

ENA Survey March 2021 Summary Responses

(To see all comments made on survey questions, see the Full Report.)

Draft 2040 General Plan and Land Use Questions

The City of Sacramento is developing the [2040 General Plan](#) to take effect next year (2022). The current draft plan calls for major changes to Sacramento zoning, parking requirements, energy use, and number of lanes and parking on some major streets.

On [January 19, 2021, the City Council](#) directed city planning staff to proceed with finalizing the draft plan. The final plan is currently scheduled to be heard by the City Council in June and adopted by August.

For information in support of the draft 2040 General Plan click here: <https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Major-Projects/General-Plan>

For information about concerns with the draft 2040 General Plan click here: <https://no2rezone.wordpress.com/>

ZONING CHANGES

Elmhurst is now zoned [R-1 Single family residential](#). R-1 zoning allows duplexes only on corner lots. (See below for zoning code specifics.)

As of January 2020, California state law mandated that two [Accessory Dwelling Units](#) (ADUs) (also known as in-law units) are allowed by right on all single- or multi-family lots in addition to what is allowed by zoning.

The draft General Plan proposes to change single-family R-1 zoning to allow duplexes, 3-plexes and 4-plexes on all lots. This means that all lots now zoned for R-1 Single-family, could have a total of six units: the 4-plexes plus the two by-right ADUs.

No additional on-site parking is required for ADUs and the draft General Plan calls for eliminating all requirements for on-site parking (i.e. on the property) including in residential areas. Residents in units without onsite parking would need to park their cars on the street.

R-1 zoning ordinance: http://www.qcode.us/codes/sacramento/view.php?topic=17-ii-17_204-ii&frames=on

ADU information: <https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Resources/Accessory-Dwelling-Units>.

1. Which of the following options best represents your views on the above mentioned California state law, that allows two Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) by right on a single- or multi-family lot in addition to what is permitted by zoning.

#	%	Responses
102	30.8%	Prefer limiting to 1 ADU per lot but on-site parking should be required for each ADU.
82	24.8%	Agree with current law permitting 2 ADUs per lot with no on-site parking requirement.
59	17.8%	Prefer limiting to 1 ADU per lot with no on-site parking requirement.
42	12.7%	Agree with 2 ADUs per lot but on-site parking should be required for each ADU.
39	11.8%	Oppose current law, prefer no ADUs by right
4	1.2%	Other (See full report.)
3	.9%	Not sure or no opinion.
331		Total Responses

Comments: See full report.

2a. What is your opinion regarding the above-described proposed changes to R-1 Single family zoning?

#	%	Responses
171	51.7%	Oppose proposed changes, support current single-family zoning (one unit per lot, corner duplexes).
62	18.7%	Support allowing a total of 2 units per single family lot.
43	13%	Support allowing a total of 6 units per single family lot.
25	7.6%	Support allowing a total of 4 units per single family lot.
14	4.2%	Support allowing a total of 3 units per single family lot.
10	3%	Other (See full report.)
6	1.8%	Not sure or no opinion.
0	0	Support allowing a total of 5 units per single family lot.
331		Total responses

Comments: See full report.

2b. For the question above: Do you think that:

#	%	Responses
205	62.5%	On-site parking should be provided for each unit.
72	22.2%	On-site parking does not need to be required for any of the units.
36	10.7%	Other (See full report.)
15	4.6%	Not sure or no opinion.
328		Total Responses

3. How concerned are you about the following potential negative impacts of changing R-1 Single-family zoning to allow up to 6 units per lot, including in Elmhurst?

	Not Concerned		Somewhat concerned		Very Concerned		Not sure or no opinion		Total responses
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
1. Increased density	80	24.7%	59	18.2%	185	57.1%	0		324
2. Lack of privacy from adjacent two or three-story multiplexes	68	21%	61	18.8%	195	60.2%	0		324
3. Less available on-street parking	47	14.2%	81	24.5%	200	60.6%	2	.6%	330
4. Increased traffic	50	15.3%	65	19.9%	207	63.5%	4	1.2%	326
5. Reduced trees & other vegetation	42	12.8%	73	22.3%	206	62.8%	7	2.1%	328
6. Reduction in available single-family homes for homeownership	94	28.8%	67	20.6%	165	50.6%	0		326
7. Outside investors buying up houses and converting to absentee rentals	43	13.1%	48	14.6%	228	69.3%	10	3%	329
8. Destruction of historic structures and neighborhoods	53	16.3%	75	23%	191	58.6%	7	2.1%	326
9. Displacement of current residents	82	24.9%	72	21.9%	169	51.3%	6	1.8%	329
10. Increased rents	99	30.3%	78	23.9%	130	39.8%	20	6.1%	327
11. Increased housing prices/property values	139	43.2%	76	23.6%	76	23.6%	31	9.6%	322
12. Decreased housing prices/property values	101	31.6%	66	20.6%	129	40.3%	24	7.5%	320
13. Changing the character of the neighborhood	69	21.1%	56	17.1%	195	59.6%	7	2.1%	327
14. Decreased quality of life in Elmhurst	85	26%	42	12.8%	194	59.3%	6	1.8%	327
15. Other (please specify in the comments)	28	23.5%	4	3.4%	40	33.6%	47	39.5%	119

