

**Elmhurst Neighborhood Association March 2021 Neighborhood Survey
Full Report
Table of Contents**

Question (Note: each question starts on a new page.)	Page
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.	3
2a. What is your opinion regarding the above-described proposed changes to R-1 Single family zoning?	6
2b. For the question above: Do you think that:	10
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?	11
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?	15
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?	18
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?	20
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.	22
8. Currently Sacramento’s architectural review standards do not address whether residential buildings are visually similar to others in the neighborhood. Do you think:	24
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?	26
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 Freeport 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?	28
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?	30
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?	32
13. How concerned are you about the following impacts from the UC Davis Medical Center?	34
14. How concerned are you about parking in the neighborhood?	36
15. What do you think is the impact of the following sources on parking issues?	39
16. How concerned are you about traffic in the neighborhood?	41
17. What do you think is the impact of the following sources on traffic issues?	43

18. How concerned are you about the following issues in Elmhurst?	44
19. What do you think the city of Sacramento should do about affordable housing?	47
20. What should the city of Sacramento include in the development plan for Stockton Boulevard?	49
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?	50
22. Are there any other issues of concern that have not been covered in this survey that you want to mention?	51
Demographic information	54

Note: This full report includes all the comments made on the various survey questions. These comments are included as submitted with two exceptions, all first words are capitalized for ease of reading and very obvious typos are corrected.

ENA Survey March 2021 Summary Responses

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 (Included in Comments below.)
3	.9%	Not sure or no opinion.
331		Total Responses (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments/Other: (64 responses)

- Resident stickers required with only 2 street per property (not unit) - others have to be on-site.
- Up to 2 ADU's; require 1/2 parking spot per unit, so 1 spot per 2 units
- Would like multifamily buildings allowed on arterials but not secondary streets, would like to see design guidelines enforced
- Agree with 2 ADUs, but if ADU doesn't have parking, renter doesn't have a car
- ADU's should not be more than 500 sq. ft.
- Don't prefer but accept
- Very few lots would be large enough to fit 2 ADUs so I don't feel it is a major concern
- I would be open to hear ideas about parking reqs.
- This isn't an HOA. People should be able to do whatever they want.
- Parking is major problem on my street.
- I have lived here for 21 years. They developed the fairgrounds behind me and I now have a giant 2 story home peering into my backyard. I don't want more!!
- I believe the views of the Elmhurst Neighborhood Association are close minded, racist, and do not reflect the community we are. This survey is very biased and is meant to manipulate people's perception of changes.
- 1 adu per lot and on site parking is a necessity to limit road congestion and provide safety to walkers and cyclists.

Question 1, continued

- Doing away with single family zoning will not bring affordable housing. The Elmhurst neighborhood could not sustain 2 ADU's per lot and no on-site parking requirement. It would bring college students and hospital people. It would also drive up rent prices and congest our already busy streets. I am opposed to it 100%!
- I prefer to have driveways if there is one already. I also think there should only be one car per unit.
- Housing capacity should not be contingent on whether or not one can "house" an automobile.
- I'd prefer on site parking. I'd prefer Sacramento residents have exclusive or at least initial rights to purchasing homes/ADU's/4-plexes.
- Parking and congestion are real issues--are getting worse.
- It's unclear what problem this proposal solves and exactly how. I couldn't find mention of infrastructure updates to support what could be a dramatic increase in population. It's very disruptive to those of us who moved to this specific neighborhood because it was single-family, intimate, it's a community.
- Our neighborhood has been assaulted by HiWay 50 more than once. No more changes. No more cars everywhere. The helicopters that are constant are quite needed but so loud. We do NOT need more cars and people. Let us be a quiet neighborhood.
- Don't want to turn Elmhurst into the sad mess called midtown
- Resident only parking stickers required with only 2 per property being issued. Other cars must be on-site. My part of the neighborhood has many UCD people parking here on the street
- Parking is already an issue in Elmhurst.
- There are currently no parking challenges where I live
- Increasing population density enables us to get better transportation services
- Elmhurst is a fully built out single family home neighborhood, primarily. In almost all cases, lots are small, and streets are narrow. Parking is at a premium, with some houses having older style garages which will accommodate only a single modern vehicle, The neighborhood is already adversely impacted by traffic and parking generated by the massive UCD expansion, and has suffered from the same for many years. Given the plans for further expansion, the impact will become more. To allow an unfettered expansion, without appropriate limitations, of residential units without appropriate expansion of City services is stupid. Politically correct perhaps, but still stupid.
- On-site parking requirements should be dictated by street congestion caused by on-street parking. For example, if there are cars parked on both on 51st street between T and the freeway overpass they narrow the road less than the width of two cars and force traffic to take turns. This is an undesirable situation and should be avoided.
- The law is ill-conceived. Once all the vacant and run-down non-residential properties, including strip malls are used for housing, then increased housing density in established neighborhoods where older adults and families live will make sense. If racial equity is the goal have the city buy houses in established neighborhoods and give them to minority elders and families. I would welcome increased diversity - but not at the expense of peace and quiet by adding more traffic and crowding in the neighborhood. When I bought the house in 1986 - even though it was a fixer upper and the only one I could afford - I chose it because of the more rural small town atmosphere of the neighborhood. I would never choose to live in an inner city (I grew up in poverty in a NY tenement.)
- The only solution to homelessness is more homes. Opposing more houses is advocating for people to be without.
- Off-street parking needs to be mandatory for all residential lots. UCD employees already take up the bulk of our available on-street parking due to the high cost of parking at UCD.
- This city needs to come to grips with the fact that more people means more cars PERIOD and provide some space for them! It is unrealistic to believe that everyone that moves here will take public transportation, Uber or bike if there is no additional parking provided. And, its nonsense to believe that Rentals and their landscaping are going to be maintained by their owners like SFHs are by theirs. I believe Sacramento politicians know this but ignore it in favor of greed and ambition and because they personally could afford to move to a neighborhood where the well-to-do will be sheltered from inner city overpopulation and traffic. I am totally against not requiring at least some additional parking for all rentals. I am 69 and single--a woman who has lived in Sacramento all my life and has worked hard for 45 years to retire into the peaceful Single-Family-home neighborhood of my dreams. I spent my life savings to finally get out of a neighborhood that had degraded into a shabby, unsafe "parking lot". Over the 30+ years I lived there, the SFH homes turned into rentals and the streets were lined with so many junky cars parked everywhere such that I could not see my house from the street when I drove home. When I looked out, all I could see were ugly cars, trucks and work vehicles. Many homes there became rentals, and many families moved in and out, who disrespected the property and their neighbors and cared nothing for the yards. I didn't want to walk the neighborhood anymore and I became depressed and dreamed of being able to one day afford to move. I would be shattered to have Elmhurst neighborhood rezoned!

Question 1, continued

- The current proposal to remove the R-1 would make Elmhurst a Metropolis. The would destroy the efforts of our past in working with UC Med in keeping Elmhurst a quite neighborhood.
- Not every house will add 2 ADUs
- This is a state law and cannot be changed by city of Sacramento to my understanding
- Whatever happened to striving to achieve the goal of bettering yourself. This is Marxism. "Equity" ensures equal result, without equal effort! Why should, or would anyone want to excel, achieve, and better themselves, when people that have not made the same effort, are given the same benefits!
- Having a diversity of zoning is beneficial, state overriding local zoning is detrimental and non-inclusive.

I don't want our neighborhood to turn into a renter market with the street full with cars.

- It's unrealistic to believe you can add ADs without assuring parking, even if your goal is to encourage public transport. In a non/post-COVID world, on street parking is scarce now. This change should not result in residents not being able to park in front of, or near, their own homes.
- I currently live backed up to "The Grounds" and the buildings are huge and don't fit the culture or style of the existing neighborhood.
- Prefer street parking for residents, not UCD employees w/fake placards
- This is not going to decrease rent... All it is going to do is have many more properties with multiple units so people can charge 2-6x more than they could for a single house on the same property. 1 ADU is fine and should be a right to build a small building on your property for parents or an office or to rent out, but not 6
- There are plenty of requirements remaining in order to have a legal ADU on your property (set-backs, being up to code, square footage limits, and much more). "By-right" is an inaccurate and loaded phrase.
- I moved to Elmhurst because I wanted to live in a quiet neighborhood. I do not want to live in a neighborhood with multi-unit parcels and crowded streets. There is a reason I don't live in Midtown; I like peace and quiet.
- I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes and not enough parking space is one of my concerns.
- I support inclusive housing. There is a housing shortage in our city and state. I would gladly welcome others into our neighborhood.
- Housing supply no doubt is an issue not just in Sacramento, but statewide. That said, if we are going to take steps to increase housing, we need to be mindful of the negative impacts that will have on existing residents and neighborhoods including parking issues.
- Did the parking requirement change? Previously I understood there would be parking requirements. This process does not seem transparent to me.
- I have duplexes nest door and they have three vehicles and use the spot in front of my house leaving my adult children no rom to park when visiting me, am surrounded by renters who are great neighbors and do not oppose low income housing but not a single lot to provide 6 dwellings with no parking. Low income should be scattered not clustered
- I don't think enforcing a parking requirement for ADUs makes sense because many people who live in such structures don't even drive (aging parents, disabled, etc...)

Just asking for illegal short term rentals

- I think it is important to allow at least 1 (possibly up to 2 ADUs) to increase density and provide additional, much needed housing, in Sacramento.
- Due to the medical center parking is already problematic.
- There is no parking provisions, not a good fit.
- Do not want multiple family dwellings except on corners and definitely not if no parking is required on lot.
- I favor more density in Elmhurst, and more options for residential land use.
- My wife and I have lived in Elmhurst close to 30 years. We've lived here because of the character and quality of life this neighborhood provides. Anyone that wants to change that will meet will face opposition including legal challenges.
- We live within 5 minutes of the city center. Give me a break. Urban infill is a part of a growing city, I am sad to see that so many of my neighbors are more concerned about parking than providing housing for everyone. I honestly believe that if parking is your biggest concern, there are plenty of large driveways in Roseville or Elk Grove, have at it.
- ADUs should be limited to single-family lots
- On site parking should be required for all dwellings

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 (Included in Comments below.)
6	1.8%	Not sure or no opinion.
0	0	Support allowing a total of 5 units per single family lot.
331		Total responses (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments/Other: (75 responses)

- I support ensuring more than white wealthy families can live in beautiful communities
- One house- one ADU
- So 4 units could all be in one structure, or 2ADU's + Duplex etc.
- How would I tell? We need more. There aren't enough for the people living on the freeway interchange end of Elmhurst.
- Depends on whether it's an arterial or not, and the layout.
- Depends on the location, the size of the lot, and the style of the construction. supportive of adding SOME denser housing into the neighborhood.
- I think the requirements are too general so I would oppose in the current design. I support housing but this is too general
- A "stroll" down P Street, from 39th counts 6 duplexes before ending at 35th! Don't want that sequence on T Street.
- Support 2 per lot with 2 off-street parking spaces
- Oppose the proposed changed, but indifferent to the duplexes on corners. I notice many duplexes in the neighborhood that aren't on corners.
- Should require architectural guidelines
- Size of lot could be a consideration for a second unit
- This is fine as would rarely occur at max but architectural review and preservation of historic homes is needed
- Question is skewed toward choosing option 1
- Stacked question
- The Victorian 4-plex houses in Midtown are fine.
- The new law would change Elmhurst from a neighborhood to a business. It isn't about inclusion or exclusion. Businesses and landlords would look to maximize development for profit. They're going to see the extensive footprint of UC Davis and see an opportunity to make as much money as they can, renting to students and employees. They're not going to care about providing fair or equal housing opportunities to residents of the city. Elmhurst doesn't have any shortage of investment or development, but many other Sacramento neighborhoods do. What happens to those neighborhoods? They are clamoring for investment and development! Do they get left behind even more? I can't live wherever I want. That's not how life works. I can't just demand to live in Malibu, or Beverly Hills, or the Fab 40's because I think deserve it. I worked and saved my money for 10 years so I could buy my home in Elmhurst. I rented in East Sac and Oak Park while I saved money. I rented where I could afford to rent, not where I thought I deserved to live.
- I don't believe a 4-plex should be allowed to also build ADU's on the same lot.
- I don't care what number of units can fit on the property.
- Parking from UCD already happens on my street. Enough is enough.
- More ADUs increases traffic and will have a detrimental impact to the environment (air quality), and limit access to services.
- I'm flexible on the exact number of units
- I feel VERY strongly about this. I've lived in Elmhurst for a long time. Purchased here because I wanted to live in a quiet neighborhood. The proposed changes would put that in a great deal of jeopardy. There are plenty of places downtown for this. Plus there's an enormous amount of building going on already. The project on 65th St. And the proposed new project on 59th St.
- I am opposed to commercial developers, especially outside developers, purchasing lots and building on said lots. Unless company is mission based, B-Corp certified, a non-profit, NGO, or something.

Question 2a, continued

- Multiplex dwellings result in transitional communities--fun and vibrant, which is great when we are young. I'm now looking forward to living in a stable mature community where people are committed to and invested in the place where they live. That and the congestion predispose me away from this proposal.

or more!

- There is already limited parking on streets. With the community center and the UCD Hospital parking in the neighborhood adding a large number of residents to an already crowded neighborhood would just make things worse. I believe this would also make our neighborhood less desirable and cause property values to drop.

- I want to make it easier to build more housing in Sacramento. I think we need to build more housing overall, including but not just affordable housing, for rents and prices to go down.

- What guarantees or recourse and/or neighborhood input will be included IF the upzoning changes take place. Increased traffic, street congestion, On-street parking, absentee landlords, crime and safety concerns will undoubtedly be an on-going problem. As an invested homeowner who will represent our interests? COUNCIL - think NOT!!!

- People worked very hard, some of us all our lives, to be able to have a home in a quite, single-family neighborhood. Open up the conversation to others to help find creative, innovative solutions to whatever problem you're trying to solve.

- If people want to be crammed in lots designed for one dwelling let them go to McKinley Village or one of the horrible apt buildings springing up everywhere.

- There is a chronic and serious housing problem in Sacramento, and California as a whole. Even if building more units means a denser Elmhurst, the cost is worth increasing housing supply so that more families can afford housing.

- Could be supportive of more than two if there are appropriate guidelines regarding setbacks, height, parking, etc

- Support up to a 4-plex, plus one ADU

we are already suffering from increased dangerous traffic(high speed common),increased noise, garbage.

- I support the General Plan, updating the R1 SFR zoning rules. it does not necessarily mean six total units, or no parking required. anyone wanting those flexibilities would have to go through the normal permit approval process, like they do now.

- Home owners and renters do not just purchase a house, they invest in a neighborhood and a way of life. This should not be disrupted, and changes decided by bureaucrats who seek permit fees, and tax income and are not affected and do not represent the local community. Builders and developers should file for exemptions or waivers to place multi unit dwellings in areas with adequate space and transportation / parking. No need for blanket zoning change. The city should continue the infill program and be more concerned about empty lots and buildings through out greater Sacramento including Stockton Blvd and So Sac. Let people keep the Lovely neighborhood they paid for. Thank you. Ralph

- Elmhurst is mainly single story homes with some two story homes. I live in a duplex and wouldn't mind there being more of them or more dual residences on properties. I am concerned about the character of the neighborhood, that being that the buildings look like regular homes, not large square buildings that impose over single story homes or neighbors' backyards.

- Single-family zoning - with special permitted in-law units meeting strict design standards.

- Do you see how many people don't have homes? Please stop opposing more housing.

- The issue is not just parking and street congestion but other infrastructure that is not explicitly supported.

Two units is a good compromise but ONLY IF ADDITIONAL PARKING IS PROVIDED!!!!

