



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, February 15, 2018

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members:	Meg Arnold (Chair), Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Catherine Brinkley, Judy Corbett, Josh Chapman, Mary DeWall, Ryan Dodge, Cheryl Essex, Matt Dulcich, Justin Goss, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, Rob Hofmann, Darren McCaffrey, John Meyer, Sinisa Novakovic, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Randy Yackzan
Absent:	Rob White (excused)
City Staff:	Bob Wolcott, Ash Feeney, Diane Parro
Consultants:	Dan Parolek and Mitali Ganguly (Opticos Design), Isabelle Gaillard (AIM)

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

- a. The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.
- b. Meg welcomed the DPAC committee members.
- c. All committee members present except Rob White.

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. Bob explains the agenda is in two parts – committee can make comments and ask questions. Public can make comments toward end of agenda items.
- b. Meg asks the Committee to accept the agenda. Motion by Eric Roe, seconded by Darren McCaffrey. The agenda is approved by consensus.

3. January 25 Meeting Minutes

- a. Michelle Byars: Are the meeting minutes on webpage?
Bob Wolcott: Yes, they are on the Committee's page – This is how meeting minutes are handled for all commissions and committees in the city.
- b. Motion by Larry Guenther, Seconded by Mary DeWall. The meeting minutes are approved by consensus.

4. Presentation on Existing Conditions and Design Charrettes, Dan Parolek of Opticos, Inc.

- a. Opticos gives a presentation of the current work status and dates on the updated Existing Conditions analysis as well as information on Design Charrettes.
 - i. What to expect from the upcoming 4.5 day design charrette
 - ii. Process, Schedule and Objectives of a typical charrette. Some of the key components of the charrette include public presentations, brown bag lunchtime information sessions as well as open and closed studio time.
 - iii. Charrette dates have changed. The first charrette dates are now between April 24 – 28, 2018.

DPAC Comments on Presentation Above

- b. Chris Granger: Regarding Existing Conditions Report, will we see a more robust presentation of those issues?

Dan Parolek: We have been having a hard time getting good feedback on sustainability – we will get their report soon.

Chris Granger: A brown bag lunch at the charrette on sustainability is a good idea.

Dan Parolek: Doug only has budget to be at one charrette, the second charrette makes more sense.

Chris Granger: I have been getting questions from people in the community about form based code and how it connects to the downtown process. We are envisioning form based code for the Downtown, but not the community as a whole. Can you give us language to respond?

Dan Parolek: We will add language to the FAQ section of the website.

- c. Michelle Byars: Why are you asking us to go to (if we can only go to a little amount of time) the opening and closing sessions of the charrette? What are we doing at those? Is there time for feedback?

Dan Parolek: There is an opportunity to give feedback at those milestones. Ideally you would find a time to come in the middle of the charrette, but we understand it is a lot to ask. Those are the formal events, the two big milestones which we are asking the DPAC to be present at a minimum. At the final event, we will have a breakout session, similar to the public workshop at the last DPAC meeting.

- d. Sinisa Novakovic: I understand we will be discussing the height of buildings, but can we also weigh in on the quality of construction? The most sustainable way to build is by building for quality. It may cost 10% more to build up-front, but there's less costs later.

Dan Parolek: That is a topic we can put on the table.

- e. Justin Goss: Will fiscal analysis be included in the presentation at the March meeting?

Dan Parolek: The fiscal analysis won't be included at next DPAC meeting. Most likely at the April 18 meeting.

- f. Matt Dulcich: Regarding the study area, would you consider expanding? Should we include the City Hall, County, School District civic block? This block might be a key block in Davis' future. It's an opportunity.

Dan Parolek: It is inevitable we will study transitions, but the boundary is

something we can discuss as a committee. That is open to conversation. Including this block would be a design exercise in it of itself, in terms of what's the program, it will bring interest from the neighbors- what, how big?

Bob Wolcott: The boundary issue is part of the scope, it will be addressed – if we expand, we need a reason why. The boundary should come out of this process.

The civic center block has multi-jurisdictional political issues.

Judy Corbett: The school district hired Robert Liberty with residents and stakeholders already, hopefully we can get that.

John Meyer: If we are planning out 40 years (I'm thinking about the 1961 plan), this could be a receiver site. It could become a nice site for creative housing.

- g. Ash Feeney: It is a specific plan. Irrespective or the initial interest in ownership of what they want to do with that property long term planning horizon to establish what that scale would be for a document like this. If we want to push edges, irrespective of the current plan, we need to look at it...It is something we will need to talk about.

Michelle Byars: We could help the political will to change the boundaries. Having our civic centers be part of our core plan could be important.

Meg Arnold: So what I understand from this conversation is that it is conceivable to talk about boundaries and that staff and consultants have anticipated this conversation but have not figured out the timing and process of this.

Matt Dulcich: Will the boundary issue be resolved before the charrette?

Dan Parolek: This could be a focus in the second charrette

Mitali Ganguly: We would look after the first charrette; we first need to study the Downtown.

- h. Catherine Brinkley: Keep in mind, the second charrette will now be in the summer.
- i. Meg Arnold: Please also note, this date change of the charrette does move it off the UC Davis finals week.
- j. Ryan Dodge: Can the charrettes be live streamed on the internet?
Dan Parolek: That is something we will look into.
- k. Michelle Byars: I want a hashtag for the UC Davis students.
- l. Justin Goss: Can the fiscal report be made available 10 days sooner? There will be no opportunity for the finance committee to weigh in. The commission meeting will be on April 9 and the next one will be the following month.
Mitali Ganguly: We can have the report available on April 19. Prior to that, the key findings will be on the website. Key findings will be submitted April 3.

