

Jessica Lynch

From: Barbara Archer
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 9:06 AM
To: 'Ron O'
Cc: Jessica Lynch
Subject: RE: Please Reject Housing Element Committee Recommendations

Dear Mr. Oertel,

Thank you for writing to the City Council with your comments about the Housing Element Update draft. All members of the Council have received your email, and I am acknowledging it on their behalf. I have also cc'd the staff person managing the project.

Thank you for your engagement on the update.

Best regards,

Barbara

BARBARA ARCHER (she/her/hers)
Communications & Customer Service Manager

MOBILE: 530-400-3418		City Manager's Office
OFFICE: 530-747-5884		23 Russell Blvd
barcher@cityofdavis.org		Davis, CA 95616

CITYOFDAVIS.ORG    



From: Ron O <roertel@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021 10:17 PM
To: City Council Members <CityCouncilMembers@cityofdavis.org>
Subject: Please Reject Housing Element Committee Recommendations

CAUTION: External email. Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

To Davis City Council:

Please review the email below, which we already sent to the Planning Commission.

Also, we hope that you find a way to ensure that the city receives full credit for the megadorms that the council already approved, in regard to the RHNA requirements. Which of course should have been checked out prior to approving them - especially since those of you who were on the council at that time were specifically warned about that risk. And yet, the council went so far as to overturn/reject the Planning Commission's unanimous vote against one of them (the University Mall redevelopment). (Thanks to the couple of you who at least voted against that one. Too bad that it wasn't enough to change the outcome.)

Below is the email that we sent to the Planning Commission, in regard to the "recommendations" from the housing element committee. We also have significant concerns regarding the makeup of that committee (and the process in which these recommendations came about) - which we suspect that you're already aware of.

From: Ron O
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 10:25 PM
To: planningcommission@cityofdavis.org <planningcommission@cityofdavis.org>
Subject: Please Reject Housing Element Committee Recommendations

To Davis Planning Commission:

We are quite concerned about the recommendations that recently arose from the Housing Element Committee. Here is what we suggest, in response to those recommendations:

- 1) Regarding the Housing Trust Fund, further exploration and discussion is needed - including where the funding would come from.
- 2) The commission should reject the recommendation to eliminate all single-family zoning. *It is absurd to think that* residents throughout the city would not mind existing dwellings next-door to them being torn down and replaced with 4-unit apartment buildings. Rezoning some areas can be explored (and is likely appropriate – especially if needed to address RHNA requirements), but must be carefully analyzed regarding the impact on current residents and businesses.
- 3) We strongly recommend not eliminating parking minimums across-the-board, since there's no evidence that this eliminates cars, and almost certainly results in more cars parked on the street. (We reiterate the reasons that parking minimums were required in the first place.) This is actually a way for developers to “shift” costs and impacts to existing residents and businesses, rather than offsetting their own impacts.
- 4) If anyone is responsible for estimating the rental cost of an ADU (or any other development proposal), it should be the organizations pushing for development such as “Sustainable Growth Yolo”, as well as any other YIMBY-type organization pushing for it. (We have yet to see any projections regarding their implied “build-to-affordability” claims, nor any support from these groups regarding measures to contain sprawl or gentrification.) Any data coming from these groups would then need to be carefully analyzed to determine if it's actually valid.
- 5) We oppose any suggestion of removing the City's 1% growth cap which Davis citizens have strongly supported. and again review the reasons that it was enacted. We also recommend redefining it, so that 5-bedroom units don't “count” the same as 1-bedroom units in regard to the unit-cap.
- 6) We do not support rezoning what's described as “strip malls” to accommodate residences, since the city already claims a lack of commercial space. Instead, we suggest exploring other potential commercially-oriented zoning, if retail is no longer working. But again, some of the “strip malls” appear to house businesses

(including a supermarket, among other businesses), already. And as restaurants recover, they will also re-open in those locations. (One of them closed in the 8th Street Mall, apparently as a result of the lockdown.)

7) We are concerned about any “By-Right Ministerial Approval Process”, especially in regard to bypassing input from neighbors (as outlined in the City’s Infill Guideline documents).

8) We strongly recommend that the planning commission and city *refrain* from advocating for initiatives to exempt any land parcel subject to Measure D, especially in the absence of any development proposals for these parcels. Peripheral expansion should almost always be considered the “least-desirable” option. In addition, no actual analysis has been performed regarding "which" peripheral parcels *might* be considered for future development (or the order thereof), nor which of the owners of these parcels might pursue a Measure D proposal on their own. There's also the matter of "fairness", regarding the city advocating for the "gifting" of extremely valuable development rights to one set of owners, but not another.

As far as the two locations mentioned in these recommendations, the Wildhorse site already lost by a huge margin. And the other site (inside the Mace Curve) might be more appropriate for commercial uses. It's difficult to imagine that the Planning Commission would put the city "on the spot" regarding this recommendation, which is essentially an “end-run” around the intent of Measure D.

9) As far as the last proposal on the list, we are strongly opposed to the concept of the City advocating any increase over RHNA numbers. As you know, the city is *already* finding it challenging to address *the already-established* RHNA requirements.

Sincerely,

Ron Oertel & Som Ashton