

# **SUMMARY MINUTES**

## **City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee**

2500 Fifth Street, Police Department Community Room  
Thursday, November 15, 2007  
7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber, Mike Harrington, Pam Gunnell, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Ellen Shields, Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Maynard Skinner, Mark Spencer, Bob Traverso, Norma Turner, Luke Watkins, Kevin Wolf (Chair) (arrived during item 5, with the discussion of Sites B12 and E13).

Absent: Kristin Stoneking, Bob Traverso.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Jesse Henkin.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Pam Neiberg, Gregg Herrington, John Hodgson, Claudia Reed, Payam Bozorgchani, Matt Williams, Landon Scarlett, Ken Topper, Lydia Delis-Schlosser, Mark Braly, Jeanne Jones, Steve Hicks, Sidney Vergis, Masud Monfared.

---

**1. Call to Order.**

Vice Chair Mark Siegler called the meeting to order at approximately 7:15 P.M.

**2. Approval of Agenda.**

Eileen Samitz made a motion to approve the agenda, Mike Harrington seconded the motion and the Steering Committee unanimously approved the agenda.

**3. Approval of Summary Minutes.**

Jay Gerber made a motion to approve the minutes, Lucas Frerichs seconded the motion and the Steering Committee unanimously approved the minutes. Ellen Shields abstained due to her absence from the November 1, 2007 meeting.

**4. Public Comment.**

John Hodgson spoke on behalf of Masud Monfared, local developer. He wanted to inform the Committee of project changes on Site H4, including its new name of Davis Urban Farms. Norma Turner asked how the “urban farms” would be operated. John Hodgson responded that they were going to look to the public for insight on how they would want to set the farms up. He added that the farms would produce high quality organic fruits and vegetables that would be used for consumption locally, either in restaurants or local markets.

Gregg Herrington, representative for the Oeste Ranch Property (Site H6), notified the Committee that he and his colleagues are working internally with other owners in the Northwest Quadrant of Davis (Sites H4-H6) to create a master plan of development for the area.

Jeanne Jones, member of the Chamber of Commerce, asked that the Committee alert her to the meeting date when they plan to discuss the Bay Area Economics Housing Needs Analysis so that she can notify other interested members in the Chamber of Commerce.

**5. Continue Initial Evaluations and Prioritizations of Sites.**

Jeff Baird restated the process for the initial evaluation and prioritization of each housing site:

- 1) Staff report and committee questions of clarification regarding the site
- 2) Public comment, questions and additional information on the site
- 3) Steering Committee discussion of site:
  - a) Factors in support/opposition to housing on this site
  - b) Should it be considered for housing? (vote)
  - c) Additional information needed from staff (if any)
  - d) Conditions/requirements for development of this site with housing
  - e) Site ranking (vote)
  - f) Preliminary housing unit #/density for this site

A preliminary evaluation was completed on:

- C2- R2 zoned parcels, potential for additional units
- C3- R-3 zoned parcels, potential for additional units
- C4/D2- Downtown estimate under existing plans & zoning – with two story buildings and taller buildings with conditional use permits (combined)
- E11- Downtown estimate with increased building height permitted
- B12- Existing neighborhood shopping centers that allow housing
- E13- Neighborhood shopping with zone changes to allow more housing

*(Please see attached for worksheets on the Committee’s initial evaluation of each site.)*

**6. Initial Overall Site Rankings and Schedule for Completion of Process.**

The Steering Committee was asked to comment on and confirm the principles to guide their individual site rankings. Staff prepared a list of principles based on the Committee’s work so far for their review and discussion. Jeff Baird stated that the

principles would be presented at the next workshop in order to provide the public insight as to why the Committee ranked the housing sites the way it did. Chair Kevin Wolf submitted a revised list of principles and goals to the Committee for consideration. Mark Siegler and Mark Spencer felt that it was counter-productive to rank the principles in order of highest importance because all of them are important and necessary, and it would be too difficult to place them in a hierarchy. Jeff Baird suggested that instead of ranking the principles that the Committee just establish the principles to be used in individual member rankings. Jeff Baird noted that after the site ranking exercise is complete, additional principles might be identified and some principles might have proven more important at that point. There was much discussion regarding Kevin Wolf's proposed principles. Eileen Samitz made a motion to use the principles provided by staff and use the documents provided by staff to rank the sites, Ellen Shields seconded the motion. After some deliberation the Steering Committee passed the motion. Additionally, the Committee recorded factors to be used in the comprehensive ranking of sites at upcoming meetings, including: preserving small-town feel, historic preservation and public safety.

