "marygomez1@sbcglobal.net" <marygomez1@sbcglobal.net>, "tamitrostel@comcast.net" <tamitrostel@comcast.net>, "kristinecelorio@yahoo.com" <kristinecelorio@yahoo.com>, "jhasko@att.net" <jhasko@att.net>, "reed.richerson@gmail.com" <reed.richerson@gmail.com>, "tguil75\_@hotmail.com" <tguil75\_@hotmail.com>, "suzmaast@yahoo.com" <suzmaast@yahoo.com>, "nikkicorbett@gmail.com" <nikkicorbett@gmail.com>, "chole531@gmail.com" <chole531@gmail.com>, "kari@sonic.net" <kari@sonic.net>, "ghostpony916@yahoo.com" <ghostpony916@yahoo.com>  
Cc: "ron vrilakas" <Ron@VrilakasArchitects.com>, "Mark Groen" <mark@vrilakasarchitects.com>, "Ben Rosen" <bcrosen@gmail.com>, "ANDREA ROSEN" <andrearosen@sbcglobal.net>, "Lisa Nava" <LNava@cityofsacramento.org>, "Robert King Fong" <RKFong@cityofsacramento.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 4:00:53 PM  
Subject: Comments on Courtyard Condominiums (P10-089)

Dear Everyone,

For those who want to comment on any aspects of this project up to now, including those of you who have provided comments to me in the past, please submit your written comments by February 25<sup>th</sup> if you need me to include them in the staff report to the Planning Commission. You may still submit comments after that, up to the hearing date, but those will be forwarded as supplemental materials. Thanks for your attention.

\*\*\*\*\*

David Hung  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
Phone: (916)808-5530  
E-mail: dhung@cityofsacramento.org

**David Hung**

---

**From:** John Hagar [hagar.john@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 23, 2011 3:33 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Robert King Fong  
**Subject:** Objections to Proposed Development P10-089

Thank you for allowing comments concerning the proposal to construct condominiums at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets in mid-town Sacramento ("24<sup>th</sup> & T Courtyard Development" (P10-089)). We live on Q Street between 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> Streets in a brick "Tudor" style single-family dwelling. We see several fatal problems with the proposal, including the following:

1. We and our neighbors chose to live in the Newton Booth neighborhood because it is primarily comprised of single family homes, with a few scattered and small multi-unit apartments. At present, the City is working with our neighborhood concerning a number of traffic calming measure. Our neighborhood does not need the increase in density that will result from an additional six-unit condominium/apartment complex (assuming the complex is occupied), especially along narrow and already busy 24<sup>th</sup> Street.
2. The proposed design of this multi-unit building is not in any manner reflective of our neighborhood, and will clash with existing structures.
3. The proposal requests that the City approve far too many variances to critical construction standards, important regulations that should be rigorously enforced. For example, we understand that the developer seeks: (a) a variance that will allow her to build a multi-unit complex in a neighborhood of single family dwellings; (b) a variance to reduce the parking spaces normally required for a proposal of this nature (a variance which, if approved, will add to the already congested street parking on 24<sup>th</sup> Street); (c) a variance that will reduce the required setback for an accessory structure (in essence, a variance to further overcrowd the tiny .19 acre parcel on which the condominiums/apartments are to be placed); and (d) a variance waiving the trash enclosures required for multi-family development (which will create health and safety issues).
4. Finally, we question the timing and appropriateness of this project in terms of the City of Sacramento's vision for the future. The Newton Booth neighborhood is at present bordered by two other condominium projects. The project at 21<sup>st</sup> Street at T Street is only partially completed, leaving almost one entire block barren except for some foundation work. Additional units are not being constructed *because no one wants to buy them*. Another project, lofts along S Street between 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> Streets, have also failed to sell and are now either short term rentals or sitting empty. Naked foundations and empty units are a blight, no matter how recently they were built. While this developer may want to build condominiums, there is no reason to believe that her condominiums will sell. Indeed, if the prior projects in the area are considered evidence, the 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard condos will remain empty, or will be rented to short-term renters for a number of years into the future.

In terms of the realities of today's market, this project is the very opposite of what our City needs to move forward. Let's keep Sacramento a place where you can work, raise a family, and retire in a decent neighborhood. There is no reason to approve four major "Special Permits" to allow this developer to construct another empty multi-unit building in a quiet, established, and very livable neighborhood.

