



City of Davis
Planning Commission Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, March 13, 2013
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners: Mark Braly, Herman Boschken, Ananya Choudhuri, Cheryl Essex, George Hague, Marilee Hanson, Rob Hofmann, David Inns

Absent: None

Staff: Principal Planner Bob Wolcott; Planner/Historical Resources Manager Ike Njoku; Assistant Planner Eric Lee

1. Call to Order

R. Hofmann called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

B. Wolcott: Suggest reorder public hearings: University Retirement Community discussed first, followed by 1514 Olympic Drive Appeal.

R. Hofmann moved, seconded by M. Braly, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Staff and Commissioner Comments

A. Choudhuri: Planning Commission training provided via League of California Cities and American Planning Association; serve as representative, can bring training to Davis and organize with city staff.

Request staff schedule Joint Commission/Council meeting.

B. Wolcott: Will check in with Community Development & Sustainability Director and City Manager.

4. Public Communications

None

5. Consent Items

A. Minutes of November 14, 2012.

A. Choudhuri moved, seconded by H. Boschken to approve the November 14, 2012 Minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Public Hearings

A. University Retirement Community, 1515 Shasta Drive: T-Mobile Antenna Replacement – Planning Application #13-14 for Conditional Use Permit #02-13

Assistant Planner Eric Lee: T-Mobile is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow antenna and equipment upgrades at an existing wireless facility site at University Retirement Community. Proposal is to replace 3 of the 6 existing antennas installed within a faux chimney structure; existing antennas measure 66" x 6.1" and proposed antennas measure 51.4" x 6.6". Antennas will continue to be completely screened within the faux chimney structure. Radio equipment will be relocated to an equipment area on the roof and will be screened by an existing parapet wall.

Project is a continuation of upgrades within the city; Planning Commission has previously reviewed and approved other sites. Subject site adopted prior to telecommunication facility ordinance amendments; does allow for changes to existing facilities. No visible changes or expansion.

R. Hofmann opened the public hearing.

Karen Lennert, T-Mobile: Support staff recommendation.

R. Hofmann closed the public hearing.

M. Braly moved, seconded by A. Choudhuri, to take the following action:

1. Determine that the proposed T-Mobile antenna replacement project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 for existing facilities; and
2. Approve Planning Application #13-14 for Conditional Use Permit #02-13 to replace existing antennas and relocate equipment at the existing T-Mobile site located at 1515 Shasta Drive, based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Motion passed unanimously.

- B. 1514 Olympic Drive: Appeal of Administrative Approval of Planning Application #12-74 for Design Review #22-12 to Add a Balcony to the Residence.

Planner & Historical Resources Manager Ike Njoku: Appeal of January 17, 2013 administrative approval of Design Review #22-12 that allowed the addition of a maximum dimension of 5'-6" x 13'-0" (72 sq. ft.) second floor balcony to the existing home at 1514 Olympic Drive. Two immediate neighbors oppose the project.

R. Hofmann opened the public hearing.

Bill Owen: Co-appellant with Patsy Owen, and Rich and Ellen Healy. No solution to problems presented by project; opposed to project. Balcony detracts from neighborhood character.

Patsy Owen: Two-story homes have very small backyards, smaller than other properties in neighborhood. When originally built, zoning designated windows only on the west side of building and space above garage prohibited from use for sleeping purposes or separate rental. Approving this project would set precedent. Visual impacts. Balcony

will cut off southern access via window. Concerned property value will decline.

Richard Healy: Privacy concerns, clear line of sight from balcony into neighbors' backyards. No other residence has built any type of similar structure that invades privacy. Visual impact should be looked at in terms of density. Consider how dense is too much in terms of FAR.

Marybeth Lawless: Neighbor on east side, reside on El Capitan. Oppose project. View from proposed balcony will be of master bedroom, bath and garage.

Ted Caldwell: Owner of subject property: Daughter and husband live in home. Hired professionals to design balcony. Plan is to retain property; all improvements to home have added to neighborhood property values. Balcony extends livability of master bedroom. Provide egress for fires. Balcony does not extend far enough to south to look into neighbor's kitchen. Houses are constructed to offset each other. Intend to have large plants on each end of balcony. Sent out notifications to neighbors in 500 ft. radius; 56 responded, 44 voted in favor. Commit to professional job with professional screening.

Isaac Heisberg: Reside at subject property for 2 years; changes to home have improved privacy of neighbors. All houses have windows on all 4 sides; prohibition of windows on east only applies to garages. Balconies are located on other properties on this street.

Lance Beck: Building designer. Many areas in communities have balconies; the denser the community, the greater number of balconies.

Richard Healy: Any value added to subject property will be at expense of neighbors.

R. Hofmann closed the public hearing.

Commissioner comments included:

- A. Choudhuri: Condition 6-change "signing" to "signage". Condition 2—remove word "such as canvas". Commission consensus.
- H. Boschken: Plant life is not appropriate mitigation; too easily removed. Suggest changing materials or configuration of 4 ft. barriers on each end to 6 or 7 ft. Not stucco, possibly redwood.
 - I. Njoku: Neighbors are opposed to a high barrier, will block sunlight.
- G. Hague: Issue of privacy is cultural one for community; only assurance of privacy is people's respect for each other
- M. Hanson: Have to look at proposals in the long term. Current owner's commitment will not extend to future owners.

M. Braly moved, seconded by G. Hague, to take the following action:

1. Determine that the project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines as an exterior addition to an existing facility; and

2. Uphold administrative approval of Planning Application #12-74 for Design Review #22-12 that allows the addition of a second floor balcony with a maximum dimension of 5'-6" x 13'-0" (72 sq. ft.) to the existing home at 1514 Olympic Drive, which results in an increase of the floor area ratio from 49.3% to 50.9%, subject to the Findings and Conditions of Approval.