- There are already too many homes without on site parking! Streets are glutted with cars parked on the streets!

- If 2 units per lot is allowed, they will get variances to create 4 to 6 units. Don't want to open the flood gates

I do find it interesting, that the city council members that are pushing for this do not live in the areas proposed for this change. I don't see Eric Guerra proposing this for his Tahoe Park neighborhood, nor do I see Mayor Darrell Steinberg offering his Pocket area neighborhood as the "test" neighborhoods!

- Allowing for a diversity of lifestyle options within the greater Sac community is important. These changes eliminate choice, change community identity, and are also poorly planned.

- Concerned that this is just a way for developers to make money. Has nothing to do with providing affordable housing.

- Don't want our neighborhood to turn out like midtown with the terrible 70 and 80;s apartments squeezed in between homes

- Already too crowded with renters

Question 2 a, continued

- This is not going to decrease rent... All it is going to do is have many more properties with multiple units so people can charge 2-6x more than they could for a single house on the same property
- Do not allow ADU's in addition to multi-unit only if they require parking for each Unit
- Elmhurst and East Sac provide a unique and tranquil landscape that complements midtown and downtown areas, and adds beauty to our city. The city should seek other underdeveloped areas (such as infill areas around East Sac, or the Railyards) to find affordable housing options. These areas provide opportunity for high-density affordable housing. Changing R-1 zoning for Elmhurst will provide minimal new housing that won't be affordable, and will only tarnish the luster of these iconic neighborhoods.
- You are clearly wording these questions to solicit opposition, thus biasing your survey
- One in-law quarters per lot sounds OK to me. Not sure if that is considered a second "unit".
- Sacramento needs more housing.
- See above
- I'm generally not opposed to adding more affordable housing as long as there are parameters in place for ensuring said housing is truly affordable. I also think infrastructure and parking needs must met when adding housing.
- The extra units should fit within the architectural appearance of the neighborhood...e.g. ~2 stories, maybe 3 if set back from the street.
- This is not a plan that benefits low income and is just a way for developers to make money.
- RE: 2b - Just as residents should not be forced OUT of driving, they shouldn't be forced INTO it either. Making parking optional enables residents to build/buy/alter their own house to fit their own needs. Plenty of residents prefer not to drive, for one reason or another, and they shouldn't have to sacrifice space on their valuable, urban land for a vehicle.
- This is a developer giveaway, not an altruistic plea for equity. What socioeconomically disadvantaged people are ever going to be able to afford a home if a developer has to pay over \$500k for land (if not more) then development costs? And what about existing neighbors facing potentially 16 new people (family of 4 x 4 DUs) and 8+ new cars? Noise? Primary and operational emissions???? Why not repurpose existing structures or invest in poor neighborhoods? Lastly, developers are not respectful of existing neighbors. Would you want your view to be a huge, light blocking, solar panel interfering hulking building?
- If I wanted to live in a de facto apartment complex I wouldn't have moved to Elmhurst.
- The parking situation will not improve no matter how they sugar coat it..
- So that means if two adults per bedroom that would be 4 cars potentially on the street. I'm seeing the house two doors down with that going on now even though there are two garages off the alley.
- I oppose more than 2 units, because more would cause our streets and neighborhood to be congested with too many cars parked along the streets.
- We should welcome more families to our cities and our neighborhoods, increase density, increase mass transit, and, in general KILL THE SUBURBS which are ecologically destructive and serve little more than to coddle the soft inexpressible fears of rich whites. To be honest. BRING IN MORE RENTERS!
- Once again, I am not scared of more people living in my neighborhood. I understand that some people are obstinate to change, but this neighborhood has a history of change, just like every other urban neighborhood. I think what people are most concerned about are the people that will be living in these units. What, like all the Dr.'s, traveling nurses and medical students that live in them now? Parking may be problematic for some, but I then encourage them to ride their bike, walk and take public transportation.
- Mandatory Parking provisions are one of the biggest waste of concrete in our country.
- As long as lot size is a consideration for the number of allowable units, this may be an okay change. I believe most lots in Elmhurst (and in many Sacramento neighborhoods) are just too small to accommodate multiple units per property.

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 (Included in Comments below.)
15	4.6%	Not sure or no opinion.
328		Total Responses (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments/Other: (33 responses)

- One on site parking should be required. It is like that for most of the homes near me now anyway, and everyone else parks on the street.
- One on site parking per lot
- On-site parking for additional some units, on two car on street pre property.
- More busses and bikes.
- On site parking should be available for at least one unit.
- Single family parking on site
- It's crowded enough on Elmhurst streets!
- One on-site parking place
- I don't think the units should be built.
- Parking should be taken into consideration for new builds if duplex expansion increases in the neighborhood. The huge plus of our neighborhood is how walkable it is with less traffic than other neighborhoods.
- On-site parking for at least one unit
- On-site Parking should be provided for half of all units
- On-site for at least 1 unit
- Don't think these units should be allowed at all except on corners
- Due to our very large employers, the ever-growing UCDCMC, DOJ, and EDD, our residential parking has a history of
- On-site parking should be provided for all units except the ADU
- If we're not mandating on site parking, we should be mandating covered bike parking
- Should be provided for at least 50% of the units
- On-site for main unit, on-site not req'd for ADU
- I think it depends, street parking is ok if the original structure has driveway and or garage
- Let's offer better options so that it's possible to not drive a car in Sac.
- It doesn't have to be provided for every unit. If people want to make it available and have the space to do so, they can. I don't think it needs to be mandated though.
- Would be open to hearing parking requirement ideas that don't pose huge barrier to dev
- Would be open to hearing parking requirement ideas that don't pose huge barrier to dev
- Residents should have street parking, not UCD employees
- See above
- If more than one ADU, then parking should be required
- If more than one ADU, then parking should be required
- If more than one ADU, then parking should be required
- 50% of units per lot should have parking
- At least 1 onsite parking space total, as long as street parking is possible.
- 1xar per unit on site
- If only one unit- no parking. But if more, need on site parking.
- Permit parking only
- Limited on-site parking is fine; encourage people to walk, bicycle, and use public transportation.
- Don't let this hold up more housing

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/Other: (74 responses)

- If increased density is allowed then walkable services such as grocery stores and drug stores should be mandated to before increased density housing allowed
- Irreversibility when this rezoning fails
- Another stacked question
- It's a city. Lots of people.
- Some of the answers did not select
- This survey is very biased and is more reflective of a community where Proud Boys live than the diverse community Sacramento is.
- Speeding traffic on T Street is concerning, and the city of Sacramento has so far not been amenable to doing anything significant to change that.
- Parking will be a BIG issue. Also, trash day will have streets more congested.
- Parking is the big issue for me. The streets are jammed with parked cars as it is.
- The city making changes based on future plans for transportation that may or may not be actually completed by the city. For instance a bus system that over the last 30 years has decreased in usability and at best was poor before the changes. Where is the actual evidence that the city will make the needed changes for their plan?
- Changing the ADU laws will destroy the historic landscape of Elmhurst. From cutting down trees, to changing the landscape from single story/smaller homes, to increase traffic and noise. I moved here because Elmhurst was quaint and safe for my family. More ADUs will change on blocks forever.
- This should be a vote of the Citizens not the City Council.

Question 3, continued

- Where is the infrastructure to support these changes?
- Potential increase of property investors who are absent and not vested in neighborhood daily living
- I think increased density is a positive impact, not a "potential negative impact", as phrased in the question. Bring it on. We need good development. Elmhurst will thrive.
- Some of the things that other people see as detriments, I see as a bonus. I love Elmhurst, but I think it could use a little more bustle - child care centers? cafes and other mixed use? One area where I may agree with rezoning opponents is that I don't want to see Elmhurst lose its lovely canopy. I think the city should find ways to protect that, maybe by giving premiums to builders for green roofs, vertical gardens, good landscaping, tree-planting and such, or maybe a rule of no-net-reduction in trees when projects are built.
- I have submitted in writing to ENA, Council and Current councilmember my opinion Jan 18, 2021 and Feb 22, 2021
- My main concern in Elmhurst is that the neighborhood has become a thoroughfare. There should not be access to UC Davis Med Center from the Neighborhood. Access to a hospital and medical center of that size should be from Broadway and Stockton only. It's crazy town sometimes, especially on T and on 51st.
- We have already experienced developers buying up properties and reselling at inflated prices. That is the reason developers have so many politicians in their pockets, such as Eric Guerra.
- The phrasing on this survey is wildly tilted to get the result that the ENA board seems to want, which is to oppose up-zoning.
- It was hard to answer some of the questions as the choices are clearly biased. I am not "concerned" about the character of Elmhurst changing, because I WANT it to change. I would like to live in a neighborhood that better represented my whole city, instead of in a little bubble. I want diversity where I live and walk each day. Your term of "concerned" makes it sound like you believe changing the character of the neighborhood can only be a bad thing. The questions about increased or decreased property values/housing prices were also difficult to answer, as those are very different issues.
- Biggest concern is lack of privacy. Currently I have a code violation for having a fence height of 7 feet to block our neighbors from looking into our windows and visa versa. If the city would allow multiple units - up to 6 - on each lot - then why don't they just require all of our walls to be made of glass? Honestly, we purchased this home not even a year ago and love the neighborhood but the political game that code enforcement plays is ridiculous and if this law is allowed in Elmhurst then we will sell as I see it really hurting the values in this neighborhood along with everything else it brings like noise and traffic. The code enforcement will Favor the city as they seem to love to money grab so this would be a big opportunity for Them in my opinion.
- Do I really think that this is going to cause a mass "Plex-building" movement in the neighborhood? No.
- Lack of consideration for property, privacy. Already terrible, now UCD expanding again.
investors buying up homes is a current concern, it does not necessarily increase with the update to zoning allowances. Increased rents will not be a result of this either. we need to increase housing supply, and updating the zoning rules will create more space to do just that. it is one piece of the solution.
- The increase in local air pollution and noise pollution, and dangerous excess traffic making neighborhood less walkable and unsafe for children and animals
Increased strain on aging infrastructure, street surfaces. Already many people think the street lighting is inadequate.
- Traffic! We already have plenty of traffic connected with UCDMC!
- The current state of the neighborhood would be ruined with increased AirB&B, apartment dwellings. The development of apartment complexes near the SacState, Folsom and 65th intersection is sufficient
- More traffic accidents and property damage. Wall-to-wall unsightly vehicles lining the street. I don't want to look out and feel like I live in a parking lot. No room for friends to park when visiting. This is already a problem due to UCD and to become worse with their expansion.
- We chose to purchase here for the quiet streets, and small-town, neighborhood feel within the city. This proposal endangers the mystique of Elmhurst and proposes turning it into a large scale condominium complex.
- There are so many other options... why isn't fab 40s part of the plan?
- Regarding "absentee rentals" - I am a renter and I am already surrounded by rentals. Regarding outside investors - It would be nice if there were more provisions that favor people buying homes to live in vs. people buying home to flip or rent, such as taxes etc.
- Too many people not invested in the neighborhood or it's upkeep
- Ugly modernist architecture.

Question 3, continued

- Conditional use permitting already allows for increased commercial/government property as well as stand alone parking structures. As density increases, these other permits will increase as well, paving over existing houses with parking lots is not progress.
 - Strongly oppose changes.
 - California is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis. Allowing for higher density zoning will help make housing more affordable, and will also allow more lower-income residents / residents of color gain access to areas of the country that lead to more economic mobility (as the result of better jobs / better schools). The economist Raj Chetty has done some great work on this. I understand the desire to "protect" the neighborhood, but I believe that reducing homelessness and decreasing income inequality doesn't just happen. It requires specific policy decisions. Allowing for more urban density is one of those policies. Living in this beautiful neighborhood with maintained streets, beautiful trees, and public amenities is a privilege that more people should have access to regardless of income. I believe that I have a moral obligation to make that happen. I understand such policies may come with potential tradeoffs, such as increased traffic and lower home values, but that such risks are a small price to pay when it comes to increasing equality.
 - Keep neighborhood RESIDENTIAL not multi renters crowded like midtown
 - This is not going to decrease rent... All it is going to do is have many more properties with multiple units so people can charge 2-6x more than they could for a single house on the same property
 - This is a ridiculous question and is written to favor objection to the new zoning.
 - As a first generation Mexican American family who has lived in Elmhurst for over thirty years, we believe this proposed zoning change will not ensure more diversity. It will also unfairly benefit outside investors rather than low income diverse individuals and families since they will most likely not be able to afford the proposed prices.
 - I am very concerned that "diversity" is being inappropriately used to support the zoning changes. This is a change that will forever change the character of the quality of life in Elmhurst and all of Sacramento. I have not seen any data that supports that this change will indeed lead to diversity or that it will provide access for more "affordable housing" that low-income diverse individuals can afford. Are council members being funded by outside investors? I want to know how much of this change is being led by outside investors who are using these zoning changes only for their self interest and profit. As a first generation Mexican-American, who has lived in this neighborhood for over 50 years I can assure you that this community is already diverse. I believe this change will unfairly benefit outside investors rather than the residents of all of Sacramento. Such a drastic change to our quality of life should not be made on a whim.
 - Increased noise and pollution for increased autos
 - I do not want to live in a high density population area with many cars on the street, removal of historic houses to build new multi-residency buildings which will change the appearance of my neighborhood, and I am not excited about potential removal of trees and other plants to accommodate new multi-unit housing. I decided to buy a house in Elmhurst because I like the quaint neighborhood that it is. If I wanted new construction multi-unit housing and crowded streets I would have bought a house in midtown or downtown.
 - Again, bias in questions.
 - Insufficient infrastructure and increased cost for city utilities--very concerned.
- increased noise, crime.
- As someone that was born and raised in this neighborhood, I would hate to see it turn into midtown or the Bay Area.
 - There are ways to increase density without worsening the characteristics of the community. It would mean smaller unit size. Parking is an issue, but the proximity to UC Davis Health and to public transit may reduce the need for cars.
 - Noise levels will increase
 - Many neighborhoods have duplexes tucked in and they are great for additional housing.
 - UC Davis should provide student housing elsewhere or on campus. Rents are high now.
 - The latest apartment complex at T and Stockton Blvd was not build to ease the housing crisis and provide affordable housing. Look at their ads to see who they are trying to attract--the UC DMC workers. Their price for a studio is higher than my daughter's mortgage payment in North Sac. I do not trust the motives of the people promoting this plan and it does nothing to support the affordable housing crisis. Look at the tent cities around the city and make plans to solve tht problem. Greed driven housing plans are not in the interest of the culture of any neighborhood.
 - Traffic is already at increased levels and nothing is being done about it.
 - This is a beautiful neighborhood , don't change it!
 - Safety

Question 3, continued

- I think granny flats are fine like turning garages into flats for mothers-in-law, but duplexes and triplexes would ruin the neighborhood. Totally and irretrievably.
 - Horrible idea
 - No evidence that these units will increase affordability of the new rentals. No provision for a percentage of the new units to be income-sensitive.
 - Congestion, traffic, noise, lack of parking--not attractive qualities.
 - No requirement for on-site parking is my greatest concern.
 - More cars on the road dangerous for playing children
 - There's a lack of diversity currently in Elmhurst.
 - I am concerned that these questions are completely skewed and one sided. This list should also have positive aspects of the new zoning, if it were to be fair. I oppose the ENA's railroading of this issue and not offering an alternate viewpoint from that of the president.
 - WOW! You do understand that the home prices in our neighborhood are incredibly high right? You do understand that is being driven by the older single family units that have been bought, flipped and sold, many times in a back and forth all-cash offer, and to people from out of town. I am once again saddened to see how sacred people. When the Gio went up people lost their minds. I see no increase in vehicle traffic, just more cute dogs on walks. I see no 'questionable element' being produced from that space, just more people with a place to call home. I hope the retail spaces at the ground level open soon and thrive.
 - Here over 30 yrs, Elmhurst is small in comparison to other areas ,med center "good neighbor promises " never fulfilled Stockton blvd,T St ,39th are packed ,speed excessive despite bumps ,especially Ned center shift change and commuter hours .No parks ,no respite ,yes I know I'm in the city , but stop and think , East sac has Mc Kinley park, Land Park has obviously huge park, Curtis Park ,has Curtis park ,Oak Park has Oak Park . Elmhurst has tried very hard through the years to keep a neighborly intimacy ,but it would be almost impossible with the proposed changes that totally erodes that possibility. I can only imagine how amazing it would be to have a park on par with the smallest Curtis Park in our neighborhood for my generation and future generations . The city leaders that would propose that idea would forever be remembered .
 - I'm concerned that this will exacerbate the issue of racist white people, and that their voices will be heard over those of the people of color in this area. Your quality of life will not be altered for the worst because people of color or of lower economic status moved into the neighborhood. Stop going NIMBY on houses, and put that energy towards the hospital and its impact on neighborhood traffic, sunset views (via large new buildings), litterbug hospital workers, and their current project which continues the problem of gentrification in a historic neighborhood.
 - I do want to take into account that for younger generations to come owning a home especially in a city setting will become further and further out of reach. The option to buy may be only available through smaller units. Does this give them an opportunity to also live and enjoy a place we all love.
- There has to be some additional rules and regulation related to dense builds. A duplex here or there that fits into the neighbourhood seems fine, but certainly the extreme of 6 allowed on any property could not just be put anywhere (?).

