

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

2500 Fifth Street, Police Department Community Room
Thursday, June 21, 2007
7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber, Donna Lott, Pam Gunnell, Mike Harrington, Eileen Samitz, Kevin Wolf (Chair), Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Mark Spencer, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso, Luke Watkins (arrived at item 6, departed at item 7), Maynard Skinner.

Absent: Kristin Stoneking, Ellen Shields.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Julie Vyfhuis.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Lydia Delis-Schlosser, Landon Scarlett, Matt Williams, Ken Topper, Joe Whitcombe, Steve Hicks, Jeanne Jones, Pam Nieberg.

1. Roll Call, Call the Meeting to Order.

Chairman Kevin Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

A motion was made by Kevin Wolf not to review, the two small sites on the agenda - E4 Haussler Property and E10 Bueri Property, so that more time could be allotted to discussing larger sites and the upcoming workshop. Maynard Skinner seconded the motion and the Committee approved by consensus. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Eileen Samitz and seconded by Jay Gerber. The Committee approved the agenda by consensus.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes.

Mark Siegler pointed out minor corrections to motions in the last meeting. Kevin Wolf stated that he will try to reiterate, with help from Staff, Committee member names during motions so that the minutes get recorded accurately. A motion was made by Mike Harrington to approve the summary minutes of the June 14, 2007 meeting. Lucas Frerichs seconded the motion and the Committee approved the minutes by

consensus. Jay Gerber and Kevin Wolf abstained from voting because of their absence at the last meeting. (*The June 14, 2007 Summary Minutes with amendments can be found on the city's website at www.cityofdavis.org*).

4. Public Comment.

The Committee discussed at length the process for public comments and some concerns were brought up which included:

- a) The public having an opportunity to speak *only* during the Public Comment period on the agenda, and
- b) The public speaking at the allotted time within the agenda and during each review of the individual sites, within a reasonable time limit or as a point of clarification that shares valuable information with the Committee on the potential housing site.

A motion was made by Mark Spencer that the public speak at the time allotted in the agenda (Public Comments) and also speak for a time limit of 1-2 minutes depending on the number of people commenting, just as a point of clarification or sharing valuable information on potential housing sites that would help the Committee in their decision making process. The motion was seconded by Luke Watkins and the Committee approved by consensus.

Public Comments: Ken Topper stated that he was submitting information in response to the staff letter requesting owner/developer input regarding timing and use of site to be used during the Committee's upcoming discussion of the Cannery Park site. The Committee thanked him for the information.

5. Continue Initial Evaluations and Prioritizations of Sites.

Staff reiterated that the use of the site worksheets is to accomplish an initial evaluation and prioritization as they consider potential housing sites. Kevin suggested that Staff introduce the sites, the Committee listen to any public comments and then, the Committee discuss factors and conduct votes on sites. The Committee agreed and a discussion followed on Site E7 Northeast Corner of Fifth Street and Poleline Road and Site E8 R-H-D zone, Oxford Circle/Wake Forest Drive. (*Please see attached for Committee's initial ranking of these sites*).

6. Begin to Review Summary Sheets for Sites on the Working List of Potential Housing Sites.

Staff explained that they are still working on summary sheets, and would likely have second unit information for the next meeting. The Committee agreed by consensus to discuss options related to second units at the next meeting, specifically requesting more information about the program in Santa Cruz.

7. Deletion of Sites from Working List of Potential Housing Sites.

Staff stated that the Committee had requested this item in order to decide whether to delete sites from the potential housing list without the completion of a site worksheet. Staff requested that the Committee provide a rationale/basis for the deletion of these sites from further study for the record, using the existing site factors. A discussion followed in which the Committee was concerned about:

- a) Staff time preparing site summaries of sites that should not even be considered. For example site H9, which some Committee members felt should be completely removed from the list of potential sites.
- b) Time limit at tonight's meeting in which factors for or against deleting said sites should be determined. There was consensus that more consideration by members would be necessary.

A motion was made by Mike Harrington to delete Site H9 at this meeting, seconded by Eileen Samitz. The motion failed 2 to 11, with Mike Harrington and Eileen Samitz in support. A substitute motion was made by Kevin Wolf that each member review the list of sites and record factors for and against the deletion of particular sites. All Committee members supported this motion, and scheduling this item for a future agenda.

