

General Site Strategy Ideas and Possible Conditions / Requirements of Site Developments

Preliminary List

Date: December 10, 2007

General site strategy ideas

1. Proposal in letter from Robert Traverso (attached) consisting of:
 - a. Relocate the Davis Little League fields (site F16) to a more appropriate location (such as the proposed new Sports Complex).
 - b. Relocate the current Fire Department headquarters / station to the current Little League fields site.
 - c. Sell the current Fire Department headquarters / station site for a more appropriate Core area use (such as mixed commercial and residential use) and the use the sale proceeds to finance the construction of the new Fire Department headquarters / station facility and the new Little League fields facility.
2. F7 (DJUSD headquarters): Possibly develop a portion of site (extend Central Park), possibly swap the Civic Center Fields site.
3. Develop F7 (DJUSD headquarters) or F17 (Civic Center Fields) but not both. F7 could be a continuation of Central Park as open space. Preferred option is to develop F7 and leave F17 as open/space recreation space for downtown.
4. F1 (Lewis) and H1 (Covell Village Site): Need to look at an integrated plan of Lewis and Covell, not two separate ones (many Committee members did not agree). Possibly designate Covell area as an urban reserve? Consider the potential delay of Lewis if planned together.
5. H4, H5, H6 and H7: 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. Present master plan as an approach or requirement for development. Must have a letter from all property owners that states cooperation.

Possible conditions / requirements of site developments

See table below.

Sites	Possible conditions / requirements of site developments Also: Requests for Additional Information and Suggested Actions
B12 & E13 Neighborhood Shop, Ctrs.	<i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What happened to the smaller local grocery stores?
C1 Second Units- Ministerial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee members 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
C2 R2 Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continued enforcement of infill guidelines ▪ Neighborhood outreach ▪ Promotion of good Infill ▪ Design Review of projects <i>Suggested Actions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible fee incentives
C3 R3 Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of parking and traffic impacts with new projects. ▪ Follow infill guidelines. ▪ Ensure compliance with parking requirements. <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the life of an apartment complex? (40 years for full depreciation) ▪ What are the ages of apartment complexes in the area?

Sites	Possible conditions / requirements of site developments Also: Requests for Additional Information and Suggested Actions
C4, D2, & E11 Downtown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Designated remote parking. ▪ Plan for increased need of parking spaces. <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Status of parking structure. ▪ Must assess the impacts of housing on downtown. ▪ Core specific plan, look at planning for housing comprehensively.
E1 Verona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interface with the park ▪ Affordability ▪ Habitat mitigation ▪ Constricted access ▪ Surrounding uses consistency ▪ Access may be limited to Fifth St., to be studied further
E2-E3 Oakshade- Lillard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restrict housing to southern half ▪ Enough units to ensure feasibility ▪ Develop triangle with buildings that provide barrier between site and I-80 ▪ Site layout to reduce noise impact ▪ Maximize setback from freeway
E5 Kennedy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Live-work unit potential ▪ Designate for senior housing
E6 Sweet Briar Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sound proofing materials on rail road side ▪ Toxics must be cleaned up prior to development ▪ Mixed-use (commercial/retail ground level)
E7 Fifth Ave Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Density related to adequate parking / open space ▪ Consider potential traffic impacts ▪ Parking/safe access/open space (usable open space for occupants) ▪ Setback from roadway ▪ Roadway capacity ▪ Appropriate design fit ▪ No 2-story units above 1-story
E8 RHD Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need better quality student housing; UCD housing on campus (MOU) ▪ Limited to this site. Need other criteria. ▪ Parking requirements ▪ Traffic impacts
E9 Simmons, E. Eighth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maximize Open Space and Ag, in exchange for higher densities on the site, otherwise lower density housing if less open space is provided ▪ The property should be preserved for agriculture use and that there is a possibility for a barn/historic park/camp. Does have potential for urban/farm/wildlife habitat/monument. <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.
F1 Lewis Cannery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to look at an integrated plan with Covell, not two separate ones (many Committee members did not agree) ▪ Possibly designate Covell area as an urban reserve? Consider the potential delay of Lewis if planned together. ▪ Negotiate agricultural mitigation and open space. ▪ Need to address site drainage ▪ Define affordability of housing.