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?

	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 (please specify in the comments)	14	17.3%	14	17.3%	0	0	7	8.6%	46	56.8%	81

Comments/Other: 44 responses

- Duplexes and triplexes should be purchasable , not rentals , like purchasable halfplexes in the Greenhaven/Pocket neighborhood
- Rent in Elmhurst is already too high for anyone on a low end budget
- UCD employees now have every opportunity to rent or buy in Elmhurst. The proposed changes will not necessarily have a positive impact on our neighborhood or these employees ability to live in the neighborhood.
- I believe that money is the motive by developers, not diversity!! Rents will be high. More negatives than altruistic thinking.

Question 4, continued

- Diversity would be great but this plan does not guarantee that this will happen. I do not believe the apartment units will increase diversity or will increase out home prices. UCDMC employees already live here.
- The negatives would far outweigh the positives.
- The rents and prices will go up and current residents will be displaced. The increased cars on street will reduce family walking and biking.
- Unless a substantial number of rezoned properties are held out for subsidized housing and drug rehab treatment residences this change will not have any noticeable impact on homelessness.
- No requirement for on-site parking is my greatest concern.
- This tool did work correctly
- Develop empty land on fairgrounds drive instead. Infill next to industrial on Stockton. Won't be affordable housing here. Out of town developers get rich.
- Increasing amount of buildings in a limited space leads to overcrowding
- Won't resolve homelessness. Need to resolve drug abuse issues and increase job training to resolve this issue. People will need to want to. Property values and rents will increase under new plan. "Nicer" areas are nicer because people become more responsible and respectful as their ability to pay for housing increases. Do not get (as much) "Ghetto" attitudes in the more expensive areas. Want nice? Work harder.
- New dense development should be clustered and look like classy easy coat walk-ups.
- Some things might not benefit the neighborhood as much as it might benefit the overall housing shortage, which is also important.
- Parking and traffic are already problems in Elmhurst due to the med center employees parking on neighborhood sts and disregarding traffic signs and speed limits
- This is not going to decrease rent... All it is going to do is have many more properties with multiple units so people can charge 2-6x more than they could for a single house on the same property
- Invites diversity into the area-- and, by diversity, I mean PEOPLE OF COLOR and people of lower income levels. This will be great for our community.
- The old practices of redlining and race-based CC&Rs, are now illegal! Enough of putting everything under the stain of racism! We already are a very diverse neighborhood! In the almost 37yrs. that I have lived here, I have never witnessed racism toward my neighbors. Everyone has been welcome. The tentacles of the "stereotyping" of all white people, for the sins of those that came before us, does nothing but plant the seeds of suspicion and division. My family didn't come to the USA until the early 1900's, from areas that had been enslaved under the Ottoman Empire. To assume, and accuse that other people think a certain way because of the color of their skin, is the definition of racism and bigotry!
- Increased ethnic diversity would be a welcome change
- Homeownership is a path to financial gains. I do not see how adding rental units will accomplish this, unless there is an opportunity for an individual from a marginalized background to be the owner. Otherwise, simply adding rental units to attract diverse renters does not support their ability to earn wealth as homeowners. Built something that will allow underrepresented homebuyers an opportunity to buy a home here.
- I have lived here for 8 years, I have worked at the local Trader Joe's for 16 years. This neighborhood, in no way shape or form reflects the diversity of our city. I can count on a single hand how many other black people I see on a daily basis as I walk, and ride my bike through the neighborhood. (and that is on a good day) The whole of East Sacramento is a sad reflection of the stark contrasts in the racial inequities of our city. History has set us up for this reality through red-lining and shady housing practices. Does our neighborhood want to continue that lineage?
- This set of questions is poorly crafted. Am I staying that I agree that these things are important or that the zoning will bring these things into reality?
- More people crammed on top of each other is not a benefit to any neighborhood.
- Re reducing homelessness: Prices here would be too high for borderline homeless to afford a home here anyway.
- Without a steady stream of progressive changes through the next decades, simply allowing more multi-unit properties will not solve anything. Owners and developers will simply maximize profits and reduce actual opportunities for home ownership. Rents in more expensive areas will continue to be expensive with greater profits for the few who are capable of owning.
- With increase in affordable housing, lots of newcomers may revitalize the neighborhood
- Hard to answer some of these based only on 6 more housing units per lot. 1 more per lot would be helpful for rental or family members to live, but 6???? 6 would devastate and destroy our Elmhurst and is very short-sighted. Why does anyone want to destroy our neighborhood? I get that more housing is needed, but that is midtown. People expect it there. We are a quiet little single-family hood with charm. We have some rentals, and that is fine. Turning one's garage into a rental is fine. But 6 UNITS TO A LOT WILL DESTROY WHAT WE HAVE HERE.

Question 4, continued

- There are many, but specifically, with no "off-street" parking required, how will electric cars be charged while parked on a public street? And if the answer is there will be less cars because it will be more difficult, why does the hospital build a giant parking garage? Should the hospital also just make it more difficult to drive?
- Really concerned about developers buying properties, tearing down historic homes, charging inflated rents, and being the main people to benefit from this plan.
- Many of these questions are subjective to the proposed re-zoning effort. I answered positively or negatively to those I can attest to while I lived here.
- This will not make affordable housing. Developers and property owners will keep prices high to get a return on their investment. All this will do is make more housing for the well to do and increase the population of our neighborhood. This will decrease our quality of life here and cause myself and others to move out of the neighborhood for a better family friendly options.
- Increasing density will not increase diversity, reduce rents or homelessness. The neighborhood will be denser/more crowded, rents and housing prices will continue to increase. Without meaningful legislation, low and maybe even mid income will not be able to afford to live here. This will not right past wrongs, the new racism in housing and rentals is economic.
- Developer giveaway. Perceived equity benefits and decreased rents a pipe dream.
- I found it hard to answer the above q because it's a mix of two kinds of questions: prediction about the future, and my values/preferences. The zoning change is just one in a suite of changes designed to increase housing supply and eventually affordability, and abating homelessness in Sacramento. How much of an effect rezoning has will depend on what else the city does. And change may be gradual - especially with prices/rents. But generally, I think it is a plus to have a mix of incomes and people in my neighborhood.
- This question was unclear to me.
- I love Elmhurst and want more people to have the chance to live here!
- I do not support the zoning change! I chose to live here because of neighborhood feel. Dense living is piling people on top of each other and not affordable. I want vested neighbors.
- The question about redlining and legacy of discrimination is a typical BS expression of somebody's white guilt. There have been no enforceable racial covenants since the early 60s. If you look at the neighborhood today, compared to what it used to be, you will see the diverse changes in the population, all without some politically motivated need to be seen as being "fair", by proclaiming how bad we all used to be.

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).

#	%	Responses (327 responses out 332 surveys submitted.)
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. (Included in Comments below.)
17	5.2%	Not sure or no opinion.

Comments/Other: 50 responses

- Ensure protection of historic structures and trees (X 2)
- For # 1, as long as not overly restrictive. Also not overly restrictive design review possibly. (X 2)
- No restrictions
- Require same setbacks but no limits on height or lot coverage.
- Suggest renters/owners responsibilities of upkeep of yard, home and vehicles to maintain value and quality of neighborhood.
- Restrictions on development should be limited and carefully considered.
- We already have duplexes !!!
- Require vegetation particularly old trees to be preserved to keep the neighborhood cool and green.
- Required street parking stickers with on 2 per property.
- Possible deviations/variances must be approved by neighbors proximate to property being modified.
- Some parking should be required, but not necessarily one per unit. Maybe N - 1 spaces where N is the number of units.
- Mandate non-vehicle transportation infrastructure (covered/indoor/lit/secure bicycle storage)
- Require garbage cans to be put out of sight
- I want the people pushing this should lead by example.
- We should slightly increase height restrictions to allow east coast style walk-ups.
- Require developers of new multi-units to pay for mass transit/parking/pedestrian/bicycle land improvements up front.
- Restrict street parking to residents, right now medical center employees park on streets
- Require on-site parking for any multi-unit over 2.
- If this zoning change takes place, I don't see my family choosing to live in this neighborhood.
- More lenient zoning on main streets, next to highways and next to the hospital – less lenient zoning on side streets.
- Limit number of multi-family units to corners or formerly zoned commercial lots.
- Not for this in any way.
- Social Housing and Land Trust build up in all neighborhoods.
- 6 units is too many for one lot.
- How many are for purchase vs rent.
- There should be language that specifies size of lot that can accommodate additional units, larger lots could have multiple units smaller lots not, i.e., x number of square feet per unit
- Would like height limits to remain the same, but allow shorter setback and more lot coverage.
- If this proposal is going to truly add adorable housing, all additional units should be affordable. Also, I think the new units should match the style and characteristics of the houses already in the neighborhood.
- This issue is happening all over California. It is not a solution to the affordable housing crisis
- Home owners typically make better neighbors than renters.
- The city council and our council member do not care about Elmhurst people or trees

Question 5, continued

- Possible variances and deviations clause must be carefully worded as to be limited to stay within the intent of the rule.
- I generally agree with the proposal, but I would support some limitations to prevent total exploitation of the new zoning (e.g. 4 units & 2 ADUs & 35ft tall & etc...). Especially on side streets and inner neighbors where the local character is most at risk. Ideally, I would like to see more targeted, thoughtful developments prioritized before altering existing single-family homes.
- Why didn't they add affordable housing and multi-units to memorial hospital and other new developments
- Keep zoning as is and issue fines to non-resident UCD employee parking violaters
- If this proposal were to be approved, then every unit must be made affordable for low income diverse individuals. Not only under market rate, since that will be at a higher rate than most lower income diverse individuals can afford.
- Having the same setback and height requirements would be a great way to find that happy medium we are all searching for. But, would that remain the same for homes backed up to alleyways, on corners, park-facing, and hospital facing?
- I am not for this proposal
- If this plan moves forward in some form, I hope that there are clear rules put in place that cannot be bypassed. Studying successes and failures of other places who have adopted similar zoning changes should be seriously looked at to make sure to avoid any unforeseen consequences of those action.
- Be sure that I am totally against any more than granny flats, period. Do not assume by my answers I in any way accept or approve 6 units per lot.
- Require developers of new multi-units to pay for mass transit/parking/pedestrian/bicycle lane improvements up front
- 1/2 parking space per new unit, so 2 parking spaces for 4 plex.
- If these zoning changes are approved, and diversity is the true intention, then it would follow that every unit must be made available for purchase by low-income and diverse individuals. This would mean that the units would need to be made available to the individuals at below the market rate because these individuals would not be able to afford the units any other way.
- This is already a very diverse neighborhood.
- Dense enough here, thank you! And what about Gio? Is that all rented, cheaply?
- I'd like to see the city provide attractive premiums for affordable housing and other desired outcomes: green energy/sustainable design, child care centers, commercial space, enclosed parking etc. The affordable housing premium would need to be attractive enough for builders to actually take it (in Minneapolis, e.g., builders preferred to take the enclosed parking option, so they are talking about changing the incentives).
- I don't want the zoning changes. If the zoning changes are adopted, how does turning my house into a 4-plex benefit the neighborhood? I'm sure I'd make a lot of money, but how does that benefit the neighborhood? 4 sets of renters and 4 to 8 additional cars added to the neighborhood? Sounds like Midtown. If you want to live in Midtown, then live in Midtown. In order to live in a traditional neighborhood, I'll have to move to the suburbs. I don't want to live the suburbs. I don't want to live in 4-plexville either...

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. (Included in Comments below.)
329		Total responses (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments/Other: 38 responses

- Home businesses are evolving and are okay (X 2)
- Open to additional but fairly restricted non-res uses (X 2)
- Commercial use allowed only through a variance
- Commercial use should be allowed in some areas but usage type should be restricted (e.g. no bars/night clubs)
- Need more information
- Some increase in density makes sense near transit stops, but any change in zoning should be in a defined area with the permission of ALL residents in that area.
- With Aggie Square coming, there will already be an expansion of some commercial activities. UC Davis is building a massive parking structure on 48th and V which is obstructing light to this area. The UCD developments should be considered within the context of also increasing density in Elmhurst.
- Develop former commercial lots with multi-family dwellings.
- If increased density is mandated then there should be mandated services allowed such as grocery stores and drug stores
- Elmhurst is a very small neighborhood
- No commercial businesses not facing Stockton Blvd
- Elmhurst would not benefit from greater population density and higher traffic.
- Commercial businesses increase traffic and walking and biking will be less safe for children
- We need some traditional neighborhoods to remain in Sacramento! especially ones with History. When the mayor made the ridiculous comment that everyone should be able to afford to live in Land Park I was shocked and alarmed. There is nothing wrong with keeping some of the beautiful areas our City is known for the way they are!
- I think some local businesses would be good for the neighborhood, but I'd want that zoning to be more strict than housing.
- Nearby empty lots on Stockton and Broadway for commercial
- Not sure the magic ratio here but some not all. Offices and food would be preferable.
- I would want to know the details of such proposals but am not against a few small businesses e.g. Cottage Market
- If allow any changes, would allow UC Davis to encroach / take over neighborhood with offices.
- Any unit should be able to have commercial on the ground floor and residential all subsequent stories.
- I appreciate the proximity of Cottage Mart and Starbucks and depending on location, would be fine with additional mixed use small businesses opening in the neighborhood.
- Generally not in favor but would be willing to consider on a case by case basis.
- Elmhurst is small enough.
- Once again, we live next to the city center. It would be crazy not to have a few small offices and business in the neighborhood. I mean, are we acting like we don't all see the giant hospital that grows exponentially every year?
- Could be very a positive development.
- It's pretty inconsistent to oppose the realtor trying to open shop literally across the street from a literal shop
- We have business zones on Folsom and Broadway. Why would we need or want or condone businesses in our quiet, beautiful, hood? NO. NO BUSINESSES HERE.
- Elmhurst is better as an all R-1 zone. Just as you don't want an auto-body shop in the middle of a farmer's market or expressway between El Capitan and Half Dome, you don't want new commercial and office properties within Elmhurst's R-1 zone.

