

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

2500 Fifth Street, Police Department Community Room
Thursday, July 26, 2007
7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Pam Gunnell, Jay Gerber, Mike Harrington, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Mark Spencer, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso, Kristin Stoneking, Ellen Shields, Maynard Skinner.

Absent: Kevin Wolf (Chair), Lucas Frerichs, Luke Watkins.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Julie Vyfhuis.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Landon Scarlett, Matt Williams, Lydia Delis-Schlosser, Don Fouts, Steve Hicks, Jeanne Jones, Ken Topper.

1. Roll Call, Call the Meeting to Order.

Vice Chairman Mark Siegler called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

Vice Chairman Mark Siegler suggested that the Committee defer Item 6 on the agenda until next meeting in light of the number of sites to be reviewed and based on a request by Chairman Kevin Wolf that the item be postponed so that he can participate. A motion to approve the agenda, without Item 6, was made by Pam Gunnell and seconded by Bob Traverso. The Committee unanimously approved the agenda.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes.

a) Jay Gerber pointed out that the minutes from the July 12, 2007 meeting did not report Ellen Shields as being present. Ellen Shields affirmed that she was in attendance and that a correction to the minutes should be made.

Vice Chairman Mark Seigler questioned the process of the Steering Committee's discussion of a potential site. He recapped a previous Committee meeting in which it was decided that the voting process on the initial evaluation of a site should occur *after* a discussion of the factors in support or opposition of housing

on a site. He suggested that the minutes be amended to state such by switching Steps 3a and 3b under Item 5 of the minutes. The motion to approve the minutes, as amended, was made by Bob Traverso and seconded by Pam Gunnell. Mike Harrington and Kristin Stoneking abstained because of their absences at the previous meeting. With exception of the abstainers, the minutes of the July 12th meeting were approved by consensus.

b) Vice Chairman Mark Seigler asked the Committee if they had any questions regarding staff's recommended amendments to Item 8 of the summary minutes of the June 21, 2007 meeting. The amendments were based on a direction from the Committee that staff consult the audio recording of the meeting in order to clarify the motion made, specifically regarding the timing and presentation of reports regarding potential housing sites for (a) the fulfillment of the RHNA requirements and (b) the 1% local growth policy. The amendments clarified that the reports were to be presented separately in time. The motion to approve was made by Mark Spencer and seconded by Bob Traverso. There was unanimous agreement by the Committee to pass Item 8 of the minutes, as proposed by staff. *(Note: The approved summary minutes with amendments can be found on the City of Davis website at www.cityofdavis.org).*

4. Public Comment.

There were no public comments.

5. Continue Initial Evaluations and Prioritizations of Sites.

Jeff Baird restated the 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

(Please see attached for worksheets on the Committee's initial evaluation of each site.)

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

This item was deferred to the next meeting, scheduled for August 9, 2007.

7. Written Communications.

Staff stated that reports related to the health risk factors of residential development near freeways from the California State Air Resources Board (CARB), Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) were included in the packet as additional background information for future discussions related to the potential housing sites located along Interstate 80.

8. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

Aside from the continuation of Item 6 to the August 9, 2007 agenda, there were no items added to the "items of interest for future agendas" list.

9. 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 9:30 P.M. **The next meeting is scheduled for August 9, 2007 in the East Conference Room at the Davis Unified School District Offices at 526 B Street, Davis.**

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F4 – Nugget Fields School Site

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

- School district got property for free

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Could be maintained elsewhere (Jr. High School?)

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- . Not yet “surplus” and no action by school district (possibly 10 yrs out)
- . Uncertainty – field is used by soccer organizations, open space area
- . Naylor Act site (cost)**

Should the site be considered further?

YES (2)

NO (3)

UNCERTAIN (7)

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

FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Adjacent to park
- On greenbelt
- Near transit

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- . Preserve for active recreational use (year round)
- . Distance from other city functions, provides recreation for this area

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- Are there other locations for fields (nearby)?

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

- “Design Charrette” process on site
- Adequate replacement fields nearby
- Naylor-act**

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

HIGH (0)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (2)

Most Important Factors

LOW (0)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (6)

Most Important Factors

NO (4)

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: _____

** The Naylor Act (Education Code sections 17485-17500) requires school districts, who propose to lease or sell land used for outdoor recreation and open space land suited for recreational purposes for 8 years prior, to offer to lease or sell a portion of the land at discount to either a city or county, whichever has jurisdiction. Under these provisions, the agency having jurisdiction would have to determine existing and foreseeable community need for the open space within the school site’s vicinity and then could acquire 30% of the site at the school district’s acquisition cost plus inflation and improvement costs, at a price not less than 25% of fair market value. The remaining 70% of the site would be available for purchase at fair market value. The Naylor Act also permits a school district to exempt one unused site from these requirements when it is seeking the immediate expansion of an existing school by 50% or more.

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F7 – DJUSD Headquarters Site

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Close to park
- Farmer’s market
- Good access – underutilized
- Full block (no neighborhood impacts)
- Close to university

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Uncertainty, not declared a surplus property by school district

Should the site be considered further?

YES (12)

NO (0)

UNCERTAIN (0)

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

FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Land use (commercial, etc.) – mixed-use
- Good site size
- Close to downtown
- On bus route
- Higher density

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)

- 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

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

HIGH (12)

Most Important Factors

MEDIUM (0)

Most Important Factors

LOW (0)

Most Important Factors

UNCERTAIN (0)

Most Important Factors

NO (0)

Most Important Factors

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: 44 u, 20 u/ac

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F9 – Willowbank Church Site, NW Mace & Montgomery

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Compatibility with neighborhood
- Good vehicular access
- Close to schools, parks, shopping

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- . Intent to develop church, not housing
- . Timeframe of development unknown

Should the site be considered further?

YES (12)

NO (0)

UNCERTAIN (0)

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

FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Could continue Ag Buffer on south edge of City
- Access to main road (Mace Blvd.)
- Corner site

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- . Traffic impact on Montgomery only two outlets (Mace/Drummond)
- . Too low a density; higher density more appropriate

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

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

- Feather density across site (high to lower density; from the South to the North)
- Continuation of setback/buffer (southern edge)

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

HIGH (<u>8</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>4</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	--	--	---

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: 4-6 u/ac¹, 10-12 u/ac¹⁰, 15-20 u/ac¹

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F10 – NE Corner Mace & Cowell

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- Good location/access for mixed use

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- . Zoned for auto center but not a good location for it
- . Noisy
- . Ideal location for retail; easy access for commercial

Should the site be considered further? All Res (0) Live/Work/limited Res (7) Keep commercial/general/rezone (5)

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

FACTORS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- Makes sense for housing or mixed use
- Foot traffic to adjacent commercial
- Bus route nearby
- Limited health concerns

FACTORS IN OPPOSITION OF HOUSING ON THIS SITE

- . Proximity to I-80 interchange
- . Noise from fire station
- . Not a good location for housing (traffic noise)
- . Air Quality
- . Impact on nearby commercial

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- Traffic volumes

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

- Live/work opportunity – for sale units/density concerns
- Office/residential
- Office buffer along Mace?
- Opportunity for office condominiums, individual ownership

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

HIGH (<u>6</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>1</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>1</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>2</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>3</u>) <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: 4-8 units