With the list of principles the Committee will rank all of the sites, except the "very high" sites, within the two groups of small sites and large sites. As part of the ranking, the Committee will write down which factors influenced their choices and submit it to staff prior to the next meeting. At the next meeting staff will present a compiled list of the site rankings and of the most commonly used factors/principles. The two ranked lists of the small sites and large sites will then be integrated into one overall site ranking of the Committee at the November 29, 2007 meeting. Any new factors/principles that are commonly used by Committee members will be considered for inclusion into the overall list of principles to be provided with the site rankings at Workshop #2.

**7. Written Communications.**

- Bob Wolcott and Danielle Foster - Memorandum to Steering Committee on UC Davis West Village Project.
- Kevin Wolf- Comments on the proposed ranking process and principles.
- Norma Turner- Comments related to Community Workshop #2.

**8. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.**

This item was discussed as a part of 6a: "Remaining tasks and schedule." No changes were made to the schedule provided by staff.

**9. Adjournment.**

Maynard Skinner made the motion to adjourn the meeting, Eileen Samitz seconded it and the Committee unanimously approved it. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:30 P.M.

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: C2-R2 zoned parcels**

**Should the site be considered further?    YES (11)    NO (0)    UNCERTAIN (0)    ABSTAIN (1)**

\*Mike Harrington abstains due to a conflict of interest

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

\*Recommendation that staff work to promote the development of 25 units using the following standards:

- Continued enforcement of infill guidelines
- Possible fee incentives
- Neighborhood outreach
- Promotion of good Infill
- Design Review of projects

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

**HIGH (9)                  MEDIUM (2)                  LOW (0)                  UNCERTAIN (0)                  NO (0)                  ABSTAIN (1)**  
*Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors                  Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors                  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: 10-25\* units**

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: C3-R3 zoned parcels**

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 (11)    NO (0)    UNCERTAIN (0)    ABSTAIN (2)**

\*Mark Siegler and Lucas Frerichs abstain due to a conflict of interest.

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

**FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE**

**FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE**

**WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?**

- What is the life of an apartment complex? (40 years for full depreciation)
- What are the ages of apartment complexes in the area?

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

- Review of parking and traffic impacts with new projects.
- Follow infill guidelines.
- Ensure compliance with parking requirements.
- Provide possible fee incentives.

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

**HIGH (9)                  MEDIUM (1)                  LOW (0)    UNCERTAIN (0)                  NO (0)                  ABSTAIN (2)**  
*Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors                  Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors                  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: 24 units\***

\*The Steering Committee said that there may be opportunity for additional development, but that staff would need to gather additional information regarding the age and densification of existing apartment complexes in the area being discussed.

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: C4 & D2- Downtown established under existing zoning**  
**E11- Downtown established with increased height and density**

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

- E11- residential parking
- Possibility of high rise buildings
- Replacement of bungalows
- may detract some of the chicness of the town.

**C4 & D2: Should the site be considered further? YES ( 10 ) NO ( 0 ) UNCERTAIN ( 0 ) ABSTAIN ( 2 )**

**E11: Should the site be considered further? YES ( 1 ) NO ( 8 ) UNCERTAIN ( 1 ) ABSTAIN ( 2 )**

\* Mike Harrington and Maynard Skinner  
abstain due to a conflict of interest.

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

**FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE**

**FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE**

- Could harm retail, no parking for customers.
- Added traffic congestion could constrict access to and from downtown.
- Possible historic decay of the district.
- Historical guidelines.

**WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?**

- Status of parking structure.
- Must assess the impacts of housing on downtown.
- Core specific plan, look at planning for housing comprehensively.

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

- Designated remote parking.
- Plan for increased need of parking spaces.

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

**HIGH ( 9 )      MEDIUM ( 1 )      LOW ( 0 )      UNCERTAIN ( 0 )      NO ( 2 )      ABSTAIN ( 2 )**  
*Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors*

**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: C4/D2 : 52 units (possible increase in future if more research is done)**  
**E11: 0 units**

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: B12 Neighborhood Shopping Established under existing zoning  
E13 Neighborhood Shopping with zone changes to allow more housing**

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Could be beneficial to Davis Manor & Westlake
- + Shopping centers are underutilized
- + Can “save” shopping centers, mixing uses promotes stability

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Parking conflicts
- Dangerous for children (playing in parking lot)
- Potential increased crime
- Protection of retail

**B12: Should the site be considered further? YES (9) NO (3) UNCERTAIN (1)**

**E13: Should the site be considered further? YES (0) NO (9) UNCERTAIN (4)**

**WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?**

- What happened to the smaller local grocery stores?

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

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

**HIGH (7)      MEDIUM (1)      LOW (2)      UNCERTAIN (1)      NO (2)**  
*Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors    Most Important Factors*

*The following members abstained from voting: Kevin Wolf*

**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: For B12: 12-50 units**

**Vote for 12 du/ac: YES (2) NO (6) Uncertain (2) Abstention (1)**

**Vote for 50 du/ac: YES (7) NO (5) Uncertain (1) Abstention (1)**

**For E13: 0 units**