For all of these reasons we request that this project not be approved.

If I can provide other information, please do not hesitate to call at (415) 215-2400.

John Hagar

QuickTime™ and a  
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor  
are needed to see this picture.

David Hung  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear David,

Developer Andrea Rosen presented her initial plan to the Newton Booth Neighborhood Association at our October meeting. The board liked the design, but declined to write a letter to the City endorsing the project as the plans were not final and the board had not visited the site. The board was also astonished when the original structure was demolished within days. This was not mentioned at the meeting and seemed to undermine confidence in the developer's transparency.

The neighborhood has voiced unanimous disapproval to the scope and size and design of the project. It does not complement the neighboring structures and is of a higher density than existing parcels. The looming corner is an affront and the plan shows the ADA unit being the furthest from the garages (inadequate parking for the number of bedrooms planned). The many variances and permits speak to the inadequacy of the design to meld and dissonance this project is creating.

This design is well suited for an L Street or R Street loft environment.

I oppose this project in its current iteration. T/23rd Street has a bungalow home with three units that perfectly integrates itself into the neighborhood.

Thank you,

Alex Zabelin  
NBNA, President  
2023 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818

Newton Booth Neighborhoods Association

24 Feb 2011

to: David Hung  
City of Sacramento

I oppose this plan  
as being not appropriate  
for our neighborhood -

Sincerely,  
Pat Melanby  
2431 You St  
Sacramento

768-7286

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Pamela Wade [peejwade1@att.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 2:20 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** peejwade1@att.net  
**Subject:** 24th & T Courtyard Development

Dear Mr. Hung:

I have lived on 24th and T for twenty-one years. I have watched this neighborhood transform from aging homes to beautiful restorations. Our neighborhood is proud of the 1920's architecture, and we have embraced the historical aspect as we restored our homes. I personally, with a business partner, have purchased 3 extremely run-down homes in the neighborhood and restored them to their original beauty. One such property is on a double lot close to Ms. Rosen's property.

I am outraged by Ms. Rosen's lack of consideration towards the homeowners in our neighborhood. She fails to acknowledge our desire to have her complex reflective of the craftsman bungalows and tudor-style homes that surround her. She likes ART-DECO and how dare us not WELCOME her taste in a neighborhood that has worked so hard to embrace the historical architecture of our homes.

I am concerned about the extreme density of her proposal, and the request for parking exemptions in a neighborhood that already struggles for adequate parking. I am concerned about the "cold" design of her courtyard, and how it contrasts with the open porches and welcoming feel of our homes. I feel that for Ms. Rosen, this is simply a "money-making" venture for her, and that our concerns are of NO CONSEQUENCE to her. Simply put, when she has made her money and moved on, our neighborhood will be forever saddled with a design that none of us like, and will have to live with until we move.

It doesn't seem fair in the least. Ms. Rosen is not concerned about any type of "good faith negotiation". I feel as if a "bully" has moved into the neighborhood, and I for one, am frustrated, angry and tired of feeling "pushed around" by her. Please support us in our desire to limit the density of this courtyard, and the blending of her design into the Craftsman, Bungalow and Tudor architecture of the neighborhood.

Our neighborhood is in the midst of an historical "revival", and I feel strongly that this construction would be an INSULT to our efforts.

Sincerely,

Pamela J. Wade

February 24, 2011

David Hung  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Blvd, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Re: P10-089

To Mr. Hung,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Courtyard Development located on the northwest corner of 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets. I live across T Street from the site with my husband and two children and we have invested too much in this neighborhood to see it undermined by Andrea Rosen's development. It absolutely inappropriate for the Newton Booth Neighborhood for its density and design and Ms. Rosen has demonstrated unwillingness to negotiate in good faith with the neighbors who have volunteered to represent the interests of the larger neighborhood.

The proposed density for this development includes six apartments of approximately 1200 – 1800 square feet. This many apartments of this size can easily house at least 12 people and as many as 24 people, somewhat comfortably. What existed at the site fewer than six months ago was a single-family home. The impact from the increase of a single-family home to six apartment units is simply too much for this neighborhood to sustain, as evidenced by the variances that Ms. Rosen has requested: a waiver from providing the number of parking units required for a multi-family dwelling and a waiver from providing the number of trash enclosures required for a multi-family dwelling. This development and these waivers will dramatically reduce available parking on T and 24<sup>th</sup> Streets. Additionally, the waiver for trash enclosures will result in clogging the 24<sup>th</sup> Street bike lane with 12 garbage and recycling cans once a week that may not be removed from the street in a timely fashion.

