

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis
General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee
Davis Joint Unified School District East Conference Room
February 7, 2008
7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber (left during item 8), Pam Gunnell, Eileen Samitz, Ellen Shields (left during item 8), Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Maynard Skinner (left during item 8), Norma Turner, Luke Watkins, Donna Lott, Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Absent: Mark Spencer, Kristin Stoneking, Bob Traverso.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Rhys Rowland, Jesse Henkin.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Pam Nieberg, Lydia Delis-Schlosser, Masud Monfared, Jeanne Jones, Joe Whitcombe, Katherine West, Sydney Vergis, Landon Scarlett, Matt Williams, Ken Topper, Gregg Herrington, Steve Hicks.

- 1. Call to Order.**
Chair Kevin Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM. It was noted that Mike Harrington has resigned from the Committee.
- 2. Approval of Agenda.**
Lucas Frerichs made a motion to approve the agenda and Eileen Samitz seconded the motion. Kevin Wolf requested the Committee move Item 9, "Special Site Strategy Ideas" to the next meeting if they go over the allotted time on previous items. The Committee agreed and unanimously approved the agenda.
- 3. Approval of Summary Minutes.**
Lucas Frerichs made a motion to approve the January 10, 2008 minutes and Jay seconded the motion. Mark Siegler noted that a motion he had made was not recorded and requested it be added. Ken Topper, representative of Lewis Planned Communities, also asked that his comments under Item 4 be corrected in

accordance with a memo that he submitted. The Committee agreed to both of these requests and requested that revised minutes be brought to the next meeting.

4. Public Comments.

No public comments were made.

5. Summary of the Results of Workshop #2 on January 24, 2008.

Paul Navazio, City Finance Director, provided a brief summary of general fiscal impacts issues related to housing development versus other types of development. Some of the main issues he discussed were:

- Challenges in ensuring fiscal viability of housing development in California
- How development impacts municipal revenues and expenditures
- Examples of hypothetical fiscal impacts
- Additional challenges in evaluating the fiscal impact of development opportunities
- Balancing community housing goals and needs with fiscal impacts

6. Summary of the Results of workshop #2 on January 24, 2008.

After reviewing the comments made by the public at the workshop the Committee raised questions about whether they should re-rank sites in accordance with what a high potential for development or keep their current list which has what the Committee deems the best sites for development regardless of whether or not the sites have developer's interest. They decided that the current list was acceptable and representative of their work and discussions. Committee members also noted their inability to accurately judge which sites have the highest potential for development. To reaffirm this point to maintain their ranking, several Committee members cited that results did not show an overwhelming majority of participants requesting the shift of any one site from a specific ranking category to another. It was agreed that this information demonstrated that the public was relatively in agreement with the Committee's current rankings.

Bob Wolcott noted that on page nine of the workshop summary packet "Station #3, Ranking of Principles" that the headings had been blacked out. In the first column the heading was supposed to say "Rank of Dots Placed", next "Number of Dots Placed" and then "Original Order of Principles". It was also noted that there were a few pages in the summary that referenced Cowell instead of Covell Blvd.

7. Review of the First Sections of the Draft Housing Element.

Danielle Foster presented an overview of the first four sections of the Draft Housing Element and focused specifically on the Steering Committee's contributions to the housing element. Mark Siegler asked when the Committee would be able to review the entire document. Danielle Foster responded that the draft for the first four sections is online and was also emailed to all the Committee members previous to the meeting. The final three sections will be provided to the

Committee for their February 21, 2008 meeting. She stated that staff would be accepting their comments all month and could discuss it at the next meeting. Mark Siegler recognized staff's work on the document and requested that staff clarify the areas of recommendation from the Committee, specifically the site list, as the Draft Housing Element proceeds with city review.

8. Remainder of Schedule and Tasks.

Bob Wolcott presented an example of what the final report to City Council might look like to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee raised some potential concerns with the "Estimated Yields from Potential Housing Sites" document. The Committee felt it would be too difficult and speculative, as well as not their role, to make projections about the types of housing to be built and the affordability of these units. They felt that the General Plan and City Code state affordability requirements that would be applied to all sites during planning review and that numerical estimates at this early stage could be misleading and unnecessary since total project units on most sites are yet to be defined.

Instead the Committee focused discussions on the one page "site recommendations" sheet. They next discussed the possibility of assigning an average number of units to each site through another vote of the Committee rather than the midpoint of ranges currently being listed. ~~Eileen Samitz made a motion that the Steering Committee should not complete another vote on the number of units in order to re-designate density. Mark Siegler seconded this motion and added that they should not use specific numbers, like the midpoint number provided by staff, but simply use the categories provided in the General Plan (low, medium, high) using the Committee's existing ranges from their original site review. Kevin Wolf and others agreed that this would be good information to start from and then the group could identify any issues with ranges that cover multiple densities, etc. The motion was passed unanimously. Eileen Samitz stated that they should not have to re-designate density because they had already spent an ample amount of time assigning the density of each site during the initial review of sites. She then made a motion that the Committee not reassign the density but use the number or range they had previously suggested in the initial review for the summary sheets and Mark Sigler seconded the motion. Kevin Wolf stated that the assigned density was not an accurate representation of the Committee's recommendation and thought that leaving it as is was troublesome. Other Committee members agreed that perhaps they should be given an opportunity to review the original densities in order to confirm that either they are accurate or need to be changed. Luke Watkins made a substitute motion, seconded by Lucas Frerichs, that staff take the Committee's initial ranges and correlate them to General Plan Land Use designations with accompanying densities (e.g. Residential-Low Density). Then the Committee can vote at a later meeting to move sites to other land use categories, if needed. The motion was further clarified to state that only unit ranges would be used to complete the~~

summary sheets, except in cases where a specific unit amount was provided by the Committee. This motion was approved by consensus of the Committee.

During public comment, Matt Williams suggested that the Committee adopt the order of rankings created by the public. Kevin Wolf and Mark Siegler both stated that they could not do this because their rankings would technically be inaccurate since they originally used the principles with no particular order of importance as a group and based on their own individual ranking of principles. The Committee agreed that the public's ranking would not coincide with the Committee's site ranking that was completed prior to receiving the public input.

Lastly, there was general agreement by the Committee and staff that staff would complete the one-page summary sheet for each potential housing site using the information from the Committee's initial review to identify the recommended residential category under the General Plan density designations and other strategic recommendations for each site. Once completed the Committee will review and discuss any necessary corrections to the density designations or other information included on the draft summary sheets.

9. Special Site Strategy Ideas.

Due to the lack of time this item will be discussed at the February 21, 2008 meeting.

10. Written Communications.

- a. Newspaper article dated January 10, 2008 on Grande School Site and Wildhorse Nugget Fields Site.
- b. Newspaper article dated January 23, 2008 on Simmons (aka Chiles Ranch) Site.
- c. Memorandum dated January 29, 2008 on the Fiscal Considerations in Review of Housing Development Opportunities.

11. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

Nothing was discussed during this item, it was covered under Item 8.

12. Adjournment.

Lucas Frerichs moved to adjourn the meeting and Pam Gunnell seconded the motion, with unanimous agreement the meeting was adjourned at 9:55 PM.