

Wildhorse East Neighborhood Association - February 2009 Survey Results

262 Surveys were mailed; 110 were completed and returned. Duplicates have been eliminated.

(Note: some respondents did not answer every question)

	#	%
1. Which one of the following best expresses your views about Parlin's August 2008 development plan?		
I oppose any development of the horse ranch.	47	43%
I support Parlin's August 2008 plan.	7	6%
I have significant concerns about Parlin's August 2008 plan, as I indicated below.	49	45%
I am neutral or have no opinion about Parlin's August 2008 development plan.	7	6%
Total Responses	110	100%

The following concerns about Parlin's August 2008 plan were raised during the February 10, 2009 Neighborhood Association meeting. Please indicate whether you share these or other concerns:

The following response results are listed under each selection as a total # count and its percentage of the total.

2. The plan needs to contain sufficient recreational facilities for children.

Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned	Not Sure	Total Responses				
45	44%	43	42%	12	12%	2	2%	102

3. The plan contains a significant number of three-story units.

Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned	Not Sure	Total Responses				
79	75%	20	19%	7	7%	0	0%	106

4. 191 residential units is too many units for this 25.8-acre site.

Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned	Not Sure	Total Responses				
86	81%	10	9%	6	6%	4	4%	106

5. How many units would you consider appropriate for the site if you are to consider a residential development on the site: (Responses were grouped)

0-15	16-50	51-100	101-150	151-191					
10	12.5%	10	12.5%	24	30%	24	30%	7	9%

Same as Wildhorse	
5	6%

Average
92

6. The potential for parking (and associated traffic) to impact the Wildhorse neighborhood, given the plan's assumption that the residents will park in their garages, which may instead be used for storage.

Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned	Not Sure	Total Responses				
60	57%	31	30%	13	12%	1	1%	105

7. The plan has units much closer to the existing houses close to the southern end of Caravaggio.

Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned	Not Sure	Total Responses				
44	42%	35	33%	23	22%	3	3%	105

8. The plan does not include provisions to discourage rentals of the market-rate townhomes or houses.

Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned	Not Sure	Total Responses				
61	58%	26	25%	15	14%	3	3%	105

9. The plan needs adequate guarantees that the orchard and greenbelt could not be developed into additional housing or streets in the future.

Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned	Not Sure	Total Responses				
90	87%	10	10%	2	2%	1	1%	103

Wildhorse East Neighborhood Association – February 2009 Survey Written Comments

10. Is there any specific change(s) to the plan that would make you support the proposal? Please specify.

- Move the project further east for southern end of Caravaggio. Eliminate third story. Reduce number of units
- Low density and the same style as current Wildhorse community
- Move the 40-unit apartment complex away from Covell placing the parking lot nearest to Covell and the building back away from street. No parking “courtyard”
- Reduce the density!
- Davis does not need more apartments. Please build more affordable single-family houses.
- Funding set aside for traffic/parking mitigation (for speed humps or permit parking).
- Yes. This area only has one main way to get in and out of Covell Boulevard. It does not make sense to have so many people (units) living here. This is sheer greed on the part of Parlin. Get realistic. It is meant for single family home only like on Caravaggio.
- Lower housing density on the overall number of units
- Senior Housing, - Affordable Housing - Housing that would assist mildly disabled persons.
- Need these type dwellings &/or need more. Not sure if any accommodations of this sort is in the plan.
- Low density!
- None
- The setbacks from existing houses on Caravaggio are completely unacceptable.
- Provide an adjacent sports park on the Shriners property.
- None
- Additional high-density housing is not needed in Davis at this time. If you are going to develop this space, why not provide something that is not met in this area – houses with adequate land.
- There should be land dedication for buffer of 25 feet for people along Caravaggio that will be negatively affected by this.
- A park and a public swim pool and a fire station.
- More open space and greenbelts needed. Pave bike path around golf course as part of connection of path.