The design for this development is inconsistent with the existing design of the homes in the neighborhood. The Newton Booth Neighborhood is rife with examples of California Craftsman bungalows, brick style homes and Tudor-style homes. The lack of porches combined with casement windows and flat roofs are not at all reflected in the homes in several surrounding blocks. Our neighborhood already suffers too much from unsightly, inappropriately-designed apartment complexes built in the 1960's and 70's. Similarly, I do not believe that the current design will stand the test of time.

Though the neighbors in the Newton Booth and Poverty Ridge neighborhoods were never notified of the existing home's demolition nor consulted in the developing design of the complex, we organized a group of representatives to reach some sort of compromise on these issues with Ms. Rosen; no compromise has been reached as a result of Ms. Rosen's obstinacy.

My family and I have lived in our home, a Craftsman bungalow, for seven years. We have invested much time, money and energy in restoring the beauty of our home consistent with its original design. We greatly improved its curb appeal with new paint and landscaping. We have watched as seven homes within 300 feet of the proposed development do the same. The trend in our neighborhood is to buy an existing home and restore and beautify it – not demolition it and build the largest complex that can be squeezed into the lot size. Ms. Rosen's complex as proposed does not belong in our neighborhood.

The beloved single-family home that existed across the street from my house, within full view of my living room window will never return and we have accepted that. We cannot accept the current proposed development as a suitable dwelling in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Bridget Whitted  
2314 T Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816

October 10, 2010

Mr. David Hung  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Mr. Hung:

I'm writing to express my concern regarding proposed development on the northwest corner of the intersection of T street and 24<sup>th</sup> street. My wife and I bought our house across T street from the property in 2004 because we were attracted to the vibrancy and diversity of the neighborhood. We were drawn to the historic architecture, so we bought and remodeled our 1928 bungalow. Since then we have grown fond of many of our neighbors and have had two children whom we plan to raise in the neighborhood. We're invested in the neighborhood both financially and emotionally, so I was surprised and troubled to come home from work a couple of weeks ago to find that the house across the street had been reduced to rubble. My anxiety mounted as I watched a chain-link fence go up around what had become a dirt lot and I learned of a proposed six-unit apartment complex to be erected on the site. My frustration is two-fold: I am concerned about the impact such a project will have on my neighborhood and I object to the process by which my neighborhood has been drastically altered with no notification or community input.

I see the proposal as detrimental to the neighborhood for a number of reasons. Given that our neighborhood is already saturated with multi-unit apartment complexes, adding more will further tip the balance of renters to home owners, increasing the number of people who may not be invested in the neighborhood for the long term. The six proposed units would likely house 10 to 12 adults and their cars, putting more stress on an already tight parking environment. The architecture of the proposed building is modern and block-like, clashing with the surrounding cottages and bungalows both in size and style. All of these effects detract from the livability, charm and long-term stability of the neighborhood.

I am also disturbed that the site became a vacant lot surrounded by a chain-link fence with no notification of nearby residents and without an approved plan for development. I am not familiar with the guidelines for public notification of this kind of project, but my experience in the neighborhood is that such notification is necessary for making even small changes, so I'm surprised that I didn't receive any information nor did I see any posting at the property. Also, while the house and grounds that previously occupied the lot were neglected, they were certainly salvageable and preferable to the current dirt lot. By allowing demolition of those structures before any redevelopment plan was approved it seems that the city has tacitly approved the project before review. This undermines the review process and puts pressure on neighbors to accept any plan that will address the current blight.

Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration and I will be happy to discuss these issues with you at any point in the process. I would also like to request that I be notified of any changes or action taken with regard to this project.

Sincerely,

Steve Whitted  
2314 T Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
(916)743-0889  
sbwhitted@att.net

Steve Whitted  
2314 T Street  
Sacramento CA, 95816  
(916) 743-0889  
sbwhitted@att.net

February 24, 2011

Mr. David Hung  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Mr. Hung:

I am a resident across the street from the proposed development at the corner of 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets. When the project was initially brought to my attention, I sent a letter expressing my apprehension regarding the proposal, and I'm sorry to report that despite efforts to work with the developer to address neighborhood objections, the project as it was finally submitted to the planning commission ignores concerns I share with many of my neighbors: the size of the buildings and the resulting population density.

