

SUMMARY MINUTES

As approved on June 21, 2007 with Amendments

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

2500 Fifth Street, Police Department Community Room

Thursday, June 14, 2007

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Donna Lott, Kristen Stoneking, Pam Gunnell, Mike Harrington, Eileen Samitz, Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Mark Spencer, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso, Luke Watkins.

Absent: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber, Ellen Shields, Maynard Skinner, Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Julie Vyfhuis.

Public: Pam Nieberg, Lydia Delis-Schlon Schlosser, Landon Scarlett, Rodney Robinson, Matt Williams, Ken Topper, Joe Whitcombe, Steve Hicks.

1. Roll Call, Call the Meeting to Order.

The meeting was chaired by the Vice Chairman Mark Siegler and called to order at 7:06 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

A motion was made by Mark Siegler to approve the agenda. Pam Gunnell seconded the motion and the Committee approved the agenda by consensus.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes.

A motion was made by ~~Mark Siegler~~ Norma Turner to approve the summary minutes of the May 31, 2007 meeting and ~~Eileen Samitz~~ Donna Lott seconded the motion. The Committee approved the minutes by consensus. Mike Harrington abstained because he was absent on May 31, 2007.

4. Public Comment.

Matt Williams commented on the analysis of the individual sites and stated that cumulative impacts need to be addressed as needed in the Third and B project. The Committee thanked Mr. Williams for his input and added that potential sites will be reviewed in more detail later, including as a comprehensive package.

5. Preliminary Methodology for the Evaluation and Prioritization of Potential Housing Sites.

Staff explained that this draft methodology is to provide an overview for the steering committee as they begin considering potential sites. Staff suggested that the Committee go through the sites and make initial findings then reconfirm the final numbers later to ensure that the target unit numbers for RHNA and 1% are met. Several concerns were raised:

- a) Whether the internal housing needs analysis would apply to both the RHNA numbers and the 1%. Staff explained that it will be used in the Housing Element and in the breakdown of the 1%. The analysis may be ready in approximately 4-6 weeks.
- b) Bob Traverso's suggestion that the Committee keep a tab on how the numbers are being generated.
- c) Mark Spencer's thought that the Committee separate their recommendations for RHNA vs. the 1% so the Committee and public can look at what counts towards the 1%.
- d) Eileen Samitz's proposal that Committee look at the RHNA numbers before focusing on other numbers related to the 1%.
- e) Mike Harrington questioned at what point the Committee would be given a chance to vote to protest the 1%. Staff stated that this issue can be set for a future agenda.

6. Summary for Site Categories A through D, plus E11, E12 and E13 of Working List of Potential Housing Sites.

Staff explained that some sites will be discussed using a summary sheet, or a short worksheet, and will not require full worksheets. The intent at this point is just to show where staff is in the preliminary process.

7. Begin Evaluating and Prioritizing Sites.

Staff explained the Committee has been given a list of densities of projects that exist in the city and that our intention at the next meeting is to provide pictures to show the Committee, which would help in the discussion of these sites. Data maps reviewed by staff included:

- a) Topographic elevation
- b) FEMA data on potential flood risk
- c) NRCS data on prime farmland soils
- d) Distances to the core area
- e) Transit lines
- f) Neighborhood facilities
- g) Redevelopment area
- h) School district boundaries

Staff sent a letter to the property owners/site developers in categories F through H so as to give them the opportunity to provide comments/input on their sites in an effort to supply the Committee with information that would help in their preliminary review process. The Committee was optimistic about the letters and asked to be provided with a copy. Luke Watkins made a motion that Staff also send a letter to the group in site E which was seconded by Eileen Samitz and approved by consensus.