Question 6, continued

- Would be wonderful to have a few additional local cafes or shops to support, or patronize while out on walks in the neighborhood.
- I consider DMV, UCDCM, CI&I, EDD all very good neighbors in our neighborhood and all of the businesses on Folsom Blvd. All commercial and Office use. It's enough. Why cram more concrete foundations and reduce our beautiful trees that have just been annihilated by the new "sound wall". The Elmhurst neighborhood has become a real boon for construction and tearing our neighborhood DOWN! Please count the trees already taken from us. Long term residents know many of the residents who planted some of the trees pummeled for a concrete wall.
- See previous
- I think complementary mixed-use zoning would suit our neighborhood well.
- What businesses would actually benefit the neighborhood? Are we hoping to turn Elmhurst into Midtown 2.0? • Should I rent my house out to a law firm or medical professional?

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).

#	%	Responses (325 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
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. (Included in comments below)
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/Other: 44 responses

- City Council seems to be pushing rezoning through without public input, assuming that the public will apply the changes, and they know what is best. (X 2)
- Most people can't be bothered (X 2)
- There is currently too much public input allowed in land use decisions.
- Our council representatives seem easily swayed by outside opinions.
- I wish that residents in a wider radius could give input. For example, GIO will greatly change my commute time and traffic in my neighborhood, but I don't live close to the property so was never asked to give input.
- I think there is opportunity, but I am not sure that all neighbors know how to participate.
- Money is the incentive, not soul of our area.
- I am concerned about a vocal minority speaking for our ENTIRE neighborhood as a whole when the overall process (at the city and also within ENA) are not very easily accessible.
- The Sac decision making process is biased on the side of developers.
- I believe the council has made up their minds with or without public input.
- Public input is of no consequence. They pretend, then they do what they want!
- Public input vs developers' demands is a false dichotomy. We don't want garish brutalist or modern architecture in Elmhurst, but handsome old-style brick apartment buildings would be fabulous.
- The city should inform me personally about any changes affecting my property and take my opinion into account.
- I don't think public input matters as much as developer influence.
- I don't believe the city council cares about the public input.
- I think wealthy incumbent interests exercise outsized power. People who have lived in Elmhurst for 20+ years believe -- in shockingly anti-democratic fashion -- that their voices count more. I mean, may I be honest? Send someone to the homeless encampments under I-50, ask the residents there what they think should be done about housing on Elmhurst. Oh? Oh? That seems too hard? Well, then, you a pretty good sense of how unrepresentative this survey is.
- Lack of trust – Too often minds are made up.
- Negative and uninformed opinions tend to dominate and reflect the entire neighborhood in a bad light. Makes constructive opinions hard to get traction
- Planning Department decisions are not transparent and planners are often not vested in community health or neighborhood impacts when they make decisions.
- If this does pass no matter what residents think I will be livid.
- Corner stores and cafes are important for communities.
- The city acts only in its own interest and to please businesses like UC Davis. The city doesn't care what we want for our neighborhood. They want to make lobbyists happy.

Question 7, continued

- I do not feel confident that the public's opinions and concerns are taken into account at all in decisions in Sacramento. Arco arena should never have been placed where it is. There were so many other choices that would have benefited downtown and Sacramentans more. They have blown many opportunities to make our downtown special without handing

it over to the developers and letting it be taken away from those of us who have lived here all our lives. Its been turned into a traffic gridlock mess--a place where only visitors, bay area implants and very young people want to go. I dread going there anymore and I grew up working and shopping there and loving it. Please let us keep Elmhurst.

- These lengthy questions are inaccessible to those with learning disabilities or issues like ADHD.
- I don't feel like our voices are being heard, that they already made up their mind because of increased revenue for the city
- While citizens might be able to provide input, we don't feel like the city is listening to our concerns.
- I feel voices can be heard but city doesn't truly consider residents feedback. More concerned with profits.
- Elmhurst has been encroached upon MULTIPLE times (by UC Med Center / related businesses). We keep having to fight off this overstepping by non-residential elements - we're already "book-ended" by duplexes and now the GIO high rise apts!
- Public input is asked only when most or all of plan has happened . Neighbors are usually surprised when awareness of said plan occurstoo late . Special interest , lobbying has already happened .
- I participated in the GP 2040 surveys. It was broadly shared through council member Guerra's office. So important for people to pay attention to the Future of their communities
- As per Elmhurst's previous experience with the "city" regarding a proposed real estate business on 51st. and Vst., and 532 signatures on a petition against it, it was just a dog and pony show. What we had to say was of no consequence to the city council. The person wanting to do this is a good "friend" of the city, and we got the song and dance about how much money this person had already spent on the property. That was his choice before the fact, before we even had the chance to make our voices heard! This should be voted on by the people of this city!
- The city's website is vague and presents a rosy image of the outcome of these changes. I feel it is deceptive and unclear as to the real intended purpose. The homeless people living under the freeway will not be helped by this.
- If you want to be a part, and have time, there is opportunity to engage. It is not always the easiest process, and will require time, but the opportunity is there. Here I am being a part right now.
- Good job.
- I am concerned about process, but I am also concerned about "not in my backyard" obstructionism.
- I believe there is some opportunity to provide input (occasionally I will see a public notice posted on a property). I do not know what the effect the input really has in the decision process.
- The current public process is difficult to find out about, almost impossible to influence or have any real input. It seems very clear to me that the City Council & Mayor have made up their minds. I only found out about all this accidentally, and most people in this neighborhood were still unaware of what was happening until very recently.
- I like that you are doing the survey, but don't feel I have expertise to predict all of the possible consequences of the change in zoning. I don't think many other residents do either.
- I had a hell of a time trying to find information about the zoning changes on the city's website. Since it has garnered so much interest, the city should build a webpage - linked prominently on the general plan website page - that includes the relevant docs and explains the proposal.
- I feel that the city is going to do whatever they want regardless of public opinion.
- The district representatives actually listen to the majority constituents

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

#	%	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. (Included in Comments below.)
327		Total responses (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments/Other: 41 responses

- Visually similar and compatible are not the same (X 2)
- Possibly incentives that encourage some design consistency (X 2)
- Diversity of style is cool, but architectural review should be conducted to screen for inappropriate uses or nuisances.
- I not concerned with the aesthetic of individual houses, but of how those houses may alter those around them: their height, number of residences, and resulting impacts on living in this neighborhood (e.g. street parking). I do not know whether these concerns do or do not fall within Sacramento’s architectural review standards.
- Would help to minimize negative visual impact.
- There are some areas this is appropriate. I do not feel Elmhurst is one of them.
- This is covered in the design guidelines, but not enforceable/at discretion of planner
- We do not live in a cookie cutter neighborhood. No homes look the same. This is an asset.
- I mean, in the hands of wealthy, fearful white people, we all know how aesthetic standards for architecture will be used. It will be used to keep out high density housing.
- The diversity of architectural styles is what gives older neighborhoods their charm over the visual monotony of the suburbs
- I like the variety of styles in our area
- Let’s take pride in the architectural era homes and make sure new buildings fit this aesthetic
- There is a wide variety of styles and eras in our neighborhood,
- This is always puzzling to me. I had to go through a review on the design of my home when I did a major remodel, and it isn't flagged as a historic building?
- By all means in Historic neighborhoods!!! That's what gives Sacramento character
- Neighborhoods are enhanced when new structures are similar to existing structures.
- Seriously? I'd rather have unique houses, which contribute to the neighborhood charm. Cookie-cutter shit belongs in places like Elk Grove.
- The huge under utilized building on Stockton and Mack show the need for architecture review.
- Not happening now and huge boxes are being built
- Architectural review is one more process that’s been used to increase the cost of new housing and ban beneficial items such as solar panels.
- Homeowners already do what they want. It would be nice to have visually appealing homes and standards.
- I can see there are times oversight might be useful but I think Elmhurst is delightful just as mixed up as it currently is.
- This is where we have diversity in the structures.
- Many other jurisdictions allow local Architectural Review Commissions to help new development fit into established neighborhoods.
- I made a point of buying a house in a neighborhood that does not have HOAs or other strict mechanisms to limit what people can do with their own property. There are already a wide variety of housing styles in Elmhurst and I trust that existing and future homeowners will make good choices. I don't need the right to veto someone else's taste.
- We have enough new ugly houses
- The images provided by the city as examples of multi unit residences are deceptive. They are decades old structures and no new construction ever looks like that. I bought a home in an old neighborhood because of how it looks and the character. I do not want to live in a new suburb.

Question 8, continued

- I am all for saving historical homes and structures. I am smitten with our 1922 craftsman, I am a happy member of the historical preservation society and daughter of an Historian. But, I also am concerned when we try to tell people how to build their homes and spaces. The reasons these homes look the way they do is because of the style of the time. Times do change, as do styles. I would think that we would want to embrace all types of architecture, just as Sacramento always has. We have an extremely varied architectural footprint throughout the city and seeing it flourish is another part of what makes this city great. I don't really care for some homes, home colors and landscape choices but it is not my home. There are a bevy of planned communities with HOA's and CCR's that would be better suited for an individual who would like an homogenized neighborhood.
- I've seen Architectural Review Commissions work very well for neighborhoods in other cities. We should have one for Elmhurst.
- Multi-unit builds need to fit into the neighbourhoods. Proper regulation can ensure that other neighbours comfort and properties and are not harmed by selfish builds.
- I would like to keep the general appearance of the neighborhood, but not so rigidly that new styles cannot appear. What I most object to is the lack of the ability for a direct neighbor to object to something being built Nextdoor. The proposed plan allows general City Staff to sign off on a proposed build with no oversight as long as no exception is requested. Who knows what these employees, whom we must assume will come and go like any group of workers, think looks good? What written standards must they follow? The neighbor might not even find out until construction starts; then they have to pay a onerous sum of \$1000 to file a complaint or request a review. This is ridiculous, and burdensome for everyone except the builder. Justin suggested the NA should be able to appeal for free, which is great for any neighborhood with a strong NA, but that is not true for all neighborhoods. What do those with a weak NA do? Just grin & bear it?
- Even with architectural review the results will be a failure.
- If one wants to live in a place where uniformity is prized above all else, one should go live in Campus Commons or Gold River or Stanford Ranch. Elmhurst has homes built in EVERY single decade of the past 100 years. I like the diversity.
- If it's a meaningful review. If is a costly hoop to jump through and it's very subjective, maybe not
- I like our neighborhood's homes, but they are mostly pretty old and I don't think new ones need to look the same.
- There are other developments that have structures that look similar for those that desire that look.
- These houses were thrown up as quickly/cheaply as possible in the postwar boom. There's no need to match that style for new construction.
- If you want conformity go live with gates and CC&Rs ! It's a century late for Elmhurst.

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.)

#	%	Responses (326 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
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. (Included in Comments below.)
326		Total responses (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments/Other: 34 responses

- No opinion unless they get rid of ‘permit parking only’ in my neighborhood.
 - There should be on-street maximums per property.
 - Somewhere between one space to a unit, and the number of bedrooms.
 - Residential on-site parking should be provided, but that requirement could be less than one-to-one per unit. E.G. 1 space for every 2 units.
 - If you’re going to get rid of the parking requirement, you need to have non-motor vehicle infrastructure – onsite showers, secure bike storage, e-scooter charging stations/locations.
 - Leave nothing to the developer. They will not do the right thing
 - There should be different requirements based on the size of the apartment. Homes and apartments should require at least one space. Big apartment complexes should require garages, not lots.
 - Let’s get people out of cars!
 - Residential parking requirements should be determined site-specific.
 - This question assumes that commercial properties will be permitted.
 - I see no need to cater to cars. If you want to own a car, you *should* be made to suffer, every time you look to park your eco-beast.
 - If larger apartments are built with no parking, residents should not be able to get residential parking stickers. They should be notified that no parking is available before moving in
 - THE UCD medical center already consumes much of Elmhurst's street parking.
- I think more commercial properties would reduce quality of life in Elmhurst. We have a commercial area nearby on Folsom.
- You should note that the first residential on-site parking space on any given lot eliminates a street parking space as well.
 - I want to be able to park in front of my house like I have been always
 - Trader Joes is a prime example of these commercial spaces not having enough parking. Traffic on Folsom Blvd. is ridiculous.
 - Street parking is already a problem!
 - A 6 unit complex would have at least 6 cars. Also, 12-18 cans on trash day.
 - If left to homeowners or commercial owners this will be abused
 - We have got to move away from car-centered culture to achieve climate goals. I'm good with incentives that push us more in that direction.
 - Not sure about the current requirements for commercial and office parking.
 - This would mean UCD could overrun the neighborhood
 - Unique neighborhood parking regulations protecting residents need to be upgraded and enforced.

Question 9, continued

- Some people don't need parking. Some people ride bikes, walk and take public transport. Some people are differently abled and can't drive. Maybe not buying a car can leave money for buying a home. As mentioned before, I work at our local Trader Joe's, parking is the main bone of contention on any given day. But the thing is, we have been there for 16 years, nothing has changed. It is not going to change. Yet, somehow people find the wherewithal, to muster the courage, to grin and bear it for their favorite friendly, and affordable grocery store. It is not ideal, but living in the city center has other benefits, there will always be trade-offs. We are at the gates city center, one of the first neighborhoods to be built. Folsom Blvd, turns into Capitol ave in less than 2 miles. T street is a main thoroughfare from Downtown to Elmhurst. This is not suburbia. Stop with the parking already!
- More bikes!
- There is not enough support currently planned for the goals of increased electric vehicle usage or mass transit at multiple levels of government.
- Parking is already impacted by residents lending or renting their visitor permits to Med Center employees. Med Center charges too much and Elmhurst is impacted.
- The quality of life in our neighborhoods should be preserved. We do NOT want to become another San Francisco where residents cannot even find parking!
- The City council seems to think residents are going to magically decide to not need cars in the future. Magical thinking is helping no one. Cars are still a reality and will continue to be so for a while. Frankly as someone who grew up in a city with actually good public transit, Sacramento is sadly lacking in meaningful public transit. I find it hard to believe anyone would take it, unless they had no other option. The City seems to think having buses running every 20 minutes on one of their major routes is a great improvement. Are they kidding? That's a ridiculous amount of time to have to build into every travel scenario, even before you count in all the time required to get to your actual destination. Light rail hardly serves any part of the City. It's great if you live along it and only ever want to go downtown. Even there, it only covers a pitifully small percentage of the downtown area. Get real. To have useable public transit, it needs to run reliably every 10 minutes on major routes, and every 15 minutes otherwise. Having light rail go in basically 2 straight lines, still mostly requires a car or one or more buses to get where you're going at the other end. As our population ages, how do you expect them to carry purchases long ways on foot? Should they plan on an exhausting 4 hour round trip every time they need to leave their neighborhood? Would you want your parents to have to do that? (Wow, glad to get that off my chest!).
- Cottage mart has no parking and it's fine. For residences. maybe it could be to provide half the parking, like one space per two units. Lots of people already park on the street, so I don't think that new house needs to include all the parking
- I'm in favor of building a society that doesn't give so much space to cars and I'm willing to give up some convenience to do it.
- The question is confusing--is this a paid parking lot or parking for a commercial use lot?

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 Freeport 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.)