Comments: See full report.

4. How do you perceive the following potential benefits of changing R-1 Single-family zoning to allow up to 6 units per lot, including in the Elmhurst neighborhood? (Answers are numbers, not percentages.)

	Will not occur		Is not a benefit to the neighborhood		Somewhat of a benefit to the neighborhood		Significant benefit to the neighborhood		Not sure or no opinion		Total responses
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
1. Increased neighborhood diversity	86	26.3%	58	17.7%	65	19.9%	89	27.2%	29	8.9%	327
2. Increased availability of units for rent	11	3.4%	165	50.8%	77	23.7%	60	18.5%	12	3.7%	325
3. Decreased rents	152	47.1%	58	18%	38	11.8%	45	13.9%	30	9.3%	323
4. Increased housing prices/property values	74	23.2%	59	18.5%	69	21.6%	55	17.2%	62	19.4%	319
5. Decreased housing prices/property values	86	27%	138	43.3%	13	4.1%	7	2.2%	75	23.5%	319
6. Decreased auto usage / increase in mass transit ridership	147	45.4%	38	11.7%	56	17.3%	69	21.3%	14	4.3	324
7. Reduce housing shortage	110	34.1%	68	21%	53	16.4%	72	22.3%	20	6.2%	323
8. Reduce homelessness	191	59.1%	28	8.6%	27	8.4%	54	16.7%	23	7.1%	323
9. Increased ability for UCD Med Center employees to live in Elmhurst	35	10.9%	51	15.9%	107	33.3%	96	29.9%	32	10%	321
10. Eliminate legacy of housing discrimination (ex. redlining, race-based CC&Rs)	118	36.9%	30	9.4%	30	9.4%	93	29.1%	49	15.3%	320
11. Increased opportunities for family members to live nearby	94	29.2%	44	13.6%	64	19.9%	80	24.8%	40	12.4%	322
12. Increased quality of life in Elmhurst	156	48.6%	37	11.5%	37	11.5%	63	19.6%	28	8.7%	321
13. Other (See full report)	14	17.3%	14	17.3%	0	0	7	8.6%	46	56.8%	81

Comments: See full report.

5. If the City were to adopt zoning changes to R-1 Single-family zoning, including in Elmhurst, that would allow up to 6 units per lot, what restrictions would you want to see? (Check all that apply).
(327 responses.)

#	%	Responses
213	65.1%	Require one or more on-site parking spaces for each additional unit.
191	58.4%	Disallow the use of additional units for short-term rentals (e.g. AirBNBs, VRBO).
164	50.2%	Require the same setback, height limits, and lot coverage as now required in R-1 Single family zoning but prohibit any variances/deviations.
134	41%	Require the same setback, height limits, and lot coverage, as now required in R-1 Single family zoning with possible deviations/variances.
121	37%	Require that one or more of the additional units be affordable (under market rate).
27	8.1%	Other. (See full report.)
17	5.2%	Not sure or no opinion.

Comments: See full report.

6. Elmhurst is zoned R-1 Single family residential. The few non-residential properties, e.g. grocery store, halls, existed prior to the R-1 Single-family zoning and are allowed to continue as they are. Which of the following options do you prefer? (Check one.)

#	%	Responses
220	66.9%	Elmhurst to stay residential with no new non-residential uses allowed.
76	23.1%	Elmhurst zoning changed to allow commercial and office use in some areas.
12	3.6%	Elmhurst zoning changed to allow commercial and office use in all areas.
11	3.3%	Not sure or no opinion.
10	3%	Other. (See full report.)
329		Total responses

Comments: See full report.

