



City of Davis
Planning Commission Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, April 10, 2013
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present: Herman Boschken, Mark Braly, Ananya Choudhuri, Cheryl Essex, George Hague, Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair), Rob Hofmann (Chair), David Inns (Alternate)

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Community Development & Sustainability Director Ken Hiatt; Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess; Principal Planner Bob Wolcott; Assistant Planner Eric Lee; Building & Planning Technician Tom Callinan

1. Call to Order

R. Hofmann called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

A. Choudhuri moved, seconded by H. Boschken, to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Staff and Commissioner Comments

Principal Planner Bob Wolcott:

- Community Development & Sustainability Director Ken Hiatt is leaving the City of Davis; last day tentatively scheduled for April 16. Previous city employee Mike Webb will be returning on May 20 as the next Director.
- April 24, 2013 Planning Commission meeting has been cancelled. The 2 items tentatively planned for that night have been moved to May 8.
- April 30, 2013 joint City Council/Planning Commission discussion is currently being planned; staff will be notifying Commissioners regarding start time. Topics will include Council goals, Planning Commission Workplan, Commission structure options, and policy issues.

4. Public Communications

None

5. Consent Items

A. Report of Subdivision Committee Action on April 3, 2013 – 2750 Cowell Boulevard: Planning Application #13-08—Wavier of Tentative Parcel Map #1-13 and Parcel Map 5023

Planning Commission accepted the report and took no further action.

6. Public Hearings

A. Davis Strength and Conditioning, 654 G Street: Planning Application #12-79— Conditional Use Permit #19-12

Building & Planning Technician Tom Callinan: Applicant requests a Conditional Use Permit to allow a personal training and fitness use on a property located in Planned Development #14-80, a unique commercial-neighborhood shopping center in the Core Area. Parcel contains a 20,937 sq. ft. commercial building with 9 individual spaces ranging in size from 1,200 to 6,300 sq. ft. Proposed fitness studio would occupy an existing tenant space of approximately 2,200 sq. ft.; floor plan primarily consists of exercise space and weight training equipment. No significant interior or exterior building changes are proposed.

As result of previous ground contamination, 670 G Street is a designated clean-up site over which Regional Water Quality Control Board has authority. Contamination was originally detected in 2001; clean-up is an ongoing effort, and includes soil-vapor-extraction wells both inside and outside the building. Because there is potential for air quality issues until final resolution occurs at 654 G Street, Conditions of Approval 12 and 13 have been modified to include planned use and occupation concurrence from the Regional Board, and increased monitoring, indemnification and insurance requirements.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

Drew Temple: Davis resident; starting Davis Strength and Conditioning with business partners. See need for a good training facility, especially for youth involved in sports. Many youth left on their own during off-seasons without location to train. Intent is to get youth ready for next steps, college sports or other recreational sports. Currently, minimum age will be set at 13. As business enlarges, will expand to offer services to younger ages.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

A. Choudhuri: Request information in future staff reports on parking space requirements. Should include CEQA section 15301 in Finding #4 (in addition to 15303).

M. Braly moved, seconded by A. Choudhuri, as follows:

1. Determine that the project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 as leasing and minor alteration of existing structures and Section 15303(c) as a minor conversion of use in an urbanized area in a commercial building not exceeding 10,000 square feet in floor area; and
2. Approve Planning Application #12-79 for Conditional Use Permit #19-12 to permit the use of a personal training and fitness studio at 654 G Street, based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval, as amended.

Motion passed unanimously.

**B. Blue Oak Ventures Office Building, 501 Oak Avenue: Planning Application #13-17—
Conditional Use Permit #03-13**

Assistant Planner Eric Lee: Applicant requests a Conditional Use Permit to allow an office use on a property zoned Residential Restricted (R-R); conditionally permitted uses include university-oriented uses or other compatible uses such as living groups, offices, and medical clinics. Project proposes to demolish the existing 4,385 sq. ft., one-story office building and construct an approximately 12,000 sq. ft., two-story office building with roughly the same footprint as existing.

