



City of Davis
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, February 12, 2014
7:00 P.M.

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

Absent: George Hague

Staff: Community Development & Sustainability Director Mike Webb; Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess; Housing & Human Services Superintendent Danielle Foster; Principal Planner Bob Wolcott; Assistant City Clerk Lisa Kemmer

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rob Hofmann @ 7:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

H. Boschken moved, seconded by D. Inns, to approve the agenda as presented.

AYES: Braly, Essex, Inns

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hague

ABSTAIN: Boschken, Hanson, Hofmann

3. Staff and Commissioner Comments

Principal Planner Bob Wolcott: City Council denied 717 Seventh Street appeal, approving Conditional Use Permit, at its last meeting.

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: Council moving forward on anylisis and public engagement for Nishi Downtown-University Gateway District. City, property owner and University will come up with framework; will return with recommendation later this year.

4. Public Communications

None

5. Consent Items

A. Minutes of March 27, 2013

Cheryl Essex, moved, seconded by D. Inns, to approve the minutes. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Braly, Essex, Inns

NOES: None
ABSENT: Hague
ABSTAIN: Boschken, Hanson, Hofmann

6. Public Hearing

R. Hofmann recused himself from the following item due to a potential conflict related to a business interest within the City.

A. Housing Element 2013-2021 (Planning Application 14-88: General Plan Amendment #01-14 and Negative Declaration #03-13)

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: Introduce Housing & Human Services Superintendent Danielle Foster and PMC Consultant Amy Sinsheimer. Overview presentation and discussion process. The Housing Element (HE) is one of the mandatory elements for a community's General Plan. State Planning and Zoning Law establishes detailed contents and process for Housing Elements. Housing Elements must include an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. The Housing Element is the only General Plan component that is subject to review and certification by the State. Communities without certified Housing Elements may be ineligible for grant funding opportunities, and have reduced ability to deny proposed housing developments.

Amy Sinsheimer, PMC: Have been assisting with Housing Element Update. The current HE planning period for the fifth cycle is January 1, 2013 through October 31, 2021. Previously submitted draft to California Department of Housing and Community Development for initial review, have revised document in response to comments received. Overview anticipated timeline in process. Updates are required every 4 or 8 years, subject to timing of certification.

K. Hess: Regional Housing Needs Allocations— City is given number by Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), based on number received by State Department of Finance. 1066 units— low, very low, moderate, above moderate income categories. Recommend the Commission recommend the City Council certify Negative Declaration #01-13 and approve General Plan Amendment #01-14 for the 2013-2021 Housing Element. Discussion of each section.

Danielle Foster, Housing Services Superintendent: Planning/Social Services Commission joint meeting. Social Services received update on HE at last meeting; needs analysis update, removed Carlton Plaza from affordable housing list, placed units in needs section; Commission supported continuing toward meeting deadlines for longer-term planning cycle.

Vice Chair Hanson opened the public hearing.

- Darryl Rutherford, Exec. Director Sacramento Housing Alliance: Submitted letter from SHA. HE does not address persons in need of emergency shelter. Updated 2013 census data in HE fails to identify needs of homeless members who identify as mentally ill, substance abusers, victims of sexual violence. Minority households under separate category, free fair housing/mediation services and reduced legal representation. City does not provide these services, should be omitted from document. City not committed to monitoring affordability as ADU's— not occupied by those it should have; City includes

Cannery ADU's in its site inventory for low and moderate income units to meet RHNA obligations. Public participation period— draft HE was not made available before it was submitted to the State for review/and subsequent approval. All meetings held at commission and Council meetings which are not well attended by lower income individuals ultimately affected. Offering assistance in further participation in the HE and community outreach. City of Sacramento pulled back deadline for submitting their HE, now holding 6 workshops to get more public feedback and participation. Funding— financial crisis at the State, losing Prop 1C funds; Council passed resolution in support of SB391; some jurisdictions are looking at way to get funds back, various options that City can look into. Caution on in lieu fees; cheaper for developers to pay rather than provide actual affordable units, takes longer for funds to build up.

M. Hanson closed the public hearing at 7:38 p.m.

Chapter 2

DF: City does an annual report; for last cycle, City met the RHNA requirements. Items on affordable, transitional and supportive housing were accomplished; HCD tracks critical items and provides feedback completion of those items. If City was not accomplishing enough with previous element, then would not be eligible for long-term planning cycle.

C. Essex: Is the HE on the ground making it better for folks. Huge run up on price of housing; crash in 2006; housing more expensive in Davis than other areas; see the homeless; maybe we are not; are we doing any good

K. Hess: GAMAT houses preserved; New Harmony development. Can measure staff time and redevelopment funding allocated to affordable housing, but not necessarily able to compare changes in homeless.

C. Essex: Number of how many not sheltered in the community. HE numbers were not much different regarding homeless. Is City saying we have made no progress if the numbers are the same.

D. Foster: Yes, the numbers might be the same; but the 25-50 beds per night through interfaith rotating shelter, another 10 beds for cold weather shelter, in addition to shelter provided in Woodland. Domestic violence shelter, transitional housing shelter. We have homeless per HUDs definitions; the City is consistently looking at expanding services those numbers; the numbers may be the same but not necessarily the same people. HUD has focused on permanent housing rather than emergency right now. Are service providers, faith community, city through CDBG sources all help.

