



**City of Davis**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616**  
**Wednesday, May 8, 2013**  
**7:00 P.M.**

Commissioners Present: Herman Boschken, Mark Braly, Ananya Choudhuri, Cheryl Essex, George Hague, David Inns (Alternate)  
Commissioners Absent: Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair), Rob Hofmann (Chair)  
Staff Present: Principal Planner Bob Wolcott; Planner & Historical Resources Manager Ike Njoku; Assistant Planner Eric Lee

---

**1. Call to Order**

A. Choudhuri called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

M. Braly moved, seconded by G. Hague, to approve the agenda. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Braly, Choudhuri, Essex, Hague

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hanson, Hofmann, Inns

B. Wolcott: At applicant's request, postpone Mission Residences to June 26, 2013. Need to open public hearing, continue to June 26, 2013 and then close public hearing.

**3. Staff and Commissioner Comments**

M. Braly: Asked to attend Government Relations Committee of Chamber of Commerce. Discussed Planning Commission Work Plan. Chamber interested in resolving conflicts and ambiguity of Core Area Plan.

B. Wolcott: Joint meeting with Council postponed from April 30, 2013. Will wait for new Community Development & Sustainability Director to come on board and a date, possibly in June.

C. Essex: Attended memorial service for Jay Gerber, public servant of Davis in Rotary Club who encouraged Cheryl to apply for Planning Commission. This was a great loss to the community of Davis.

**4. Public Communications**

None

**5. Consent Items**

A. Planning Commission Minutes of April 10, 2013

Z. Mirabile: Date incorrect, will fix.

C. Essex: Page 8, Item 6A; didn't say need more parking per unit. Remove comment.

H. Boschken: Page, 7, comment, if senior restricted project, commission would need to consider variety of conditions. Staff should create different set of conditions for Planning Commission to evaluate.

Page 8 comment: change "proscribed" to "prescribed"

David Inns arrived at 7:09 p.m.

H. Boschken moved, seconded by C. Essex to approve the minutes of April 10, 2013. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Braly, Choudhuri, Essex, Hague

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hanson, Hofmann, Inns

## 6. Public Hearings

### A. Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Implement Program Requirements of the 2006-2013 Housing Element

Planner & Historical Resources Manager-Ike Njoku: The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment will satisfy State law and the City's Housing Element's Implementation Program by defining emergency shelter, single-room occupancy (SRO) units, transitional and supportive housing, and allow these uses in the applicable zoning districts.

Chair Choudhuri opened the public hearing, and after no comments, closed the public hearing.

Commissioner comments:

- C. Essex: Benefit to commission discussing on a case-by-case basis for emergency shelter minimum feet apart from another shelter. Flexibility during conditional use permit stage.
- A. Choudhuri: Standard common zoning practice to have minimum 300-foot distance between similar uses.
- I. Njoku: Most sample ordinances attempt to avoid over concentration. Can change wording to "may be" or remove language in Section 5, Article 40.24 (d)

C. Essex moved, seconded by M. Braly, to accept staff recommendation 1 and 2, with exception of Section 5, (d) Remove from list of requirements as follows: Section 5. Article 40.24 (Performance Standards) of the Davis Municipal Code is hereby amended to add Section 40.24.120 (Emergency Shelters) as follows: remove "(d) The emergency shelter shall be a minimum of 300' apart from another emergency shelter".