Sites	Possible conditions / requirements of site developments Also: Requests for Additional Information and Suggested Actions
	<i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Legal aspects of doing an area plan that includes Covell Village site. Does this trigger a measure J vote?
F2 Seiber, Chiles Rd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More study of noise, particulates and their health impacts ▪ Need an exceptionally well-designed sound wall or other well designed barrier from I-80 ▪ Buffer ▪ Extension of greenbelt (provide houses with an access to greenbelt) <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are health effects along freeway?
F3 Grande School Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completes neighborhood/compatibility ▪ Augment greenbelt (connections for bike/pedestrian paths) <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will there be affordable units (desirable location)?
F4 Nugget Fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Design Charrette” process on site ▪ Adequate replacement fields nearby ▪ Comply with Naylor-Act <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there other locations for fields (nearby)?
F6 PG&E	<i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the significance of this site for existing industrial use? ▪ How many of the PG&E employees currently live in Davis? ▪ Are employees on-site spending their day in Davis, do they buy lunch here, shop here etc., how many trips do they take a day and to where? ▪ Is there another site in Davis that would be suitable for the relocation of the service center? Can there be a property swap? ▪ Clarify timing and availability of site. ▪ Get a report of the toxins on-site
F7 DJUSD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finding an alternative site for district offices ▪ What kind of commercial use? ▪ Good site only for residential (potential conflicts with residential) ▪ Possibly develop a portion of site (extend central park, possibly swap the Civic Center Fields site) ▪ Good site for persons with disabilities and/or senior flats/housing with elevator ▪ Parking ▪ Encourage school district offices at this location to maintain proximity to City Hall
F8 Willowbank Church, Mace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greater density considered? ▪ Buffer from existing residential ▪ Improve creek
F9 Willowbank Church, NW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feather density across site (high to lower density; from the South to the North) ▪ Continuation of setback/buffer (southern edge)
F10 N.E Corner of Mace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Live/work opportunity – for sale units/density concerns ▪ Office/residential ▪ Office buffer along Mace? ▪ Opportunity for office condominiums, individual ownership <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic Volumes
F11 Willowcreek Neighbor. Commercial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible need for a park in the area ▪ Continuity of greenbelt (importance of connecting bikeways, greenbelts, pedestrian) ▪ Green space connections

Sites	Possible conditions / requirements of site developments Also: Requests for Additional Information and Suggested Actions
F12 Willowcreek Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Buffer from freeway ▪ Need an exceptionally well-designed sound wall or other well-designed barrier ▪ More study of noise, particulates and health risks <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the health effects along the freeway?
F13-F14 Ott Parcels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Buffer (at least as high as housing) ▪ Aesthetic approach from freeway ▪ Pedestrian safety (safe access points) and traffic circulation ▪ Need an exceptionally well-designed sound wall or other well-designed barrier ▪ More study of noise, particulates and health risks <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the health effects along the freeway?
F15 City-DJUSD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Potential health risks (real or perceived) of living next to bio-technology companies ▪ How will residents or potential residents react to visual sighting of equipment ▪ Needs to be sensitivity to the surrounding neighborhood buffer*?*?*?** <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the city own land elsewhere for the Corp. yard? (Should be moved to a marginal piece of land, i.e. freeway sites.) ▪ Relationship to school district, are there schools nearby?
F16 Little League Fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Money/ Plan for replacement of fields ▪ Are there funds to maintain the fields elsewhere? ▪ The Little League needs to support the move
F17 Civic Center Fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compatible design with existing development. ▪ Senior Housing? (discussion of flats, need 2 & 3 bedroom units and elevator) ▪ Needs adequate parking <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The school board's opinion on their site: what is the future of the school district site?
F18 Transit Corridor - Anderson Rd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good way for Davis to reduce their carbon footprint because students could live right near campus and would be less inclined to use their cars. ▪ Concern about parking, because even if students do not need to drive to campus they will still need to park somewhere as most have cars. ▪ Creative car management strategy.
G1 Wildhorse Horse Ranch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs a Measure J vote even though it is within the city boundaries because it is agricultural land. ▪ Where is the Ag mitigation located? (As part of the Steering Committee Requirement). ▪ Portions of 2:1 mitigation on non-urban side of property or on the property itself. ▪ City fee incentive for smaller units. ▪ Must have adjacent Agricultural mitigation <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was the ranch left undeveloped because of the Wildhorse development? i.e. Are there legal issues surrounding the development of the site. ▪ Why is there a timeframe for processing the application? ▪ Is there adequate water supply, overall sewer capacity, area-specific sewer capacity, police and fire services?
H1 Covell Village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at sewage treatment capacity as an overall issue <p><i>Requests for Additional Information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City sewer/water information

Sites	Possible conditions / requirements of site developments Also: Requests for Additional Information and Suggested Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definition of “affordable” housing ▪ Poleline/Covell intersection improvements/who should & can pay (mitigation)? ▪ Is there a limit to size and density in a city? ▪ What is projected traffic going to be? ▪ Response to “study area” request – would concept plan trigger Measure J? ▪ Link multiple projects (i.e. Lewis homes, Wildhorse)
H2 Signature Properties	<i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the Yolo county “Ag preserve” zoning?
H3 Nishi Property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not impact downtown ▪ Possible student housing/facility housing ▪ Lot of ways to reduce traffic impacts (not using Richards undercrossing) ▪ Traffic mitigation <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contact University ▪ Any UCD plans for property? ▪ What would be traffic impacts? ▪ What is the number of train trips?
H4 P arlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at all four sites (H4, H5, H6, and H7) 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. <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for coordination with other properties. ▪ 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?
H5 Lin/Boschken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present master plan as an approach or requirement for development. ▪ Must have a letter from all property owners that states cooperation. <i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How safe is the flood prevention program? ▪ Willingness of property owner to master plan. ▪ Multiple property owners.
H7 West of Stonegate	<i>Requests for Additional Information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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?