H. Boscken: Do not find 2012 number useful; comparable data is not identified between sheltered, unsheltered, transitional, etc.

Chapter 3: Housing Needs Assessment

A. Sinsheimer: HCD streamline review process only looked at pieces that were updated. Updated statistics related to housing stock and number of renters; includes single households, female head of households, seniors, disabilities. Very little variation in trend data.

K. Hess: Staff worked to come up with baseline data; SACOG identified and provided data for staff to conduct the analysis.

Chapter 4: Regional Housing Needs Assessment

A. Sinsheimer: Provide background. Previous HE identified 448 units, now at 1,066 units. Must accommodate low, extremely low and moderate households. State requires if site doesn't have housing already approved; that we look at allowable densities and development standards that might meet those needs.

K. Hess: Provide brief overview. Focus on low-income needs; able to establish that land is available to meet those needs. Davis considered urban jurisdiction. If land has no building permit established, then land can be used to meet the RHNA requirements.

D. Foster: Provide overview of deed restricted affordable housing parcels and Cannery affordable housing site. City has additional affordable units, ones identified are the only that would be credited in this HE. First portion of RHNA calculation.

K. Hess: Offered brief background how Accessory Dwelling Units fit in with RHNA. City previously approved amendments to inclusionary requirements that allowed developments to receive credits for including ADUs as part of affordable housing obligation. City staff sent out 100 surveys to owners of ADUs, received 50% back; found over half of the ADUs currently rented at very low-income or extremely low-income rents. Cannery ADUs were included based on specific design requirements that must be met. City plans to obtain that information to see what gets rented. No units for families, but very large number of low-income single individuals that work and try to live in Davis.

D. Foster: Need to correct information on extremely low-income units that were previously grouped into low-income category. New Harmony development would be included extremely low-income unit count. Land dedication sites could also potentially include extremely low-income units.

A. Sinsheimer: Another way to look at, affordability by design; assessor units to add to your stock that can be for very low incomes rather than just a deed restriction

MH: Deficiencies identified by letter; assertion for Mission Residences as affordable site. Seems cynical to count Mission Residences as affordable housing. They will be market rate condominiums. May be meeting legal requirement; those units do not meet reality as affordable units.

K. Hess: Meets the eligibility requirements for density not affordability. Same assertion for ADUs at the cannery. Policy is still being worked through for stacked flats that will be rezoned after the HE period.

D. Rutherford: Allowable by statute, but will not meet the need of the community. They will be market rate and not affordable. The market will dictate affordability of those units.

D. Inns: Find it difficult that State would pass a statute to cheat how to get out of doing affordable housing by being able to count these units to meet requirements.

A. Sinsheimer: Statute has selected the building permit approval as the line in the sand; Mission Residences is a fully approved project, regardless of the incomes the project serves. If

not permitted, then is looked at as a site based on allowable density.

K. Hess: City does try to provide additional affordability where possible. The policy is for the City to try to meet the needs, in addition to checking those boxes on what is required by statute. Program #10— condominium sites at Cannery were zoned after October, sites flipped into different category. Working with HCD staff and Cannery owners on policy that calls for ensuring will meet requirement for RHNA credit that was anticipated when project was approved. Recommending approval with added flexibility to adjust language in program #10. Final component of the low-income RHNA is potential redevelopment in Core Area. Environmental impact report went parcel by parcel, were very conservative in count.

Chapter 7 Implementation Program

D. Foster: Overview of programs. Identify program addressing monitoring and reporting of affordable housing development

K. Hess: Identify new program requested by HCD— address how practical infill sites are, program to provide outreach letting property owners know about incentives available to them. Identify ongoing program calling for greenhouse gas reduction.

Commissioner Comments

M. Braly: Compliment staff and consultant for work. Used to be on CHOC board in 1990's. Davis has done a good job on providing affordable housing where possible. Support staff recommendation.

H. Boschken: Request staff reconcile some numbers relating to total household units identified in various tables in document.

A. Sinsheimer: Generally does occur in most census data collection and analysis; staff can double-check those numbers.

C. Essex: Appreciate staff and consultant work on HE. Regarding letter received— request to provide HPAC data relating to persons in need of emergency shelter. Support recommendation.

D. Inns: City has done well within its means to meet housing needs. Support integrating variety of affordable housing options in developments.

M. Hanson: Concerned City is targeting downtown core area to assert it will be redeveloped to meet Housing Element. Developments built on those sites are unlikely to provide low-income units. City could end up pushing out low-income people from the core area. Maybe the city should be looking at sites like PG&E for potential zoning. Could end up losing historic properties because of the illusion that by having 30+ unit density leads to providing affordable housing.

B. Wolcott: Other opportunity sites other than RHNA; had we not met RHNA sites; we would have had to look at these sites. Will address in annual review.

H. Boschken moved, seconded by M. Braly, to recommend the City Council certify Negative

Declaration #01-13 and approve General Plan Amendment #01-14 for the 2013-2021 Housing Element, with flexibility in Program Action 10.

AYES: Boschken, Braly, Essex, Hanson, Inns

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hofmann, Hague

7. Staff and Commissioner Comments (continued as needed)

None

R. Hofmann returned to the dias at 9:24 p.m.

8. Informational Item

A. Schedule of Upcoming Meeting Dates

Principal Planner Bob Wolcott: March 5th date set for next Planning Commission Meeting; Following meeting will be on March 26th, no meeting on March 12th.

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:26 p.m.