

January 14, 2021 (updated with additional signers on January 19, 2021)

Board of Directors
Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
c/o Cottage Mart, Box #125
2130 51st Street
Sacramento, CA 95817

Sent via email: ElmhurstNeighborhoodAssocSac@gmail.com and enaboard@elmhurstna.com

Also submitted as an ecomment to the City Council meeting, January 19, 2021, Item 15. 2040 General Plan Update - Draft Land Use Map, Proposed Roadway Changes, and other Key Strategies [Continued from 12/01/2020] File ID: 2020-01381

RE: ENA advocacy around the City of Sacramento's proposed 2040 General Plan Update

Dear ENA Directors,

The undersigned 32 Elmhurst residents are writing to respectfully -- but strongly -- disagree with the [advocacy position you have communicated](#) on behalf of the association with respect to the City's proposed changes to the 2040 General Plan that would allow duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes to be built on properties that are now zoned exclusively for single family homes. We are troubled by the use of arguments that we perceive as hyperbolic and aimed at provoking fear among residents.

This is [not the first time](#) we have observed ENA's take on a land use issue displaying a form of dysmorphia about what Elmhurst already is -- and has been.

The Elmhurst we love living in is one we prize for being: affordable, unpretentious, mixed use, mixed income, diverse (although becoming less so), rich with trees and shared green spaces (like the boulevards on T Street), close to downtown and to a world-class trauma center, walkable to desirable retail, services, and restaurants, and served by not one, but two light rail stations, and with easy access to Highway 50 at either end of the neighborhood. Most Elmhurst homes are a mere meter apart and nearly half are occupied by renters -- predominantly aspiring medical professionals who are able to walk to work. The pre-1960s zoning rules that allowed for duplexes on many corners yielded many great housing options that fit in well with the rest of the neighborhood. We encouraged the addition of the GIO apartment building at the corner of T and Stockton -- and view it as addressing a much-needed City-wide rental housing shortage and a welcome change from the blighted and stranded AT&T building. We lament only that the pandemic has likely kept a great restaurant or bar from opening on the first floor and that the City did not insist on more affordable units in that complex so that renters with lower incomes were able to live there too.

We actively welcome the addition of well-designed duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes that would allow more Sacramentans to enjoy Elmhurst's many amenities and do not feel that this is a zero-sum proposition. It is unfathomable to us that simply allowing these housing types will "eliminate" single family housing neighborhoods entirely, and we believe it would indeed be a positive development for a wider variety of housing types to be permitted. There will be ample opportunities during future zoning discussions to ensure that concerns about design, parking, and traffic are addressed in ways that maintain the character of this neighborhood while incentivizing climate-friendly behaviors.

It is well-documented that single-family housing only zoning is exclusionary. And refusing to increase density in neighborhoods this close to the urban core and along public transit corridors is at odds with climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies. We find ENA's assertion that the zoning change will increase climate impacts to be fundamentally in error.

An implication in the arguments made throughout your letter is that ENA fears reduction in property values. Let's be honest: our steeply increasing property values -- like the rents at the GIO complex that you express concern about -- are being largely, if not completely, driven by the City's housing shortage. It is inequitable and unjust to build wealth and home equity in this way.

The City of Sacramento needs more housing -- of every type and at every income level, and in every neighborhood. We urge ENA board to revisit the decision to oppose the 2040 General Plan Update proposal, particularly in the absence of offering any constructive alternatives.

We would also ask that ENA engage more in City outreach efforts and to do more to reach out to neighbors in advance of expressing neighborhood views on such significant matters, so that a more diverse array of voices and viewpoints are included when developing advocacy positions on behalf of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Jay and Jennifer Chamberlin
Elmhurst homeowners since Apr 2009

Steven Tritto and Jessica Kitchens
Elmhurst homeowners since 2020

Malea and Toby Heim
Elmhurst homeowners since Apr 2000

Steven Maviglio
Elmhurst homeowner since 2001

Kelli Boehm and Robert L'Heureux
Elmhurst tenants since Feb 2019

Aimee O'Brien
Elmhurst former renter (1998-2000)
Elmhurst homeowner since 2000

Samantha Corbin
Elmhurst homeowner since Jul 2006

Joseph Marsano and Laura Kurek-Marsano
Elmhurst residents since 2016

Jamie Callahan and Jonah Johnson
Elmhurst homeowners since Nov 2017

Kate Golden and Wesley Brooks
Elmhurst homeowner since Jun 2020

Claire Van Zuiden and Kevin Hartsoch
Elmhurst homeowners since Dec 2014

Heather Resetarits
Elmhurst homeowner since Apr 2015

Adam and Cassandra Donaton
Elmhurst homeowners since Jun 2014

Dale and Margaret Dodson
Elmhurst homeowners since 1974

Bryan Neff
Elmhurst tenant of a duplex since Dec 2017

Lawrence and Alyssa Moua
Elmhurst homeowners since 2019

Stefan and Stephanie Spich
Elmhurst homeowners since May 2011

Stevie Cook
Elmhurst homeowner since Dec 2013

Michael Stuart and Hailey MacNear
Elmhurst homeowners since 2017

cc: EGuerra@cityofsacramento.org; KSaeteurn@cityofsacramento.org;
MGrigsby@cityofsacramento.org; TPace@cityofsacramento.org;
planning@cityofsacramento.org; pdn.nicolina@gmail.com; RMendoza@cityofsacramento.org;
MHertel@cityofsacramento.org; CHodge@cityofsacramento.org