September 6, 2007

TO: City of Davis General Plan Steering Committee

FROM: Robert Traverso, General Plan Steering Committee Member

SUBJECT: Re-Utilization of Selected City Properties

Issue: As the City grows to the north, west and east, and as the City's population increases in these new areas, (1) the location of the current Fire HQ Station will be increasingly inappropriately located to effectively service these newer areas, (2) the Little League Fields facility will become increasingly inadequate in its present location with no expansion capability, (3) there will be pressure to construct, staff, equip, and operate a fourth fire station, (4) the City will incur a significant increase in its operating budget to pay for this fourth new fire station, and (5) the City will incur a significant reduction in its ability to provide other desirable, needed services because of the diversion of its finite financial resources to pay for the ongoing, annual operating costs of the fourth fire station.

Proposal:

- (1) Relocate the Davis Little League Fields (currently at SE corner of F Street & Covell Blvd.) to a more appropriate location (e.g., the proposed new Sports Field Complex),
- (2) Relocate the HQ Fire Station (currently on Fifth Street between D & E Streets) to the current Davis Little League Fields site, and
- (3) Sell the current Fire HQ site for more appropriate Core Area use (e.g., Mixed Commercial/Residential Use), and use the sale proceeds to finance the Construction of the new HQ Fire Station facility and the new Little League Fields facility.

Discussion: Any organization, as it grows, needs to reassess the functionality of its existing organization, infrastructure, revenue sources, etc., and make the necessary changes to more effectively utilize its finite resources in order to continue to operate in a cost-effective manner in the changing environment.

As we are well aware, the School District has historically had to deal with this issue:

- (1) the closure and sale of the elementary school at 3rd & Second Streets (now the location of the Farmers' Market Pavilion and the Teen Center),
 - (2) the closure and sale of the school facility on the block bounded by Russell Blvd.-A & B Streets-Seventh Street (now the City Offices Complex, the Senior Citizens Center, the County Facility, and the School District's Continuation School),
- and continues to have to deal with this issue: (1) the closure of Valley Oak Elementary School, and (2) the effective utilization of the new Korematsu Elementary School.

As we are also aware, the City is no exception to this principle. Some examples would be the following:

- (1) the relocation of the Fire Department HQ Station from its original location in the "City Hall" building at Third & F Streets to its current location at Fifth & E Streets,
- (2) the relocation of the City Offices complex from its original location in the "City Hall" building at Third & F Streets to its current location on Russell Blvd.,

(3) the relocation of the Police Dept. from its original location in the “City Hall” building at Third & F Streets to its current location at Fifth Street and Cantrell Drive,

(4) the relocation of the wastewater treatment facility from its original location on the west side of Pole Line Road one-half mile north of Covell Blvd. to its current location at the east end of County Road 28-H, and

(5) the relocation of the City’s landfill from its original location on the west side of Pole Line Road one-half mile north of Covell Blvd., to its current location, and its consolidation with the County’s landfill on County Road 28-H.

Fundamentally, as the City grows, it has two options with respect to how it provides fire service to its residents:

(1) do not re-evaluate, and simply accept, the current location of the existing Fire HQ Station as an appropriate location as the City grows to the north, west and east, and, instead, build, staff, and equip a fourth fire station, or

(2) re-evaluate the appropriateness of the existing location of the Fire HQ Station, and recognize that the existing Fire HQ Station will no longer be located appropriately, that it needs to move farther to the north to the current Little League Field site to create a better balance for its service area as the City grows, where it will also have quicker access to the major streets to the north, east and west, as well as still be able to provide quick response to the Core Area.

If the City chooses the first option, the consequences will be:

(1) an inappropriately located Fire HQ Station,

(2) the probable necessity to build, staff, and equip a fourth fire station with a marginal net benefit to the City,

(3) a significant annual increase in the City’s operating budget to fund the cost of the fourth fire station, and

(4) a significant reduction of the City’s ability to fund other desirable, needed City services as a result of the diversion of substantial funds from the General Fund every year for the operating cost of the fourth fire station.

If the City chooses the second option, the City can:

(1) sell the existing Fire HQ Station site for the private development of a Residential-Commercial Mixed Use project on this site to enhance the Core Area, and use the sale proceeds to finance the construction of a new Fire HQ Station at the existing Little League Fields site and the construction of new Little League Fields elsewhere (possibly at the proposed new Sports Complex),

(2) have three well-positioned fire stations to provide cost-effective fire protection service to the residents of the City as the City grows to the north, east and west,

(3) avoid a significant annual increase in the City’s operating budget to fund a marginally cost-effective fourth fire station,

(4) have greater flexibility in the use of its finite financial resources for various other desired, needed services, and

(5) make very effective use of its existing properties for the cost-effective response to the City’s infrastructure needs as the City grows to the north, east and west.

Recommendation: Discuss this proposal on a timely basis at one of our Steering Committee meetings, and, if the Steering Committee concurs with the concept, forward it to the City Council with our recommendation for City Council consideration and approval.