

Sterling Apartments Project
Public Comments on Project and Policy Issues

Transcribed from verbal comments made at the September 29, 2016 Community Meeting

1. Concern that the investment spent by the applicant on the project planning and processing creates an incentive to approve by the City.
2. Comment about the applicant's profit motive for the project.
3. Comment that non-profit owner will benefit financially from the property sale.
4. Question about fiscal impacts to city.
5. Concern about keeping up with potential changes to the project and having to respond to the new iterations and uncertainty about what the actual proposed project is.
6. Compatibility and neighborhood character issues. Proposed building looks like it belongs in New York or Chicago.
7. The 4- and 5-bedroom apartments are not marketable to non-students which limits the potential users.
8. Visual impact is a huge impact.
9. Design concerns about the project and buildings which are too high and too big.
10. Concern about the number of bedrooms proposed and the potential double-occupancy of the bedrooms which would drastically increase the number of residents. Comment about how to enforce a single-occupancy requirement.
11. Project disregards policies on density. The density is twice what the city allows.
12. The project's density also affects and exacerbates other issues, such as noise, traffic, waste, water use.
13. Concern about noise from the project and outdoor amenities. Confusion about the proposed amenities and what might be changed.
14. Concern about project's water use. One bathroom per bedroom is likely to result in excessive water use.
15. Insufficient parking is provided. Surrounding neighborhood will be impacted by overflow parking.
16. A water meter should be provided for each apartment.
17. Comment that left turns out of the project site onto 5th Street should be prohibited because of traffic and safety issues.
18. There is no reason why the project needs to have more than zero cars. The City should be implementing policies such as those in the Beyond Platinum Bicycle Plan intended to increase the City's bike share mode. There are measures that can be incorporated to eliminate the need for cars by the residents.
19. Concern that if on-site parking is eliminated or reduced, the project will get even larger.
20. The project density may result in a larger number of bike trips, but bike traffic is still traffic. There will be constant traffic interruption on 5th Street from bicyclists using the rapid flashing light at the proposed mid-block pedestrian crossing.
21. City's parking ratio used calculate the parking requirement is out-of-date. The requirement is the same ratio for any unit with three or more bedrooms the same.
22. There are limited connections from East Davis over railroad tracks to other parts of the city. Other projects are also potentially impacting arterials across town and access to downtown. This project will worsen the situation.

23. Comment that the project's impacts are widespread and would not only affect Rancho Yolo. Example of the Cannery project impacting Pole Line Road and Covell Road.
24. Question about what the proposed benefits to the City would be from the project.
25. This kind of project should be on campus, not in the City.
26. The institutional use and existing facilities provide a public use and should be maintained.