- To allow for more parking within the development so they don't park all over the development or on Caravaggio. I would love the land to be undeveloped, but since that may not happen I am more pleased with this new development from Parlin Group.
- No
- I would like to see a development similar to the Wildhorse Development. Just adjacent to it.
- Traffic problems are too great! Five-acre lots most useful.
- None other than there should be some type of senior housing on the site which might alleviate concerns.
- Covell cannot/does not sufficiently support current traffic level. How home owners access this development is not identified adequately. Traffic on Bonnard too high now!
- 1) Reduce the number multi-family dwellings to no more than 15 and town homes to no more than 45.
2) The number of residential units should be reduced to 150.
- There should be no three-story units.
- The Wildhorse East Neighborhood Association seems to be more interested in keeping Caravaggio their own private road. The members who live on Caravaggio are rude to those who try to drive or walk down Caravaggio when they have blocked it off, which is often.
- In summation, we completely oppose Parlin's plan and would have indicated so above if there had been an opportunity to do so. Since there was not an option specific enough for us to mark, we chose to express our own view through "very concerned" marks. Parlin's plan is a bad idea for the Wildhorse neighborhood as well as the City of Davis. We do not, and will not, support Parlin's August 2008 development plan! Thank you – citizens of Wildhorse.
- Reduce multifamily units and townhomes.
- Only single family homes.
- Less units, more parking, add sports field.
- Remove the 3-story units. Too many town homes. Too many homes. Reduce the town homes, remove the apartments and reduce number of homes.
- No 3-story building.
- I would like to see less town homes and multi-family housing. Also larger lot sizes and less cookie cutter houses.
- How many acres are housing, and how many are greenbelt? The lots seem extremely small. All egress is to be one No-So Street. There will probably be 700-800 people in the development plus guests and business vehicles. Why not a horse shoe street?
- No high density housing at all. Single family much preferred. We have experienced an increased crime rate in our area in those type of residences. Also, a big concern about "no rental restrictions". Concerned

it would lower the value of our home and lower standard of living in our area. We are proud homeowners and we do not want to deal with more renters/absent landlords in our area. Thank you for your consideration. We care very much about the quality of life for our family, especially our children!

- NO!!!!
- Change the composition of housing to mimic current Wildhorse subdivision configuration and lot size. Intend to create parity of ratio of low cost and extra low cost housing to market rate housing with other Davis neighborhoods – Westwood, Stonegate, West Manor, East Manor, University Circle, Evergreen, The Birds, etc.
- Less development; more greenery. Less density.
- Provision for roaming security in Wildhorse. Less density. Zero rentals or rentals strongly discouraged. Some type of homeowners association CC&Rs to ensure exterior upkeep.
- Significantly lower the density. Remove the three-story building. Increase the buffer zone, especially in the south end.
- Have no buildings larger than 2 stories.
- No 3-story units, larger buffer/orchard behind South homes, restrictions on rentals and street parking, mature trees in orchard.
- No
- Who has access to the “orchard”? Will there be fruit/nut trees? Who prunes and keep the orchard area attractive?
- Less units, guarantees of minimal construction noise and disruption, more infrastructure for children, some light retail (café, etc).
- Guarantee that the number of residential units will decrease from the planned 191. Guarantee that construction won't impact travel and traffic on Covell Blvd.
- Not at this time. The housing market is way down. We don't need a bunch of empty house with overgrown weeds.
- Bring density lower so there would be less 3 story, or more single family possibly and less town homes.
- The density is not appropriate. People are not going to walk or ride their bikes anywhere from this location.
- Who will monitor the above concerns – with the city services cuts looming, I don't see the continued oversight of the above concerns possible once the project is approved.
- In the past as well as the present, developing any type of residential units will have a negative and dangerous impact in that area and in Davis. I am opposed to any development in that area.
- The entry road is close to our home and it would impact traffic in our neighborhood significantly.

