

**Senior Citizen Commission Minutes for Special Meeting**  
**Thursday, November 19, 2009**  
**2:30 p.m.**  
**Davis Senior Center, Multipurpose Room #1**  
**646 A Street**

Commissioners present: Elaine Musser (Chair), Romeo Favreau (Vice Chair), Shula Blumenthal, Steve Hayes, Mariana Henwood, Tansey Thomas, George Hinkle (Alternate)

Absent: Kitty Liebhardt, Janice Bridge (Alternate)

City Council Liaison: Sue Greenwald, City Council Liaison

Staff: Maria Lucchesi, Community Services Supervisor  
 Robert Wolcott, Principal Planner, Community Development Department

**1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda**

Meeting was called to order at 2:30pm by Chair E. Musser.  
 Motion to approve the agenda was moved by R. Favreau, seconded by G. Hinkle and passed unanimously.

**2. Public Communications/Comments**

Members of Choices for Healthy Aging (CHA), Robert Chasen, Mary Jo Bryan, Charlotte Soback, and Cindy Royval-Unger, voiced their concerns that current housing choices in Davis were not adequate and asked not to put restrictions on number of senior housing units. CHA members also requested that their report "What Are the Housing Needs of Davis Seniors?-CHA Community Outreach Results" be included in the Draft Senior Housing Strategies. Member of the public Bill Streng stated he had no objection to Carlton Plaza.

**3. New Business**

Staff read responses by absent Commissioners J. Bridge and K. Liebhardt.

Below are the comments and recommendations made by Senior Citizen Commission which will be presented to City Council by City Planner Bob Wolcott - date yet to be determined.

Aspects of Draft Strategies	Commission Comments and Recommendations
<p><b>Overall strategy process</b>  <b>(1) Generally OK? Or what should be done differently?</b></p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Excellent start on planning ahead, will need to review and update.</li> <li>▪ This is being done too quickly.</li> <li>▪ Data is not produced internally.</li> <li>▪ Should address other housing issues and needs, and all income levels.</li> <li>▪ Like community to be balanced, and the strategies do address this.</li> </ul> <p><u>Motion passed unanimously:</u> The Davis Senior Citizens Commission is highly supportive of city staff's general approach in setting some type of senior housing parameters as a guideline for City Council use. The burden is on the proponent of any project to</p>

Aspects of Draft Strategies	Commission Comments and Recommendations
	<p>explain why it would be necessary to depart from any of the given parameters (as modified in the motions that follow).</p>
<p><b>Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>How many and when?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>What types?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>How to locate, plan and design?</i></li> </ul> <p><b>(2)</b> Are these the appropriate issues? (recognizing you may have comments on the draft strategies) Do you recommend that other issues be addressed? What issues?</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need versatility, build for future and changes in living through Universal Design.</li> <li>▪ Develop a policy to promote the retrofitting of existing homes (motion not passed).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Emphasis on 55+ age-restricted senior housing</b> (including 55+ age-qualified) as one of the major strategies? <b>(3)</b> Agree with emphasis on age-restricted housing as one of the major strategies? Is 55+ the appropriate age range for consideration? Do you recommend other strategies not related to age-restricted senior housing? What strategies? (eg higher city standards for “universal design”?)</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agree with emphasis on age-restricted housing as one of major strategies.</li> </ul> <p><u>Motion passed unanimously</u> regarding age range: The Davis Senior Citizens Commission recommends that the appropriate age range for consideration of age-restricted senior housing be set at 65+.</p> <p><u>Motion passed unanimously</u> regarding other strategies: The Davis Senior Citizens Commission recommends the city adopt a Universal Design Ordinance, that requires designing new housing units so that future modifications to increase unit accessibility, functionality, and visitability can be made in an economical and efficient manner that accommodates aging in place.</p> <p><u>Motion passed 6-1</u> regarding other strategies: The Davis Senior Citizens Commission recommends, in keeping with its Senior Housing Guidelines, that an independent needs analysis and fiscal impact analysis be completed before approving any senior housing project. Commissioner S.Blumenthal abstained.</p>
<p><b>Strategy 1: Targets for the number</b> of new 55+ age-restricted senior housing units. <b>(4)</b> Existing unmet need: Agree with general methodology (p.8) and determination of 200 units? <b>(5)</b> Agree with assumptions for target? (a) 1% growth - Any comments to Council? (b) Student population in city is kept stable. (c) Shifts in age brackets assume age groups in city mirror trends in County overall.</p>	<p>General consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need some definition of what a housing “unit” is, with conversion factors.</li> </ul> <p>Individual comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider using the persons per household assumptions from Quimby formula. Comment by S. Greenwald</li> </ul> <p>(4) Do not agree with general methodology and determination of 200 unit deficiency. <u>Motion passed unanimously:</u> The Davis Senior Citizens Commission recommends assuming there is no current deficiency of 65+ senior age-restricted housing subject to further</p>

