

## **SUMMARY MINUTES**

### **City of Davis**

### **General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee**

526 B Street, Davis Joint Unified School District Conference Room

Thursday, October 11, 2007

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Mike Harrington, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Ellen Shields, Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Maynard Skinner, Mark Spencer, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso, Luke Watkins.

Absent: Jay Gerber, Pam Gunnell, Kristin Stoneking, Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Staff: Danielle Foster, Rhys Rowland, Jesse Henkin.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Jeff De Mure, Chelsea Morris, Beverly McFarland, Masud Monfared, Dwight Sanders, Donna Sanders, Randy Yackzan, Chuck Cunningham, Lydia Delis-Schlosser, Jeanne Jones, Mary Jackman, Pam Nieberg, Ed Walton, Rob Odell, Jay Davis, Margherita Molnar, Kent Lloyd, Robert Paylor, Ken Topper, Steve Hicks, Dan Wynne, Lucille King, Greg Kruekewitt, Denise Satterfield, Dan Rubins, Megan Satterfield-Smith, Dale Smith, Joe Lin, George Lo Buono, Bill Streng, Mike Shipley, Jim Wirth, Alfred Smith, Tim Newell, Bill Fitzgerald, Bob Snell, Gregg Herrington, Steve Hayes, Matt Williams, Bob Pavlov, Charlene Pavlov.

---

#### **1. Call to Order.**

Vice Chairman Mark Siegler called the meeting to order at 7:03 P.M.

#### **2. Approval of Agenda.**

Mike Harrington made the motion to approve the agenda for the night's meeting, Eileen Samitz seconded the motion and the Committee unanimously approved the agenda.

#### **3. Approval of Summary Minutes.**

Lucas Frerichs made the motion to approve the minutes from the September 20, 2007 meeting and Ellen seconded the motion. The rest of the committee approved the minutes with the exception of Mike Harrington, Maynard Skinner, Bob Traverso and Norma Turner who chose to abstain because they were not present at the September 20, 2007 meeting.

#### **4. Public Comments.**

The public had concerns regarding the consideration of sites in the northwest quadrant of the City. Some of the property owners of H4, H5, and H6 sites discussed planning the sites together in order to maximize the size of ag mitigation land to the north and west of the three sites. Representatives of H6 also discussed water flow in the northwest quadrant, and how cooperative planning could assist in rerouting water. Others from the community implored the committee to stop expanding the City's borders in order to reduce the carbon footprint, and maintain compact internal development. Speakers stated that these sites have a distance too great from downtown, and one speaker voiced concern that there might be a shortage in water supply with so many additional residents with development of the sites.

#### **5. Brief Overview of Drainage and Floodplain Issues.**

Will Marshall, Assistant City Engineer gave a brief overview of the drainage and floodplain issues in Davis.

Some of his key points were:

- ❖ The definition of a 100 year flood is: a flood that has a 1% chance of happening in any given year.
- ❖ The type of flooding that would occur in Davis would be shallow (1-2 feet of water at most).

Improvements that could be made:

- Developers need to replace water storage lost by fill for the duration of the rainfall/runoff event.
- Do not block floodways, and/or displace flood flows to additional properties.
- Do not increase 'peak' water flows going downstream. (i.e., if peak runoff rates, are kept the same, no new problems with channel capacity downstream; however, the total volume of runoff will indeed increase. As long as there are no failures of the conveyance system downstream, no additional lands would be inundated.)
- Foundations of properties need to be built so that the finished pads are at, or above (generally 1' or more) the base flood elevation.

#### **6. Continue Initial Evaluation and Prioritizations of Sites.**

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

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

*(Please see attached for worksheets on the Committee's initial evaluation of each site, including Site H4, Site H5, Site H6, and Site H7.)*

Before doing the evaluations for each site the Steering Committee discussed the value of

evaluating the last four H sites. Several members felt that they should not be evaluating the remaining sites because they believed that there are adequate sites available elsewhere to meet the requirements for RHNA and the 1% local growth policy. They stated that further site review was going above and beyond what was requested of them by the City Council, especially since it is unlikely many of these H sites would be developed before 2013. Council only gave the Committee direction to find potential housing sites that could be made available for construction prior to 2013, to meet RHNA and the 1% local growth policy.

Other members stated that their charge from Council was to evaluate all potential sites and that this is only their first round of review. In order to carry out their charge fully the Committee must be comprehensive and evaluate every site. They will have opportunity in the second review to narrow down the sites and remove those unlikely to be developed before 2013.