#	%	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 (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments/Other: 45 responses

- City should first improve public transportation. (X 2)
- I want the safest way for cyclists but I don't know what that is.
- People need to learn to use alternative modes of transportation to do our part to reduce climate change.
- This question was confusing. I'm in agreement IF it produces bike lanes but not if only to gain Parking spaces
- I'm for bus and bike lanes but it doesn't discourage travel. It encourages parking in side streets. There's still a societal expectation of driving and that won't change from lane reduction.
- Isn't Folsom already a restricted boulevard to one lane per side in areas that run adjacent to Elmhurst? I don't see a problem here.
- So you want to add more people to neighborhoods and then reduce the number of lanes... Smh
- Mixed opinion. The relatively recent changes to Folsom Blvd from 4 lanes to 2 with a suicide lane and bike lanes has actually improved traffic flow. The reduced lanes pushed more traffic to the freeway and the suicide lane alleviated the left lanes from coming to abrupt halts. However, there are much better streets for cycling and I would never use those bike lanes. There is not enough parking near the businesses on Folsom Blvd, such as around 48th Street. If parking is further restricted on Folsom, it will only push cars further into the residential areas to find parking, which is not wanted. While I have not read the draft 2040 General Plan, I am concerned that its overarching proposals will not contain the proper nuance.
- Again, you can't just take away infrastructure and not provide an alternative to fit the need. Protected bike lanes, pedestrian amenities, parking for carshare services, etc. will be needed.
- Other cities constrict free public parking structures, and we should, too.
- Until better, more accessible, more frequent public transport is available,
- Need more information
- Want more info
- Need to make more roads safer for bikes!
- RT is not safe, especially older citizens and women
- Answers are slanted with negative bias. Instead of No Problem, what about Support?
- Plan should ensure sufficient public transport.
- I'm not sure how lane reduction could be done in Elmhurst.
- Riding a bike in this town is dangerous.
- I don't think this will be an issue as long as this is intended for bike lanes or bus only lanes to offer cleaner mobility options.
- I think I would have to hear the potential impacts or results of other areas it went well for
- Limited lanes will not increase the use of mass transit. Are you kidding?
- Less density means less cars. Overbuilding and reducing car lanes and parking will make people drive where they can park. Cars are needed to carry groceries and packages.

Question 10, continued

- To take away a whole lane downtown (which is a horrible mess already) and dedicate it to the considerably smaller proportion of people who are able to bike to their appointments and work downtown is unfair to those of us who cannot bike and restricts us from being able to enjoy downtown. We have more people; we need to keep at least as many of our traffic lanes as we have to accommodate them. They have cars. to think they wont drive is wishful thinking and makes everybody miserable. J street is a horrible mess. One of the very few streets that actually goes across town was taken away from us to give to a few bikers. Busses can share our current lanes.
 - I like bike lanes, but don't like increased traffic
 - Bike lanes need to be on right side of a one-way street. That is where car drivers will be expecting them. Also, goes with "Slow traffic keep right". If rider has a mirror, it is apt to be for viewing traffic on the left side.
 - If parking is to be restricted, then a public transportation option needs to be provided. Make it safe for me to ride my bike if you want me to not drive.
 - Not only will this make it safer for biking, it will also make walking on these streets safer as well.
 - This is a good idea. We should pursue this vigorously.
 - I don't know enough about the details of this plan to give opinion or comment.
 - Until better, more frequent, more accessible public transport is available, cutting lanes/parking doesn't make sense. I had to drive to work (and pay exorbitant parking fees) when I wanted to take a bus, but the schedule was impossible and the bus skipped the stops I tried to use. The Metro didn't go where I worked.
 - Strongly support, as long as bike and public transit are a focus of the plan.
 - Parking is horrible as it is. Why make it worse?
 - Reducing vehicle traffic flow is a coercive approach instead of providing real solutions
 - As far as I can tell, the SBDP study has taken into account the amts of traffic along Stockton (pre-COVID). Unlike the 2040 GP update, the SBDP has actually done a great deal of research with actual real #'s for traffic. They do predict an increase in transit time if one were to drive the entire 4 miles of the re-imagined corridor, but consider it to be within acceptable amts. (2 mins+ most places, up to 3-4 mins+ in one stretch). On the other hand they have the first real suggestion I've heard to make public transit more palatable, ie decreasing bus transit times. Also the combined & separated bus & bikes lanes are a huge improvement for cyclists, while I think it is reasonable to suspect UCD will have an increased #of cyclists as conditions improve. So I am on board with the SBDP traffic/lane changes, which they have discussed in detail in the meetings. It is also possible that we will have a honeymoon period of reduced car traffic from COVID-19, with more people working from home.
 - We need more bike lanes, especially protected ones, and better flow for public transit. We need to get cars off the street by disincentivizing driving and incentivizing other transportation.
 - I LOVE THIS!!!! Realistically, the roads in Elmhurst are not going to be torn up and narrowed (though I can dream...) If they are repainted to include more bike lanes I would be thrilled.
 - It is a fact you can't get CA residents out or give up their vehicles. Sac also need to improve their alternative transportation plan. Getting around inn public transit is impossible and not convenient
- Stockton Boulevard is already a congested mess of traffic. Those who are proposing a reduction in lanes, and an increase in traffic, probably never drive on Stockton anyway, so they don't care.
- I don't understand the push to restrict car lanes and parking before the city establishes a better public transportation system. Although there is a bus stop on T street, I have never seen a bus come through. How are people supposed to grocery shop without driving, if there is no public transportation to drive them home with all their groceries?

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.)

#	%	Responses (329 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
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. (Included in Comments below.)

Comments/Other: 34 responses

- Natural gas aggravates asthma and chronic lung disease (X 3)
- Sounds good but need to know more (X 2)
- Major improvements need to be made in the electric grid before going all electric
- I prefer to use gas for cooking - don't take that away from me!!
- Large electric appliances are inefficient and reduce the quality of life, this is why they are not electric to begin with, and only are when forced to or incentivized!
- Oppose mandatory elimination of gas in single family homes but support financial incentives for all to do so.
- Yes. Everyone in America should immediately have to make sacrifices, including financial sacrifices, in order to achieve carbon neutrality.
- Should have option to add gas lines for any building for aesthetics/lifestyle
- Again. This doesn't provide for support or mention the environmental and safety benefits
- We do not live in the Dark Ages and need to be part of the solution, not a community of NIMBY's.
- Look to recent Texas winter and no electricity as an example of why not.
- I enthusiastically support this proposal, particularly with the subsidies for those with lower income. Electric appliances are safer, more energy efficient, and have a smaller carbon footprint.
- CA has recently demonstrated it can not keep up with current electrical demand, and all electric energy is not green at this point. If my power goes out I can still have hot water and heat from gas appliances. If we do go all electric everything (power lines) should be underground.
- Need much better policies and infrastructure to accommodate distributed energy such as the solar on all homes/construction that will be required. Clean Energy is essential - but well designed planning that incorporates 'health in all policies' is also essential. So far SMUD is not adequately considering health in its programs, such as peak usage cost increases.
- How do they plan to address the high electric rates from 5-8 p.m. when most people will need to use electricity to prepare meals for themselves/their families etc; maybe bathe their children, and in the summer that is the peak time for a/c use.
- Don't overburden developers and builders with a lot of new requirements. Make them use the money to pay for parking and areas for people to get away from the chaos of an overpopulated city.
- We utilized the SMUD discounts, but it was all very expensive, but the new electric water heater was free.
- I'm a renter and my gas bill is really high in the winter. It would be nice if the landlord had to replace with electric , when it fails. He has the money.
- Just where do people think this "electricity" will come from, solar and wind? No sun, no wind, no power!! No heat, no cooking, no hot water, no clothes drying, I already hang my clothes outside in the summer, but, what if you don't have the capacity to hang clothes outside, no charging your car, or devices, no fans no air conditioning. They don't want you to build a fire for heat, or cooking, too much pollution! Just sayin'.

Question 11, continued

- Natural gas is a hideously dangerous source of energy. I had a family member who was murdered by PG&E due to a natural gas line explosion. It's absolutely ridiculous to think that we would allow explosives to be constructed in a pipeline network underneath our homes.
- Electricity must be generated somehow and cannot be efficiently stored, even in toxic batteries. Therefore all electric households increase the demand on electricity, often when it is in short supply from renewables.
- Support more moderate density housing (e.g. 3-4 plex) but would like to see incentives to use mass transit. Also expand parking restrictions to prevent UCD employees from street parking outside residences.
- These changes are not clear. Without more information, "financial incentives" leave too much room for abuse and manipulation. Who would be responsible for creating these financial incentives? And would these financial incentives even be enough to truly help low income diverse individuals to be able to afford the expenses?
- I hate cooking on electric stoves.
- Natural gas is dangerous and injurious to our health and should be phased out totally for all new construction.
- Electric fireplaces are bogus. Gas are pretty and warm.
- I am in love with my gas stove, but understand the need to convert to a more sustainable energy source. California is a world leader when it comes to codes, regs and standards. I can't argue with science.
- Offer options to electric i.e. solar
- It is hard to imagine absolutely no gas. Perhaps it is the future, but it seems hard to force people when it comes to heat, cooking, and hot water.

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.)

#	%	Responses (329 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
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. (Included in Comments below.)
17	5.2%	Not sure or no opinion.
13	4%	No mitigation is necessary

Comments/Other: 45 responses

- Provide on more on campus housing (X 2)
- Don't allow employee on street parking
- Please improve of the west side of the intersection of T and Stockton Blvd. Ban non-resident street parking 7 days a week to prevent the employees from parking in the neighborhood.
- MITIGATION IS MANDATORY IN MY VIEW!!!!
- Provide enough new parking to accommodate the influx of employees.
- More parking structures for those people as well
- Working on improving walking/biking access to and through its property
- Make sure locals can still park in the neighborhood
- Allow free parking to employees so they don't have to park in the neighborhood. Why do they charge for parking anyways?? Makes no sense.
- Provide double parking
- Continue with permit only parking and expand to all impacted Elmhurst streets
- Privacy landscaping should be used to benefit neighborhood residents
- MUST put in legal mandates that private companies implement and abide by good neighbor policies and NOT take over low SES neighborhoods.
- The project should include additional housing. The current number of units proposed is much less than the number of new jobs, meaning that all those new employees will be increasing demand for nearby housing, which will drive rent and housing costs up.
- Build housing for the new employees into those new structures, and make the rent income based. If owned, cap the appreciation that the owner receives (UC Davis professor housing model)
- Any new development should be multiuse – with commercial below and residential above.
- Provide for employee parking
- Add speed bumps on T street to discourage speeding by commuters
- Plant lots of trees
- Provide free on-site parking for employees so they don't take up all the on-street parking as they tend to do now.
- Free on-site parking for their employees
- Allow employees flexible schedules to allow working from home.
- Make certain roads in the neighborhood limited to pedestrian/local traffic
- Currently UCD employees park on streets instead of in their parking structure and walk to work causing too much on street parking just outside the area-that requires parking permits. On V street at 52 and 53rd are a good example.

Question 12, continued

- They should provide job training so local people can work there.
- The UCDCM employees who park in Elmhurst will only increase. This is already a huge problem, and adding thousands more employees will negatively impact the neighborhood.
- Have housing solution in place prior to building expansions. Not disturb the neighborhoods around UCDCM - they are pushing existing homeowner out!
- I think it is the city's responsibility to add more cycling and walking options, which I wish would include replacing car lanes on Stockton Boulevard with bike and bus lanes, and allowing bikes & pedestrians to enter UCDCM at 2nd Ave.
- Don't worry about displacement. It is unnatural for there not to be displacement.
- Conversations mandatory that this is a much loved and long lived in area for residents. RESPECT ELMHURST.
move the helipad to reduce neighborhood noise, and do not add more helipads
- UCDCM refers to the Medical Center. The entire campus is now referred to as UC Davis Health and includes the Med Center, School of Medicine, School of Nursing
- There MUST be city and UC policies to protect African American and racial minority residents of Oak Park from being displaced.
- No parking in Elmhurst neighborhood. Ensure access to UC Davis is via Stockton Boulevard and Broadway, discourage drive through traffic in Elmhurst neighborhood
- UCDCM cannot provide assurances that individuals in adjacent neighborhoods would not be displaced :)
- Access must be restricted to the current commercial corridors of Broadway and Stockton Blvd.
- Move the helipad to reduce neighborhood noise, and do not add more helipads
- Allow for on site parking
- They should build student and employee housing on campus. Or if they build off campus - provide a transport to campus to reduce cars.
- Med Center again needs to take care of its employees in ways that don't harm its neighbors.
- More parking for their employees
- This is a world class facility. We are lucky to have it in our city.
- Traffic circles, dead ends, like Berkeley alternate freeway access etc for neighborhoods impacted
- This gentrification project seems more harmful to existing communities, and will increase traffic in the Elmhurst neighborhood. If I get hit by a car at a crosswalk one more time, I'm going to lose it.
- Increased traffic is a concern. There definitely needs to be very strong planning for transport and traffic flow.

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/Other: 31 responses

- I assume you meant increased illegal street parking in Elmhurst
- Construction noise and pollution
- Employees from UCD smoking and leaving cigarette butts on V St is a problem as is litter on V from the hospital (example masks and gloves). The water tower is an eyesore and should be painted or have a mural.
- Too many Med Center employees are already parking in the neighborhood, I would like to see less of that, not more.
- If they are adding several thousand new employees then they need to add several thousand employee parking spots located somewhere where they will be safely accessed by female employees walking at night.
- Maintaining character of neighborhood
- Increases Police coverage needed by both City and UCDCM for Aggie Square
- Relocate hospital and campus to a more open location - develop affordable housing in place of hospital
- If Aggie Square creates pressure for denser housing in Elmhurst, I think that Elmhurst should densify in order to make life here even better.
- Density is good.
- Some of the things listed as potential concerns here, I see as benefits - such as development along V Street
- Proposed New Hospital - 45th & V; New parking structure 48th & V. WE need assurance that V street WILL NOT BE the entrance and/or exit to these new buildings. "T" Street is already beyond its capacity as a funnel to UCD complex. And yet, as a homeowner, I could not get speed bumps along 42-45th to slow vehicles down. After that failed, tried to locate a stop sign at 45th & T. City Transportation regulations makes it insanely difficult to maneuver an acceptable approach to accomplish this.
- WE NEED TO CLOSE 49th STREET AT V STREET!!!
- Would rather see Aggie Square development than a zoning change for Elmhurst & other neighborhoods.
- UCD Med Center is perhaps the greatest asset to the property values in Elmhurst. Fighting against UCD expansion not only is against neighborhood interests but would only push parking and traffic into Tahoe Park & Oak Park.
- We should only allow for walkable neighborhoods with mixed use development.
- Increased pollution; air, noise, crime and neighborhood will be impacted significantly
- In favor of Aggie Square development and all the benefits it will bring to the neighborhood.
- Increased traffic speeds on T street
- I'm very concerned about eminent domain issues. Many people's savings are in their homes, and lots of people lost lots of money they couldn't afford to lose in the past because they were most definitely not always given fair market value for their homes. This isn't right.
- Access between freeways and Aggie sq.
- Not sure what is meant by development on V? Is it an ugly parking structure then yes but a nice building with trees ok

Question 13, continued

- An 18 story tower would block the sky and invade privacy. It should be set back from the street and have trees as a buffer to V.
- UCDMC has historically not been a good neighbor. The helipad, lights, and traffic (until they finally closed most of the Elmhurst entrances, except poor 48th and 51st) have made me wish I could move.
- We don't need or want high-rise development in Elmhurst, the traffic and parking impact will be bad for the neighborhood.
- The bias in this questionnaire is really very impressive. I get it. You all, the authors of this survey, are trying VERY hard to appear neutral. But whoever drafted these questions opposes density, opposes change, favors the whining NIMBYism of this little suburb over the desperate and immediate need of California to build housing everywhere, at every price point, in every city. That means Elmhurst must change. And I can taste already the misuse to which this biased survey will be put.
- Insist UCDMC have parking for their employees
- Think of all the wonderful opportunities this can provide and prepare for the negative impacts before they occur. City planning is not easy, not glamorous and contentious, but necessary. Thank you for the opportunity to have the neighborhood be a part of the conversation.

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 (Out of 332 surveys submitted.)

