



MEMO

DATE: May 26, 2021

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Jessica Lynch, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Housing Element Committee Recommendations on the Housing Element Update 2021-2029 Public Review Draft

Introduction

A public workshop on the Housing Element Update 2021-2029 Public Review Draft was held at the final Housing Element Committee (HEC) meeting on Thursday, May 20, 2021. The HEC made and approved a total of 10 motions for recommendations that that, as a committee, would like to present to Planning Commission and City Council for their consideration of the document.

Representatives

Greg Rowe and Darryl Rutherford: Planning Commission
Georgina Valencia: Social Services Commission
Caitriona Moloney: Senior Citizen Commission
Doug Buzbee: Finance and Budget Commission
Don Fouts: Brett Lee Appointee
Don Gibson: Dan Carson Appointee
Jonathon Howard: Lucas Frerichs Appointee
Karen Mattis: Will Arnold Appointee
Dulce Ochoa: Gloria Partida Appointee

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

Motion by Valencia. Move that the Housing Trust Fund draft [proposal] that was presented at the last meeting and voted on unanimously by the Social Services Commission be added as an appendix to the Housing Element.

Second by Gibson.

Vote: 9 Ayes (Buzbee, Gibson, Howard, Mattis, Moloney, Ochoa, Rutherford, Valencia, Rowe);
1 No (Fouts)

Notes: Fouts is in support of housing trust fund but will not vote yes at this time because the language needs to be more refined and more equitable.

Recommendation 2

Motion by Rutherford. The City should develop a Housing Trust Fund program that clearly identifies the needs of the community that will be addressed, the programs that will be funded by the Housing Trust Fund, how the Housing Trust Fund will be administered, and to develop an oversight committee to ensure that the Housing Trust Fund funds are being used to meet the affordable housing needs of the community.

Second by Valencia.

Vote: 9 Ayes (Valencia, Rutherford, Ochoa, Moloney, Mattis, Howard, Gibson, Buzbee, Rowe);
1 No (Fouts)

Recommendation 3

Motion by Rutherford. Regarding Policy 4.1, explore removing R-1 (Single Family) zoning from the Zoning Ordinance to allow for more flexibility to develop more dense housing and multifamily housing throughout the city.

Second by Gibson

Vote: 10 Ayes, unanimous

Note: Single family housing can be allowed, but allows more flexibility to add different densities of housing. Allow maximum flexibility, so do not put specific standards at this time.

Recommendation 4

Motion by Rutherford. Recommend that the City explore removing parking requirements from residential development within the city.

Second by Fouts

Vote: 9 Ayes (Buzbee, Fouts, Gibson, Howard, Mattis, Ochoa, Rutherford, Valencia, Rowe); 1 No (Moloney)

Notes: Developers have the opportunity to include parking in projects if they choose. Setting up the opportunity to start the dialogue to get to a decision later down the road. Exploring feasibility. Parking is an issue for seniors.

Recommendation 5

Motion by Ochoa. To have the City of Davis ensure the accuracy of ADU affordability levels reported in the 6th cycle Housing Element by examining the current market rents for reasonably comparable rental properties to determine the average price per square foot in the City of Davis.

Amendment to Motion by Rowe: As a Committee, we want to communicate to City Council that we are not necessarily happy with the SACOG ADU affordability as it pertains to the affordability of ADUs and request that as soon as its practicable that the City carry out a survey to determine if there is better ADU affordability data available.

Vote: 10 Ayes, unanimous

Notes: The SACOG study on ADU affordability is suspected not to be an accurate representation of ADU rents in Davis. Verify whether it is, and if so, use affordability levels from the study for fulfilling RHNA requirements. Look at market trends to determine affordability of ADUs. The HEC is concerned that ADUs are not affordable to lower income households.

Recommendation 6

Motion by Howard. Recommend that the City drop the 1% growth rate cap.

Second by Fouts.

Amendment to Motion by Buzbee. Recommend that the City permanently repeal the 1% growth cap ordinance.

Vote: 10 Ayes, unanimous

Recommendation 7

Motion by Gibson. Move to include as a comment in meeting to rezone strip malls from commercial property to mixed use property in this upcoming housing element to allow housing.

Second by Rutherford

Vote: 10 Ayes, unanimous

Recommendation 8

Motion by Gibson. In the current Housing Element Update, the City of Davis will explore including a by-right approval process for housing projects which meet the current affordable housing ordinance as is and current zoning standards at the time of application.

Second by Buzbee.

Vote: 7 Ayes (Buzbee, Fouts, Gibson, Howard, Mattis, Ochoa, Rowe; 2 Noes (Rutherford, Valencia); 1 Abstention (Moloney)

Notes: The intent is for projects that meet the current 15% requirements (5% ELI, 5% VLI, 5% LI). Some disagreement on whether this should include the current ability for projects to use in lieu fees or site dedication to meet the current dedication. Some members would prefer that this only apply to projects that provide on-site inclusionary housing.

Recommendation 9

Motion by Buzbee. Recommend that the City Council to consider placing a measure on the ballot that would exempt the Wildhorse Ranch and the Mace Curve from the requirement of having to subsequently be approved by a Measure D vote.

Second by Rowe.

Vote: 8 Ayes (Valencia, Rutherford, Ochoa, Moloney, Howard, Gibson, Buzbee, Rowe); 1 No (Mattis); 1 Abstention (Fouts)

Note: The intent is to remove one obstacle to developing housing. Infill is aspirational, but city needs more land to develop a meaningful amount of housing.

Recommendation 10

Motion by Buzbee. Recommend that the Committee provides the following comment to the City Council on the Housing Element Update: The Housing Element Committee supports a higher target for the projected number of housing units that we as a community want to provide in the next housing cycle, and we should use the 2,075 [RHNA] as a floor rather than an aspirational ceiling or target.

Vote: 8 Ayes (Buzbee, Fouts, Gibson, Howard, Mattis, Moloney, Ochoa, Rutherford, Rowe); 2 Noes (Valencia)

Notes: This recommendation is not asking for a change to housing element, but rather to convey the HEC's support for more housing than the current RHNA requires of the City. Going forward the City needs to target more land to provide more housing units in the city.