7. What best describes your perception of public input into decisions about land use changes, like rezoning and decisions about whether projects can get exceptions to setback, height limit, lot coverage, and other zoning requirements (check all that apply). (325 responses.)

#	%	Responses
185	56.9%	I am concerned about land use or building exceptions in my neighborhood.
148	45.5%	The decision-making process is difficult to understand and not easily accessible.
121	37.2%	There is not enough opportunity for public input.
77	23.7%	There is currently enough opportunity for public input.
33	10.2%	Not sure or no opinion.
19	6.7%	Other. (See full report.)
17	5.2%	The decision-making process is easy to understand and accessible.
13	4%	I am not concerned about land use or building exceptions in my neighborhood

Comments: See full report .

8. Currently Sacramento’s architectural review standards do not address whether residential buildings are visually similar to others in the neighborhood. Do you think: (327 responses.)

#	%	Responses
210	64.2%	There should be architectural review to ensure that new buildings fit in visually with existing structures.
79	24.2%	There is no need for architectural review to ensure that all new buildings fit in visually with existing structures.
27	8.3%	Not sure or no opinion.
11	3.3%	Other. (See full report.)
327		Total responses

Comments: See full report..

9. The draft 2040 General Plan proposes to “Eliminate City-mandated parking minimums citywide” so that commercial, office, residential, and other properties would no longer have to provide on-site parking (i.e. parking on the property). Note: this would not necessarily eliminate on-site parking but rather would leave it up to the developer/owner of any building to decide how much parking to provide. What do you think about this proposal and its potential impacts? (Check all that apply.) (326 responses.)

#	%	Responses
144	44.2%	Residential on-site parking requirements should continue as currently required.
137	42%	Commercial off-street* parking requirements should continue.
119	36.5%	Residential on-site parking should be a minimum of one space per unit.
74	22.7%	Residential on-site parking should be more than one space per unit, based on number of bedrooms.
47	14.4%	Commercial off-street parking requirements should be increased.
39	12%	No problem with the proposal to eliminate requirements that on-site parking be provided
22	6.7%	Not sure or no opinion.
11	3.3%	Other. (See full report.)
326		Total responses

Comments: See full report.

10. The draft 2040 General Plan proposes to reduce the number of car lanes and/or institute “parking maximums [i.e. restrict available parking] along important transit corridors, including along Freepoint Boulevard, Northgate Boulevard, Del Paso Boulevard, Stockton Boulevard, Folsom Boulevard, and Florin Road [in order to] discourage excess vehicle trips and ensure that valuable land is available for more important uses.” Note that some car lane reductions are intended to provide bus or bike lanes. What do you think about this proposal and its potential impacts? (Check all that apply.) (326 responses.)

#	%	Responses
124	38%	Disagree with the proposal to reduce lanes
112	34.4%	No problem with the proposal to reduce lanes.
92	28.2%	Disagree with the proposal to restrict available parking.
49	15%	No problem with the proposal to restrict available parking.
62	19%	Not sure or no opinion.
15	4.5%	Other. (See full report.)
326		Total responses

Comments:30 responses – see full report for comments.

11. The draft 2040 General Plan proposes to: 1) require all new buildings, including residential, to be all electric and eliminate the use of natural gas and fossil fuels for building operations by 2026, and 2) “require HVAC system replacements and new hot water heaters, and other appliances to be all-electric or utilize other low-carbon technologies as the market evolves.” It calls for assisting low-income residents by offering financial incentives. What do you think about this proposal and its potential impacts? (Check all that apply.) (329 responses)

#	%	Responses
149	45.3%	Concerned about potential cost implications for existing houses, for example, if gas equipment fails (stoves, heaters, water heaters) and they have to be replaced with electric.
120	36.5%	Ok with eliminating gas in new construction but oppose eliminating it in existing buildings.
112	34%	Would like to see that all households be given financial incentives regardless of income.
96	29.2%	Would like to see that moderate-income households also be given financial incentives.
96	29.2%	Oppose the elimination of gas in any new or existing buildings.
85	25.8%	No problem with the proposal to convert all buildings to electric.
15	4.6%	Not sure or no opinion.
11	3.3%	Other. (See full report)

Comments: See full report.

