



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, November 14, 2019

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Meg Arnold (Chair), Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Judy Corbett, Mary DeWall, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, Darren McCaffrey, John Meyer, Sinisa Novakovic, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Randy Yackzan

Liaison Members: Matt Dulcich, Doug Buzbee, Todd Edelman, Cheryl Essex

Not Present: Catherine Brinkley, Josh Chapman, Ted Parks

City Staff: Eric Lee

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. Member attendance noted. Catherine Brinkley, Josh Chapman, Ted Parks absent. It was noted that liaison member Todd Edelman was attending a BTSSC meeting and would join DPAC afterwards.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve agenda by Guenther. Seconded by McCaffrey. Approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve October 24, 2019 meeting minutes by McCaffrey. Seconded by Guenther. Approved unanimously.

4. Brief Announcements from Staff, Committee Members, or Liaisons

None.

5. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

None.

6. DPAC Discussion of Meeting Memo Topics

Staff reviewed general meeting topics and the public review of the draft Downtown Plan. DPAC questions included clarification on the scheduling of the presentation by Opticos to the general city commissions, process for identifying discrepancies between the Downtown Plan documents and Building Code, and question about street sections and Public Works Department comments.

Public commenters included: Jennifer Anderson, Greg Rowe, Wesley Sage Walker, Steve Greenfield. Comments to DPAC included or addressed: the difficulty in redeveloping properties downtown and making it work financially; need for discussion of fee reductions and building heights; less than 4 stories does not make sense; consider revisions to TDM strategies; TDM plans and TMA requirements can discourage developers; efforts to manipulate private transportation behavior may not be effective; PD 2-86 is a complex and difficult zone; consider addressing PD 2-86 in the downtown plan to avoid barriers to reinvestment and redevelopment, particularly the large apartment sites; request contingency zoning under the plan for the Trackside Center property currently being litigated with possible options allowing 4 stories or 4 stories with a stepback; does not support 3 story maximum.

DPAC identified several discussion topics, which included: University Avenue PD 2-86 neighborhood, Trackside Center property, affordable housing and fees, implementation section, benefits of TMA, and the G Street finger north of 5th Street.

University Avenue PD 2-86

DPAC discussion comments included:

- Request from some property owners for changes in the neighborhood under the Downtown Plan.
- Suggestion meet with neighbors to discuss possible changes.
- Interested in addressing PD 2-86 and concern about lost opportunity if don't.
- Interested in the consultants thoughts on the area.
- University Avenue area is different from rest of downtown.
- Opportunity to find common ground using the existing zones would be progress.
- Concern about process and excluding public and the university.
- Comment that Opticos considered the PD was a perfect transitional neighborhood and focused on downtown.
- Clarification that DPAC's previous votes on the neighborhood were to avoid exceptions for individual properties, not necessarily to not look at the neighborhood more generally.
- Solution to process concern is to evaluate it as an EIR alternative which provides a public process.
- Reiterate support for looking at 3rd Street.
- Comments in letter from Catherine Brinkley about the PD was read aloud.
- Concern about not including students.
- Suggest forming subcommittee on the issue.

Motion by Roe to empower Sinisa to convene a meeting with the neighbors and property owners and form a subcommittee of DPAC consisting of Novakovic, Roe, Brinkley, Tamimi, Byars with staff support. Second by Tamimi.

Motion approved unanimously.

Trackside Center Property

DPAC discussion comments included:

- Consideration of Trackside Center property zoning.
- Would also like to discuss all existing commercial properties on east side of train tracks. Would like more input from property owners and reconsider properties like Cable Car Wash and Bernard's Tires. Would like the same zone to extend to these properties down and up and to allow up to 4 stories if Trackside is upheld.
- Property owners have had 2 years to participate and comment.
- Important to respect those who are living in their houses in the affected areas.
- Seemed odd that the commercial properties on east side of the tracks were left out.
- Property owners and the neighborhood of downtown have not been represented enough.
- Interested in considering including other properties, but don't want anything tied to a court decision.
- Worry about going back on decisions.
- Worry about peripheral decisions distracting DPAC from the bigger issues.
- DPAC does have downtown voices on the committee not just those providing input. Making changes does not feel right.