8. Proposal to Separate Recommendations Regarding (a) Regional Housing Needs Allocation and (b) the City's 1% Growth Guideline.

The Committee requested clarification from Mark Spencer on his proposal to have two separate reports completed, one on RHNA and one on the City's 1% growth guideline. Mark explained that he thought it was important that there be transparency between the two numbers so that the public understands the distinction of the state requirement versus the local target.

Jeff Baird reminded the Committee that their purpose is to review potential housing sites and make recommendations that would help create a better community. He added that the Committee should focus on creating a good package of sites which addresses local housing needs and how best to meet them, and, he added that it may best to delay this decision related to how the Committee's recommendations should be packaged.

A motion was made by Mark Spencer to prepare two separate reports, separate in time, of recommendations that comply with 1) RHNA numbers and 2) the City's 1% growth guideline numbers, which would include recommendations for sites beyond the year 2013. It was agreed that these reports should be discussed and prepared after the 2nd workshop once the Committee has heard from the public. The motion was seconded by Norma Turner and passed by an 11 to 2 vote with opposition by Jay Gerber and Maynard Skinner.

9. Written Communications.

There were no written communications submitted.

10. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

Staff updated the Committee on a change to the schedule which includes a meeting on September 6th and moving the workshop to September 13th. The Committee questioned Staff on the purpose of the 2nd workshop and a motion was made by Kevin Wolf to clarify such at an upcoming meeting. There was unanimous agreement.

11. Adjournment, Next Scheduled Meeting Date.

A motion to adjourn was made by Kevin Wolf and seconded by Maynard Skinner. By unanimous agreement the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:05 P.M. The next meeting is scheduled for July 12, 2007 at the Police Department Community Room, 2500 Fifth Street.

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: E7- Fifth Avenue Place / Alders

Factors regarding why the site should or should not be considered for housing:

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

Should the site be considered further?

YES (12)

NO (1)

UNCERTAIN (0)

What are other factors related to the consideration of this site for housing?

FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Good location for higher density
- Efficient use of land
- Close to transit, shopping, schools
- Surrounding similar density/uses

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Too much on site
- Not enough parking/open space
- Impacts on people who live there and on Pole Line Road, Promises to residents
- Site small for density
- Post off nearby

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

CONDITIONS / REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE (Mixed-Use, Special Planning Requirements, etc)

- Parking/safe access/open space (usable open space for occupants)
- Setback from roadway
- Roadway capacity
- Appropriate design fit
- No 2-story units above 1-story

After discussion and in light of the above requirements, how would you RANK THIS SITE as a future location for housing?

HIGH (4)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (4)

Most Important Factors

LOW (4)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (1)

Most Important Factors

NO (0)

Most Important Factors

The following members abstained from voting:

What do you think should be the preliminary range of HOUSING UNITS and DENSITY for housing on this site?

RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS / RANGE OF DENSITY: 4 to 16 units (net increase)

- Density related to adequate parking / open space
- Consider potential traffic impacts

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: E-8 – R-H-D Zone, Oxford Circle

Factors regarding why the site should or should not be considered for housing:

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

Should the site be considered further?

YES (10)

NO (2)

UNCERTAIN (1)

What are other factors related to the consideration of this site for housing?

FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Percent increase of 32 units would be minimal in impact
- Within walking distance of UC Davis
- Confine to this site
- Surrounding high density

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Don't want "Isla Vista" in Davis
- What would higher density look like?
- Should not be precedent setting
- MOU with UCD regarding student housing
- Promises made

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- New high density category in General Plan? Only location of R-H-D zoning in city. (50 du/ac). Would have specific criteria with designation.

CONDITIONS / REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE (Mixed-Use, Special Planning Requirements, etc)

- Limited to this site. Need other criteria.
- Parking requirements
- Traffic impacts

After discussion and in light of the above requirements, how would you RANK THIS SITE as a future location for housing?

HIGH (4)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (4)

Most Important Factors

LOW (1)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (0)

Most Important Factors

NO (4)

Most Important Factors

The following members abstained from voting:

What do you think should be the preliminary range of HOUSING UNITS and DENSITY for housing on this site?

RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS / RANGE OF DENSITY: 16 to 32 units (net increase)

- Need better quality student housing; UCD housing on campus (MOU)