

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

526 B Street, Davis Joint Unified School District Conference Room
Thursday, September 6, 2007
7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber, Pam Gunnell, Mike Harrington, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Ellen Shields (arrived during Item 5, discussion of Site F6), Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Mark Spencer, Kristin Stoneking, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso, Luke Watkins, Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Absent: Maynard Skinner.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster, Jesse Henkin.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Lydia Delis- Schlosser, Gregg Herrington, Steve Hicks, Jeanne Jones, Masud Monfared, James Morante, Tim Ruff, Landon Scarlett, Ken Topper, Jon Whitcombe, Matt Williams, Randy Yackzan.

1. Call to Order.

Chairman Kevin Wolf called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

Chairman Kevin Wolf proposed that the Committee remove the Nishi property from the list of sites to evaluate for this meeting. He believed that there would be too many sites to consider otherwise and it may affect the Committee's ability to end their meeting on time. Kevin Wolf made the motion to pass the agenda with the removal of this item and with the reversal of Site F6 and Site G1 on the

agenda, Pam Gunnell seconded the motion. The Committee unanimously approved the agenda with the amendments.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes.

Both Staff and the Committee made clarifications to the minutes. Changes were as follows: two of the committee members who were present that the August 23, 2007 meeting requested that their name be added to the minutes, there were adjustments made to the F1- Site Worksheet and it was requested that the two votes taken on the number of units for the Lewis Cannery site be recorded. With inclusion of the discussed changes to the minutes Jay Gerber made the motion to approve the minutes and Donna Lott seconded it. The minutes were unanimously approved, as changed.

4. Public Comment.

There were no public comments.

5. Continue Initial Evaluation of Potential Sites.

Jeff Baird restated the process for the initial evaluation and prioritization of each housing site:

- 1) Staff report and Committee questions of clarification.
- 2) Public comment, questions and additional information.
- 3) Steering Committee discussion:
 - 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 numbers/ density for this site

(Please see attached for worksheets on the Committee's initial evaluation of each site. Sites include: G1-Wildhorse Horse Ranch, F6-PG&E service center and H2-Signature inside the Mace Curve.)

6. Discuss Process and Next Steps, Including Approach for Community Workshop #2.

Consultant Jeff Baird gave a brief overview of where the Committee is now and where it is envisioned to go from here. He stated that their immediate goal is to get through all of the initial site evaluations to and prepare for Community Workshop #2. The purposes and intent of the workshop are to:

- Link with input from Community Workshop #1. Bring back to the community what they heard at Community Workshop #1 and describe how they have used the Workshop #1 results.
- Provide information about the process. Provide an opportunity to describe where they are in the process, the purposes of Workshop #2 and the next steps the process.

- Obtain feedback on potential housing sites through site “packages”. Provide the community an opportunity to give the Steering Committee feedback on the viability of potential housing sites through the presentation of site packages/ groupings/ themes discussed above.
- Obtain further feedback confirming important factors to select housing sites. Provide the community with an opportunity to give the Steering Committee further feedback on important factors guiding the selection of viable housing sites.

Kristen Stoneking suggested that for Workshop #2 the Committee devise an approach that helps the public think of different ways of living. She suggested giving examples of different types of housing styles so that the public is not limited to only thinking in terms of traditional apartments or houses. She thought this would help the public not simply focus on quantitative factors but also assess the quality of life within different housing options.

Donna Lott thought a good approach was to make part of the workshop a planning game where people are given scenarios and they would try to plan the best way to plan with what was presented to them. In this way Donna thought the Committee would begin to see what issues were really important to the public.

Kevin Wolf’s biggest concern was that the public would be too focused on the “not in my back yard” (NIMBY) issue and they would not be thinking holistically of what is best for Davis. He wants to impress upon the public at the next workshop that residents have to be thinking of what is best for the entire town, not just themselves, including the tradeoffs associated with any decision regarding a potential housing site.

7. Written Communications.

There were no written communications submitted.

8. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

Staff proposed that the October 4, 2007 meeting date be changed to October 11, 2007 instead because both staff members would be absent on the October 4th meeting date. By consensus the Committee changed the meeting date to October 11, 2007.

9. Adjournment.

Michael Harrington moved to adjourn the meeting and Kristin Stoneking seconded the motion. By unanimous agreement the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 P.M.

*Note: The Steering Committee Minutes can be found online at the following website:
www.cityofdavis.org/cdd/GPUUpdate/documents.cfm.*

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: G1- Wildhorse Horse Ranch

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Good road access
- + Parks and schools close by
- + Outside 100 year flood area
- + Surrounded by city on 3 sides
- + completes neighborhood
- + Accessory units
- + Adds to existing greenbelt

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Development agreement/ Vote
- Mitigation may be inappropriate
- Impact on burrowing owls (potential)
- This property is agricultural land

Should the site be considered further?

YES (12)

NO (1)

UNCERTAIN (0)

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

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- 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?

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

- 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.

(See the following page for Options A & B for this site)

Site G1- OPTION A: MIX OF HOUSING TYPES INCLUDING ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

(Same as listed above for overall site)

(Same as listed above for overall site)

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- Is there adequate water supply, overall sewer capacity, area-specific sewer capacity, police and fire services?

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

- Must have adjacent Agricultural mitigation.

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

HIGH (<u>4</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>3</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>4</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>2</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: 160-300 units with extra accessory units

Site G1- OPTION B: AG-RELATED HOUSING/ ORGANIC FARMING

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

(Same as listed above for overall site)

(Same as listed above for overall site)

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

Same as listed above for Option A.

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

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

HIGH (<u>7</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>2</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>2</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>2</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	--	--	---

RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS / RANGE OF DENSITY: 10-25 units

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: F6- PG & E Service Center

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Close to schools, parks, downtown, Valley Oak
- + Tax base is relatively high
- + Reassessment with new housing
- + Possibility for better bike access downtown
- + Bike access through the site
- + Proximity to 5th Street Transit (buses, trains)
- + Possibility for mixed use

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- This site is suitable for commercial

Should the site be considered further?

YES (12)

NO (0)

UNCERTAIN (2)

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

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- 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

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

(See the following page for Option A for this site)

Site F6- OPTION A: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

(Same as listed above for overall site)

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

(Same as listed above for overall site)

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

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

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

HIGH (<u>10</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>2</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>2</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>0</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: 15-46 du/ac. (125-500 units) mixed use, 25-50% non-residential

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: H2- Signature Properties Site Inside Mace Curve

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Adjacent Ag mitigation
- + Bounded by city roads
- + Bike connections important (makes shopping accessible)
- + Short driving distance from shopping in South Davis
- + No impact on other residential areas
- + Easy access to freeways
- + High intensity roadway access- close to freeway

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Not within walking distance to shopping

Should the site be considered further?

YES (14)

NO (0)

UNCERTAIN (0)

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

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- What is the Yolo county "Ag preserve" zoning?

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

(See the following page for Options A & B for this site)

Site H2- OPTION A: MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

(Same as listed above for overall site)

(Same as listed above for overall site)

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

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

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

HIGH (<u>13</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>1</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>
--	---	--	--	---

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: 12.5-18.5 du/ac. (350-520 units)

Site H2- OPTION B: AG-RELATED HOUSING/ ORGANIC FARMING

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

(Same as listed above for overall site)

(Same as listed above for overall site)

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

Same as listed above for overall site.

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

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

HIGH (<u>5</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>1</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>1</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>7</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>
---	---	--	--	---

RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS / RANGE OF DENSITY: 10-25 units