Comments: 69 responses

- Sacramento has very few parking enforcement officers so many non-residents park all day long without penalties in Elmhurst
- Currently
- Very concerned if these proposals go through but not currently concerned.
- Residential parking restrictions should continue
- I'm basically happy with the residential parking system currently in place
- UCD employees park in front of my house for 12 hr shifts. Often block driveway.
- UCDCM staff parking on V St after permitting zone ends (after 52nd St.)
- Again, too many Med Center employees park here.
- UCD employees avoid paying parking fees by parking in our neighborhood and walking 4 blocks to work.
- Many smaller streets are continuously used as parking spots effectively eliminating two-way traffic. Great example -- 51st between T and Folsom.
- I personally petitioned the city to change parking on my street, 45th between S & T from 2-hour M-F to 2-hour 24/7. I tried to get them to change it to "no parking anytime without permit" but they refused. They claimed their study of our street did not qualify for no parking anytime. Yet, many of my neighbors have to park several houses away or even on the next street. I watch the same UCDCM employees rotate their cars, and each others, all day long around the 45/46/S/T streets loop. The city also is not supportive of enforcing the 2-hour limit. Their shift changes seem to interrupt the return of parking enforcement and lead to fewer tickets. For example: I will report a parking violation, an officer will come and make note of the vehicle, no one will ever return to issue a citation. I will call and they tell me they had a shift change or it was too late in the day to come back to cite.
- Ideally each home should have a functioning garage to mitigate parking. But the reality is the street is public and I can't control who parks in front of my house. My current neighbor across the street is a one person household but has not less than 4-6 cars parked. As a result our guest can never park in front of our house. Is it an inconvenience, yes but he's not breaking any rules so there's no point in making a fuss.
- UCDCM people park by Coloma Center everyday and walk to work... no patrol lately since COVID
- A lot of parking is on the streets which makes it harder to navigate the neighborhood.
- Increase traffic and pollution. Noise
- 99/100 times I've been able to park directly in front of my house.
- I have a driveway
- If I am concerned, it is because I see UCDCM employees being ticketed for parking on blocks where there are no other cars around. Flies in the face of the "we love you UCDCM heroes" signs to ticket them for parking here. I wish the City would stop enforcing these parking restrictions, particularly during the pandemic. I welcome the employees to park in front of our house.
- UCDCM employees block my driveway and feel they have the right to do so. I have gotten into arguments with them.
- Not concerned in my block but Elmhurst in general. I know the community center is a parking lot for UCD workers.
- Med center employees are already clogging narrow neighborhood streets leaving some streets with no where for residents to park during the week and daylight hours
- UCD should be required to provide parking for ALL employees that work in the building on their campus. A lot of employees park in the neighborhood now but when the additional businesses move in our streets will be impacted and it will be harder for local residence to find parking or even put out the trash for pick up.
- We have the least street-parking pressure in Elmhurst compared to almost everywhere I have ever lived. I also don't live on V Street near the Med Center, though.

Question 14, continued

- When we moved here 15+ years ago, I championed residential permit parking in our area, due to the number of UCD employees parking in front of our homes. Now, they resort to the side streets and park willingly. This has to be changed to allow ONLY residents and visiting folks to park in OUR neighborhood. Period.
- UC Davis people crowd my neighborhood and just are rude
- Concern because of all the UC Davis employees who park on the streets have made it so votes have been taken to limit parking. This means elderly relatives and others have to park away and walk to our house since we only get one guest pass. Always worried visitors will get tickets.
- I do wish that it was enforced when Med Center employees park on U Street. We know they don't live here, and someone has sold them a permit. If there are going to be more people trying to do this, the penalty should be prohibitive.
- UC Davis employees using V street And 42nd St. As a handicapped parking lot
- I would like to protect my ability to park in front of my own property
- Concerned for others, as I live on a permit only street.
- My street (2nd Ave @ 51st) is not permitted and UCD workers often park on it- parking is VERY limited.
- It is not currently an issue where I live but I know other parts of Elmhurst experience parking issues.
- Enforcement of B permit time restrictions is lax - City needs to do better.
- UCDCM employees often park on V Street, which is not regularly patrolled by city parking enforcement, so why wouldn't they? Unpermitted vehicles are only ticketed if residents manually call 311 or use the 311 app. In addition, many UCDCM employees have obtained disability placards—which happen to be exceedingly easy to obtain—and are free to park legally on V Street at their pleasure. Residents living on V Street have extremely limited street parking available for their guests or visitors. The new UCDCM developments will only make a bad situation much worse.
- More concerned about the Semi's driving on residential streets - our streets weren't made to take that much weight and cannot hold up to the loads.
- See my comments on initial questions.
- In the neighborhood's current state, I am not concerned.
- We're far enough away from UCDCM that people don't park here
- Very important that any new units have additional off street parking. The parking issues vary greatly from street to street so would be helpful to retain neighborhood flexibility regarding regulating off street parking
- Parking enforcement seems to have completely disappeared
- I rent an apartment and I can only park on the street
- UC Davis employee parking on the street in Elmhurst neighborhood
- We have already seen a dramatic increase in parking on our street (52nd) and others. Medical workers and students should not be forced to pay monthly fees to park at their place of employment/education.
- Plenty of parking on T street
- I've lived the "parking nightmare" for years. It took years to be able to safely get out of my driveway due to cars parked on both sides of my driveway, and directly across the street! And I am not alone! Our streets are old and narrow. People will do what they are allowed to do. Unless you have lived it, you can't imagine what it is like! Cars are not the only issues. Dump bikes and scooters are "parked" anywhere, and everywhere!
- Multiple cars parking with cars registered to Elmhurst but not living here and use of handicap placards.
- Parking in Elmhurst wouldn't really be that big of a deal if we forced the UC Davis medical center to plant shade trees in their parking lots or to construct additional garages.
- UCD employees are constantly parking on 2nd Avenue for 12 hour shifts. I can't park in front of my own home.
- It already feels like UCD employees abuse residential parking along V street & surrounding streets, always activity dropping off people, deliveries and leaving trash, illegal turns etc.
- Plenty of parking for the most part. Yes some days you might need to walk another 30 seconds to get to your car....not a big deal
- Would like to see a focus on the use of public transit rather than the retention of parking.
- Parking is already difficult and too many cars are parked along the streets making already narrow streets difficult to navigate.
- There is more than enough parking in this neighborhood. We should be discouraging car use anyway.
- Current system should be kept. Homeowner has a "guest" parking card for visitor parking
- 12 people live in the house next door and the massive oil leaks have destroyed our parking areas. I'm now a staunch advocate for morning awareness.

Question 14, continued

- I park off street at night. Visitors park on street. I want them to be able to park in front or close to the house like they can now.
- I'm not as concerned about parking, per se, but the traffic that comes with it, the speeding, the littering, the running over our beloved turkeys and squirrels. In short, people who don't live here don't care about us, our animals, our children. They only care about getting a parking space on their break time and throwing their cigarette butts on our streets and lawns
- Any new construction should include off street parking!
- 42nd and T is the first free parking and 42nd is full on Saturdays and sometimes I have to park on T street which is resident only. Now the parking is continuing past the alley on Saturdays.
- Not a major problem now. Would be if new housing units were not required to have parking.
- Permit parking has been added to our block for residents only. Med center Employees continue to park on side streets and other residential streets in the neighborhood due to the high cost of parking for employees.
- However, I do agree that having permitted parking is welcome for areas close to the hospital.
- I am sick of hospital employees parking by my house and smoking weed, littering in my yard, and people blocking my driveway and garage. I wouldn't have as much of a problem if they were more respectful of my space.
- Street parking narrows roads and reduces visibility. I see many broken side mirrors and worry about young kids who cars may not see.

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 (Please specify in comments box.)	11	19.6%	6	10.7%	2	3.6%	37	66.1%	56

Comments/Other:18 responses

- Existing multifamily units on V including what appear to be group homes have a lot of cars on the street
- The lack of parking at Starbucks is an example of the issues presented in the neighborhood. During the morning commute customers park anywhere without regard for red zones or no parking without permit.
- UCDMC employees and a huge problem, not only do they take up parking from residence, they have little to no regard for the neighborhood. They dump their ashtrays on the street, leave food waste, end even biohazard like surgical booties, gloves, etc.
- I would prefer that the entire neighborhood be converted to "no parking anytime without permit" because as soon as one street changes to that restriction, the UCDMC employees simply start parking on the next closest street. As more and more streets have these limitations, the few streets left without them become overwhelmed and congested. 45th between S & T is one example of a street where UCDMC employees have more vehicles on the street than residence do.
- Please help change the parking to "no parking anytime without permit"
- Parking for guests is still an issue if not enough passes or is in a restricted location.
- Gio has a giant parking garage already seems dumb not to use it to capacity and offer spots to ucd folks who can then walk. Gio residents take up street parking a lot and they shouldn't need to
- I don't care about parking. People make it work in much denser neighborhoods than Elmhurst. We currently have a huge surplus of street parking on U St.
- Coloma visitors block my driveway and cuss at me when I call the police
- Low to moderate impact for rental scooters, bikes and Gig cars.
- More enforcement of parking restrictions that already exist.
- How much each of these will impact car use is an empirical question to which I do not know the answers. • However, what is clear is that making parking easy and low density housing creates greater use and need for cars. We should be investing in public transit infrastructure.
- UCD and their contractors make a huge profit and they should absorb the cost of parking for their employees, patients and patient visitors.
- UCDMC employees parking illegally (or legally with disability placards) is by far the largest impact on parking availability in Elmhurst.
- In it's current state, there are no parking issues in my immediate area; although, I see impacts on streets such as T and V.
- I see UC Davis Medical Center employees parking in our neighborhood even while UC Davis' parking lots are not full – this will continue to happen so long as UCD is not required to plant an adequate number of shade trees in their parking lots, or replace lots with garages.
- Already seeing GIO, Jump and other transportation parked on city streets. corners etc

Question 15, continued

- UC Davis has the ability to provide employee parking and Mass transit vouchers to employees as a benefit which would solve most of the parking issues.
- I feel like this is very street dependent but the permits have helped control a lot of these problems and most people have driveways
- It is important to discourage non-residents from using Elmhurst and in particular T Street as a thoroughfare/transit route and continue Residential Parking Permits program.
- I mean, you want fewer cars? TAX CARS.

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

#	%	Responses (324 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
159	49.1%	Very concerned
106	32.7%	Somewhat concerned
59	18.2%	Not concerned
0	0	Not sure or no opinion

Comments: 59 responses

- Non-residents drivers speed through the neighborhood and also some residents do too
- Currently
- Increased safety mechanisms like more speed bumps and measures to reduce speeding and not stopping at stop signs are a concern.
- Between 55-51 on V st. Speeding cars going 45+ mph. Would like speed bumps.
- Need better enforcement of traffic laws.
- Traffic is impeded by all-day street parking. I assume many of these are UCD med employees.
- Already 2nd Ave traffic has grown triple since moving here in 2014. Regardless on speed bumps cars and delivery vans speed down and use this and thorough fare. The noise of the commercial vehicles is disruptive. Almost been hit walking across V St and 51st. Riding my bike on 2nd st or Vst in dangerous in the morning or at 4:30-6 Pm. V st needs a bike lane.
- Cars drive too fast. UCDCM employees are hasty in parking, especially when they are moving their cars every two hours.
- Not only more congestion but vehicles drive way too fast for a neighborhood.
- Speeding on T St.
- The speed of travel is often exceeding the speed limit for a street with high walkers, biking and children about
- Will get even worse when parking structures (s) are complete and when the new hospital building goes up.
- Speeding in the morning, lunch and evening
- People drive really fast down major thoroughfares like T, 48th, and 51st.
- My only concern is with the number of drivers (neighbors included) who don't stop at stop signs.
- I'm only concerned with speed, not at all with quantity. Roads should be narrower in order to slow traffic.
- Additional traffic calming measures and more stop signs and speed bumps are needed.
- I live on 51st between U & T and it's like NASCAR during the day.
- Stop signs and speed limits are routinely ignored by drivers in the area particularly during shift changes at med center. I have voiced my concerns to SPD numerous times and have seen no improvement nor an increase in enforcement.
- More and more families with children are moving into the neighborhood. This is a good thing. If traffic increases as it will with the new proposals this will be dangerous for children.
- This is my main concern. We live near 51st and U and people drive way too fast down 51st either going to or coming from the Med Center. People also drive way too fast down T in both directions and it seems STOP signs are now optional!?
- I walk and ride my bike daily in my neighborhood and cars that are being driven like they are on the freeway is a daily occurrence.
- UC Davis workers are out of control. Something needs to be done.
- When the pandemic is under control and Gio is fully rented, I have concerns about the traffic on T as they head over to access grocery shopping etc. on Folsom.
- Speed and running of stop signs is very concerning.
- RUDE,DANGEROUS DRIVING ON T ST IS INCREASING MONTHLY.VERY STRESSFUL.PETS,PEOPLE IN HIGH RISK SITUATIONS DUE TO INCONSIDERATE DRIVERS.
- Not concerned, other than people who speed, but that doesn't relate to the number of cars.
- Trucks over 3 tons are restricted on 39th Street and trucks over 5 tons are restricted on T Street, with certain limited restrictions - City needs to enforce these requirements and they do not. Signage needs to improve. Google maps and other such services need to advised. Tree and property damage have resulted from big trucks + additional noise and vibration. Need more done here.