Aspects of Draft Strategies	Commission Comments and Recommendations
<p>(d) Target based on 15.3% of households with at least one senior person.</p> <p><b>(6)</b> Target: Agree with amount of 1,000 units / 20 years (average of 50 units / year) and to distribute over time?</p>	<p>investigation (such as wait lists). (At a minimum, re-calculate based on ages 65+.)</p> <p>(5a) Do not agree with 1% growth assumption.  <u>Motion passed unanimously:</u> The Davis Senior Citizen Commission recommends the 1% growth rate represent a “cap” rather than a “target”.</p> <p>(5b, 5c, 5d) Agree with these assumptions.</p> <p>(6) Do not agree with amount of 1,000 units over 20 years.  <u>Motion passed unanimously:</u> The Davis Senior Citizens Commission recommends the average over twenty years be reduced by 185 units for 65+ age-restricted housing.</p>
<p><b>Strategy 2: General proportions of different types</b> of new 55+ age-restricted senior housing units.</p> <p><b>(7)</b> Agree with concept to distribute unit types?</p> <p><b>(8)</b> Agree with general methodology of moving closer to national percentages as a rationale for distributing units types? If not, what?</p> <p><b>(9)</b> Agree that this is a general goal but not an absolute “cap” or minimum for any given year?</p>	<p>(7) Agree with concept to distribute unit types.</p> <p>(8) <u>Motion passed unanimously:</u> The Davis Senior Citizens Commission recommends that more investigation be done in determining the wait lists for each type of facility as a better gauge of need for unit distribution types, than necessarily following national averages.</p> <p>(9) <u>Motion passed unanimously:</u> Page 7, Other Aspects of Strategy 1, b: Eliminate second sentence which states “In order to distribute the units through time and to provide a limit in any five-year period, consider limiting the number of approved units in a five-year period to two times the targeted number of units.”</p>
<p><b>Strategy 3.1: Adopt and implement the “Guidelines for Housing that Serves Seniors and Persons with Disabilities”.</b></p> <p><b>(10)</b> Agree?</p>	<p><u>Motion passed unanimously:</u> Agree with the following addition: The Senior Citizens Commission recommends that a development application submitted on one of these sites, for 16 or more units, should be reviewed by the Senior Citizens Commission for a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council (as required by the project application process) for recommendations on any aspect of the site plan or design <u>that would determine whether the project is suitable for Davis seniors.</u></p>
<p><b>Strategy 3.2: Consider sites as potentially suitable</b> for age 55+ senior housing, subject to additional review.</p> <p><b>(11)</b> Agree with identifying this list for further review? (Including that this does not mean site must be developed with senior units with or without age-</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Add reference to Resolution #08-158 adopted by City Council on November 5, 2008 for the location of these sites and potential number of housing units.</p>

Aspects of Draft Strategies	Commission Comments and Recommendations
restrictions, or preclude other sites being considered.)	
<p><b>Strategy 3.3: Establish guidelines</b> for the review of a proposed age-restricted development project or component of a project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Minimum size:</b> 16 units.</li> <li>b. <b>Maximum size:</b> 250 units.</li> <li>c. <b>Maximum size for one general housing type and density:</b> 150 units.</li> </ul> <p><b>(12)</b> Agree with concepts of these guidelines and their sizes?</p>	<p>(3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3c) Commission agreed unanimously:</p> <p>Agree with concepts and sizes.</p>
<p><b>Other comments or recommendations</b></p> <p><b>(13)</b> Do you have any other comments or recommend any other strategies? Recognizing any concerns stated above, can the Commission proceed with making comments and recommendations to Council on the draft strategies?</p>	

#### 4. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn moved by R. Favreau, seconded by T. Thomas, and passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 5:10pm