

## Campus Commons Village Four

Mr. Zack Dahla  
City of Sacramento Planning Division  
300 Richards Blvd. 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

December 29, 2022

Re: Planning Application Z22-079; 707 Commons Drive

Dear Mr. Dahla,

I am writing this on behalf of the Campus Commons Village Four Board of Directors representing 53 homeowner units.

I understand that you have already received many comments from residents of Campus Commons regarding this proposed development, but Village Four's residents have requested that the Board write and set forth various concerns that have been raised as it was felt that these have not been adequately addressed in the meetings that have taken place to date. The purpose of this letter is to summarize those main concerns.

The overall concern is whether this proposed development conforms to the City's General Plan requirements and expectations. Specifically, this proposed development is within a neighborhood where *"the City shall strive through its planning and urban design to preserve and enhance their distinctiveness, identity and livability from the downtown core to well integrated new growth areas."* LU 2.1.1.

Further, *"[t]he City shall preserve, protect and enhance established neighborhoods by providing sensitive transitions between those neighborhoods and adjoining areas, and by requiring new development, both private and public, to respect and respond to having those existing physical characteristics buildings, streetscapes, open spaces, and urban form that contribute to the overall character and livability of the neighborhood."* LU 2.1.2.

Also, *"[t]he City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking to services, biking, and transit use; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity, ensure public safety; are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities."* LU 2.1.3.

This proposed development is bordered on three sides and therefore is being built substantially within Campus Commons. The existing structure at 707 Commons Drive presents a consistent and conforming appearance to Campus Commons, whereas the proposed development is not on inconsistent but actually presents a significant contrast which conflicts with the entire Campus Commons

neighborhood, and is in conflict with the General Plan's intent to maintain conformity in the neighborhood.

The 707 Commons Drive building may have historical/architectural significance that should be preserved. *"Where a developer proposes to convert a non-residential historic structure/building to residential use, the City shall not require compliance with density regulations."* LU 2.1.5. If this is an historic building as some claim, compliance is required, and the proposed density is not in compliance with the surrounding neighborhood. *This point is confusing to me – doesn't it say that the conversion of a non-residential historic building does not have to comply with density regulations? Better way to word...?*

Campus Commons is a private planned unit development (PUI) with amenities such as established green spaces, tennis courts, swimming pools, lakes, fitness center, playground, etc. The proposed project includes no amenities and its density as much as quadruples or more that of the surrounding neighborhood. The immediate proximity of Campus Commons creates an increase in liability caused by the likelihood of the proposed development's residents attempting to take advantage of the Campus Commons park-like setting and amenities. The proposed development does not proposed to have any fences or barriers designating the boundaries to protect Campus Commons resident from intrusion. The developers have indicated that they do not intend to notify prospective purchasers that Campus Commons is private property and not affiliated with or usable by the development's homeowners. They also stated that they intend to market the property as being in an urban forest-type environment, which could be interpreted as being available for public use. The potential for trespassing on Campus Commons' private property is exacerbated by the lack of any services, walking paths, open space, playground or other amenities being included in the plans.

The proposed development calls for one vehicle access point for the property, a driveway currently utilized by Campus Commons Village One and Village Two. The occupants and visitors from the existing building at 707 Commons Drive rarely if ever utilize that driveway. Instead, they use the parking lot, which is accessible from University Avenue. While this driveway is scheduled to be widened, this situation raises several concerns. Traffic on Commons Drive will be significantly increased, which will have a negative impact on all of Campus Commons, particularly on the immediate neighboring residents of Villages One and Two. Their driveway will be subject to more congestion and noise. The additional daily drivers from the proposed development will adversely impact the intersection of Campus Commons Road and Commons Drive, which already suffers from heavy traffic and speeders during rush hour from commuters avoiding the intersection of Howe Avenue and Fair Oaks Boulevard. Having the one entrance to the proposed development may create issues for emergency vehicles as well as current Campus Commons residents.

Campus Commons is nestled within a beautiful and mature urban forest, a distinct point of pride for the residents. This forest extends to and includes mature heritage trees on the site of the proposed development. The plan calls for the complete removal of these trees.

The destruction of these magnificent trees will be a tremendous loss for the entire community and is contrary to City standards. The developers simply stated that they would pay money to the City for the removal of the trees. Payment for the removal of these mature heritage tree does not compensate the neighborhood for the loss to the community. Sacramento prides itself as being a "City of Trees." This development, as proposed, violates that assertion.

The current neighborhood has its buildings set back from the sidewalks, which improves the sight distance for drivers, provides a green space from the sidewalk to the road, and is consistent with the ambience of the neighborhood. The proposed development's structures have minimal setbacks of just a few feet, essentially placing buildings next to the sidewalks. It is questionable whether this placement meets City building standards and the General Plan's goals.

The proposed development has no interior parking other than the two-car garages. If garages are used in part or in total for purposes other than vehicle storage, residents would utilize the already limited amount of street parking. The existing 707 Commons Drive property currently uses the University Avenue parking lot. The developer stated that the University Avenue lot would only be available temporarily until the anticipated second development is constructed. Additionally, with no on-site parking other than garages, visitors will be forced to use street parking, which again, is already limited.

This is a summary of some of the major concerns raised by Campus Commons residents including those in Village Four. We request that all of these matters be addressed.

Please notify us of all hearings regarding this proposal as we have many residents who desire to attend to express their positions.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to our concerns regarding this proposed development.

Sincerely,

Nancy Comstock  
President  
Campus Commons Village Four