UC Davis Medical Center

12. Aggie Square is a proposed new development on the UC Davis Medical Center (UCDMC) campus that would include the addition of several multistory buildings, some of which would be used for the Medical Center and some of which would be leased to private companies. It is estimated to add another 3,000-5,000 employees. What should the UCDMC do to mitigate impacts and assure benefits to the community from the Aggie Square project? (Check all that apply.) (329 responses)

#	%	Responses
266	80.9%	Provide public transportation options and incentives to their employees.
252	76.6%	Facilitate biking and walking by building bike lanes, walking pathways, etc.
216	65.7%	Partner with local schools to create workforce programs that help students get jobs at UCDMC.
189	57.4%	Provide assurances that individuals in adjacent neighborhoods are not displaced.
172	52.3%	Commit to hiring local people.
57	17.3%	Reduce project scope to limit number of new employees.
24	7.2%	Other. (See full report.)
17	5.2%	Not sure or no opinion.
13	4%	No mitigation is necessary

Comments: See full report.

13. How concerned are you about the following impacts from the UC Davis Medical Center

	Not Concerned		Somewhat concerned		Very Concerned		Not sure or no opinion		Total responses
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Helicopter noise	143	44.4%	96	29.8%	82	25.5%	1	.3%	322
Development along V Street	85	26.4%	108	33.5%	122	37.9%	7	2.2%	322
Increased traffic from proposed Aggie Square Development	56	17.3%	92	28.4%	172	53.1%	4	1.2%	324
Increased parking from proposed Aggie Square Development	59	18.3%	87	26.9%	170	52.6%	7	2.2%	323
Increased housing costs (rent and sales prices)	130	40.6%	92	28.8%	82	25.6%	16	5%	320
Pressure for denser housing	80	25.2%	62	19.5%	169	53.1%	7	2.2%	318
Other (please specify in comments box)	16	24.2%	3	4.5%	15	22.7%	32	48.5%	66

Comments: 31 responses – see full report for comments.

14. How concerned are you about parking in the neighborhood? (Check one)

#	%	Responses
146	45.5%	Very concerned
110	34.3 %	Somewhat concerned
64	19.9%	Not concerned
1	3%	Not sure or no opinion
321		Total responses

Comments: See full report.

15. What do you think is the impact of the following sources on parking issues?

	1- Little Impact		2- Moderate Impact		3- High Impact		Not sure or no opinion		Total responses
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
UC Davis employees and clients	32	9.8%	108	33%	180	55%	7	2.1%	327
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	88	27.2%	116	35.9%	101	31.3	18	5.6%	323
GIO apartment building (on Stockton and T)	136	41.7%	77	23.6%	43	13.2%	70	21.5%	326
Commercial uses on Stockton (i.e. Starbucks)	141	43.5%	95	29.3%	53	16.4%	35	10.8%	324
Institutional use (i.e. Coloma Center, Masonic Hall, Julia Morgan House, etc.)	178	55.1%	88	27.2%	25	7.7%	32	9.9%	323
Homes with multiple vehicles	70	21.5%	149	45.7%	100	30.7%	7	2.1%	326
Visitor parking	134	41.5%	124	38.4%	48	14.9%	16	5%	323
Short-term rentals	110	33.8%	85	26.2%	87	26.8%	43	13.2%	325
Other	11	19.6%	6	10.7%	2	3.6%	37	66.1%	56

Comments: 18 responses – see full report for responses.

16. How concerned are you about traffic in the neighborhood? (Check one.) (324 responses.)

#	%	Responses
159	49.1%	Very concerned
106	32.7%	Somewhat concerned
59	18.2%	Not concerned
0	0	Not sure or no opinion

Comments: See full report.

17. What do you think is the impact of the following sources on traffic issues? (Figures below are numbers, not percentages.)

	Little Impact		Moderate Impact		High Impact		Not sure or no opinion		Total responses
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
UC Davis employees and clients	23	7.1%	105	32.5%	184	57%	11	3.4%	323
Commercial vehicles such as trucks	91	28.3%	127	39.6%	90	28%	13	4%	321
Use of Elmhurst as a thoroughfare	38	11.9%	102	31.9%	170	53.1%	10	3.1%	320
Lack of non-driving options (bike lanes, public transit, etc.)	99	31%	122	38.2%	81	25.4%	17	5.3%	319
Increased density due to development (GIO, ADUs)	81	25.2%	106	33%	114	35.5%	20	6.2%	321
Neighborhood commercial (Starbucks and Cottage Mart)	189	58.9%	83	25.9%	34	10.6	15	4.7	321
Institutional buildings (Coloma Center, Masonic Hall, and Julia Morgan House)	193	60.3%	78	24.4%	27	8.4%	22	6.9%	320
Other (please specify in comments box)	12	20%	5	8.3%	5	8.3%	38	63.3%	60

Comments: 20 responses – see full report for comments.