Question 16, continued

- We may need stop signs at all T type intersections, many drivers do not yield or slow
- The corner of 51st and V is a fairly busy intersection. I am concerned about it becoming even busier with the expanded UC Davis medical facilities.
- We need STOP signs on every corner of T Street. Prior to pandemic it was a major hazard to try crossing with children (or older adult) - now cars just 'play chicken' and seem to try to intentionally scare pedestrians.
- Need more speed control as vehicles try to use T st instead of 50 & drive too fast! I don't know how to make people stop at stop signs tho!
- I do not support speed bumps no matter how much traffic.
- Traffic on my street is not currently an issue, thus, one of the reasons we purchased here.
- Traffic in Elmhurst is not very bad. There needs to be better accessibility to UCD Med from 51st /49th street. Much of the problems with V street traffic is directly related to Elmhurst decision to advocate for blocking off most entrances to UCD from V street.
- I have been very active to bring crosswalks to the neighborhood. Attempting to cross a street, means that you take your life in your hands. Too bad, that more times than not, a stop sign no longer means "STOP"! The cars just roll on through!
- I'm more concerned about unreasonable speed bumps. It shouldn't be legal to put up a speed bump that makes you go 10 to 15 mph lower than the posted speed of a road.
- Way too much speeding, demonstrations of loud vehicles, running stop signs, huge 18-wheelers trying to take turns that are too small for vehicle size and tearing up berms and parks
- Besides 2 times a day we should not be complaining about traffic in our neighborhood.... the med center is a big reason our housing prices are where they are and we should be grateful for this
- We live on V Street. No one stops at stop signs and they accelerate as they drive by
- Coloma Community Center
- Concerned about entrance/exit to new UC Davis Med Ctr parking structure at corner of V and 48th.
- T st is now an on/off ramp to 50. Hideous.
- Corner of 51st and V is currently dangerous
- Ppl don't stop at the cottage mart stop sign
- By traffic, I mean I'm concerned about how people drive in the area. Not the number of cars. Question wasn't specific.
- Cars run the stop signs at 48 and T and 48 and U. A wheelchair occupant was hit coming from light rail. 49th and V is busy at shift change times. I am concerned about pedestrian safety. I like that a lot of people walk for pleasure in the neighborhood. I was sad for that to be lost.
- The speed on T Street is increasing again as our businesses open back up. I loved the non-traffic of covid lockdown.
- It is important to discourage non-residents from using Elmhurst and in particular T Street as a thoroughfare/transit route and also to continue Residential Parking Permits program.
- I'm wondering if the 50 expansion will cause T Street to get busier soon.
- More speed bumps with increased traffic. We have a toddler and a dog and enjoy walking the neighborhood.
- I've been in Elmhurst neighborhood since 1989, traffic has done nothing but increase! Parking on my street also has increased. Assuming folks working at hospital parking in neighborhood.
- T street has always been busy, and med center traffic calming has directed staff to 51st to get to T street & then the freeway, so traffic increased for that route.
- It is not so much how many cars, as how fast they are driving. I can attest that many of my neighbors drive with disregard, running stop signs and flying around corner. I always see people walking in the street, not my thing, we do have sidewalks. However, I don't want to have to see them get hit as a car runs a stop sign or tears around a corner.
- I really do not want to see more traffic. I believe it will bring more drivers who are inattentive and speeding through the streets.
- Prefer to keep traffic low

17. What do you think is the impact of the following sources on traffic issues?

	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

- UC has somewhat reduced traffic through Elmhurst
- We need to allow GIG parking
- Delivery trucks drive too fast, are loud and have proliferated during the pandemic
- Speeding on V is a problem. More speed bumps are needed. Also there should be a stop sign at all 4-way intersections on T, speed bumps on 39th, and more enforcement to ensure that people stop at existing stop signs.
- We currently have little or no bike lanes. Additional traffic increases danger to bike traffic
- I am concerned about Starbucks, but not about the Cottage Mart. there are a few spots in front of the market and traffic is lower there.
- It would be great if there was a SacRT line that consistently ran thru the neighborhood for UCDMC commuters • The increase in commercial traffic I believe is mostly due to UPS, Fedex and Amazon. There's no a lot that can be done about that.
- Coloma guests block my driveway and cuss at me when I call the police.
- There will be no parking available. It is like that now. It will be just another nightmare for residents. At some point I assume all of Elmhurst will be torn down.
- Traffic speeds on T Street and i is dangerous - need more traffic stop signs or bumps but people unwilling to vote for them
- The increase in commercial traffic I believe is mostly due to UPS, Fedex and Amazon. There's no a lot that can be done about that.
- Increase in traffic from transient renters who have no stake in our neighborhood.
- I think it's absolutely ridiculous that the city put giant, suspension-ruining speed bumps on 39th St., where the posted speed is 30 mph, and where ambulances have to drive to get from Folsom Blvd. to the hospital. Those rich assholes knew that they were moving onto a street with a 30 mph posted speed. Because of city ordnance governing the posted speed on the streets, they can't reduce the posted speed. So they shouldn't be able to use speed bumps as a backdoor.
- The trucks related to campus construction start very early. Last summer the pounding of pile hammers went until past 9:30 PM. The HWY 50 sound wall construction will start soon. The noise pollution of construction and traffic is already bad.
- Cottage Mart is NOT the same as Starbucks! Even if they're both zoned commercial.
- There appears to be some abuse of the Residential Parking Permits by the UC Davis employees..
- Residences with multiple vehicles-3,4,5 to a household of 2adults
- I just cannot bear to answer you questions anymore, ENA.
- As noted previously, specific times of day are congestion, speeding is consistent issue. Engagements at Julia Morgan etc. , creates no homeowner parking

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. (Please specify in comments box.)	9	17.3%	2	3.8%	11	21.2%	30	57.7%	52

Comments: 93 responses

- My neighbor's children (age 13 and 17) were home alone and a mentally ill homeless man came into their yard and frightened the children.
- I am very concerned with homelessness but it is not currently effecting life in Elmhurst
- Homelessness is currently not an issue but it is encroaching our neighborhood more and more.
- I think everyone in Sacto should do their part to reduce homelessness for the benefit of unhoused people & the city
- More enforcement of anti-camping laws
- On a number of occasions, including during the day, I've witnessed homeless hanging out/sleeping at the Coloma center.
- Also very concerned about leaf blower air and noise pollution. Concerned about removal of backyard trees and increasing hard scape in front yards so that street trees will not get water.
- Our street has had issues with homeless and petty crime (porch pirates, needles on the ground, stealing from front porches, etc.)
- Our challenges with unhoused people is just getting going, but based on what's happening in Midtown, it's likely to get worse.
- Concerned about patients leaving UC Davis emergency room that do not have any place to go after.
- Petty thefts.
- Homeless people (and others) stealing what isn't nailed down.
- Let's do all we can to avoid additional homelessness. Perhaps a shelter nearby?
- Homeless people who loiter around the light rail station and under the Hwy-50 overpass are safety concerns.
- Homeless dig through the garbage, used needles found on the T St greenway and near Stockton. Use water hose in front of house. Drug house at the end of 2nd that homeless stream in and out of. Reported but not acted on
- I have had few issues with homelessness in Elmhurst, but it is a problem the city needs to address ASAP.
- Health of trees in Elmhurst
- There is little being done in other areas of Sacramento for the homeless so there's no reason to think Elmhurst would be immune to that same impact (camps, garbage, noise, etc.)
- Homeless folks need to be cared for in proper housing locations, not in alley ways or at Coloma Center
- Homelessness is prevalent and out of control
- Homeless camps along the RT line and Cal Trans right of way are expanding
- I am starting to see homeless people and problems they bring in Elmhurst recently. I don't feel as safe as before.
- The overpass on 39th street has been occupied by the homeless since I first bought my house. I've never had a problem with them and they appear to be completely harmless, the gentleman who currently "lives there" even waves at every car who come by, but I'd still prefer a reduction of • Homeless people in my neighborhood, and city-wide.
- Would love to be able to give our homeless a safe place to go in Sacramento
- I have not observed unhoused neighbors in Elmhurst.
- I have had my garage broken into. My Mazda Miata parked on the street has had its fiber top stolen, radio stolen, license plate stolen on different occasions.
- City needs to proceed with accommodations for the homeless.

Question 18, continued

- Homelessness is Sacramento's biggest challenge IMO. It is a humanitarian, health and economic crisis. Fortunately it has not hit Elmhurst in a major way yet, but it must be simply a matter of time. We have to quit ignoring it or it will be our undoing.
- Starting to find homeless in the alleys of Elmhurst. And under the bridges.
- I am concerned about homelessness more generally. We need to do more to help people find housing but arresting/keeping homeless people out of the neighborhood is not a solution, it's just unjust punishment.
- I care about homelessness very much but I haven't seen unhoused people in Elmhurst. I care about crime but I haven't seen any evidence that there are serious problems here.
- It's also the patients who are mentally challenged just coming from the UCD med complex who appear to be just released and are finding their way thru our neighborhood streets.
- Hard to tell where the illegal fireworks are coming from - could be Tahoe Park
- With new parking structures and parking lots for UCDCM, theft increases and homeless population numbers increase in the surrounding area.
- I am concerned that there are homeless people in Sacramento and that there is no social safety net for them. Other rich societies have better systems in place for helping people avoid homelessness and sheltering the homeless. Surely Sacramento can do better.
- Homelessness & Use of illegal fireworks and crime are severe national problems that are growing and not being dealt with as a nation, state & Sacto & Elmhurst.
- Our neighbors that are experiencing food fragility. We often think because they live here that they are not, but statistics would prove otherwise. We should ensure that all of our neighbors have the food they need.
- Homelessness is already an issue answer this would just help multiple the issue
- Petty crime seems to already be on the rise and I don't see it getting better (my car has been stolen from my driveway). Additionally, I have recently had to fence my property due to finding the homeless sleeping in my yard under my bedroom window.
- 51st and T is dangerous not having a street light
- CONCERNED FOR INDIVIDUALS SAFETY,HEALTH.CRIME DOES INCREASE AT TIMES.
- There are street lights, aren't there? on T Street? People need to get over themselves.
- Homelessness is a statewide issue and I don't see a path to resolving it.
- Need prompt action on people sleeping/camping under the 39th Street overcrossing.
- Concerned about homelessness everywhere, not about whether homeless people are here.
- We don't have enough houses. It costs a crazy amount to put a roof over your head. It's no wonder so many people are living without houses.
- Homeless people use 57th street to get through to T Street and/or Broadway. People using this street as a thoroughfare has made receiving mail/packages a pain and I often get things stolen from my porch and decorations taken.
- More and more homeless people are being pushed into the local neighborhoods - they need to be provided appropriate housing and services.
- We live near the rail station and there some people who camp out behind the fence there. On numerous occasions I have seen them rummaging through our waste bins. While we haven't had any issues with trash being thrown around or attempted thefts or break-ins, it makes us concerned about safety in the area.
- Degradation of property and loss of historical buildings and architecture
- I'm concerned about mentally ill homeless who are released from the ER or group homes along Stockton blvd who do strange things around our homes
- Should be kept away from houses and places of business
- There have been a lot of homeless in the neighborhood sleeping on benches and in middle where trees are.
- Would like to see more supports and additional housing options for the unhoused so that they are not sleeping in tents. I don't just want to see them moved to another area.
- Garbage, filth, rodents.
- There should never be 15 mile-per-hour speed bumps on 30 mile-per-hour streets. If you move to a neighborhood where the street is rated at 30 mph, you should never be able to put speed bumps in.
- I don't want a single tree to be cut down due to "lighting." I want more trees, not less. I also want more public housing to house the homeless. I'd rather have poor people living in homes in my neighborhood than homeless people with nothing to lose roaming the neighborhood.

Question 18, continued

- The trash left behind near the light rail. My car has been broken in to. I've had them on my drive before going through my trash (across from the kitchen window)
- We have lots of strange people coming from the 59 street exit, entering the neighborhood at t street and 55th
- Loud stereos going down the street at night when I'm trying to sleep.
- Homelessness has only been an intermittent problem. when folks are released from UCDM
- Homelessness issues vary depending upon location - near the freeway/CalTrans property, potential in alleys, squatters in vacant homes.
- Homeless use ER, then roam neighborhood on regular basis
- We must not let our homelessness continue on. It is a moral and safety issue for all people. The drug addiction and mental illness appears to be the biggest problem. We need to get people off the streets. That is not okay for people to live like that!!
- Squatters in vacant houses and empty lots
- Homelessness seems to be increasing in spite of city's attempts to decrease.
- UC Davis employees smoking on the sidewalks, in front of houses and leaving trash.
- Homelessness is definitely on the increase- I have seen this in just the 9 short years I have owned my house in Elmhurst. There are more and more instances of people digging through our trash and recycle bins, unsavory characters walking around at all hours and even squatters coming into vacant properties.
- Unsecured/unattended/dark alleyways, freeway embankment.
- There have been reports of stolen catalytic converters.
- The noise of construction and traffic is bad and if huge zoning changes come more construction will follow.
- My "other" is street lighting. Lights that shine 50% or more light upwards are horrible for nighttime, like in the 40s. They are pretty but stupid and impractical. Lights should shine down only like in San Jose. Waste of money and ruins night sky by shining they 360°.
- UCDMC helicopter noise and traffic.
- Some increased presence of unhoused people. It's a citywide issues, and until the city and county commits to massive building of affordable housing, with supportive services, it will only get worse.
- Homeless people from downtown often appear in Elmhurst due to a lack of shelters and low-cost housing for them.
- I have lived in Elmhurst for 47 years and have noticed a marked increase in neighborhood crimes including car break-ins, catalytic converter thefts, package thefts and home break-ins in the last few years. There is little law enforcement for any crime under \$900 which pretty much creates a free for all! This really creates a climate of fear and the loss of a sense of well-being in our neighborhood. (Homelessness: see Comments in # 19.)
- Homeless people on 39th street underpass/at light rail; homeless encampments (large) on Alhambra near Broadway, on X Street, .are seeming to be permanent fixtures now-
- It will be interesting to see if we get more when the 50 expansion closes the streets under the freeway downtown.
- I am not concerned about fireworks but was unable to select the unconcerned option button. Regarding homelessness- it is reprehensible and I humane that our city does not provide sufficient housing opportunities to keep people sheltered
- Homelessness is an immediate moral crisis facing all of California, including Elmhurst.
- Lots of homeless looking through trash and using the bathroom in my yard
- Lack of support for homeless, places to go, etc. The large camps are a health hazard, and are also turning into stockpiles of stolen property, i.e. bicycles, etc.
- Crime, sanitation, and blight from homelessness is a real concern.
- Homeless person is living next to my garage. I don't know how I can help her.
- The lack of street lighting can be mitigated by people turning on their porch lights. I go to work very early in the morning and only see about 1/4 of the homes with porch lights on!!! And, homelessness is a city wide problem, our tiny neighborhood does not even really feel the true impact.
- All of the construction. I'm tired of waking up to large trucks, jackhammers, and other loud equipment at 7 a.m. It is hard for me to teach (since I'm still teaching virtually) when these noises are interrupting my audio feed.
- Mainly concerned about homeless people camping out in alley ways.
- I do not see major concerns of homelessness in Elmhurst.

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

#	%	Responses (325 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
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. (Included in Comments below.)
15	4.6%	No policy changes.

Comments/Other (41 responses)

- Instate a requirement that 10% of new housing be affordable to lower-and moderate- income households.
- City should not spend money on this
- Reinstate 1st time buyer program.
- Utilize current open space/vacant lots and commercial unused buildings. Make them affordable not competitive in all cases.
- Upzone, densify, build more housing
- Incentivize affordable housing in new construction but don't require it. Limit and regulate short-term rentals (like SF has done) but don't forbid them.
- Allow more housing to be higher densities.
- Not their business.
- Look at developing empty lots next to industrial areas
- I support public housing and community land trusts, as well as denser housing that is not directed by large, private corporations.
- The amount of affordable housing can not keep pace with the need.
- Invest in low income neighborhood and repurpose commercial. For the sake of the planet, no new construction.
- Tiny homes seem to be a good idea.
- Social Housing and Land Trusts
- Stop gentrifying historically low-income neighborhoods
- Use requirement/incentive for individuals born in Sacramento, or who have lived here for 20+ years, similar to DC. There is evidence of Bay Area influx.
- The City Alone should not be responsible for addressing statewide economic issues
- People with lower income should do what we had to do 40 or 60 years ago, if you can't afford rent, you get room mates and share the cost.
- Provide lower interest rate for 1st time buyer, who have 20% down payment and enough income to qualify for loan.
- Without the items above, new rental units will go for \$2,000 a month, which will not accomplish any of the problems with housing currently
- "Requiring" isn't the word I would use. I think the city should allow and/or encourage higher density.
- Stop commercial and outside developers from flipping houses and driving up home prices. Give opportunities to Sacramento residents first.
- More housing is the only solution. All others are patches that fail with time.
- The city should do anything to get more housing built. Any kind of housing. That doesn't mean throw out the rules and allow anything, but affordable housing requirements shouldn't prevent more housing from getting built.
- First time buyer assistance helped me get my foot in the door. It's made all the difference in my ability to prepare for retirement.
- Honestly, I don't know what works. Most of us are not experts but surely there are policy experts know what is most effective.

Question 19, continued.