Staff has been working with applicant for over 6 months to identify and mitigate any issues. The project under consideration by Commission is the request for the Conditional Use Permit for the proposed office use, including the overall site plan for the building, compliance with development standards and general use of the site and building, but does not include review of the specific building design or demolition of the existing building. Applicant has also submitted a planning application for Demolition and Design Review for the new building and a Minor Modification to reduce the required parking and to increase the allowable height of the building; those applications are currently being reviewed and may be approved administratively by staff. The City's Demolition Ordinance requires structures built in or prior to 1945 to be reviewed by the Historical Resources Management Commission to make a determination on whether the structure should be considered for historical designation; the HRMC reviewed the historical resources survey of the property and concurred with the conclusions that the structure is not eligible for listing as a historical resource on the local or state register and did not qualify as a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

Ken Ouimet, Blue Oak Ventures: Intent is to bring high tech company to City, focusing on research and development. Interested in Oak Avenue property location across from the university, give students opportunity for experience. Want a creative space, modern building; architectural design will also serve as branding for company.

Murray Duncan, architect: Worked closely with staff for almost a year; designed to orient structure on property without affecting neighbors; vision of reaching to campus. Will preserve trees as much as possible, reduce hardscape surfaces, plan to achieve LEED silver, will be very aggressive in using as many sustainable products as possible.

M. Braly: Request report back to Commission after is has been decided exactly what is going to be included in building.

Murray Duncan: Happy to share when completed.

Rich Rifkin: Building has historic significance, just does not reach criteria to designate as resource. Not opposed to demolition, but would like City to require some sort of historic display on street. Resident originally built by W.W. Robbins, famous botanist and Chair of Botany Department at UCD. During the 1960s, building transitioned to a prominent medical practice with Dr. Thomas Cooper. Would like to see City require owners of property to pay for historic display, to potentially include a photo of the

previous building and history.

Glen Gills: Reside half a block from property. Structure appears to be 3-story office building, not 2; footprint will be 25% larger than current. No street parking is available. Building is too tall; straight sides and flat roof accentuate height.

Eric Nichol: Support project. Russell corridor is a good location for a high tech business, synergy with campus.

Jay Solnick: Resident on Oak Avenue. Concerned that building does not fit with resident character of neighborhood; other buildings facing Russell are residential-like, fraternities and sororities have residential appearance. Building should tie into neighborhood, not university.

Rhonda O'Brien: Resident on Oak Avenue: Hard to tell from drawings, but structure seems to be a little bit too industrial. One of the sides appears to look directly into neighbor's yard. If possible, would like it to appear more fitting for neighborhood.

Matt Williams: Housing Element Steering Committee analyzed all housing locations in Davis, recognized densification will have to happen if we want to preserve peripheral farm lands. Project is an attempt to make core of Davis more productive, and at the same time, preserving trees and trying to fit in on a major thoroughfare on Russell. Good attempt at highest and best use of site by owners.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

Commissioner comments included:

- M. Braly: Request information in the future on project energy features. Hope staff is working with applicants to get beyond minimum energy requirements. Would like to see design review at Planning Commission, to include final review of energy requirements. Support commemorative display at site. Would like to have received more information on historical background of site in staff report.
- M. Hanson: In future, would like renderings to include photovoltaic panels.
- R. Hofmann: Would like to request staff discuss historical display with applicant.
- H. Boschken: Can Commission insert condition that LEED certification be required? Architect spoke of intent to reach silver status.
Ken Hiatt: If Commission supports bringing design review back for review, condition could be applied to design review application.
- A. Choudhuri: Concern over location of trash enclosure, will cause noise in evening as trash will be taken out at end of day or late evening. Consider moving location away from neighbors.
- H. Boschken: Wondering about flexibility in building should start-up business fail. Consider subdividing building for more than 1 tenant or variety of tenants. Owners anticipating growing business to 50 employees, yet only planning to provide 27 parking spaces.

Murray Duncan: Many current employees will be commuting from San Francisco on train. Requested 2 less parking spaces in desire to increase open space. Building is designed to be flexible; second floor and half of first floor are designed to be sublet.