Based on communication among neighbors, I understand that the developer, Andrea Rosen, insists that the project is in keeping with "smart growth" principles and that including six units in her proposal is fundamental to these principles. I applaud the idea of development that encourages alternative forms of transportation. Indeed, I choose to live in my neighborhood exactly because it is possible for me and my family to walk, ride our bikes and take light rail easily and safely. I also understand that increased population density is an important component of this kind of urban planning in that more people can live in comfortable proximity to work, entertainment and transportation. However development of this kind has to take established neighborhoods into account. I don't think anyone would advocate for a high rise apartment complex in an existing midtown neighborhood. So where do we strike the balance?

I agree with many of my neighbors that the proposed increase in density at 24<sup>th</sup> and T from one unit (pre demolition) to six is excessive. Three or four single story units would be much more in keeping with our neighborhood than the imposing buildings Ms. Rosen hopes to construct. The proposed buildings would be more at home on the R Street corridor where they would blend with existing light industry and office buildings than in our neighborhood of cottages and bungalows. I also take issue with the idea that fewer than six units would be irresponsible from a smart growth perspective. Certainly the lot in question can and should accommodate more than the one house that existed prior to demolition, but in a neighborhood of single family homes and small apartments, an increase from one to three seems more reasonable.

So I find Ms. Rosen's motive for insisting on six units dubious, and I believe that the only other possible motivation for her unwillingness to negotiate the number of units is financial gain. While I don't begrudge anyone's right to line their pockets, I do object to someone doing it to the

detriment of the neighborhood in which I hope to raise my family. I therefore urge the Planning Committee to reject the proposal in the hope that Ms. Rosen or someone else will find a way to develop the property in a way that balances "smart" growth with the concerns of our neighborhood. Thank you for taking the time to consider my input.

Sincerely,

Steve Whitted

**David Hung**

---

**From:** MARLENE RICE [marlenerice@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 10:10 AM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Robert King Fong  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed 24th and T Development (P10-089)

Dear Mr. Hung,

I would like to add my concerns regarding this development project. I was alarmed to discover that a single residence could still possibly be replaced by a 6 unit project. The increased density in an area of our neighborhood that already has many multiple unit residences creates an unfair increase in parking issues in an already impacted area.

I am also concerned about the height of the project overshadowing the closest properties. The project is attractive, but has no place at the current site. When a new project discounts the size and architecture of existing properties, it changes the quality of life and property values of existing residents.

I would like to see 3 units maximum with adequate onsite parking to accomodate the new residents and a height and architecture that blends with surrounding properties.

I hope that city representatives now recognize that we are strong and unified neighborhood, not just a development opportunity for an individual who does not have to live with the result of her intrusion.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Marlene Rice  
2225 T Street  
(member of the Poverty Ridge Traffic Calming Committee)

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Linda McNamara [amaroo2@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 3:28 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** Proposed 24th & T Development (P10-089)

Dear Mr. Hung,

I would like to express my disappointment with Ms. Rosen's plan for the 24th & T project. I believe she has not listen to the neighborhood or tried to be reasonable with us. We do not oppose any development on the property but we would like a project that would compliment the neighborhood by matching our period stuctures.

My block which is the same block for the proposed structure. We have already two apartment buildings. I feel that my block has already fulfilled the city's desire for "in fill" quota. My desire would be for Ms. Rosen change her design to 3 to 4 units, single story and reflect the styles of the neighborhood.

Linda A. McNamara  
1911 24th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
916/42-3616

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Tim Gussner [timgussner@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 3:40 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** Proposed 24th & T Development (P1-089)

Dear Mr. Hung,

I am disappointed with Ms. Rosen's plan for the 24th & T project. She has not negotiated in good faith with our neighborhood or tried to be reasonable with us. We do not oppose any development on the property but we would like a project that would compliment the neighborhood by matching our period structures.

I live on the same block for the proposed structure. We have already two apartment buildings. I feel that my block has already fulfilled the city's desire for "in fill" quota. Ms. Rosen could change her design to 3 to 4 units, single story and reflect the styles of the neighborhood. This would not require any special clearances.

