Meeting Minutes
City of Davis
Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard
Thursday, October 24, 2019
7:00 P.M.

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

Liaison Members: Matt Dulcich, Doug Buzbee, Cheryl Essex

City Council Liaisons: Dan Carson

City Staff: Sherri Metzker, Eric Lee

Consultants: Dan Parolek, Tony Perez, Mitali Ganguly, Martin Galindez (Opticos Design)

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
   Meeting was called to order at 7:07 PM. Member attendance noted. Todd Edelman absent.

2. Approval of Agenda
   Agenda moved by Guenther. Seconded by Byars. Motion approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

4. Brief Announcements from Staff, Committee Members, and Liaisons
   Guenther announced that the Tree Commission planned to review the draft plan and provide comments.

5. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
   None.
6. **Opticos Presentation**  
Opticos Design presented the Draft Downtown Davis Specific Plan and Draft Downtown Form Based Code.

Public commenters included Leslie Sage Walker. Comments included: a question about the retail requirement in the main street zoning and whether it was required for the entire bottom floor, a question about newly identified historic resources and whether an owner could choose not to have it designated, and question if the financial aspects of requiring civic spaces on a project was looked at.

DPAC questions and comments included:

**General comments:**
- Appreciation to the consultants, DPAC, and staff on intense amount of work that went into developing the documents.
- Impressed at the extent to which the plan has incorporated the community input.

**Comments on Chapter 1 Purpose:**
- Add more narrative linking the specific plan to the general plan. Council decision to start with the specific plan which would inform the general plan update.

**Comments on Chapter 2 Existing Conditions:**
- Page 19 population breakdown. Should break out the population under 25, which is an important piece of information for a university town.
  - Response: However, fastest growing age demographic is 25-34.
- Page 27 question about commuting numbers. 9,000 into Davis, 20,000 leaving includes going to UC Davis, but should be considered part of Davis or described more clearly in the context.
  - Response: Clarified that DPAC has discussed it previously and it includes about 10,000 commuting to UC Davis.
- Encourage the public to look at the Existing Conditions background document which has a lot of good information.

**Comments on Chapter 3 Visions:**
- This is a city plan but city does not own a lot of downtown property. Will depend on private development to drive the plan. Plan cannot provide all the answers and it’s okay not to know everything.
- The plan is people and placemaking. If we create a place that people want to be, that will be a success.
- Appreciate the integration of sustainability in the vision.
- Question of how comments will be addressed or incorporated.
  - Response: There will be a final draft which can take comments into account.
- Sustainability terminology (triple bottom line) uses different words than typically used, such as equity, environment & economy. Less comfortable with it and may be missing some concept with the new terms.
• Does not have clear goal directly addressing businesses and economic development. Page 56 goal 3 should maybe be separated into two goals.

• Question how much room is there to change the draft, e.g. why downtown plan includes Rice lane is it too late to add this neighborhood back into the Downtown Plan boundary and fully addressed? Is this possible to have this area receive same level of design treatment.
  o Response: Changes could impact time and budget, but depends on extent of the change.

• Previous DPAC decision was to leave University Avenue neighborhood in the plan but to not change it.

Comments on Chapter 4 Built Environment:
• Section 4.3 Question whether plan addresses allowable uses and if the uses in the table on page 75 are the zoning uses
  o Response: Form based code will include list of more specific permitted uses. Uses in the page 75 table are general uses.

• Section 4.4 concept of special areas – why was Hibbert site not identified as a special area site.
  o Response: Status of site changed as plan was being drafted. Also now have historic resource evaluation of the site.

• Historic section is new to DPAC. Haven’t discussed it yet,
  o Response: Historic surveys have been updated and are online.

• Page 88. E Street plaza area. Question if City move forward with it on their own or does it require adjacent property owners to improve when they develop?
  Removing parking would be a concern for downtown businesses. Need to accommodate parking.

• Clarification about the when the historic adjacency standards apply.
  o Applies to all three types of historic resources.

• Section 4.3. Hatching on regulating plan is confusing. For Main Street Medium it denotes increased height. For Neighborhood Medium it denotes reduced height.

• Clarification about whether or not there are subzones.
  o No subzones. Subzone is used for allowing more or fewer uses.

• Are there treatments for Neighborhood Medium zone such as stepbacks? Can it be a 3-story box?
  o Response: Form based codes includes standards to shape the building. It cannot be a box.

• Question about the public realm and trigger for civic spaces. If less than 1.5 acres for new development are there requirements to contribute to open space. What about rooftop gardens.
  o Response: Specific plan does not change current city parkland requirements. The plan does require civic spaces for larger developments. Most sites will be allowed more development by right with increased certainty and improved process which is a good tradeoff.
• DPAC had previously discussed fees and whether City should provide a waiver for fees downtown. There was discussion but no formal recommendation.
• Question about other commercial properties on east side near Amtrak site that are not included and why wasn’t included.
• For University Avenue area, should there be consideration to treat 3rd St. corridor differently than rest of that neighborhood. These areas can be more strategically planned. It is an important corridor and connection to the university.
• What do the existing rules allow and how do they relate to what is proposed for rest of plan?
  ○ Response: Staff can provide information on the uses and zoning on 3rd Street.
• Would like proposal on cost to make this section be part of Downtown vision – e.g. additional treatment for 3rd Street area. What would it mean or require to change?
• Are there density requirements? Add as agenda item discussion of having density requirements
  ○ Response: Building types determined for specific sites – so density standards/regulations are not necessary. The form and square footage can be used to set the dwelling units. Don’t need to use density as a regulation. It stifles and distorts form.

Request by Chair to focus on burning issues on Historic, Transportation, Infrastructure chapters in the time left.

• Was HRMC involved in designation and surveys.
  ○ Response: The additional surveys identified eligible resources. Not designated and would need to go through process. It does identify need for CEQA review of those sites.
  ○ HRMC has not formally reviewed the survey results, but has been involved and consulted in the survey methodology and have been provided the surveys and findings.
• Does plan include tools to offer incentives to assist developers to make projects feasible? Are there tools for planners & staff to use for this?
  ○ Response: Lists of options provided – what tools are adopted are up to the city.
• Looking at economic viability – what things can city do that will really help – focus on those things that have high sensitivity?
• Finance and Budget Commission will focus on what will assist City’s fiscal resiliency goals, whether there are places where impact fee structure to make downtown development more viable, look at other impact fees. Also want to look at economic feasibility report BAE report – what are the really costly policies city puts in place that restrict development
  ○ Fiscal impact Analysis is on website under Resources.
• What is the time frame for phased implementation? Are there plans for phasing and staging that correlate financial costs and revenue generated – and how to make them work?
• Have consultants & staff taken into consideration potential state mandates to increase supply of housing? Lot of activity taking place at state level to promote development of housing, eg density requirements – a lot of new action at state level that could impact the plan – what laws have been passed recently that will have significant impacts on downtown area & present implications for downtown plan – e.g. SB 50 Weiner bill will override local zoning.
  ○ Response: Recommendation to proceed as we don’t know what will ultimately be approved and don’t have control over it.
• This is where local staff take ownership of the plan and regulations – e.g. for implementation purposes – this is where consultants are less involved.

7. **Other Committee or Staff Communications**
   None.

8. **Adjournment**
   Meeting was adjourned at 9:37 PM.