Bob Traverso moved (1) to not consider further the final four "H" sites in Far West Davis (namely, H-4, H-5, H-6, and H-7) because, (a) given the limited scope of the Committee's assignment from the City Council as to time frame and number of housing units to include in our recommendations, (b) given the significant number of proposed housing units in these four "H" properties, (c) given the number of proposed housing units in other, more proximate sites which would provide more than the number of housing units we can reasonably include in our recommendations to the City Council, and (d) given the limited flood control benefits to be gained from these four "H" sites for existing City development and for other, more proximate proposed development, there is not any credible land use and planning basis to include these four "H" properties in the Committee's recommendations to the City Council, but (2) to recommend that these four "H" properties be included for consideration in the next major revision to the City's General Plan with the stipulation that they should be incorporated into a Specific Plan for Far West Davis and that they should not be considered unless they are included in a joint planning effort for Far West Davis. The motion was seconded by Mark Siegler.

Luke Watkins made a substitute motion not to remove the last four H sites, but to finish review of all potential housing sites, make recommendations on the sites, and leave the final decision to Council. Donna Lott seconded the motion and by a simple majority Luke Watkins's motion passed.

## **7. Written Communications.**

These three items were listed on the agenda and provided with the meeting packet:

- Letter submitted by David and Lois Suder discussing the consistent application of criteria for site evaluation and site deletion.
- Materials submitted by the proponent of site H7–West of Stonegate.
- Housing Needs Assessment Background Report, September 28, 2007 (to be discussed at future meetings).

In addition to the written communications included on the agenda and in the meeting packet, the following written communications were submitted:

- Written communication from Norma Turner, Steering Committee member, regarding UCD West Village Project and its provision of units for local housing needs.

- Written communication from Jay Davis, Davis resident, regarding suggested green principles/criteria for use in consideration of future housing sites.
- Written communication from Kathryn Dewey, Davis resident, regarding ecological information related to Site H7.
- Written communication from Sig and Dorothy Falk, Davis residents, regarding their opposition to the development of Sites H4, H5, H6, and H7.
- Written communication from Lis Fleming, Davis resident, regarding her opposition to the development of Sites H4, H5, H6, and H7.
- Written communication from Beverly McFarland, Davis resident, regarding her opposition to the development of Sites H6 and H7.
- Written communication from Jo Peterman, Davis resident, regarding her opposition to the development of Sites H4, H5, H6, H7.
- Written communication from Kelly Ridgeway, Davis resident, regarding her opposition to the development of Sites H4, H5, H6, H7.
- Written communication from Dwight E. Sanders, Davis resident, regarding his opposition to the development of Site H7.
- Written communication from Bob Snell, Davis resident, regarding additional information for the Committee's review of Site H7.
- Written communication from Masud Monfared, local developer with Site H4, regarding idea of organic farm concept.
- Written communication from Gregg Herrington, local developer with Site H6, regarding cooperative planning of Sites H4, H5, and H6.
- Written communication from Al Smith, local developer with Site H7, regarding water drainage on site and senior housing needs.

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

The Steering Committee briefly discussed this, without any changes.

**9. Adjournment.**

Maynard Skinner moved to adjourn the meeting, Ellen Shields seconded the motion and by unanimous approval the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 P.M.

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: H4- Parlin**

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Easy access to Covell Blvd. and the 113
- + Possibility of On-site agricultural mitigation
- + Adjacent to hospital
- + Close to schools and parks
- + Organic Farming Opportunity

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Timing is not right within the 1% charge (2013)
- This is a possibility for long term but not now
- No shopping services
- Could create a critical mass of people with not enough shopping shopping and services to accommodate them
- Sewer system expansion of 113
- Does not contribute to compact urban form
- Distances to existing community facilities and the downtown are too great and auto trips would be encouraged
- Development would involve excessive new infrastructure
- Development at this location would negatively impact scenic resource of the community
- Development here would not be conducive to transit or bicycle mobility

Should the site be considered further?

YES ( 5 )      NO ( 3 )      UNCERTAIN ( 2 )      ABSTAIN ( 1 )

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 cost of a major upgrade of sewage treatment?
- How would a master plan be created that would be consistent with measure J?
- What is the fire station/response capability?

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

- Look at all four sites together in a comprehensive plan.
- Develop an allocation system among properties.
- Master Plan: flood, sewer, water, agricultural mitigation, infrastructure, money and timing and sequence.
- Review Steering Committee report to describe the criteria for master planning.

*(See the following pages for Options A and B for this site)*

**Site H4 - OPTION A: Residential with On-site Ag Mitigation**

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

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

- + Closest in proximity to interchange
- + On-site agricultural mitigation

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

- No western edge agricultural mitigation

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

- Need for coordination with other properties.

