

# SUMMARY MINUTES

## City of Davis

### General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

2500 Fifth Street, Police Department Community Room

Thursday, October 18, 2007

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber, Mike Harrington, Pam Gunnell, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Kristin Stoneking Ellen Shields, Maynard Skinner, Bob Traverso, Norma Turner, Luke Watkins, Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Absent: Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Mark Spencer.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Jesse Henkin.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

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

---

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

Chairman Kevin Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:10 P.M.

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

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Maynard Skinner and seconded by Mike Harrington. Kevin Wolf asked that the Committee not spend too much time discussing item 5, which includes underutilized sites and the possible designation of secondary unit areas. He suggested they simply listen to Staff's explanation of these sites, and allow time to ask questions only, with no further discussion after that. He also asked that the Committee finish reviewing sites by 8:30 P.M. in order to discuss the upcoming workshop. Pam Gunnell asked that the Committee not review the Anderson Transit Corridor site until the public has been given enough notice that the Committee would be discussing it. Kevin Wolf proposed they only look at the second units for the October 18, 2007 meeting and the rest of the Committee agreed. The agenda was approved unanimously.

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

The October 11, 2007 minutes will be reviewed at the November 1, 2007 meeting.

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

John Whitcombe informed the Committee as a representative of the Covell Village site that Covell Village would have two to one on-site agricultural mitigation that connects to the project area. Interpretations of the term "on-site" were discussed.

**5. Continue Initial Evaluations and Prioritization of the “Other” Categorical Sites.**

*As with the project sites, the “other” sites start with a staff presentation, followed by Committee questions and public comments. Discussions and vote by the Committee are generally recorded, but do not include use of a formal discussion worksheet.*

**INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: Site C1 – Ministerial Second Units; and Site D1 – Discretionary Second Units**

During this item the Committee discussed the potential and feasibility of future accessory second dwelling units being added on existing residential properties. Historical data and potential incentives were provided to the Steering Committee, including an estimate of 18 units for Site C1 and 24 units for Site D1. Staff noted that due to their size and likelihood of being leased, accessory second dwelling units are able to be counted towards moderate income levels within the city’s RHNA requirement.

The Committee discussed the positive effects of building second units as an alternative to new development. Many were supportive of incentives to spur the development of additional accessory second dwelling units, but members of the Committee wanted to be sure that the public and potential neighbors of lots with owners interested in building accessory second dwelling units be included in planning for additional accessory second dwelling units.

Luke Watkins stated that this is a very big discussion and that increasing second unit potential would take more study and some local policy changes or incentives. Luke Watkins made a motion to accept Staff’s estimate of 18 units for Site C1 and 24 units for Site D1. Bob Traverso seconded the motion. Kevin Wolf made a substitute motion to use Staff’s estimates for Sites C1 and D1 for RHNA, but to recommend that staff find ways to make it easier to develop second accessory dwelling units in Davis so that production could double to 36 units for Site C1 and 48 units for Site D1 prior to 2013. Mike Harrington seconded the motion. As part of the discussion of the motion, Luke Watkins wanted to establish that the Committee was not trying to fill the fair share numbers with the potential for additional second units, beyond the 42 estimated. Staff replied that the conservative estimate of 42 units is what would be submitted and could be justified to HCD towards RHNA, but that additional potential units could be valuable for meeting the city’s 1% growth policy. Eileen Samitz discouraged allowing for larger ministerial accessory units as a way to add density without getting input from the surrounding neighbors first. Kevin Wolf amended his motion to include that public notification and transparency not be diminished within city incentives or policy changes to promote increased development of accessory second dwelling units. Mike Harrington, who seconded the motion, accepted the amendment. The motion passed 11-2, with Pam Gunnell and Eileen Samitz dissenting.

**6. Continue Discussion of Purpose and Approach for Community Workshop #2.**

Consultant Jeff Baird used an outline provided to the Committee previous to the meeting to discuss his and Staff’s recommended approach for Workshop #2 and the overall schedule.

The memorandum showed a timeline of what items the Committee would be covering each month until July 2008. The Committee was very concerned at the amount of months left in the schedule before they were scheduled to dissolve. They agreed that they did not foresee the Committee enduring for longer than one year, completing its work by March or April 2008. The Steering Committee was comfortable with Staff drafting the Housing Element and providing the Committee a review prior to it going to city commissions and City Council in order to get it to HCD in March 2008.

The memorandum addressed the Steering Committee's end product. The Committee agreed that they would review the drafted Housing Element and provide recommendations to Council regarding the local 1% policy.

The rest of the discussion was focused on the Community Workshop #2, including when it would be held and what information would be presented. The majority of the Committee agreed that the originally scheduled November date would be too soon to hold the next workshop. They decided instead to hold it in January because it would allow the Committee more time to organize and group the site information and also bring more to the Workshop than they would be able to do by next month. Jeff Baird suggested that they should visually present their results to the public by making a matrix that rates all sites with the most important factors. Pam Gunnell suggested it be a quick visual citing the most important factors only (maybe five or six main factors) in the form of a simple graph. Mike Harrington does not agree that the workshop be moved to January, he feels that if the Committee waits too long to get the public involved that they will begin to lose valuable input. Eileen Samitz suggests a compromise, that the Committee hold it in December instead. Staff responded that if the Committee decided to have the workshop in November or December, they have a very good start but the ideas are currently in rough stages and are not ready to be presented to the public and get the kind of positive feedback they are expecting. Jay Gerber stated that they should bring something specific for the public to respond. Kevin Wolf proposed they discuss tradeoffs in their next workshop, such as what are the positive and negative factors of picking one site over another. Bob Traverso suggested that they bring the public something more tangible that they can relate to rather than general tradeoffs. Staff thought that the Committee should give the public something to react to in terms of initial groupings of sites, rather than continue to evaluate individual sites. Several Committee members agreed that they should present the sites in some sort of ranking that makes sense for the public to look at and, that by packaging the sites and presenting them to the public with Workshop #2, the scheduled Workshop #3 may no longer be necessary.

Bob Traverso made a motion that, prior to Community Workshop #2, the Steering Committee (1) rank and group all of the various properties studied by the Committee in a way that makes geographic and land use sense to the Committee and that is consistent with the City Council's charge to the Committee, (2) assign those properties and the number of housing units associated with them, which the Committee thinks are most consistent with "(1)" above, on a tiered develop basis, to a "Phase One" development recommendation to the City Council, thereby giving the City Council the ability to increase or decrease housing units in certain of these "Phase One" development properties in a rational manner and still be consistent with the City Council's charge to the Committee, (3) assign the remaining other properties, using the Committee's ranking of these properties, to a tiered back-up development position, so that, if any of the properties in the "(1)" above don't develop as planned, the appropriate back-up property (s) can be moved into "Phase One" development position in an orderly manner which will be most consistent with the geographic and land use criteria in "(1)" above, (4) display these recommendations graphically on a map, and (5) then schedule Community Workshop #2 and ask the public for input on the Committee's recommendations. The motion was seconded by Pam Gunnell, and approved unanimously by the Committee.

**7. Written Communications**

No written communications were submitted prior to the meeting. John Whitcombe provided a map to the Committee related to his public comments that showed a potential agricultural mitigation area for Site H1 – Covell Village.

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

This item was covered by Item 6.

**9. Adjournment.**

The motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Bob Traverso and seconded by Jay Gerber. By unanimous approval the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10 P.M.