

## Sunrise Neighborhood Association Comments

SNA Issue	Staff Response
<p>1. Not in favor of expanding the unit count (as proposed by the developer) beyond the previously agreed count of 107 units. We believe the proposed ADU's and associated parking are not appropriate. The membership considers this addition to be in bad faith and should not be considered at this late date.</p>	<p>Staff believes one additional unit would be insignificant in terms of density. The dwelling would be a single story fully accessible unit. It would be approximately 830 square feet and contain one-bedroom and one bath. Two parking spaces would be provided for the unit. Staff notes that the city required an additional low/moderate unit due to a rounding error. It is possible that the additional required unit could be provided in one of the existing 107 units. However staff believes that the applicant's proposal for a small accessible unit is a benefit to the project and would provide at least one housing unit in the development that would not otherwise be available.</p> <p>Staff believes that second dwelling units within the development would be consistent with city policies to provide a variety of housing types, prices and rents. Staff believes that adequate parking is provided within the project. This issue has been addressed in the staff report. The final determination would be made by the City Council.</p>
<p>2. Site plan configuration creates a significant safety hazard for bicyclists in light of the cemetery's unwillingness to support the routing of a bicycle path through the cemetery. Believe it is critical that this clear safety hazard be addressed "before" approval of the project, particularly in light of the expansion of the Da Vinci High School to Valley Oak, with the additional attendant traffic, vehicular and bicycle.</p>	<p>The bicycle path located in the east greenbelt and continuing southward has been modified to address potential safety issues. Both the Public Works Department and the traffic consultant hired to prepare the traffic analysis for the project, independently recommended that the connection between the bike path and E. 8<sup>th</sup> be designed so that bicyclists stop prior to entering E. 8<sup>th</sup> Street. This would reduce the confluence of bikes and vehicles at the entrances, which are less than the standard city street width. The bicycle path was revised</p>

SNA Issue	Staff Response
	<p>accordingly so riders enter the street within the development and then proceed onto E. Eighth Street and the bicycle lane system.</p> <p>Staff is not aware of other significant safety hazards that may exist.</p>
<p>3. Will not support any reduction in width or extent of eastern greenbelt below the agreed 50'. The current width is a minimum below what the SNA felt was appropriate when compared with surrounding green belt areas of between 70 to 120 feet in width.</p>	<p>This comment relates to the proposal to increase the east side property lines on six lots adjacent to the greenbelt from zero to 3 feet, 3 inches. The change would allow for installation of fencing delineating private property from city greenbelt. The homes would not be expanded in size or shifted on the lot. This is a staff driven recommendation and is addressed in the staff report.</p>
<p>4. Very concerned with perceived attempts to minimize the “green” elements of the development beyond the original proposal.</p>	<p>This issue is addressed in the staff report. Staff is recommending that less than half the acreage proposed by the applicant be accepted as city greenbelt to minimize maintenance and liability costs for the city. The applicant is requesting that all of the "green" space shown as greenbelt be city owned for community use. However, should the Council agree with staff recommendation, the applicant has proposed an alternate plan to reduce the size of the common areas and associated HOA costs to residents.</p>
<p>5. Very concerned that the developer is not seriously pursuing evaluation and inclusion of photovoltaic systems as part of core element of the development. This was a key aspect of the “wow” factor associated with the SNA support of this development at this density. A large portion of the SNA membership believe it would be inappropriate to approve any further developments in the Davis area without insisting</p>	<p>The applicant’s Carbon Emission Reduction Proposal includes exceeding current Title 24 standards by 35% (the city standard is 15%); pre-wiring of all homes for photovoltaics; and installing a total of 37kW of photovoltaics in the development. The carbon emission reduction proposal meets the threshold recently adopted by the City Council.</p>

SNA Issue	Staff Response
<p>on the inclusion of solar and other energy reduction technologies. Based on discussions re: other developments in the area, we do not agree that the use of solar would be uneconomic. We believe the City should insist on full photovoltaic systems on every house and unit in the development to support at least the energy requirements of residents.</p>	
<p>6. Very, very concerned that removal of legacy oaks is premature and not in keeping with the value of the trees to the community and surrounding neighborhood. Believe a separate audit of the existing trees needs to be performed in cooperation with SNA's representatives having appropriate expertise</p>	<p>A Tree Appraisal Summary was prepared for the project by a certified arborist in July 2007. The report included the diameter, canopy radius, location, condition, and appraisal value for 265 trees on the site. The report indicated which trees would be retained and which would be removed. The city's Urban Forest Manager has reviewed and approved the report.</p> <p>Two large oak trees are being retained. The loss of other trees would be mitigated in part through the planting of approximately 217 new trees within the development. The applicant would also be required to pay fees to the city's tree preservation fund, consistent with the city's Tree Preservation Ordinance.</p>
<p>7. Very concerned that it appears the entry way "green" area is being reduced in favor of expanding residential footprints. Believe this reduction is a negative for neighbors and the new residents of the development. Do not support.</p>	<p>See #4.</p> <p>The applicant is not proposing to reduce the space; the city is recommending it. The alternative plan proposed by the applicant is in response to staff's recommendation. The revised site plan is not intended to increase the size of dwellings. The proposed modifications would increase the size of some lots, but the developer intends to use the area to add driveways on many of these lots. This would provide additional on-site parking for residents, with a net gain of 18-</p>