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

<b>HIGH ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>0</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>5</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
<b>ABSTENTION ( <u>1</u> )</b>				

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: 389-750 du/units**

---

**Site H4 - OPTION B: Ag-related Housing**

<b>HIGH ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>0</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>0</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>4</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
<b>ABSTENTION ( <u>1</u> )</b>				

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: 10-20 units**

---

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: H5-Lin/Boschken/Eliot/Schaal/Smith**

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

**Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing**

- + Easy access to Covell Blvd. and the 113
- + Possibility of On-site agricultural mitigation
- + Close to hospital
- + Close to schools and parks
- + Organic Farming Opportunity

**Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing**

- Timing is not right within the 1% charge (2013)
- This is a possibility for long term but not now
- No shopping services
- Could create a critical mass of people with not enough shopping shopping and services to accommodate them
- Sewer system expansion of 113
- Not adjacent to 113 or the hospital
- Without the H4 development this would possibly be a leap frog community
- Does not contribute to compact urban form
- Distances to existing community facilities and the downtown are too great and auto trips would be encouraged
- Development would involve excessive new infrastructure
- Development at this location would negatively impact scenic resource of the community
- Development here would not be conducive to transit or bicycle mobility

**Should the site be considered further?**

**YES ( 7 )**

**NO ( 3 )**

**UNCERTAIN ( 1 )**

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

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

- How safe is the flood prevention program?
- Willingness of property owner to master plan.
- Multiple property owners.

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

- Present master plan as an approach or requirement for development.
- Must have a letter from all property owners that states cooperation.

***(See the following pages for Options A and B for this site)***

**Site H5 - Option A: Residential with On-site Ag Mitigation**

**Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing**

**Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing**

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

<b>HIGH ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>4</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	--	--	---

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: 389-750 du/units**

---

**Site H5 - Option B: Ag-related Housing**

<b>HIGH ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>0</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>5</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	--	--	---

**ABSTENTION ( 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: 10-20 units**

---

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: H6-Oeste Ranch**

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

**Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing**

- + Easy access to Covell Blvd. and the 113
- + Possibility of On-site agricultural mitigation
- + Adjacent to hospital
- + Close to schools and parks
- + Organic Farming Opportunity

**Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing**

- Timing is not right within the 1% charge (2013)
- This is a possibility for long term but not now
- No shopping services
- Could create a critical mass of people with not enough shopping shopping and services to accommodate them
- Sewer system expansion of 113
- Furthest site from downtown
- Potential leap frog
- Does not contribute to compact urban form
- Distances to existing community facilities and the downtown are too great and auto trips would be encouraged
- Development would involve excessive new infrastructure
- Development at this location would negatively impact scenic resource of the community
- Development here would not be conducive to transit or bicycle mobility

Should the site be considered further?

YES ( 7 )

NO ( 4 )

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)

*(See the following pages for Options A and B for this site)*

**Site H6 - Option A: Residential with On-site Ag Mitigation**

**Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing**

**Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing**

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

<b>HIGH ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>4</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	--	--	---

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: 1000-2000 du/units with 2-1 on-site agricultural mitigation**

---

**Site H6 - OPTION B: Ag-related Housing**

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

<b>HIGH ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>0</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factor</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
<b>ABSTENTION ( <u>1</u> )</b>				

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: 10-20 units**

---

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: H7- West of Stonegate**

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Easy access to Covell Blvd. and the 113
- + Possibility of On-site agricultural mitigation
- + Adjacent to hospital
- + Close to schools and parks
- + Organic Farming Opportunity
- + Self-Financing of open space
- + Need for senior housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Timing is not right within the 1% charge (2013)
- This is a possibility for long term but not now
- No shopping services
- Could create a critical mass of people with not enough shopping shopping and services to accommodate them
- Similar to H6
- Sewer system expansion of 113
- Limited access for fire service
- Does not contribute to compact urban form
- Distances to existing community facilities and the downtown are too great and auto trips would be encouraged
- Development would involve excessive new infrastructure
- Development at this location would negatively impact scenic resource of the community
- Development here would not be conducive to transit or bicycle mobility

Should the site be considered further?

YES (  7 )

NO (  4 )

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?**

- What is/ will be the projected age demographic of Davis?
- How do we define Ag mitigation? (What is required? City partner/land trust? etc)
- What is the legal structure for Ag mitigation?
- How maintenance on all parcels be paid for?
- What is the legal structure for Ag mitigation?

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

*(See the following pages for Options A and B for this site)*

**Site H7- Option A: Residential with On-site Ag Mitigation**

**Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing**

**Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing**

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

<b>HIGH ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>1</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>4</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	--	--	---

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: 590-900 du/units with 2-1 on-site agricultural mitigation**

---

**Site H7 - OPTION B: Ag-related Housing**

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

<b>HIGH ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>MEDIUM ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>LOW ( <u>0</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factor</i>	<b>UNCERTAIN ( <u>3</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>	<b>NO ( <u>2</u> )</b> <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	---	--	---

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: 10-20 units**

---