Any consideration in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Timothy Gussner  
1911 24th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
916/42-3616

ALAN LoFASO  
2001 24<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
(916) 457-4322  
*ALoFaso@sbcglobal.net*

February 25, 2011

David Hung  
Associate Planner  
Community Development Department  
City of Sacramento  
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**RE: P10-089**

Dear Mr. Hung:

I write to express serious concerns regarding the proposed 6-unit condominium development at the corner of T and 24<sup>th</sup> Streets. This proposed development anticipates two buildings of substantial mass employing an International/Moderne style of architecture that is out of character in a traditional neighborhood of architectural styles largely consisting of Craftsman, Bungalow, and Tudor style homes. The lot is now vacant as a result of the destruction of a historic home last September.

Consistent with many of my neighbors, I request that the City approve a project to be developed on the site comprising of three single-family homes, contained in three separate structures of no more than two stories; all units should provide off-street parking; and no additional height or setback variances should be allowed. Moreover, the architectural style of the development should be consistent with that of structures within the immediately surrounding area, which are generally although not exclusively Tudor cottages, Craftsman bungalows, and Depression-era brick duplexes. In keeping with these styles, and the general character of our neighborhood, the structures should not be too massive for the surrounding area, and they should employ porches and generally adhere to the principal of "eyes on the neighborhood."

This request is consistent with several planning principals enunciated in the City's general plan. For example, Goal LU 4.3.1 of the City's general plan requires that the "City shall protect the ... character of traditional neighborhoods, including ... architectural styles..." Poverty Ridge/Newton Booth is one of 13 traditional neighborhoods specifically mentioned in the general plan. Moreover, the general plan provides that the "City shall preserve the existing ... densities on each block of Traditional Neighborhoods." (See LU 4.3.2.) The general plan also provides that "[w]ithin the Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density designation, [a] development shall be allowed to reach 36 units per acre" only under limited conditions, including that the "development [must] maintain the character of Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density by presenting a façade of single family homes or duplexes..." (See LU 4.3.3.)

David Hung – February 25, 2011 – Page Two

The neighbors' request regarding this project is also consistent with developments in the surrounding area. For example, a nearby project recently approved by the City Planning Commission at 20<sup>th</sup> and S Streets (P10-069) would provide for nine single family homes, each as a separate structure, and built according to a Craftsman architectural style on a site approximately three times the size of the one at issue in this application. Three single family structures, in an appropriate architectural style, would be equivalent to nine units on a site three times as large. Moreover, this proposal would increase the number of units on the site threefold—well beyond the requirement to “preserve existing densities on each block.” Finally, the density of the proposed project at 20<sup>th</sup> and S Streets is approximately 24 DU/AC, within the mid-range of the general plan's density provisions for Traditional Neighborhood Medium Density.

Poverty Ridge/Newton Booth is a unique, historic Sacramento neighborhood with a character that varies even from block to block. It is important to preserve the character of this neighborhood. The surrounding area was the victim of many poor development choices during the 1960s and 1970s. These examples should not be the justification of additional developments out of character with the immediate surrounding area. Moreover, even an architectural style of greater quality that might be appropriate in a part of downtown or midtown Sacramento comprising of more recent infill developments characterized by a more modern style is not appropriate for this particular traditional neighborhood.

City planners have a variety of choices to meet the City's general plan requirements, including policies supporting appropriate infill development and smart growth. My neighbors and I support these principles. However, this application as currently proposed, is not an appropriate approach to meeting these policy goals. There are other alternatives, and the neighborhood is poised to work constructively within these policy goals in a manner that will preserve the traditional character of the Poverty Ridge/Newton Booth neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

/s/

Alan LoFaso

Cc: Honorable Robert King Fong, Council Member, Fourth District  
Lisa Nava, District Director, Office of Council Member Fong

Claire Pomeroy, MD, MBA  
2009 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818

February 23, 2010

RE: Proposed 24<sup>th</sup> and T project

Dear Planning Commission members,

I write to ask that you help our diverse and thriving neighborhood achieve our dream of rejuvenation with urban renewal and infill projects designed to create a strong community. Specifically, I ask that you do this by requiring that the 24<sup>th</sup> and T project be limited to 3 units and constructed in a style consistent with the character of our neighborhood.