SNA Issue	Staff Response
	19 parking spaces.
8. Very concerned that the “community” environment will not exist as originally planned and promoted by the developer (based upon arguments that the City would need to maintain the space.)	Staff does not oppose community use of the open space owned by the HOA, at the discretion of the members. Staff believes that a sense of community would be provided through the city greenbelt and new bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to E. Eighth Street. This would connect surrounding neighborhoods to Chiles Ranch and each other, and provide a link to the city's greenbelt system to existing and new residents, and the community at large.
9. Very concerned that the current economy could cause significant delays in development, jeopardizing the wellbeing and quiet enjoyment by surrounding neighbors.	Staff cannot speculate on economic trends. The project is proposed in two phases and it is the applicant’s intent to meet their construction timing schedule.
10. In light of the noise associated with construction, request very tight restrictions on hours for work at the site.	Permitted hours of construction are (Municipal Code Section 24.02.040) between the hours of seven a.m. and seven p.m. on Mondays through Fridays, and between the hours of eight a.m. and eight p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. If hours of construction are restricted, staff believes that this could delay the project and exacerbate the concerns related to well being and quiet enjoyment noted above. Weather could potentially cause further delays. Staff believes that construction hours as permitted under the code would minimize the length of time to complete the project, in particular the heavy construction activities such as grading, installation of streets and other infrastructure, and would be beneficial in the long run.
11. Believe the greenbelt buffers should be built prior to any residential development.	<p>The greenbelts and buffers would be installed in two phases, consistent with the construction phasing.</p> <p>The east greenbelt would be installed in Phase I beginning at E. 8th Street and north to the end of the Phase I line shown on</p>

SNA Issue	Staff Response
	<p>the tentative map. The bicycle path and emergency fire lane access located in the northeast corner of the site would also be installed in Phase I. It would be logistically impossible to install the entire east greenbelt landscaping and irrigation before all homes are built along that edge. Heavy equipment would need to maneuver in the area, and while paths located in the greenbelt would be constructed to withstand this, landscaping would not. The project has been conditioned to install the Phase I east greenbelt prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for a residential unit in that phase.</p> <p>The remainder of the east greenbelt, beginning at the Phase II line northward, and the north buffer would be improved in Phase II. The street adjacent to the buffer and the dwellings adjacent to the greenbelt must be in place before the areas can be landscaped. The second phase street would not be installed until Phase II is underway. As noted above it is not practical to install plants, shrubs, trees and other landscape features in either area that would be destroyed by heavy equipment during construction. Until there is development in Phase II, the northern portion of the site would remain unchanged and would not require buffering from any new development. As with Phase I, the project would be conditioned to install remaining greenbelt / buffer in Phase II prior to issuance of first Certificate of Occupancy for a residential unit in that phase.</p>
<p>12. Very concerned that greenbelt areas accommodate recreation, e.g., grassy areas, as originally intended vs. simply xeriscape.</p>	<p>The landscaping proposed is consistent with the city's policies for water conservation and 50% drought tolerant landscaping. It might be possible to add pockets of turf in the greenbelt or</p>

SNA Issue	Staff Response
	buffer, but due to the size constraints, these areas are primarily provided for buffering and passive recreation, such as walking and biking. The greenbelt and buffer areas in this infill site are not traditional greenbelts with an average width of 100 feet intended to provide areas for outdoor recreation.
13. Supportive of the developers agreement to reduce the number of parking places on the northern edge of the property	No comment.
14. Very concerned that parking along the northern edge should be “time limited”, e.g., no overnight parking.	<p>The Police Department is not supportive of restricting parking where demonstrated parking problems do not exist. Typically restricted parking occurs in an area that hosts a community asset that draws large crowds or adjacent to large multi-family housing units.</p> <p>Staff notes that prohibiting overnight parking could negatively impact adjacent neighborhoods. If visitors of Chiles Ranch residents could not park overnight within the development itself, they would park in adjacent neighborhoods.</p>
15. Concerned with ensuring that the passage way into the cemetery on 8 <sup>th</sup> complies with the design commitment to the neighbor, Joy and John Tian, immediately to the west of the entry.	The development would include an undeveloped 35 foot wide easement on the west side of the project site, fronting E. 8 <sup>th</sup> Street. The easement would be located between the existing home noted, and the new development. The developer would enter into an agreement with the cemetery district which would prohibit the easement from being developed for twenty-five years. After that period of time, if the cemetery district wishes, a road for funeral processions only could be installed in the easement. The easement would be landscaped in Phase I. The buffer between the existing and new home, including easement, existing dwelling side yard setback, and new dwelling side yard setback would be minimum distance of 43 feet.

<b>SNA Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	<p>The applicant is also proposing a one and a-half story plan within the development. The dwelling constructed on Lot 1 would be this model. The single story portion of the dwelling would be oriented to the west, facing the easement. The two story portion would be located on the eastern side of Lot 1. The design and orientation of the new dwelling would serve to reduce the perceived scale of the home as viewed from the home of Joy and John Tian.</p>