Motion by Roe that the boundary east of the train tracks be moved to include all existing long-time commercial properties from Bernard's Tires at the top of Rowe Place west of the alley down to the carwash. Seconded by DeWall.

Discussion comments included:

- Neighborhood opposed including car wash site because of concern about annexing the neighborhood into downtown. Neighborhood was okay with properties that are currently included because of the Trackside Center project and the uncertainty it caused.
- Comment about where the downtown boundary lies and what defines it.
- Propose friendly amendment that there be language stating that these parcels are officially part of Old East Davis.
- Downtown is the commercial center and these are commercial properties and should be considered part of downtown. Goal with Measure J to avoid sprawl and so need densification. Mistake to leave out this block to the north and block to the south.
- Motion is unchanged. Motion is to move the boundary.

Ayes: Byars, Corbett, DeWall, Roe, Yackzan

Noes: Arnold, Granger, Guenther, McCaffrey, Meyer, Novakovic

Abstain: Tamimi

Motion fails 5 to 6 with one abstention.

DPAC discussion of the properties on the east side of the train tracks that are currently within the plan boundaries, which includes the Trackside Center property within the boundaries but is not currently rezoned by the plan. DPAC comments included:

- Suggestion to consider treating the Trackside Center property consistent with the zoning of the adjacent properties.
- Would also like to change the zoning of the adjacent properties.
- After considering whether to treat Trackside Center property in the same manner, can consider whether to adjust the zoning for all those properties.

Motion by Arnold that in order that it does not find itself in a zoning limbo that the zoning of the Trackside property be handled in a manner consistent with the adjacent commercial properties. Seconded by McCaffrey.

Discussion comments included:

- In spirit of densification, living close to downtown, and development close to downtown, the goal is to make it viable. Limiting the size of a building, limits the feasibility of the development. BAE report found 9 out of 10 building types not feasible so nothing will get done. Property owners should be empowered and allowed to do things at a size so that something can get done. Believe that along the alley, 3 stories with a 4th story set back is a stepback that can be lived with. Will only have some effect on those properties immediately to the east. Everything from 5th to 3rd Street along the alley to the tracks should be able to go to 4 stories, perhaps with 4th story stepback and for Trackside Center to ultimately become part of that whatever that outcome.
- That includes both including Trackside as well as what the zoning should be.
- Current motion only addresses first part.
- DPAC is advisory board. Ultimate decision is city council's.
- SB 50 could allow 5 stories and may show up.
- Have not built enough housing.

Substitute motion by Roe to add into the current motion to allow 5th Street to 3rd Street to go to 4 stories with a setback. Seconded by Yackzan.

Discussion comments on substitute motion included:

- Clarification that motion includes allowing 4 stories with a stepback.
- It is 3 full stories and your upper story can go half a width closer to the railroad tracks.
- Stepback is as defined in the draft plan.
- Old East neighborhood is happy with the Plan so far. Everything there is one story. 3 stories would already be denser than it is now. Residents who live next door feel that 4 stories is different than 3 stories. People in the rest of the neighborhood also agree that it would affect other people in neighborhood,

especially if the houses along alley become non-viable as single family homes and get redeveloped and want 4 stories.

- Have good faith issue. It has been discussed at various meetings. At one point it was described as 4 stories. People were upset. Subsequent meeting that it was really meant to be 3 stories. Allegations of distrust. DPAC has landed here. There can be merits to 4 stories, but if saying property owners were not represented, the people who advocated for this are not here tonight. Worry about losing the big idea with these tweaks.
- Lost in the substitute motion is what was requested for Trackside Center and how to address that parcel in the Downtown Plan.
- Clarification that the substitute motion would incorporate that.

Motion on table is the substitute motion that incorporated the original motion and extended beyond it. Motion is that DPAC recommends that the Trackside Center property be handled consistent with the adjacent commercial properties and that those commercial properties between the railroad tracks and the alley from 5th Street to 3rd Street be allowed to go to 4 stories with a 4th story stepback.

Ayes: Arnold, Corbett, DeWall, McCaffrey, Roe, Tamimi, Yackzan

Noes: Granger, Guenther, Meyer, Novakovic

Abstain: Byars

Motion approved 7 to 4 with one abstention.

Comment about the stepback and clarification that Opticos' original recommendation was a 30-foot stepback.

7. Other Committee or Staff Communications

None.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.