Ken Ouimet: Goal is to encourage employees to ride bikes to work. Currently have office in downtown Davis, 80% of employees bike or commute on train from Sacramento or San Francisco. Also have work from home program.

- C. Essex: Appreciate attention paid to preserving existing landscaping and trees.
- A. Choudhuri moved, seconded by M. Braly, as follows:
 1. Determine that the proposed project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 as an infill development project; and
 2. Approve Planning Application #13-17 for Conditional Use Permit #03-13 for a two-story, 12,000 square-foot office building use based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval, amended to include a requirement for the Design Review and related applications to undergo Planning Commission review and consideration of a historical marker.

Motion passed unanimously.

Planning Commission recessed at 8:26 p.m. and reconvened at 8:37 p.m.

- C. Mission Residences, 225 and 229 B Street: Planning Application #12-72—General Plan Amendment #1-12, Core Area Specific Plan Amendment #1-12, Zoning Amendment #1-12, Tentative Map #2-12, Design Review #20-12

Community Development & Sustainability Director Ken Hiatt: Applicant proposes to combine 2 adjacent lots, remove 2 existing dwellings, and construct a 5-level 14-unit condominium building (4 stories above a basement garage). Proposed building would reflect a Mission Revival style of architecture; condominiums are designed to be senior-friendly with single-level living, common areas including exercise and meeting rooms, and great room/master bedroom floor plans.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

Jim Kidd, applicant: Intent is to build a 14-unit senior complex consisting of 2 bedroom, 2 bath condominiums. Focus on home ownership in neighborhood; promote self-sufficient community. Green design features, supports downtown community and retail.

Maria Ogrydziak: Reside 2 doors from proposed project. Original design was for-sale senior condos with underground parking. Support infill projects and bonuses for underground parking. Staff report abandons bonus approach and supports increased floor area ratio because already recommended 2.0 for retail with offices. Does not make sense; Mission residences is entirely residential and parking is underground 5 feet, only half level below grade. Path of travel in and out of complex is via stairs; not ideal for seniors aging in place. Project is proposed with balconies facing B Street, not meet visioning process idea to provide attractive frontage on alley. Project is too large and too tall.

Mark Truscott: Reside directly north of project. Support senior housing, infill development and 3rd Street visioning process. Do not support project as proposed; not enough full size view windows, concerned about potential problems from windows facing towards neighboring properties affecting future developments. Project will set standard for all other infill projects, should improve architecture. Proposal will choke out orange tree on neighboring property; would like to see entry on north side.

Bill Cavens: University Avenue resident. Held meeting on December 3 attended by approximately 50 residents of University Avenue area; all but 1 in attendance felt that project was too big. Does not meet design guidelines and rules worked out by community or fit into neighborhood.

Sue Greenwald: University Avenue resident. Project and staff report show disregard for existing long term owner residents. Biggest impact is to the neighbors behind project, does not respect privacy of existing property owners. Infill should be focused on large underused parcels. Should pay attention to downtown character; buildings should be human scaled. Should not exceed densification approved through visioning process.

Karina Skinner, on behalf of Maynard Skinner: Read letter from father. Recognize that neighborhood will change. Not opposed to increased density, but should maintain neighborhood character. No compelling reason for size and scope of this development. Alley is a blind intersection; large concentration of student population on foot, bikes, cars, should not add more traffic to alley. Karina: Concern regarding impact of excavation. Human remains were discovered on the corner of A and First last year. Encourage City to talk to Native American Heritage Commission. Should consider re-evaluating potential environmental impact.

Matt Williams: Need for densification. Conflicted about project. Issues associated with back neighbor and side windows impacting side neighbor should be addressed. Project should include a full basement, not half. Prefer previous design style; California bungalow style was consistent with neighborhood. Should make project dedicated senior housing. FAR proposed is consistent with others in area. Precedent setting building; suggest opposing project.

Mike Sevannan: University Avenue/Rice Lane area resident. Involved in community discussions regarding densification of B Street going back 10 years. Residents agreed that stretch of houses on B Street could be removed in order to densify area. Original plans for developing property have changed substantially. Oppose project.

