

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

**Thursday August 9, 2007, 7:00 PM
526 B Street, Davis Joint Unified School District Conference Room**

Committee Members: Jay Gerber (arrived during Item 4), Pam Gunnell, Mike Harrington, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Maynard Skinner, Mark Spencer, Kristin Stoneking, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso, Luke Watkins (arrived during Item 5, with the discussion of Site F15), Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Absent: Lucas Frerichs, Ellen Shields.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Jesse Henkin.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

1. Roll Call, Call the Meeting to Order.

Chairman Kevin Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

Chairman Kevin Wolf suggested that the Committee not attempt to get through all of the sites listed on the agenda, but rather get through as many as they could by 8:50 P.M. and then move to item six, deletion of sites from Working List of Potential Housing Sites. With this change, Maynard Skinner moved approval of the agenda, Mike Harrington seconded it and the agenda was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes.

Bob Traverso noted errors and vague information in the Site Worksheet Summaries of the July 26, 2007 meeting minutes, and he proposed changes to the minutes. A motion was made by Mike Harrington to approve the minutes with Bob Traverso's proposed changes. The motion was seconded by Eileen Samitz and approved unanimously. Chairman Kevin Wolf abstained due to his absence from the July 26, 2007 meeting.

4. Public Comments.

- a. Don Fouts stated that the Committee should not consider sites unless the owner of the property is willing to develop the site.
- b. Ken Topper offered to meet Committee members at Site F1, if they have interest in visiting and seeing how the site has changed.

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 Sites E9, F15, and F16.

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

6. Deletion of Sites.

The following H Sites were deleted from the Committee's Working List of Potential Housing Sites. The reasons for deletion are provided next to each site listed.

- a. H9 (Northeast Area) - Kevin moved that site H9 be removed from the Working List of Potential Housing Sites, Bob Traverso seconded that motion. The reasons stated by Committee members regarding why this site should not be considered were: that there is no owner interest in development at this time, development of this site would not contribute to a compact urban form, distances to existing community facilities and the downtown are too great and auto trips would be encouraged, development at this location would involve excessive new infrastructure or excessive extension of existing infrastructure, development of this site would convert prime agricultural land, development at this location would negatively impact scenic resources of the community, and development here would not be conducive to transit or bicycle mobility. The Steering Committee voted unanimously to remove the site from the list.
- b. H10 (Sphere of Influence Site south of El Macero) - Maynard Skinner made the motion to remove site H10 from the list, Pam Gunnell seconded the motion. The Committee stated that removal of this site was consistent with the same reasons listed for Site H9, and also because the people who live near the site in El Macero voted against having it developed. The owner's intent as it relates to the development of this site is unclear. The Steering Committee voted unanimously to remove this site from the list.

- c. H11 (Sphere of Influence site east of Davis, south of I-80) – Bob Traverso made the motion to remove site H11, Mike Harrington seconded the motion. The Committee stated that removal of this site was consistent with the same reasons listed for Site H9, and also because the neighboring levee is subject to possible failure. The Steering Committee voted unanimously to remove this site from the list.
- d. H12 (Southeast area along Solano border) – Bob Traverso made the motion to remove site H12, Luke Watkins seconded it. The Committee stated that removal of this site was consistent with the same reasons listed for Site H9. The Steering Committee voted unanimously to remove this site from the list.
- e. H8 (Shriner’s property, east of Wildhorse) – Maynard Skinner made the motion to remove site H8 from the list, Bob Traverso seconded it. The Committee stated that removal of this site was consistent with the same reasons listed for Site H9. The Steering Committee voted unanimously to remove this site from the list.

Bob Traverso moved to remove the site H6 (Oeste Ranch, southeasterly portion), with a second from Mark Spencer based on the same list of reasons as those provided in H9. There was discussion amongst the Committee regarding the removal of Site H6 from the Working List of Potential Housing Sites. Maynard Skinner stated that the site has poor soil for farming, and that its development could assist in solving drainage issues currently found in the northwest area of the City. The Committee voted 8-5 to keep this site in the Working List of Potential Housing Sites, so the site will be reviewed and discussed further at a future Committee meeting.

7. Written Communications.

There were no written communications submitted.

8. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

The Committee agendaized for the next meeting to look at their Near-term Schedule and evaluate whether an adequate amount of meetings are scheduled to complete site reviews. Bob Traverso also requested that Jeff or staff prepare a summary of which sites the Committee has reviewed so far, and which they have left to review.

9. Adjournment.

Maynard Skinner made the motion for adjournment, Mark Siegler seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 P.M. **The next meeting is scheduled for August 23, 2007 in the East Conference Room at the Davis Unified School District Offices at 526 B Street, Davis.**

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F16- Little League Fields

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Access to library and other services
- Not so dilapidated
- Close to a neighborhood park (Community Park)
- Site can accommodate compact dev. and higher density housing
- Proximity to existing community facilities
- Distance and ease of bicycle mobility
- Close to Unitrans bus stops
- Site being developed can be served by existing schools
- Close to Core Area and UCD

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Not a desirable residential area (dilapidated)
- Proximity of other fields in Community Park, near these fields
- There is good public access/transportation to these fields

Should the site be considered further? YES (3) NO (10) UNCERTAIN (0)

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?

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

Money/ Plan for replacement of fields

Are there funds to maintain the fields elsewhere?

Little League needs to support the move

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

HIGH (___) **MEDIUM (___)** **LOW (___)** **UNCERTAIN (___)** **NO (___)**
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: 17-25 du/ac

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F15- City & DJUSD Corp. Yards/ Community Gardens

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Possible place for live/work housing, including condo commercial space for businesses to own space
- 5th Street, is on a main bus route
- Housing toward back/north of property, commercial in front
- Could provide Medium Density/ Workforce housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Parking (existing need for additional parking)
- Traffic Safety
- Loss of community gardens (about 2 acres)
- Commercial Service Uses exist

Should the site be considered further? YES (___) NO (___) UNCERTAIN (___)

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?

Does the city own land elsewhere for the Corp. yard? (Should be moved to a marginal piece of land, i.e. freeway sites, or land on north end of Pole Line)

Relationship to school district corps yard, do they own their parcel or is it leased?

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

- Residential and commercial impacts of a new development.
- Need to plan developments for the Corp yards and PG & E not just Corp yards. In other words the area needs to be planned long-term as if both will get developed someday. A Fifth Street Corridor Visioning Process is needed.
- Potential health risks (real or perceived) and visual impacts of living next to bio-technology company (Calgene)
- Needs to be sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood, both densities and surrounding uses

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

ALL HOUSING (0) MIXED-USE: 5TH ST COMMERCIAL W/ HOUSING IN BACK (9)

NO HOUSING (2) UNCERTAIN (2)

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: 8-16 du/ac

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: E9- Simmons Estate

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Large Site (12 acres) and is within city
- Near schools
- Logical location for housing
- Good transition b/w densities, from medium to high density
- Prime site rather than going out to the Periphery
- Would support neighborhood retail (Davis Manor)
- Could be used for workforce housing
- Surrounded by Residential on 3 sides

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Historic farm site, not intended for housing
- Conversion of Ag land
- One of the oldest pieces of Davis heritage left, it should be preserved
- Limited vehicular access (only access is from E. 8th)
- Ag. Oasis in the middle of all the development
- Large, unique parcel
- Preserve barn
- Could be used as an organic urban farm or nature reserve

Should the site be considered further? YES (7) NO (2) UNCERTAIN (3)

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/ OTHER COMMENTS?

- It could be used for a senior village or a mix of uses that incorporate open space/ ag land. (look at village homes for an example.)
- Explore funding sources (\$4 million, the cost of property, would consume approx. 8 years of funds, no leveraging ability at site)
- Maximize density of housing on property so as to keep as much open space as possible, then it can be used as a greenbelt to connect to community gardens, bike ways, etc and preserve some of the farm homestead.

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

Maintain a portion of open space on the site

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

RES FOCUS- Standard Open Space (2) MIX: RES AND OPEN SPACE- Res Primary (6)

MIX: RES AND OPEN SPACE- Res Secondary (1) NO HOUSING (2) UNCERTAIN (1)

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: 8-20 du/ac

Maximize Open Space and Ag, in exchange for higher densities on the site, otherwise lower density housing if less open space is provided.