- Quit calling the building of “low income housing” to all of these apartments and duplexes. Real low income people and welfare recipients can afford these. It is another cruel lie by developers and politicians.
- SOME rent control, not across the board.
- There are many open lots and strip malls along the light rail tracks that would not disrupt established neighborhoods that are ideal for high density housing that can be well designed to provide a healthful home for low-to-moderate income families. (The SMUD development might prove to be a good model...but it may end up an upscale scam like Gio.)
- Help those who really need but not those who are faking it for a handout. Provide jobs at lower levels.
- Rent control absolutely does not increase affordability. It incentivizes landlords to neglect their properties from which they are receiving an artificially low return. It incentivizes developers to build luxury residential or commercial buildings instead of rent-controlled properties, thereby creating a housing shortage. Rent control also does not necessarily help low-income people, it only helps whoever is living in the unit at the time rent control is instated.
- The City should focus on improving the lives of its people, rather than reducing the quality of its housing.
- Move to Texas. You’re going to have affordable housing in California.
- Since the Trumps made billions building subsidized housing, I'm not in favor of that. I don't think City employees are usually the type of people who are good at riding herd on ruthless, crafty, sharks. Maybe people building big commercial buildings that will employ lots of people should be required to partner with residential developers to build appropriate residential units nearby.
- Tax incentives for moderate housing development
- Support higher wages that can meet the cost of living.
- Would not allow me to click on no airB&Bs. I hate those things. Keep them out of our Elmhurst.
- The homelessness problem is completely out of hand! Not only do we need humane living & housing opportunities but there must be counseling, addiction and mental health services readily available. There must be a dramatic investment/increase in wages, job training and employment opportunities for those who are able to work.
- What's this got to do with Elmhurst?
- Gentrification is a major issue - white folks with money want to live in neighborhoods that are predominantly POC, so the demand fuels the need for folks to sell their homes, which are then flipped/remodeled and sold at a higher price. These higher prices are in turn raising the property values in the surrounding neighborhood, which pushes out those who were living on a lower income.
- Low-income first-time home buyer incentives need to be stronger. The housing market still doesn't not provide competitive edge to purchases houses in a desired area.

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

#	%	Responses (325 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
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. (Included in Comments below.)

Comments/Other: 27 responses

- Plant more trees (X 2)
- I want safer streets for bikes, but don't know the best way. Look at Holland.
- Parkways, green belts, safe walking pathways along corridor.
- GREEN SPACE. A park with trees and dog part
- Public transit options i.e. Run a light rail line down Stockton Blvd.
- I don't know enough about this plan to answer at this time
- Tiny house pods! Very needed
- Mixed use, not a dichotomy of commercial vs residential.
- Elmhurst can continue to be a special place without either no development or rampant development. We should look to Burlington as a model. Public land trusts can make home ownership more attainable, make rent more affordable, and commercial development more agreeable.
- Build affordable high density high rises
- Services for enhanced trash pick up
- Maintain public spaces/greenery
- I think biking is important but I'm not knowledgeable on Stockton issues.
- Unhoused? How about drug treatment and mental health treatment?
- "Ensure that traffic is not diverted into surrounding neighborhoods" means building fences where streets would otherwise connect. These fences make it miserable to get around by cycling or walking - you end up forced to go farther and use high-speed, high-traffic routes. These fences are all over Sacramento (nearby examples include the fence cutting off 2nd Ave where it reaches the UCDMC, the fences around Greenfair Park and the Fairgrounds, the blocked-off alleyways, and the fences separating 47th Street from Eastlawn cemetery.) It sucks.
- Single family housing doesn't belong on Stockton (although I do appreciate the compact, attractive way that GIO has evolved). It is an economic thoroughfare. Develop it and let the surrounding neighborhoods use the services provided by the businesses there, but develop with awareness of parking needs.
- Set that land aside well away from city center. Cluster all services there and remove from central city.
- It's currently very unsafe to bike on Stockton, so any kind of bike lane would be an improvement. Current traffic pressure will worsen if they take out a car lane, so the transit options would need to improve substantively at the same time.
- Experts should implement whichever policies are effective at: building denser, more sustainable, communities and reduce homelessness
- More help for the unhoused please.
- The percentage of new housing to be affordable must be 20% or higher
- Small business face hurdles that larger established companies when they were the same size. Prioritizing opportunities for small businesses provides the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion that is needed.
- I still need to learn more about this issue.
- I would be afraid to bike on Stockton even with bike lanes
- I am not a NIMBY. I would like to see all unhoused folks who want one have a home (for them and their pets). But they must have services and security. Security is essential to keep everyone safe.
- Increase restaurants cafes and pubs in addition to office space

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?

#	%	Responses (321 out of 332 surveys submitted.)
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 (Included in Comments below.)

Comments/Other: 13 responses

- Join as in merge? No. But they should partner for sure.
- I dislike developers and most of their goals. But I support public housing, mixed use development, and higher density development ONLY if it won't harm the tree canopy.
- I don't know this organization but there is strength in numbers.
- I mean, I know *your* opinion.
- This is a radical organization involved in litigation with the city. ENA should have nothing to do with it. The above description is biased and shameful advocacy's
- This was entirely too long for a community survey.
- SIWD takes far too radical approach that would bar nearly all neighborhood development.
- No ENA is focused on neighborhood issues and should remain so. SIWD is a quixotic economic based organization that is narrowly focused. Development is as inexorable as time. SIWD is fighting the wrong battle.
- I'm in favor of not displacing current residents or making their lives worse and I like the idea of negotiating a CBA collectively with UC Davis. Traffic and parking inconveniences in Elmhurst itself are a much lower priority than the impacts to low-income residents in other nearby neighborhoods, to my mind. But I haven't been able to figure out from the SIWD's website what they actually want to happen, or might ask for, at Aggie Square, which is why I clicked "need more information." I do not want to see the group try to block the project, which might also be a good reason to join.
- Leaning towards yes. Obviously neighborhoods need real protection, as evidenced by our limited ability to get the Mayor and the CC to even pay attention.
- We should require that any new development in the proposed Aggie Square area be mixed-use that includes dense and affordable residential.
- Who sits on the ENA board?
- I think this is a big problem and the ENA should seek allies to stand with us. Not sure if SIWD is the only choice - but joining forces with one or multiple groups is a good idea.

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

(Responses: 78 out of 332 surveys submitted.)

- No
- UCDCM should increase on-campus affordable housing for students, employees , a mixture of rentals and purchasable housing ie, condos, halfplexes, townhomes with adequate parking
- Stop through traffic on 49th & V st to the hospital. Make them go around our neighborhood
- More community involvement
- Whoever wrote this survey has an activist agenda. ENA should be a forum for diverse viewpoints instead of promoting narrow ideals. What has happened to our association?
- No a well done survey
- We need to allow GIG parking so we don't need to own so many cars.
- Replacing trees that were taken out where the sound wall is.
- This should have been broken in up and organized differently. Very disappointed by the implementation of this survey. Several answers would not select.
- This was way too long, so I had to quit.
- Hey concerned about over all parking on V street. I am concerned of very high traffic. I am concerned about patients entering and leaving the emergency room and roaming into the neighborhood. I am very concerned about increased crime.
- Speed bumps, especially on V st between 51 and 55. Other streets have them, and people use this st as a thoroughfare
- If people do not like the direction ENA board is going to, they can work with or even join board.
- I am concerned that the City will permanently destroy the unique livability of our beautiful and historic old neighborhood. Once ruined, it will never be replaced. I realize the City's goals are honorable, but this Rezone change will not solve either the problem of housing capacity or affordability in any meaningful way...but it WILL inexorably change the character of our neighborhood permanently. We have lost forever many of the beautiful homes in Midtown and even our local historic Alhambra Theater in the name of "progress" but have gained little...except ugly apartment buildings and a Safeway. This rezoning approach has failed elsewhere and will fail us too. Please, City Council Members, not on your watch...don't make neighborhood destruction your legacy. Thank you.
- I don't believe that a historical neighborhood should be subject to the same building requirements as rural newly developed areas.
- Trash and garbage around homeless encampments;
- I applaud you for creating the surveys to really hear from the make up of the neighborhood vs assuming what we want/don't want. However surveys should be anonymous, not doing so will reduce your response rate. The survey was excessively long and biased against several initiatives. The biased is guaranteed to show alignment with board members on key issues
- GREAT SURVEY!!!!!! AWESOME WORK ON THIS!!!! I HOPE OTHER NEIGHBORHOODS USE THIS TOOL! I HOPE THE CITY/PLANNING DEPT. AND UCDCM ALSO SEE RESULTS.
- More speed bumps on V street or more stop signs to control speeding. Enforce noise issues and complaints, such as loud vehicles playing excessive load music.
- I would like to see more space given to green spaces.
- I love this neighborhood bc people at least care about what happens. There's lots of trees and cute dogs. Thank you for working on building our community
- I'd like to see either the 51st or 48th street overpass turned into a bike and pedestrian -only crossing. I'd like to see Elmhurst's electrical lines moved underground (this will require greater density to be economical). I'd like to see the alley between U and T opened for bicycle & pedestrian traffic.
- If the zoning in Elmhurst changes and single family homes are torn down to build small apartment complexes it will ruin the character of the neighborhood. I will probably move if the zoning is changed. It is not fair to the people who already live here to change the zoning after they have bought houses here. It will increase the number of rentals and rental homes are not maintained as well as homes that are occupied by the actual homeowner. The change in zoning only promotes rich people's profits and does not help low income people. The new rentals will most likely be rented according to the market rate, not according to people's income.
- Development is inevitable, so make it good and be bold.
- NO

Question 22, continued

- ENA meeting attendance I've seen has been very, very low - would be hard to argue the org is representative of the neighborhood. I am glad you are doing this survey, but I suspect it will be way too long and complicated for most people to answer - it took me most of a morning. Good practice on survey methods is to put a few simple, top priority questions on page one - then ask for more detail in subsequent pages IF people feel inclined. The ENA should also solicit folks to work on outreach through physical (door to door fliers, signs) and social media. Now that vaccination is spreading, we can try meeting up on the green (masked) periodically to get to know each other better. I am looking forward to it.
- The addition of street lights was briefly mentioned. If we are to be a walkable neighborhood this needs to be a priority. My continued pet peeve of the city property between our sidewalks and street is the homeowners responsibility. Absolute NO city support of the invasion of tree roots on lawn areas, uplifting sidewalks, and input to the care of trees. I am currently in the process of all of this - only to have done this 5 years ago at my expense. For starters, the City should be the responsible party just as they are for city streets. This has to change!!!
- No
- I bought my home in Elmhurst because it is a family neighborhood. I for one do not want to see this neighborhood become a rental mecca.
- Yes easier access to the Ellison bldg. Put back entry and exit samecas when opened. Easy access was promised by UCD and they say Ena had it changed. Now you cannot exit into neighborhoods we live in.
- More about SIWD.
- Yes - The assumption by some neighbors (and 'representatives') who support increased housing density that anyone not wanting increased housing density in the neighborhood is either a racist or elitist. Maybe those opposing zoning change (as written) just have a different sense of aesthetics and/or a different need for a quieter small community scale of living - which is what Elmhurst offers. Please everyone - lets be kind and respectful of one another - the last ENA meeting I attended was disturbing with hostilities and assumptions on all sides.
- I strongly feel that we have a better chance of being listened to by the CC if we present one or more possible solutions to each proposal that we object to. Climate change is real; cities will become more dense. I believe we will all have to make unpleasant sacrifices to try to keep global warming in check. So I do think some of the changes proposed are necessary, but can be made less damaging to neighborhoods with some tweaking, and WRITTEN regulations. I also think it is of the utmost importance to NOT CUT DOWN ANY TREES TO MAKE WAY FOR ADU's or density increases. Also real green spaces must be added along with increased density, such as mandatory rooftop gardens for every residential and possibly commercial building over a certain size, parks, etc. if we're going to be more crowded, we have to be able to have places for people to go to connect with trees, gardens, greenery.
- Nimbyism. We need more houses somewhere in California/Sacramento, why isn't elmhurst the place?
- I am a homeowner of on a stretch T Street where there are no speed bumps or stop signs at intersections to slow traffic. Therefore my concern is more about traffic speed than traffic volumes. In the previous traffic calming plan, implemented several years ago, our section of T Street got 'tree pots' which were completely ineffective, and were taken out after a short time. I would be very interested in receiving some assistance so that motorists do no treat our street like a highway.
- Concerned about the proposal of 4800 Folsom Blvd. Building being converted into Mixed Use building with apartments on top.
- UCD needs to have a lot more parking for their employees.
- I love Elmhurst. Its one of the few jewels left in Sacramento. For the first time in my life, I LOVE where I live.
- Speed on residential streets
- Your survey is way to long.
- Elmhurst board members need term limits.
- Leaf blowers - their use should be restricted, discouraged, or better yet, eliminated
- Have a city pay for sidewalk repairs. City pruning of trees . At least enforce current parking restrictions
- I don't care if Elmhurst has 1 story buildings or 10 story buildings as long as we don't disrupt the tree canopy. Also, aging boomers who move here but then insist on putting speed bumps on 30 mile-per-hour roads are completely unreasonable and delusional, and must be defeated.
- Way too many historic canopy trees have been cut down in Elmhurst during the past few years. Cutting down the 'Hugging Tree' desecrated T Street. Most of these tree removals are done without actual, scientific evidence of any damage to the tree, or danger to the surrounding area. The City Arborist under Kevin Johnson was a disgrace, but we still seem to be cutting down public trees with no actual justified reason whatsoever. This has to stop!
- We need a cross walkway on 55th and t street, motorist has a tendency to run the stop sign time to time. On top of it, there is a day care on the corner.

Question 22, continued

- Ban gas-powered leaf blowers. 4 mornings a week my neighbors employ gardeners who use these. Everyone is working from home! Horrible, noisy and polluting. Pay gardeners more for the time they need to rake. This noise is worse than any car traffic.
- Concern for care of Elm trees as many have been removed due to disease
- New Davis building with two new helicopter pads. The noise now is too loud. Also, the low flying Executive Airport planes.
- City should ticket parking and illegal turns made during shift changes
- I don't feel that ENA represents the interests of all the Elmhurst residents and is opposed to any change that endangers the Status Quo.
- The Elmhurst residents were not provided proper notice of this proposal, in a variety of ways, to ensure all residents were aware of these proposed changes and able to effectively voice their opinions. Especially during the COVID pandemic.
- I learned of the proposed zoning changes almost by accident. It is my understanding that the City Council believes it satisfied the notice requirements. I believe, however, that because the nation and all of the residents of Sacramento were undergoing the COVID pandemic the notice provided to Elmhurst residents and all of Sacramento was inappropriate and not legally sufficient. Such a drastic change to the city-wide zoning should not be made without giving residents the opportunity to provide meaningful input.
- The parking restrictions in front of our house is ridiculous and should be taken off. We live far enough away from the hospital that nobody parks over in our neighborhood.
- Do not destroy existing neighborhoods to accommodate current and future problems.
- We need more residential development due to the housing affordability crisis in California. I agree there will be some impacts to the neighborhood, but the positive benefits out way any concerns. Please do not align your organization with individuals who stifle development, that only makes the crisis worse. We need to support any and all housing but find creative ways to preserve neighborhood character. Thank you for providing the survey.
- I don't want my home ruined.
- Chopper noise esp with new pad. Traffic and freeway access
- Lack of investment in the Coloma Center
- Too many people going through recycle bins and garbage cans on pick up days
- Trash along light rail and Highway 50
- Equity matters and is part of the discussion.
- The noise and dust from the construction. Disregarding Quiet hours with beeping trucks and pile drivers.
- No
- Make it cheaper to be able to convert our garages to flats. It costs way too much for sewer and other permits. If I could have done this, I would be able to rent my home out and move into the flat and age in place. But as it stands now, it is impossible to afford it. And composting toilets should be allowed in a granny flat. They work fine and do not require sewer hookup. Ridiculous Sacramento still had permitting standards from the 1950s.
- Police patrols in neighborhoods, we only see the police when someone calls 911 (if then).
- You do not represent me. Thanks.
- East Sacramento, Curtis Park, Land Park, all seem to have more protection ,influence if you will for changes in their neighborhoods. Seems a more cohesive, influential groups. I have friends in these neighborhoods, they are not concerned .

Demographic information

1. How long have you lived in Elmhurst?

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