- Less homes, no apartments or town homes. Approx 25 single family homes.
- The density is too high. Three story structures are out of concept and paradigm for the rest of Wildhorse (except for the new condos, and 3 story was a mistake there!!) The high density will significantly impact stress on remaining Wildhorse open space / parks – TOO MANY PEOPLE!!!
- It looks very unfair to neighbors on the southern end of Caravaggio. The plan needs to be changed to give an equal barrier to ALL houses. Where is the child area? I see one area. Not enough!
- Lower density of residential units and fewer 3-story units.
- Add playground, basketball court, picnic table.
- I think housing market is not the same as Parlin developed this plan in 2008. There is no reason to build more homes when people cannot afford to buy just like GM building new cars but nobody is buying them. Stop this development plan is the best.
- Density needs to be reduced. Housing should be similar to adjacent housing rather than multi-family, town home and small-lot detached. This type of plan would be more appropriate for core-infill, not peripheral infill.
- No town homes no apartments. Only 1 + 2 story single family homes.
- 1) The original intent of the development, single-family homes with reasonable lot sizes, melded nicely into the culture of the surrounding environs and limited overcrowding. It is disappointing that the newest plans for town homes and communal-style design break dramatically from the original vision, since the new plans fail to embrace the single-family home community of Wildhorse and surrounding developments. We do not oppose inclusion of i.e. some affordable housing per se, but town homes etc. are unacceptable to virtually all I've spoken to and diminish the community "feel" of the area.
2) Related to (1), with the Hunt property and other clear infill zones available (not to mention the tract just East of Harper), there are plenty of other places where more dense development would fit nicely and meet the growth needs of the City and County. The horse ranch is the least logical place to incorporate dense housing plans—thus, there is little rationale to propose anything other than single family homes with reasonable large lots within the horse ranch area.
- Remove the third stories without changing the area where the housing goes.
- I would like larger lot sizes, more open spaces, much less multi-family units, more bike paths.
- Reduce the # of units. Its way too many people in too little space.
- The proposed development is too dense, it should be similar to adjacent Wildhorse community, like the single family house, the existing ones mostly > 2000 ft not proposed one < 2000 ft.
- I oppose the development, as described.
- Build it somewhere else; too much traffic!
- I would reduce the town homes to 2-story. Require addition of stop light on Covell.

11. List any other concerns about Parlin's August 2008 plan that are important to you. Attach additional sheets if needed to fully express your comments & suggestions. Or email comments to: swinton@cityofdavis.org

- Traffic impact on E. Covell Boulevard
- Traffic and pedestrians increased in the neighborhood.
- Guarantee that we will receive 20' of land to add to our back yard. It has been promised by Parlin for a while.
- We like the orchard. Any bike paths in there?
- The buffer space needs to be greater and consistently the same distance from each property line on Caravaggio. Get rid of the northern most and south eastern units (with those only a single line of trees) from the plan.
- This development should NOT be used to satisfy City of Davis needs for densification or in-fill projects. This open-space and ranch were part of the original development plan. If we are to approve such a plan it must conform to the overall Wildhorse Community and nearby housing density. Do not blight Wildhorse with more high density housing!
- Buildings should conform in height to existing homes in Wildhorse adjacent to the development.
- If there are affordable or low-income housing it needs to be owner occupied.
- Parlin needs to pay for new fencing for the properties neighboring the new development.
- Land dedication along Caravaggio should be considered. Existing Parlin plan is too dense and too many three stories and it does not mitigate negatives for Caravaggio owners.
- Too dense for surrounding area. Needs more parks and bike path.
- Traffic and/or safety issues with the addition of a new traffic light, leading into and out of the development. The bike and pedestrian sidewalk is used by our children riding to school.
- Far too many units, far too dense. Think ahead, imagine Hunt-Wesson already paved combined with so many units here? How could Covell/Mace handle traffic??
- Three-story fourplex homes with shared driveway and two-car garage – really congested. Paper states home owner fees would pay for tree belt upkeep but majority of housing is low income. How do you expect these fees to be covered and by whom?
I am very concerned with the points of access for emergency access through Bonnard and only two points of access elsewhere.
Too many units into small space.
Small street congested area even more.
Parking for # of units too small and no other parking for guests or units with >2 car garages.

