

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

3100 Fifth Street, Windmere I/II Community Room
Thursday, September 20, 2007
7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Jay Gerber, Pam Gunnell, Donna Lott, Eileen Samitz, Kristin Stoneking (arrived during Item 5, discussion of Site H3), Ellen Shields (arrived during Item 5, discussion of Site H3), Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Mark Spencer, Luke Watkins, Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Absent: Maynard Skinner, Bob Traverso, Mike Harrington, Norma Turner.

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Julie Vyfhuis.

Consultant: Jeff Baird.

Public: Karen Hulbert, Lawrence Shephard, Lydia Delis-Schlosser, Charles Brownold, Pam Nieberg, Steve Hicks, Masud Monfared, Shariar Monfared, Joe Whitcombe, Pena Nayyar, Matt Williams, Landon Scarlett, Jeanne Jones, Eddie Kho, Gregg Herrington, Chuck Cunningham, Ken Topper, Randy Yackzan.

1. Call to Order.

Chairman Kevin Wolf called the meeting to order at approximately 7:05 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

Kevin Wolf requested that the Committee endeavor to stay within the allotted time for each agenda item so as to adjourn the meeting by 10 P.M. Lucas Frerichs made the motion to pass the agenda and Eileen Samitz seconded the motion. The Committee unanimously approved the agenda.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes.

Staff apologized for misspelling Kristin Stoneking's first name on page 3 of the September 6th minutes. With that minor change, Jay Gerber made the motion to approve

the minutes and Donna Lott seconded it. The summary minutes were unanimously approved by the Committee.

4. Public Comment.

Kevin Wolf restated the process for public comments - the public speak at the time allotted in the agenda for a time limit of 1-2 minutes depending on the number of people commenting, and as a point of clarification or sharing valuable information on potential housing sites that would help the Committee in their decision making process.

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 the attached worksheets on the Committee's initial evaluation of each site. Sites include H1 Covell Village and H3 Nishi Property).

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

The Committee discussed possible approaches for Community Workshop # 2:

Mark Siegler questioned the legitimacy of the City's 1% growth guideline and the exercise concept involving 2,500 units. He thought what the Committee wanted to do was to find out what people thought generally about where to put housing, not to put a specific number of units. He proposed that the workshop focus on the 630 - 700 unit number (the regional allocation), describe the City's 1% guideline, and ask people where they would put the houses, and possibly how many houses they would put between now and 2013 and beyond.

Staff commented that the Council's direction to the Committee included the 1% guideline. This concept of this workshop option is to provide some relationship of scale to the number of units in the guideline, and to obtain input on the reasons for where the units would be located. Jeff Baird mentioned that in addition to the numbers the reasons for choosing a certain site option would help provide the Steering Committee feedback on the viability and important factors and preferences that should guide the selection of potential housing sites.

Pam Gunnell questioned the need to provide the public with a maximum range in number of housing units and maintained the importance of focusing on providing the public with a clear distinction between the RHNA's numbers and the city's 1% growth guidelines.

Kevin Wolf suggested using a "broad survey" requesting the community to prioritize their overall goals of housing (important concerns about growth in Davis, how much and what type of growth) which he thinks, is a more accurate way of obtaining valuable feedback and would help the Committee achieve a direction.

Donna Lott questioned whether the Committee should have the workshop focus somewhat on long term planning (beyond the year 2013).

Planning for workshop #2 will continue at the October 18th meeting.

7. Written Communications.

Staff provided the Committee with the following documents:

- a) Updated overall and near-term schedules.
- b) Memo from Committee member Bob Traverso dated September 6, 2007 regarding the potential "Reutilization of Selected City Properties."
- c) Letter from Ernest Dahl dated September 6, 2007 regarding Site H7-West of Stonegate.

8. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

Jeff Baird informed the Committee that due to staff vacations they consider finishing the rest of the sites on the October 11th meeting and save the detailed workshop discussion for the October 18th meeting. There was unanimous agreement.

9. Adjournment.

Mark Seigler moved to adjourn the meeting and Kevin Wolf seconded the motion. By unanimous agreement the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:20 P.M. The next meeting is scheduled for October 11, 2007 at Davis Joint Unified School District East Conference Room located at 526 B Street.