We are a re-emerging city neighborhood that strives to be an important part of the future of Midtown Sacramento. We celebrate our neighbors - people from all walks of life, the elderly and the young, renters and owners, families and singles - who have discovered the joy of living in this special part of the city. We celebrate the combination of stately homes, historic bungalows, garden cottages, and affordable apartments. As we walk through our neighborhood, we see the pride of our neighbors reflected in well-kept gardens; we meet each other to chat as we walk our dogs; and we embrace new families when they move in to build their lives here.

Our neighborhood has a personality - one that has emerged over the past several years. We want to ensure that as we grow and improve, we maintain that personality, so that we become a vibrant part of the future of our city.

That is why I write to you today to ask that you honor and support our neighborhood's wish that the housing project proposed for 24<sup>th</sup> and T not radically diverge from the previous density of housing at that address. I ask that you respect the neighborhood's suggestion to limit the number of units to 3 (an increase in density from the previous single family home that is acceptable to the neighbors) and that the style, height, size and landscaping be consistent with the neighborhood.

I want to emphasize that we believe in urban neighborhoods (that's why we live here!) and we believe in in-fill projects. What we are asking is that the in-fill projects respect the character of our community. We believe that the community's acceptance of an increase from 1 unit to 3 units is a thoughtful and reasonable position on the part of those of us who will welcome the inhabitants as new neighbors. We believe that this is a responsible use of the land that would represent a compromise on both sides. It is unfortunate that the current developer's request to put 6 units on the property appears to be driven by a desire to maximize business profits, not to help create a dynamic city neighborhood. By building an oversized structure with 6 units, we fear the project will skew the neighborhood away from a balance of single family homes and

apartment complexes and risk a “tipping point” that could destroy the neighborhood feel of our community.

A group of neighbors has diligently tried to discuss reasonable compromises with the developer, Andrea Rosen. I am disappointed that she has maintained that the number of units in the project is not an issue that she is willing to discuss. I do not see good faith or evidence of caring about our neighborhood in this negotiation stance. She appears unwilling to think beyond “cash flow” to consider the “impact on our neighborhood”.

Our Newton Booth Neighborhood Association has also expressed their lack of support for the project as currently proposed.

Therefore, I ask the Planning Commission to require project plans that limit the density increase on the 24<sup>th</sup> and T project site to 3 units and ensure that the style, height, size, and landscaping are consistent with the overall character of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,

Claire Pomeroy, MD, MBA  
Vice Chancellor and Dean, UC Davis Health System\*  
Resident - 2009 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, Sacramento, California

\*This title is used for identification purposes only, per UC policy.

cc: Mayor Kevin Johnson

cc: Councilman Rob Fong

**David Hung**

---

**From:** Bill Robertson [w.preston.robertson@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2011 12:10 AM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Subject:** AR letter to CP  
**Attachments:** AR letter to CP.pdf

David--

Attached please find a .pdf of the letter that Ms. Rosen hand-delivered to my wife, Dr. Claire Pomeroy, at the UC Davis Health System, where she is Vice Chancellor and Dean. The letter speaks for itself in its inappropriateness and as a representation of the challenges our neighborhood has faced in its efforts to negotiate, just as, I am sure, Ms. Rosen has had her own perceived challenges with us.

I would note only that Ms. Rosen's claim in the letter of her development's "health benefits" is contradicted by her own admitted haste to demolish the existing 1940's house on the lot in order to avoid impending lead paint abatement guidelines set to take effect.

Please include both the attached .pdf and this email explaining it inclusion.

Thanks,

Bill Robertson

--

William P. Robertson  
2009 23rd Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916-607-2405

February 9, 2011

Dr. Claire Pomeroy  
Chief Executive Officer, UC Davis Health System  
UC Davis Vice Chancellor for Human Health Sciences  
Dean, School of Medicine  
4610 X Street  
Sacramento, CA 95817

HAND DELIVERED

RECEIVED  
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE  
OFFICE OF THE DEAN  
11 FEB 11 PM 3:22

**RE: Your Position Regarding Two-Triplex Residential Infill Development at 24<sup>th</sup> and T Streets (Courtyard Condominiums)**

Dear Dr. Pomeroy:

I am writing to you in your capacity as a regional health leader in Sacramento. I am asking you to re-evaluate your position on the above-named residential development project in light of the public health benefits of this type of residential development.