The Committee then discussed the potential housing site worksheets provided for initial ranking of potential sites. (*Please refer to Evaluation Factors for Verona Mace Ranch, Oakshade/Lillard, Kennedy Place, Sweet Briar Drive and Simmons, E. Eighth St. provided in the last meeting packet and on the city's website*). A discussion followed:

- a) Public member Joe Whitcombe commented on the E6 Site in which he provided information that the western half of property, which was mentioned to be contaminated by a spill, and the eastern part which was toxic by the previous dry cleaning business, is being investigated and the present consensus is that the site will not be ready to be developed until on-site pollution is addressed.
- b) Public member Rodney Robinson commented on Site E9 that due to the wishes of a member of the family who used to own the property, it should be preserved for agriculture use and that there is a possibility for a barn/historic park/camp. He further commented that it does have potential for urban/farm/wildlife habitat/monument/, and that the analysis on the traffic and distance to shopping center impacts were based on “how the crow flies” and not actual driving route.
- c) Some Committee members remarked on Mr. Robinson’s comments and some suggested that the site be preserved for agricultural use, in keeping with the wishes of the previous owner. Eileen Samitz added that there are open space funds in the city’s budget for this possibility. The Committee agreed by consensus that more information on this site is needed in order to effectively produce a preliminary vote. The Committee agreed to come back to this site at a later date when the discussion of site F15 begins.

A summary of the initial votes and findings by the Committee for each of the first five potential housing sites is attached.

8. Near-Term Draft Schedule.

Staff questioned whether the Committee was satisfied with receiving meeting packet information every Tuesday before each meeting. Committee complimented staff on a job well done and approved the timing for receiving such materials.

A short discussion followed regarding the next meeting dates. It was agreed by consensus that the next meeting dates would be June 21st & 28th. Due to Committee vacation schedules during meeting dates in August, it was agreed that the Committee would come prepared for the next meeting with their August schedules in order to find alternate meeting dates.

9. Written Communications.

There were no written communications submitted.

10. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

One item was added to the next agenda – review of the Committee’s proposal that their recommendations to City Council be prepared in two separate reports: (1) site recommendations to comply with RHNA and (2) the city’s 1% growth guideline.

11. Adjournment, Next Scheduled Meeting Date.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mark Siegler and seconded by Pam Gunnell. By unanimous agreement the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:03 P.M. The next meeting is scheduled for June 21, 2007 at the Police Department Community Room, 2500 Fifth Street.

Site Name: E1-Verona Mace Ranch Should the site be considered further? YES (9) NO ()

Number of Votes

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

The following members abstained from voting: 1

How would you **INITIALLY RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing through June, 2013?

HIGH (9)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (1)

Most Important Factors

LOW ()

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN ()

Most Important Factors

Discussion

Factors in support of the site for housing:

- Proximity to schools, parks, transportation (public, both bus systems), vehicular access
- Adjacency to development, medium density
- Good fire response time

Factors NOT in support of the site for housing, or uncertain:

How would you **RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing **FOLLOWING THE DISCUSSION OF IMPORTANT FACTORS?**

HIGH (9)

MEDIUM (1)

LOW ()

UNCERTAIN ()

What do you think should be the preliminary **RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS** and **DENSITY** for housing on this site?

Range of Units/Density: 59 to 78 units / 9 to 12 units per acre (based on 6.5 developable acres)

COMMENTS ON SITE (Density, Number/Type of Units, and Special Planning Requirements) *Continue on Separate Sheet If Needed*

- Interface with the park
- Affordability
- Habitat mitigation
- Constricted access
- Surrounding uses consistency
- Access may be limited to Fifth St., to be studied further

Site Name: E2/E3-Oakshade/Lillard Should the site be considered further? YES (7) NO (3)
Number of Votes

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

How would you **INITIALLY RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing through June, 2013?

HIGH (4)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (1)

Most Important Factors

LOW (3)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (2)

Most Important Factors

Discussion

Factors in support of the site for housing:

- Adjacency to greenbelt
- Close to elementary schools
- Close to shopping
- Within Redevelopment Area

Factors NOT in support of the site for housing, or uncertain:

- Proximity to freeway
- Noise
- Air pollution (SACOG study)

The following members abstained from voting: _____

How would you **RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing **FOLLOWING THE DISCUSSION OF IMPORTANT FACTORS**?