18. How concerned are you about the following issues in Elmhurst?

	Not Concerned		Somewhat concerned		Very Concerned		Not sure or no opinion		Total responses
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Crime and safety	69	21.3%	129	39.8%	126	38.9%	0	0	324
Affordability of housing	100	30.8%	139	42.8%	81	24.9%	5	1.5%	325
Lack of street lights	85	26.3%	123	38%	112	34.6%	4	1.2%	324
Homelessness (please describe in the comments box)	82	25.7%	118	37%	103	32.3%	16	5%	319
Use of illegal fireworks	133	41.2%	104	32.2%	79	24.5%	7	2.2%	323
Other. (See full report.)	9	17.3%	2	3.8%	11	21.2%	30	57.7%	52

Comments: See full report.

19. What do you think the city of Sacramento should do about affordable housing? (Check all that apply.)
(325 responses.)

#	%	Responses
189	58.2%	Provide assistance to low-income first-time home buyers.
181	55.7%	Invest in the construction of low-income housing.
152	46.8%	Reinstate a requirement that 20% of new housing be affordable to lower-and moderate- income households.
134	41.2%	Not allow the conversion of permanent housing to short term rentals (inns, BNBs).
127	39.1%	Provide rental subsidies.
95	29.2%	Rent control.
75	23.1%	Providing more housing by requiring that new developments be higher densities.
37	11.4%	Not sure or no opinion.
16	4.8%	Other.
15	4.6%	No policy changes.

Comments: See full report

20. What should the city of Sacramento include in the development plan for Stockton Boulevard? (Check all that apply.)

#	%	Responses
235	72.3%	Ensure that traffic is not diverted into surrounding neighborhoods.
187	57.5%	Ensure that any new housing development includes a percentage of affordable units.
186	57.2%	Set aside land for new affordable housing development (as opposed to commercial construction).
181	55.7%	Increase public transit options.
174	53.5%	Set aside land to address issues of the unhoused. Including, service centers, shelters, tiny houses, parking areas.
135	41.5%	Prioritize commercial development opportunities for small business owners.
119	36.6%	Add bike lanes without taking out car lanes.
74	22.8%	Take out car lanes to Increase biking lanes.
47	14.5%	Increase commercial development (retail, office, etc.).
18	5.5%	Not sure or no opinion.
14	4.2%	Other

Comments: See full report.

21. Sacramento Investment Without Displacement (SIWD) is a coalition working to help protect vulnerable communities and neighborhoods from potential negative and destabilizing impacts of large development projects in Sacramento including Aggie Square. Representatives from SIWD did a presentation at the Feb. 8 ENA board meeting. Do you think the ENA should join SIWD? (321 responses.)

#	%	Responses
148	46.1%	Not sure/need more information
94	29.3%	Yes. The ENA should join SIWD
51	15.9%	No opinion
24	7.5%	No. The ENA should not join SIWD
4	1.2%	Other

Comments: See full report.

22. Are there any other issues of concern that have not been covered in this survey that you want to mention? See full report for comments.

Demographic information

1. How long have you lived in Elmhurst?

- 38.9% Over 20 years
- 20.2% 5-9 years
- 17.8% 10-20 years
- 13.3% Less than 2 years
- 9.9% 2-4 years

2. Are you a renter or homeowner?

- 84.6% Homeowner
- 12% Renter
- 1.3% Other
- 2.1% Prefer not to answer

3. Approximately how much of your income goes to your rent or house payment?

- 53.9% Less than 30%
- 20.5% Between 30-50%
- 3% More than 50%
- 22.6% Don't know or prefer not to answer

4. How old are you?

- 41.6% 60 or older
- 21.7% 30-39
- 20.2% 40-49
- 9.9% 50-59
- 2.1% 18-29
- 4.5% Prefer not to answer but over 18

5. How many people in your household?

- 49.1% 2 people
- 17.2% 1 person
- 17.2% 3 people
- 11.4% 4 people
- .9% 5 or more
- 4.2% Prefer not to answer

6. Which of the following best represents your racial or ethnic heritage?

- 71.7% White or European American
- 13% Hispanic or Latino
- 5.4% Asian or Asian American
- 3.6% Native American or Alaskan Native
- 2.7% Black or African-American
- 1.8% Other
- .6% Native American or Pacific Islander
- 13.9% Prefer not to answer