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

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: H1- Covell Village

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Proximity to health care
- + Proximity to transit, shopping, senior art center
- + Ag buffer/urban limit
- + Completes greenbelt/bike path
- + Size – more options possible
- + Parks
- + Innovative opportunity
- + Large site and housing opportunities
- + Senior housing needed (smaller lifestyle)
- + Potential for park land
- + Address Poleline/Covell transit improvements
- + Development on three sides

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Recent vote
- Provides viable ag inlet into urban area (views, experience)
- Cost of infrastructure/services
- Bordered by farm, landfill site
- County land (Davis only receives a small portion of taxes)
- Half of property in flood plain
- Class 1 ag land
- Traffic impacts on Covell Blvd., Pole Line Rd., F St., L St.
- Pollution with more traffic
- Safety issues
- Loss of ag viability
- Limited access

Should the site be considered further?

YES (8)

NO (2)

UNCERTAIN (1)

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

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- City sewer/water information
- 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)

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

- Look at sewage treatment capacity as an overall issue

(See the following pages for Options A, B & C for this site)

Site H1 - OPTION A: 800 Du To Top of Lewis and "Urban Reserve" to North

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)

Should the site be considered further?

YES (8)

NO (2)

UNCERTAIN (1)

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

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>6</u>) Most Important Factors	MEDIUM (<u>1</u>) Most Important Factors	LOW (<u>0</u>) Most Important Factors	UNCERTAIN (<u>1</u>) Most Important Factors	NO (<u>3</u>) 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: 800 units

Site H1 - OPTION B: Joint Planning with Lewis Site, Development Limited to Land Adjacent to South Half of Lewis Site with 400 DU on Site H1 (north part permanently protected)

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)

Should the site be considered further?

YES (8)

NO (2)

UNCERTAIN (1)

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

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>3</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>1</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>4</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: **400 units**

Site H1 - OPTION C: Ag Related Housing

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)

Should the site be considered further? **YES (8)** **NO (2)** **UNCERTAIN (1)**

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

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>2</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	MEDIUM (<u>0</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>9</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: 10-25 units

INITIAL SITE EVALUATION: H3 - Nishi Property

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

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + Proximity to UCD and downtown
- + Bolster downtown economy
- + Potential to provide special housing/add to diversity & people
- + Proximity to freeway
- + Bike connection So. Davis
- + Remove at-grade crossing & whistle
- + Proximity to arboretum
- + Proximity to transit
- + Higher density/higher heights not impacting existing neighborhood

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- Prime ag land with good access
- Bad urban access for cars
- Value of "visual quality" of ag land view from freeway
- UCD involvement can make a better development (no UCD involvement now)
- Lose opportunity for organic farming & other
- Potential impact on worst intersection in Davis (do not worsen traffic)
- Any commercial would generate traffic
- Substantial increase in rental vacancies/win petition with other rentals
- Walking and biking goals may be met
- Noise from I-80 & railroad pollution

Should the site be considered further?

YES (9)

NO (1)

UNCERTAIN (1)

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

- Similar to Aggie Village
- Walking/Bicycling

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

- Any UCD plans for property?
- What would be traffic impacts?
- What is the number of train trips?

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

- Not impact downtown
- Possible student housing/facility housing

- Lot of ways to reduce traffic impacts (not using Richards undercrossing)
- Traffic mitigation

(See the following pages for Options A, B, C & D for this site)

Site H3 - OPTION A: Housing with Commercial (with local serving retail only)

Why the site SHOULD be considered for housing

- + (Same as listed above for overall site)
- + Permanent year round foot traffic to downtown

Why the site SHOULD NOT be considered for housing

- (Same as listed above for overall site)

Should the site be considered further?

YES (9)

NO (1)

UNCERTAIN (1)

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

-

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

-

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

- Can we contact university and have them come to a meeting to discuss this site?

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>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>1</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>0</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: 462 - 770 units

Site H3 - OPTION B: Residential and R&D – Elimination of Access to Richards & Access to UCD is Obtained

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)

+ Permanent year round foot traffic to downtown

Should the site be considered further?

YES (9)

NO (1)

UNCERTAIN (1)

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

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

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

- Can we contact university and have them come to a meeting to discuss this site?

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>4</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	LOW (<u>0</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	UNCERTAIN (<u>1</u>) <i>Most Important Factors</i>	NO (<u>1</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: 460 - 1000 units

Site H3 - OPTION C: Innovative Ag Use (Ag-related Housing)

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)

+ Permanent year round foot traffic to downtown

Should the site be considered further?

YES (9)

NO (1)

UNCERTAIN (1)

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

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR THIS SITE?

RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS / RANGE OF DENSITY: 462 - 770 units

O:\JHENKIN\SC GP update Meetings\September 20th\Minutes for September 20th meeting.doc