A. Choudhuri made a substitute motion, seconded by D. Inns, to approve staff recommendation 1 and 2, proposed by staff as follows:

1. Recommend the City Council determine that the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of CEQA Guidelines under the general rule that CEQA only applies to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment, and that it is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15305 under Class 5, Minor Alterations to Land Use Limitations; and
2. Recommend the City Council introduce and adopt the Zoning Ordinance text amendment, which is consistent with State law and the City's 2006-2013 Housing Element of the General Plan Implementation Program.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Braly, Choudhuri, Hague, Inns

NOES: Essex

ABSENT: Hanson, Hofmann

**B. Blue Oak Ventures Office Building, 501 Oak Avenue: Planning Application #13-18—  
Demolition #2-13, Design Review #04-13, Minor Modification #3-13**

Assistant Planner, Eric Lee: On April 10, 2013, Planning Commission approved use permit and included condition that design review return to commission. Staff is supportive of project. Site is buffered from adjacent properties by vegetation and large setbacks. Project is in transition area. Project will help activate location, orient towards university. High quality design, benefit to neighborhood and community.

Principal Planner, Bob Wolcott: Oak Avenue is collector street, average daily traffic counts 2,000 cars. Russell Boulevard is a major arterial, with average daily traffic of 19,000 cars.

G. Hague: Transition between UC Davis and residences—trees are critical to buffer impact of architecture. This is an excellent project that should be encouraged and building is in keeping with character of neighborhood.

M. Braly: Agree project is excellent. Want to thank applicant for sustainability analysis provided at commission's request, as attachment 9. However, it is not clear in tier 2 re considering. What kind of analysis? Life cycle? Disappointed at some proposals. Why not lease solar panels? Programs to provide incentives. What is the nature of Blue Oak Venture?

E. Lee: For this particular location, they do internet applications; they develop internet applications.

Chair Choudhuri opened the public hearing. 8:03 p.m.

Gayle Sosnick: Retired architect; on HRMC. Cited two problems with project: appropriateness in area and aesthetics due to too many design elements. The elevations, multiple colors( red, green, tan), three different styled roof lines (pitch, flat, shed) three story instead of two or one story like the surrounding neighborhood.

Rich Rifkin: HRMC. Built lot extra big to accommodate tree. Robbins named subdivision Oak after tree; built Oak out to 8<sup>th</sup> St. Robbins was an important figure, head

of Botany Department at UCD (Robbins Hall named after him). Site was home to medical office of Cooper, Vaughn and Larkey for a long time. Nice historic sign with picture of house with verbiage would be nice for community. Encourage commission to use historic sign as mitigation. Council should push this issue.

A. Choudhuri: Should come from HRMC as recommendation to City Council.

R. Rifkin: Rest of commission hasn't discussed yet. Would like to make part of revision to the proposed demolition ordinance.

G. Hague: Would support marker designating historic tree. The City should pay for this since the history should be known.

Matt Williams: Marker would be good representation that Blue Oak wants to be part of community and contribute to history. Cost is minimal to project. Blue Oak ventures will be good citizen of Davis. Support project.

David Morris, Director TechDavis Business Assoc.: Goal is growth of technology ecosystem in town. Endorse project and encourage moving forward. Opportunity for success story.

Murray Duncan, represents applicant & Blue Oak Energy: Architectural philosophy. Site plan—losing 6-inch elm, less than 10 years old. Respect existing trees and vegetation. Building design intentionally to nestle back in trees. Held tight to front, energy of building intended to push toward university. Research and development company, want to draw energy from campus. Intention is to meet LEED silver certification; special conditions would limit possibilities.

Chair Choudhuri closed the public hearing at 8:23 p.m.

C. Essex: Like project, use is appropriate; good location, synergy with UC Davis. Design is dynamic; interplay of site design and building sensitive to trees and vegetation. Support HRMC recommending policy to tell story through signage or use of remnant pieces from buildings. Continuing to densify, we lose historic structures in city. More appropriate for city or historic group to tell history; do not want to condition owner to provide historic marker.

H. Boschken: Economic development issues are well presented but major concern is nature of building itself in relation to neighborhood. Architecture is closer to campus buildings than it is to the neighborhood. Don't agree with findings 3 & 4. Not consistent with neighborhood architecture. Foliage that is supposed to shield, especially on western and northern side. Concerned over north, single family home. Section that contains only low foliage. Would like to reserve right of commission, planning staff or Council itself to determine whether project is LEED certifiable.