This Smart Growth residential infill development brings important short term and long term health benefits to the region and to its residents - current and future. This project contributes to a reduction in Sacramento's air pollution- a continuing public health challenge to the region.

**I am asking you to join other regional health leaders who are supporting this project in large part due its health benefits.** Please see the attached letters from:

- Larry Greene, Sacramento's Air Pollution Control Officer
- Mike McKeever, Sacramento Area Council of Governments Executive Director
- Teri Duarte MPH, Sacramento Design 4 Health Chair\*

These leaders recognize the health benefits of 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard Condominiums and its contribution to regional health improvement by making high quality residential housing available to future Midtown residents who will be able to choose a sustainable lifestyle that includes less or no reliance on the automobile. High quality housing built within close walking distance to light rail increases ridership thereby reducing Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT), thereby reducing air pollution which improves individual and community public health.

Infill such as 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard Condominiums provides attractive housing options for individuals who choose to prioritize walking and cycling as a lifestyle choice by making these travel options easier and therefore more likely to be used. This project, in particular, is pedestrian-oriented and thus contributes to a healthy lifestyle by its residents.

I encourage you to read the support letters from these important health leaders. I have also attached a bibliography of articles documenting the health effects of air pollution and the health benefits of Transit Oriented Development. 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard Condominiums is a perfect example of a Transit Oriented Development and has been recognized as such.

I know you are very busy, but health and our built environment is an important regional health concern that merits your attention. Community support for Smart Growth residential infill is a priority for Sacramento. (See Sacramento General Plan adopted in March 2009).

I request an opportunity to review this project including its health benefits with you at your earliest opportunity. Please contact me at 916.508-6721 to set up a time to meet.

Dr. Pomeroy. You could use this project as a vehicle to educate the neighborhood and community about the health benefits of Smart Growth residential infill. There are MANY UC experts on this topic who would be happy to work with you to organize such a forum. As a doctor, educator and health leader, I urge you to support the requested residential density at this critically important site.

Respectfully,



Andrea Rosen MPH, JD

Enclosed:  
Support Letters for 24<sup>th</sup> and T Courtyard Housing as described  
Bibliography

\*This group includes doctors from UCD who will be testifying publicly in support of the health benefits of this project.

**David Hung**

---

**From:** trostel4@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 27, 2011 9:33 PM  
**To:** David Hung  
**Cc:** Robert King Fong  
**Subject:** Proposed 24th & T st development

Mr Hung,

I apologize for the timing of this email but I have been out of town for approximately one week and just arrived home to find I could voice my family and I concerns with the proposed project on the corner of 24th and T st.

We believe the specifications of the project would bring numerous negatives to the neighborhood.

My wife and I bought our house on the corner of 24th and S st approximately 3 yrs ago. We bought in this particular neighborhood because it encapsulated the quintessential midtown neighborhood with the old victorian architecture and family atmosphere all in one. My wife now runs a successful childcare facility out of our home in which she has multiple children each day.

Although we love our neighborhood it is not without it's problems. Because we have numerous businesses and a bar in the neighborhood we constantly struggle with parking and oversaturation of traffic on our streets. With two young children this makes it difficult for them to play anywhere in the neighborhood outside the boundaries of our fences as well as the difficulty of finding parking for us when we arrive home. There is simply too many cars and not enough parking in the neighborhood. It is my understanding that the developer of the project in question is asking for variances on the parking that is essential for the size of the project. This is of great concern to my family and this will greatly effect the neighborhood in an extremely negative way.

Another concern for my family is the overall size of the project. My wife and I could have moved anywhere but we chose to buy in Sacramento because of it's beautiful victorian architecture as well as it's small city feel. Similar to the brownstones of Brooklyn New York or the row housing of Baltimore, Midtown Sacramento is known for it's early century architecture and that is something that has always attracted people such as myself to this beautiful city. We feel that something in the same theme of the existing neighborhood would be in order with no more than 3 units going into 2 very small lots.

This letter is not a protest against change. My family and I welcome positive changes for the neighborhood, like restaurants shops and even housing. The issues we have with the proposed design is the sheer size and potential problems this project would bring to the neighborhood.

We thank you for hearing our concerns and once again I apologize for the timing of this letter.

Thank you,  
Michael Trostel  
2400 S st  
Sacramento Ca 95816  
530-400-1515

Attachment 6: Land Use & Zoning Map

