

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

2500 Fifth Street, Police Department Community Room
Thursday, July 12, 2007
7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Mark Spencer, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso (arrived at Item 5), Luke Watkins, Maynard Skinner, **Ellen Shields**.

Absent: Kevin Wolf (Chair), Pam Gunnell, Mike Harrington, Kristin Stoneking, **Ellen Shields**.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Julie Vyfhuis.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Lydia Delis-Schlosser, Pam Nieberg, Ken Topper, Matt Williams, Steve Hicks, Gregg Herrington, Jeanne Jones, John Ott, Landon Scarlett.

1. Roll Call, Call the Meeting to Order.

Vice Chairman Mark Siegler called the meeting to order at 7:07 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

Motion to approve the agenda was made by Maynard Skinner and seconded by Ellen Shields. The Committee approved the agenda unanimously.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes.

Staff stated that Luke Watkins requested that the minutes for the June 21, 2007 meeting be amended to include his arrival to the meeting at Item 6 and his departure from the meeting at Item 7.

Mark Spencer stated that the minutes did not capture whether or not separate reports would be provided to Council on separate meeting dates, including one report to Council to provide site options to adequately meet the RHNA numbers and a second report on a separate Council meeting date to provide a list of sites able to address the city's 1% growth policy to meet internal housing needs.

The Committee conversed at length about what was discussed at the last meeting regarding this topic. A motion by Mark Spencer was made to provide the two reports at two separate meeting dates so that the Council would discuss and focus on each report independently. Maynard Skinner made a substitute motion, seconded by Lucas Frerichs, that staff first review the tape recording of the discussion on this topic at the June meeting, then return to the next meeting with that information for the Committee's direction on whether to amend the minutes. This motion passed by a 5 to 4 vote. Luke Watkins abstained. With exception to the substitute motion and its required follow-up, the rest of the minutes were approved by consensus. *(The June 21, 2007 Summary Minutes with amendments will be posted on the city's website at www.cityofdavis.org once they are approved in their entirety by the Committee).*

4. Public Comment.

Ken Topper stated that he has provided the Committee with a "Working Paper" regarding the potential non-residential use viability study at this time for the Cannery Park and Covell Village sites. Mr. Topper suggested that this information be used during the Committee's upcoming discussion of Item 6. The Committee thanked him for the information.

5. Continue Initial Evaluations and Prioritizations of Sites.

Jeff Baird reiterated the meeting 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

Staff explained that the meeting packet includes an Addendum with additional information for site evaluation of the potential housing sites along Interstate 80, including an analysis report on potential health issues and noise level effects. The Committee questioned what types of health issues would be a concern, what options would reduce noise levels and potential health impacts, and how effective those options would be.

A member of the public, John Ott, expressed personal interest as an owner/developer of sites F13 & F14. Mr. Ott asked that the Committee consider these sites for a mixed-use development, similar to what he submitted to the Committee. He pointed out that one significant factor to consider would be the sound/buffer wall that is in discussion, and whether some sound could be blocked with the development of office buildings on the site.

A motion to return to sites F2, F12 and F13/14 with more information on health issues, air quality, buffer/noise levels and effect failed by a 5 to 6 vote. Instead the Committee conducted a preliminary review of the sites and requested that additional information regarding noise and potential health impacts of these sites along Interstate 80 be brought forward during the more detailed review of these sites after Workshop #2. *(Please see attached for the committee's initial site evaluation of each site).*

6. Request for Committee Recommendation Regarding a Non-residential Use Viability Study for Sites F1 and H1, North-central Area.

Staff explained that this is a request for the Committee's recommendation regarding a potential non-residential use viability study for sites F1 and H1 (Lewis Cannery Park site and Covell Village site) that would provide information for the Committee related to the feasibility of non-residential uses on these sites. Staff asked that the Committee send their individual recommendations by email or mail no later than Monday, July 23, 2007 for a vote to be tallied.

A short discussion followed in which the Committee questioned the procedure and reason for requesting this study in addition to the proposed voting method. Staff explained that this item was being brought forth in order to determine whether the Committee would find this additional information useful in their upcoming review of the sites, otherwise speculation would be needed on the potential mix of land uses on these sites. Staff also stated that this voting format was proposed for use in order to obtain a recommendation that included votes from all Committee members.