- The low income units at Pole Line and Moore across from Nugget field are somewhat crime ridden. We don't want to see more of that which is understandable. Packing too many people in a small area encourages this. Parking may be inadequate and there should be a sports field or two.
- The close proximity of the very large traffic circle to the existing homes between Bernini and Bellows. There needs to be more distance with trees planted, between this noisy traffic circle and existing homes.
- Small square footage homes mean cars in driveways or on the street. Children grow up and get in cars. Easily 2+ cars per housing unit.
- Inclusion of extra low cost housing creates more business for the Davis Police Dept, impacts market value of current homes, etc. When the City of Davis recruits clients for extra low cost housing from outside the city, it brings a criminal element to our neighborhoods. What is the reasoning for such housing? - Politics? Matching funds?
- The Horse Ranch provides a natural buffer between residential area and farmland. The proposed development significantly disrupts the ecological integrity of the area. And the City of Davis would lose an import feature as an ecological friendly city.
- This is far too dense for property that was intended to be a "soft transition" to ag land on the eastern border of Davis. Not compatible with existing neighborhood with taller structures than our homes. This will be crime-ridden just like terracina on the other side of Wildhorse. Rentals, transient renters, etc. This was originally "open space" in the original Wildhorse Plan!
- Traffic into Wildhorse area and on E. Covell.
- Fully landscape the lot on Caravaggio that connects to the site. The lot is vacant-looking and ugly. Make it pretty (see circled area on illustration).
- I am opposed to multi unit dwelling or small < 2000 sq ft single family house on Wildhorse. It is a luxury single family housing in Wildhorse.
- I'm concerned that another "bedroom community" in the vicinity of Wildhorse will make the area more of a magnet for burglaries...
- That the public is fully informed with sufficient time to vote on the issue.
- I am concerned about bicyclists on the bike path along Covell, who will now need to cross the two streets that go into the new development. Some thought is necessary to minimize the risks for this (e.g. as children from Wildhorse ride to Harper or to Slide Hill Park).
- How come this property is being pushed to develop before other more appropriate sites within Davis?
- The increase in people trying to cross Covell at the development to get to the east bound bus stop at Monarch (the ped undercrossing is a long detour!) Combined with the increase in cars coming onto Covell in that very area.
- With the significant impact of the project on our community, why hasn't this been referred to a community vote prior to its tentative approval?

- Another concern of mine is that it is environmentally unsound to the area.
- Why is Wildhorse being congested / impacted when there are many superior development options / sites in Davis. Given the amount of high density / affordable housing already in Wildhorse (Terracina, Condos, Moore Village, Morrison Cottages), the area will become very congested with inadequate parks / recreations / traffic, etc.
- Three-story units would be unfair to our Caravaggio friends. We do not oppose to developing this property but it needs to be a plan that is fair to existing homeowners.
- Street parking.
- When Wildhorse was developed the Horse Ranch was part of the open space component. To develop it as high density housing isn't appropriate.
- 1) Traffic concerns: people leaving the area are certain to cross Covell even if warned otherwise, by foot or bike, leading inevitably to a death or serious injury. The overcrowded nature of the development increases this probability many-fold.
2)Greenbelt: the greenbelt and walking path with protected animals is a community gem and of course open to everyone in Davis. It is well-trafficked currently but not overburdened. With the dense housing planned currently for the horse ranch, it is certain to dramatically increase foot and bike traffic, making the look and experience of the greenbelt/pathway system less casual/open for everyone, especially those living at the edge of Wildhorse as we do. In other words, there will be even a heavier flow of people on the path making many times a day a continual line of folks walking by. This is obviously a nuisance, but in addition detracts from the enjoyment of all who use the greenbelt and compromises the integrity of the protected animals and plants.
- 1) The placement of the one and only access road that serves the entire development runs right behind the existing homes, why? It seems to us that to mitigate the noise from constant traffic the road should be on the other side of the development. This would place the road next to an open field rather than all the existing homes. Most of the homes that back up to the ranch have the master bedroom at the very back of the house. This development would take what has been a reasonably quiet area next to ones bedroom and turn it into a nightmare of constant traffic noise.
2) The tree buffer zone is not evenly distributed and looks to only really buffer a third of the houses on Caravaggio. The road and the proposed construction being only a few trees away from some of the homes makes it not much of a buffer zone at all.
3) The idea of having three-story construction seems way out of line with the surrounding neighborhoods, it would completely block any kind of sense of open space. I understand the city council wants density but this plan feels like overkill.
- If we are going to lose nugget field, we need more soccer/lacrosse fields.
- The traffic will be heavy.
- Why is it necessary to have an emergency vehicle access at the existing gravel path? The emergency vehicle access is not necessary and can be used for green space.