

MEMO

TO: Sherri Metzker, Principal Planner
Eric Lee, Planner
FROM: Greg Rowe, Planning Commissioner
DATE: November 11, 2019
SUBJECT: Comments - Article Downtown Zoning Codes for Downtown Davis Specific Plan ("Plan")

The comments below appear in the same order as the draft Plan, preceded by general comments. This memo should be read in tandem with my November 6 comment memo on the Downtown Plan.

Section	Sub-Section	Subject	Comments
NA	NA	Overall Approach	<p>The proposed Article 40.13 provides practical guidance through the generous use of photographs and illustrations. Compared to the current zoning code for the Core Area Specific Plan, the proposed "form-based" code will allow or more flexibility and creativity on the art of both developers and City staff. It will greatly reduce the need for action by the Planning Commission, including consideration of Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) and Planned Developments (PDs).</p> <p>In talking about the draft downtown plan with friends and acquaintances, the most prominent comment is dissatisfaction with the current perceived and/or actual lack of convenient vehicle parking and the Plan's proposal to even further reduce the parking supply. Based on these comments, I continue believing that it is unrealistic to assume that a great number of Davis residents will start riding bikes to get downtown. They'll simply drive somewhere else, potentially outside Davis, where parking and carrying out the daily needs of their busy lives is perceived as being easier and hassle-free.</p>
NA	NA	Page Numbers	The document does not have page numbers. Reviewing and writing comments on the zoning code would have been easier if page numbers had been included.
40.13.140	140.A	Note 4	"Stealth Design" needs to be defined in this section (not just in the definition section).
40.14.030	F.2.A.	Screening	Screening for Roof-Mounted Equipment is described. <u>Comment:</u> such screening must not interfere with the activities of repair/maintenance personnel.

Section	Sub Section	Subject	Comments
40.14.050	A.3 and A.4	Parking and Loading	<p>This section describes standards and limits on the development of motor vehicle and bicycle parking. Among the goals is reducing motor vehicle trips per capita to and from downtown development.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> The standards and limits described in this section may have the effect of limiting Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) to the extent that fewer people will go to downtown Davis. They will simply drive to other destinations perceived as more convenient. Restricting the number and availability of parking spaces will not necessary equate to more people deciding to bike or walk from home to downtown.</p> <p>Attempts to reduce VMT by limiting the availability of parking spaces can actually have the reverse of the intended outcome. For example, during the development of Terminal A at Sacramento International Airport (SMF), the California Air Resources Board (ARB) attempted to place limits on the number of total annual passengers, the number of flight operations, and the number of airport parking spaces. ARB's goal in restricting the number of customer parking spaces was to reduce vehicle emissions by inducing travel to SMF by mass transit, which was limited in schedule and viewed as inconvenient. (Congressional action in the early 2000s blocked such action by state agencies such as ARB, as it violated the Constitution's interstate commerce provisions.)</p> <p>It was ultimately realized that the result of ARB's actions was the exact opposite of the intent. As airport users became aware that they were unlikely to find parking at SMF, many resorted to having someone drive them to SMF for their departing flight and then pick them up when arriving back at the airport; i.e., a friend or relative would drive them to the airport for their departing flight and then pick them up from their arriving flight. Thus, instead of incurring one roundtrip to the airport, these passengers required two roundtrips by their driver, thereby doubling vehicle emissions. This is an excellent example of unintended consequences, and one that was confirmed by surveys of airline passengers. It shows that most people will find a way to defeat government imposed social engineering.</p>
40.14.050	C.1.	On-Site Parking	Sharing parking is a great idea. It helps maximize utilization of parking resources.
40.14.050	F.1.b	Carshare Spaces	What is the rationale for 800 feet? Why not another distance such as 500 feet or 1000 feet?
40.14.050	F.3.	Unbundled Costs	This is a great idea. There is no reason to charge a person for a parking space they don't need. This is an excellent way to encourage lower vehicle use without imposing a prohibition.
40.14.050	J.1.	TDM Standards	This subsection addresses Commercial Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Standards. It would require developments to prepare and implement a TDM Plan, which would be overseen by Yolo Commute, a Transportation Management Association (TMA). The goal of this requirement would be to achieve a maximum 50 percent employee drive-alone mode share.

Section	Sub Section	Subject	Comments
---------	-------------	---------	----------

			<p><u>Comment:</u> I strongly recommend that the City delete this subsection from the proposed downtown zoning code. This ill-conceived decree would be the ultimate example of too much governmental interference with and involvement in the personal lives of employers and citizens. Faced with such a draconian and unrealistic mandate, employers could very well ignore or evade this measure by whatever means possible. Or, when made aware of such requirements, prospective employers contemplating locating to downtown Davis may simply choose to go elsewhere, thereby defeating the City's goal of encouraging more downtown development. This requirement would also mean that downtown developments would be forced to comply with different and discriminatory requirements to which developments and employers outside downtown would not be subject. I further question whether the City has the legal authority to impose such a requirement, particularly a requirement that employers pay dues to a TMA. In addition, enforcing a TDM plan would require the allocation of scarce fiscal and human resources on the part of both employers and the City.</p> <p>Please delete this counterproductive mandate and instead look for incentives to encourage commute modes other than single-occupancy motor vehicles.</p> <p>Below are additional comments on this subject, copied from my November 6 comment memo on the draft Downtown Plan.</p> <p>Transportation Management Association (TMA) Membership: The Plan says that all non-residential developments should be required to join Yolo Commute and that tenants should remain members in perpetuity. I recommend that this strategy be deleted. Requiring dues-paying membership will impose an uncompetitive cost on downtown Davis development and tenancy. And, based on my experience, TMAs are ineffective.</p> <p>I dealt with a TMA during my 13-year tenure as Senior Environmental Analyst with the Sacramento County Department of Airports (Airports). The CA Air Resources Board (ARB) imposed an air quality management plan on Mather Airport, and delegated implementation and monitoring to the Sac Metro Air Quality Management District. Both agencies periodically criticized Airports because TMA ridesharing goals were continually unmet. The airport had many tenants, which included UPS, other air freight companies, corporate commuting aircraft fleets, aircraft sales and service, etc. The airport belonged to the local TMA and the airport manager served on its Board of Directors. He and I urged airport tenants to join</p>
--	--	--	---

Section	Sub Section	Subject	Comments
---------	-------------	---------	----------

			and pay dues to the TMA, and to provide incentives for their employees to commute by modes other than single occupancy vehicles. Our efforts fell short, however, because: (1) The airport could not compel tenants to join the TMA; and (2) employers can't dictate how their employees commute to work. TMAs are a prime example of failed social engineering.
40.14.070	E	Duplex (Stacked)	Table 3 (Building Size and Massing) lists the maximum number of stores as 2, but the photo depicting an example of such a structure on the bottom of the preceding page could be viewed by many readers as having 3 stories. (The photo caption says it is a 2-story duplex, but in my opinion this building has 3 levels of living space.)
40.14.110	F	Illumination - Typo	This subsection refers to "reserve-lit" letters. I believe the intent was to say "reverse-lit." Also, please define "box signage and visible raceways."
40.14.110	M	Sidewalk Signs	Such signs can be inherently dangerous. I tripped on the leg of such a sign outside a restaurant at a shopping center in Natomas, sustaining an injury and torn clothing.