Luke Watkins made a motion that was seconded by Bob Traverso that a non-residential use viability study of these sites is not needed for the purposes of the Committee and that a more comprehensive study including both peripheral and interior sites would be more appropriate.

Mark Spencer proposed a substitute motion that was seconded by Norma Turner stating that a non-residential use viability study of these sites is not needed for the purposes of the Committee. (Mr. Spencer's motion did not include the second half of the first motion that included mention of a more comprehensive study by Council.) This motion passed 11-0.

This original motion by Luke Watkins and Bob Traverso was withdrawn.

Luke Watkins then made a motion that if Council chooses to complete a non-residential use viability study, that it should be a more comprehensive study that includes assessment of both peripheral and interior sites. This motion was seconded by Donna Lott and passed 6-5.

7. Deletion of Sites from Working List of Potential Housing Sites.

A recommendation was made by Mark Seigler to move this item to a future agenda given the time at which this item arose. There was consensus by the Committee that this item be continued.

8. Written Communications.

Lewis Planned Communities submitted a "Working Paper" regarding the potential completion of a non-residential use viability study. (*Please refer to Item 6*). Staff stated that they continue to receive written information from owner/developers of potential housing sites. Staff reminded the Committee that information submitted about individual sites will be attached to the site's evaluation packet and discussed during the Committee's evaluation of the site. No discussion followed.

9. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

Jeff Baird presented an updated near-term schedule. The Committee questioned if the schedule could be achieved and staff pointed out that this is not permanent and will continuously be updated in accordance with the Committee's schedule as sites are reviewed. (*A copy of this schedule can be found on the city's website at www.cityofdavis.org*).

10. Adjournment, Next Scheduled Meeting Date.

A motion to adjourn was made by Maynard Skinner and seconded by Bob Traverso. By unanimous agreement the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:37 P.M. The next meeting is scheduled for July 26, 2007 at the Police Department Community Room, 2500 Fifth Street.

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F2 - Seiber

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Noise mitigation (to a certain extent) through mixed use
- Southern half ok
- Access problems for commercial

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Particulates (smaller particular matter) from I-80, health impacts
- Aesthetics along freeway (no continuous "wall" along the freeway)

Should the site be considered further?

YES (___)

NO (___)

UNCERTAIN (___)

- Least appropriate for housing (most narrow and close to freeway)

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

FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Mixed use potential
- Distance to facilities: near parks, schools, and shopping
- Units oriented to greenbelt at the south

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Particulates (smaller particular matter), health risks from freeway
- Narrow site
- Noise impacts

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- What are health effects along freeway?

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

- 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)

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

HIGH (1)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (3)

Most Important Factors

LOW (5)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (___)

Most Important Factors

NO (2)

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: _____

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F11 – Willowcreek Neighborhood Commercial

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

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

- Site distance to freeway
- Limited commercial potential
- Bounded by residential
- Distance to parks, shops, bus transit, schools

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)

- Possible need for a park in the area
- Continuity of greenbelt (importance of connecting bikeways, greenbelts, pedestrian)
- Green space connections

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

HIGH (9)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (2)

Most Important Factors

LOW (___)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (___)

Most Important Factors

NO (___)

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: 14-16 u/ac

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F12 – Willowcreek Lt. Ind.

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Noise can be mitigated (to a certain extent)
- Access problems for commercial
- Southern 1/3 for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Particulates

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

- Distance to facilities
- Mixed use potential – large site

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Keep for future opportunity for commercial (largest parcel)
- Site proximity to freeway / Mace exit makes commercial more feasible

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- What are health effects along the freeway?

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

- Buffer from freeway
- Need an exceptionally well-designed sound wall or other well-designed barrier
- More study of noise, particulates and health risks

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

HIGH (5)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (2)

Most Important Factors

LOW (2)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (1)

Most Important Factors

NO (1)

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: _____

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F13/F14 – Oakshade Parcels

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Noise can be mitigated (to a certain extent)
- Access problems for commercial
- Southern half ok

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Particulates

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

- Mixed use potential
- Distance to parks, shops, bus transit, schools
- Housing with buffer
- Adjacency to greenbelt
- Orientation away from freeway

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Site proximity to freeway

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- What are health effects along the freeway?

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

- Buffer (t 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

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

HIGH (8)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (2)

Most Important Factors

LOW (1)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (___)

Most Important Factors

NO (___)

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: _____