Barbara King: Project is out of scale with neighborhood. Conditions should be placed on project to make sure units remain owner occupied and senior restricted.

Sunny Shine: Reside across the street. Current residents have cared for older homes and meet design guidelines previously adopted. Lighting from proposed project will affect neighbors.

Kim Gould: Read letter from Carolyn Bacha. Support project; low inventory on market, especially in downtown Core area. Home purchase options for seniors. Need to give seniors options to downsize and remain in the community. Design of parking under the building is important—little parking is available in downtown area. Beautiful building.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

Commissioner comments included:

- M. Braly: Privacy is a legitimate concern, but not dominant. B Street is a citywide resource. It is up to the Commission to represent the entire city with regard to issues such as infill, densification and senior housing. Difficult to follow sustainability portion of staff report. Suggest report return to Commission after developer and architect have decided on sustainability features.
- A. Choudhuri: Should be clear whether project is age restricted. Staff is recommending senior friendly. Applicant states intent is for age restricted.
Ken Hiatt: Looked at 2 tiers for age restriction: 55 and over level, and 62 and over. Because development is only 14 units, only option is 62 and over.
- R. Hofmann: Staff is proposing something different than applicant; 2 different impacts. Should be separate analysis.
- G. Hague: Propose project be returned to staff for clarification of age issue.
- H. Boschken: If senior restricted project, staff should draft a separate set of conditions for Commission to evaluate.
- M. Hanson: Potential additional requirements if senior restricted. Different environmental impacts. Parking does not meet restrictions for non-senior housing.
Jim Kidd: Elected to go with age 62 and over for specific reasons. Want to ensure neighborhood that there will not be students. Only avenue is to make 62 and over. Have ability to put in CC&Rs that building is age restricted.
- M. Hanson: Project includes community room. Any provision for parking for visitors?
Katherine Hess: No parking proposed specifically for visitors. Timed parking is available on street.
Jim Kidd: At intersection of Second and B are 2 commercial buildings which are empty in the evenings, 45 spaces within 2 or 3 lots of building. Area is being used for overflow parking already.
- C. Essex: Support senior housing downtown and densification. Should meet goals of B Street visioning, existing FAR.

M. Braly moved, seconded by G. Hague, to approve the subject applications, based upon the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval, amended to include the stipulation and condition that project be restricted to senior housing 62 years and older:

1. Core Area Specific Plan Amendment to increase allowed density within the B Street Transitional District for underground parking, 1-2 bedroom units, and open space greater than required by the zoning; and

2. Planned Development #2-86B Amendment for the B Street Transitional District to increase allowed Floor Area Ratio for underground parking, 1-2 bedroom units, and open space greater than required by the zoning; increase allowed height to four stories and 45 feet; and
3. Waiver of Tentative Map requirements for the 14-unit condominium project; and
4. Design Review application for site plan and architecture of the project, including a determination that parking is adequate.

A. Choudhuri moved substitute motion, seconded by M. Hanson, to direct staff to return to Planning Commission with an analysis of senior restricted project. Staff report, analysis, and conditions should include the following:

M. Hanson: Address B Street visioning issues.

C. Essex: Concerns regarding size and balconies on north side of the building. Building is too large for the neighborhood. Removal of upper 2 units would be accepted as compromise. Potential removal of 3 balconies might satisfy some privacy concerns with home to north. Should be compatible with future 3-4 story building to be built next door.

R. Hofmann: B Street visioning went through community process, completed in 2007. What has changed? Commission hasn't received direction from Council that would justify change in decision-making. Same issues have been brought up on other projects in the past which have been denied. Need historical background; why do these 2 lots different from those on either side?

H. Boschken: If underground parking is a full level, will remove height problem. If units scaled back in the rear, project will come close to conforming with density prescribed for area. Parking should be lowered a full story and remove 2 units in back.

Substitute motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Choudhuri, Essex, Hague, Hanson, Hofmann

NOES: Braly

7. Staff and Commissioner Comments (continued as needed)

None

8. Informational Items

A. Schedule of Upcoming Meeting Dates.

Accepted as presented.

9. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 10:39 p.m.