M. Braly: University is not within city limits, but within city. Should commission look south toward future, or north toward past? Appropriate for design to break with past and look toward university.

A. Choudhuri: Project is great. Architecture issues, looking at building from neighborhood and surrounding properties, see boxy wall. Conditions 3 & 4; design elements are not compatible; 3-story building, not 2-story. Thank staff for coming up with alternative language on trash enclosure. Commission requested design review so that applicant could come up with modified design to present but have no alternative to consider. Issues are with the architecture and design of building.

David Inns: Commend staff for good job putting reports together. Report responds to commission concerns from last meeting. Amount of trash to be generated is not that much. Don't find compelling reason not to approve. Design is set back far enough, give blending between natural elements and modern design of building. Minor issues shouldn't keep commission from allowing this building to be built.

1. C. Essex moved, seconded by D. Inns, to approve staff recommendation 1 and 2 as follows: 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 #13-18 to demolish an existing structure and construct a new two-story office building and site improvements based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Braly, Essex, Hague, Inns  
NOES: Boschken, Choudhuri  
ABSENT: Hanson, Hofmann

- C. Mission Residences at 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)

A. Choudhuri: Formally opened the public hearing, and continued to June 26, 2013.

## 7. Business Item

Oakshade Town Center: Similar Use Determination, Permitted Use in Planned Development #5-95D

B. Wolcott: Over half of city is on planned development. 10 neighborhood shopping centers, all with unique development uses and standards. Almost all require food store and typically allow 1-2 other large tenants. Staff faced with question of whether use is permitted. Staff felt that pet supply use is generally similar to other uses. Trip generation, parking standard the same.

G. Hague: What is the difference between the shopping center on Covell and the shopping center at Oakshade? Why would it not be compatible?

B. Wolcott: We don't see any compatibility issues with this going in.

A. Choudhuri: As infill project, exempt from CEQA.

Jim Moore: Pet Food Express: When permitted, like to do pet adoptions and low cost vaccines in store.

A. Choudhuri: If hosting adoption events, may want to think about having water connection outside for volunteers to use. Consider logistics when planning uses.

B. Wolcott: Only pertains to this particular use category in this particular Planned Development

H. Boschken moved, seconded by M. Braly, to approve staff recommendation and acceptance of determination made by staff as follows:

1. Determine that the use of “pet supplies” is similar in character to the other uses in the permitted use category of “Linens, fabric, toy, hobby, or crafts stores not exceeding 15,000 square feet” in Planned Development zone PD #5-95D for the Oakshade Town Center.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Braly, Choudhuri, Essex, Hague, Inns

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hanson, Hofmann

**8. Staff and Commissioner Comments** (continued as needed)

None

**9. Informational Items**

A. Schedule of Upcoming Meeting Dates.

B. Wolcott: Mission Residences postponed to June 26, 2013. As soon as a Joint meeting is scheduled, will let Planning Commission know.

A. Choudhuri: Transportation element update scheduled June 12, 2013.. Will staff respond to commission comments from previous presentation?

B. Wolcott: Staff is working on response to comments received. Tentative response to comments will come back. Will probably be rescheduled to June 26, 2013.

A. Choudhuri: Would like in advance. Basically appeared to be Bicycle Element, not transportation. If it comes back in similar state, will not be responsive. Should have picture of all commissioner comments provided to staff.

M. Braly: Informed he will be absent on May 22, 2013 Planning Commission meeting.

A. Choudhuri: Mission Residences. Did not keep original report. Would like to have original provided with supplemental. Also, include minutes from last meeting. Need more information on B Street Visioning process in order to make determination on project.

B. Wolcott: Transportation element. Can see one of the outcomes being that Planning

Commission finds that this is a Bicycle Element. Don't think we can go into endless cycle of revisions and comments.

**10. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.