5. Presentation on Zoning, Dan Parolek of Opticos, Inc.

- a. Opticos gives a presentation on Zoning and Existing Regulations, Preliminary Analysis Results, Potential Metrics for Program and Vision: Scale, Form, Missing Middle Housing, and Neighborhood Transitions.

DPAC Comments on Presentation Above

- b. Darren McCaffrey: Units per acre – is that taking into account the actual unit size?

Dan Parolek: We take in the lot size, divide acreage of the lot, and multiply that by the number of units on the lot. That gives you the unit per acre. It should not discourage small units.

- c. Larry Guenther: You talked about “like facing like” – do you draw boundaries in the middle of blocks instead of streets? Does that help alleviate the problem we realized on the tour? That we can’t tell what street we are on when in downtown?
Dan: Yes, mid-block is the change in the zoning district. It would help establish different hierarchy.

- d. Darren McCaffrey: The population has grown a lot in 40 years. I’d be surprised if Davis tripled in size again – if it did, an 18 story building is starting to seem reasonable (even though it does not now). We need to think about the longevity of the plan and be flexible.

Also, in the transition zones, the transportation consultants should consider the Richards underpass. They should also consider 5th Street, Russell, F Street, and B Street because that is how cars get into downtown. We also need to consider the University biking arteries – 5 Street, B Street... If people try to come downtown, it takes a while on those arteries at rush hour.

Dan Parolek: That will be a part of the conversation with Fehr and Peers.

- e. Deema Tamimi – Good point, we need to think about population. Could rules be adapted based on population growth?

Dan Parolek: Yes, we can put a policy in place – It could be that if the population reaches a certain number, that trigger will require the City to reassess the plan.

Bob Wolcott: For a sense of scale, if we continue at 1% growth in population, it would be at 85,000 population in 2040.

- f. John Meyer: Looking at downtown as an ecosystem, it is not only serving Davis, it could serve the whole region – while that is a lot of pressure, its positive pressure if we do it right. There could be more demand.

- g. Ryan Dodge: Clarification question, is this plan for the next 40 years, or until 2040?

Bob: 2040, per the parameters adapted for the project by Council.

6. **Presentation on Preservation Architecture, Mark Hubert of Preservation Architecture**

- a. Preservation Architecture gives a presentation on Historical Resources Analysis prepared for Existing Conditions Analysis.

DPAC Comments on Presentation Above

- b. Cheryl Essex: Will your analysis be done for the April Charrette? Would you propose a historic district?

Mark Hulbert: There is a lot of analysis already done in the Existing Conditions – I will present options at the first charrette. We need to think about how we want downtown to be. We will be looking for you input on preference for historic districts – Do we want to eliminate? Preserve? Designate? These are all things we will ask and consider. We will pre-analyze and explain the history of the buildings so you give informed input. I won’t specifically propose a historic district – I’m not here to impose considerations on your community, just here to help you sort

what you want to do. I am not making determinations – the community needs to weigh in.

Dan Parolek: What's great about the co-design process is that it will be clear about tradeoffs. We will look at alternatives.

- c. Larry Guenther – It's my understanding Old North and Old East were a designated Conservation District because the community believed designating the community as a Historic District would cover less ground. They chose to make it a Conservation District because they wanted protections, but now they realize as a conservation district, legally they don't have that protection they thought they did.
Mark Hulbert: It's true, Conservation and Historic Districts are different. Conservation district is not property by property, it's looking at an area.
- d. John Meyer: I sense there is more interest in flexibility – to keep the character of a community, but not be so constrained that it removes flexibility. We want to find the right tools for that - Historic District designation might be too prescriptive.

7. Public Comment

- a. Cathy Forkas: I have a charrette question - Are people able to give input over the web? Through email? It might be hard for people to give their input right away.
Dan Parolek: Haven't thought specifically about that, but might be able to give feedback live. We will look into it.
Mitali Ganguly: We will have a virtual workshop between the charrettes (and open for two weeks) which will give people an opportunity for people to get involved.
- b. Doby Fleeman: My concern is similar to Justin Goss, the timing of economic data and beginning of charrette process do not line up well. We need this information – the sooner the better. It is important if we want larger investors.
Dan Parolek: For initial charrette process, we don't have that market research go to 100%, we have it go to 75% so when we do the charrette, we give the economist the ability to go back and tweak that analysis based on the specific range of alternatives that are generated during the charrette. We need them to get to an important milestone – they will use information collected at charrette to inform the future data.
- c. Todd Edelman, member of the Bicycling, Transportation and Street Safety Commission. We need to plant trees; Can buildings be built to have additional stories added in future? We should look into building modular buildings; Expanding the boundary to include the civic centers is good for elderly; Need to eliminate parking minimums, make parking maximums; The Depot only serves people whose jobs start early in the day; Our passage tunnel cannot grow.; We will have more parking needs. We need to put parking on the south side of train tracks close to I-80. We could have a transportation hub there.
- d. Eric Roe: I enjoyed learning everyone's comments through the homework assignment – what will happen with this now?
Meg Arnold: All are on the website – anyone who is interested could view it. Seems like our role is to drive people to the charrettes, as well as provide the community with the information on the web.

- e. Michelle Byars- Consider reaching out to people at the dog park for public notification.
I'm in a landscape architecture class – we made redesign options for E Street Plaza – we will submit those designs to the project team.
- 8. Adjournment**
- a. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. The next scheduled committee meeting date is March 8, 2018. The committee will discuss the updated Existing Conditions Report.