HIGH (4)

MEDIUM (1)

LOW (3)

UNCERTAIN (2)

What do you think should be the preliminary RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS and DENSITY for housing on this site?

Range of Units/Density: 30 to 62 units/ 10 to 20 units/acres

COMMENTS ON SITE (Density, Number/Type of Units, and Special Planning Requirements) *Continue on Separate Sheet If Needed*

- 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

Site Name: E5-Kennedy Place Should the site be considered further? YES (9) NO (1)
Number of Votes

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

How would you **INITIALLY RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing through June, 2013?

HIGH (9)
Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (1)
Most Important Factors

LOW (____)
Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (____)
Most Important Factors

Discussion

Factors in support of the site for housing:

- Proximity to shopping
- Potential for senior housing
- Opportunity for live-work units

Factors NOT in support of the site for housing, or uncertain:

- Adjacent to office
- Not good for housing, cul-de-sac
- Not good due to conflicts of kids and cars

The following members abstained from voting: _____

How would you **RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing **FOLLOWING THE DISCUSSION OF IMPORTANT FACTORS**?

HIGH (9)

MEDIUM (1)

LOW (____)

UNCERTAIN (____)

What do you think should be the preliminary **RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS** and **DENSITY** for housing on this site?

Range of Units/Density: 7 to 16 units / 7 to 16 units / acre

COMMENTS ON SITE (Density, Number/Type of Units, and Special Planning Requirements) *Continue on Separate Sheet If Needed*

- Live-work unit potential
- Designate for senior housing

Site Name: E6-Sweet Bair Should the site be considered further? YES (8) NO (2)
Number of Votes

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

How would you **INITIALLY RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing through June, 2013?

HIGH (5)
Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (1)
Most Important Factors

LOW (1)
Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (2)
Most Important Factors

Discussion

Factors in support of the site for housing:

- Opportunity to densify the downtown

voting:

The following members abstained from

1 – Kristin Stoneking

Factors NOT in support of the site for housing, or uncertain:

- Pollution on site, status of site clean- up
- Frequency of trains
- Live-work?
- Mixed use?

How would you **RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing **FOLLOWING THE DISCUSSION OF IMPORTANT FACTORS?**

HIGH (5)

MEDIUM (1)

LOW (1)

UNCERTAIN (2)

What do you think should be the preliminary **RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS** and **DENSITY** for housing on this site?

Range of Units/Density: 16 units/ 30 units/acre

COMMENTS ON SITE (Density, Number/Type of Units, and Special Planning Requirements) *Continue on Separate Sheet If Needed*

- Sound proofing materials on rail road side
- Toxics must be cleaned up prior to development
- Mixed-use (commercial/retail ground level)

Site Name: E9-Simmons Should the site be considered further? YES (7) NO (2)
Number of Votes

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

How would you **INITIALLY RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing through June, 2013?

HIGH (___)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (___)

Most Important Factors

LOW (___)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (___)

Most Important Factors

Discussion

Factors in support of the site for housing:

- Surrounded by residential on 3 sides
- Within city
- 12 acres, large site
- Near schools
- Logical location for housing
- Good transition of housing densities (medium to high density)
- Good opportunity next to open space

Factors NOT in support of the site for housing, or uncertain:

- Not intended for residential, site history
- Conversion of agricultural land
- Organic urban farm/habitat reserve
- Last piece of Davis heritage
- Preserving barn?
- Large parcel, unique, alternate potential for site should be considered
- Only access from E.8th
- Senior Village?
- Consider moving community gardens here?
- Moving Explorit?
- Mixed uses?
- Funding sources for open space? Explore funding sources.
- Measure O money?
- Get answers concurrent with review of Site F15

The following members abstained from voting: _____

How would you **RANK THE SITE** for potential for housing **FOLLOWING THE DISCUSSION OF IMPORTANT FACTORS?**

HIGH (___)

MEDIUM (___)

LOW (___)

UNCERTAIN (___)