A. Chadhuri moved substitute motion, seconded by M. Hanson, as follows:

1. Determine that the project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines as an exterior addition to an existing facility; and
2. Uphold appeal and deny administrative approval of Planning Application #12-74 for Design Review #22-12 to Add a Balcony to the Residence.
3. With regard to findings: staff's determination is in error.

A. Chadhuri: Do not agree with findings—will not enhance livability and character of neighborhood.

M. Hanson: Does not seem to be consistent with guidelines in, privacy issues not addressed by reducing size of balcony; not compatible with neighbor properties.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Chadhuri, Hanson, Hofmann

NOES: Braly, Essex, Hague

Commission recessed at 8:57 p.m. and reconvened at 9:08 p.m.

C. General Plan Transportation Element Update and Transportation Implementation Plan Process

Transportation Planner Brian Abbanat: On January 18, 2011, City Council authorized staff to initiate an amendment to the existing General Plan Mobility Element (title since changed to Transportation Element) and create a new Transportation Implementation Plan (TIP). City Council concurred that a long-term commission structure to address comprehensive transportation issues should be determined after the TIP is completed, or substantially completed. Staff utilized a technical advisory group to guide this effort.

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: Current horizon for General Plan is 2010; staff recommendation is to extend to 2015 for all elements except housing element. General Plan horizon has passed, but continues to be a valid planning document; 2015 was chosen because it is the date of the traffic model. City has ability to change any element up to 4 times a year.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission take the following actions:

General Plan Amendments Including Transportation Element:

1. Recommend City Council:
 - a. Certify a Negative Declaration as adequate for environmental impacts; and
 - b. Adopt Draft General Plan Transportation Element, incorporating Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) recommendations from the Transportation Element Commission Feedback Summary Table; and

- c. Extend planning horizon for all sections of the General Plan except the Housing Element from 2010 to 2015

Transportation Implementation Plan:

2. Recommend City Council:
 - a. Approve Draft Evaluation Criteria; and
 - b. Approve TIP process for prioritizing transportation plans, programs, and capital projects; and
 - c. Incorporate TAG recommendations from the TIP Commission Feedback Summary Table.
3. Recommend an appropriate commission structure for addressing comprehensive transportation issues in a holistic manner and further development and implementation of the TIP.

Commissioner comments included:

- G. Hague: Does not achieve objective of establishing goals and policies over the next 25 years. Need to address impacts from senior population increase. Not include data on comparative periods of traffic impacts. Disabled community not represented; traffic signaling not addressed, telecommunication relay systems for hearing and sight impaired. Plan has short term focus. Support establishment of separate transportation commission. Bicycles over represented in report; should have equal weight for all modes.
- R. Hofmann: Not provided with data to make determination on Negative Declaration. Global aspect of transportation process not fully represented; Amtrak buses between city and outside jurisdictions. Concern over Planning Commission taking on additional duties, dealing with more policy work than before.
- C. Essex: Request more time to present written comments over next few weeks. Support Planning Commission taking on transportation and possibly giving up design review role; support scenario 3, support phasing.
- M. Braly: Request additional time to deliberate. Support phased approach, scenario 3; support shifting more decisions to staff level so that not as much time is taken by policy making body.
- A. Chadhour: Focused on bicycle safety and circulation. Not balanced element. Transit not very well addressed; concern over distance between schools. Concern over combining transportation and planning. Future growth in Davis will be infill, more second units. Not able to accomplish Planning Commission work plan as it is. Support scenario 2.
- H. Boschken: Virtually all scenarios-sequential process. Other models should be considered—concurrency and deliberation not represented. Sequential process—first in line usually has the most influence and last in line the least. Bicycle Advisory Commission reviewed first, bicycles are prevalent throughout document. Pg. 10 assumptions—model ascribed to comes from long standing planning theory mostly applicable to larger cities. Davis is not a spoke and hub system; that assumption changes goals and expectations. Traffic signaling and roundabout usage would lead to reduction in carbon emissions—not addressed in document.
- D. Inns: Long history of supporting bicycling and infrastructure, emphasis on

bicycles is important to community. Support separate Bicycle Advisory Commission; part of community character and plan to reduce carbon emissions.

Principal Planner Bob Wolcott: Request commissioner submit written questions, comments, and opinions within 7-10 days. If possible, organize into 4 categories—element, TIP, environmental, commission structure. Staff will return to Planning Commission.

7. Business Items

A. Appointment of Vice Chair

M. Braly: Nominate M. Hanson.

A. Chadhour: Nominate H. Boschken

M. Braly moved, seconded by C. Essex, to appoint M. Hanson as Vice Chair. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Braly, Essex, Hague, Inns, Hofmann

NOES: Boschken, Chadhour

ABSTAIN: Hanson

B. Planning Commission Work Plan Update

B. Wolcott: Request commission consider preliminary proposal for 3 main objectives. Prioritized correctly? Should they be ordered differently, based on resources? Possible joint meeting with Council can help inform priorities. Item will return to commission for further discussion.

8. Staff and Commissioner Comments (continued as needed)

None

9. Informational Items

A. 2012 Residential Development Status Report and 2012 Annual General Plan Housing Element Progress Report)

B. Schedule of Upcoming Meeting Dates

Cannery project planning postponed from April to May.

9. Adjournment Meeting was adjourned at 11:03 p.m. The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 27, 2013.