1. Call to Order
Vice Chair Hanson called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda
M. Braly moved, seconded by G. Hague, to approve the agenda. Motion passed by the following vote:
AYES: Braly, Essex, Hague, Hanson
NOES: None
ABSENT: Boschken, Hofmann, Inns

3. Staff and Commissioner Comments
B. Wolcott: Nishi Gateway community engagement meetings scheduled to start this month. Project will be agendized for Planning Commission discussion.

During July, City Clerk’s Office will report out information on commission recruitment activities.

D. Inns arrived 7:06 p.m.

4. Public Communications
None

5. Public Hearings
A. Paso Fino Subdivision / 2627 East Covell Boulevard and 2675 Moore Boulevard: Planning Application #13-54—Mitigated Negative Declaration #5-14; General Plan Amendment #1-13; Planned-Development #3-89; Zoning Amendment #1-13; Affordable Housing Plan #1-14; Merger and Tentative Map #3-13; Final Planned Development #2-13; and Design Review #20-13

Planner & Historical Resources Manager Ike Njoku: Proposed merger of properties located at 2627 East Covell Boulevard, 0.97 acres of Residential Low Density, and 2675 Moore Boulevard, 0.42 acres of Neighborhood Greenbelt. The project will merge and re-subdivide two parcels into eight lots, and establish both preliminary and final development standards. The land use designation of Neighborhood Greenbelt will be modified to Residential Low Density
to consolidate the General Plan and Zoning land use designations. Proposal also includes demolition of the existing single family home built in 1966.

In 2009, City Council approved a 4-unit subdivision for site; original proposal was not implemented and some permits have expired. Current proposal is subject to new conceptual agreement between City and applicant. Council has not yet approved land transfer agreement. If project is approved by Planning Commission, Council will decide on land transaction.

Jason Taormino, applicant: Compromise within boundaries of City’s sustainability and building policies. Attended several meetings with other commissions. Project focus on energy efficiency and universal design; tree mitigation.

Public Comments:
- Josh Lutsker: Support project, community will benefit from tree mitigation portion of project.
- Dan and Claudia Morain; Jan and Travie Westlund; Warren Westrup; Louise Walker; Alan Fernandes; Rula Sulton; and Eileen Samitz: Support original proposal for 4-unit subdivision. Current proposal includes lot lines too close together, too dense, privacy concerns, parking and traffic impacts in neighborhood. Should preserve existing natural resources and valuable open space.
- Napal Devra, Paul Grandy, and Alan Hirsch: Oppose project. Too many impacts to neighborhood. Not in alignment with community values. Does not meet Davis standards.
- Paul Boylan: Not enough information for Commission to make informed decision on current proposal. Staff has taken no position on project, usually make recommendation. Need to answer more questions. Consider current residents, property values, potential risks involved. Request consideration of holding another hearing.

Dave Taormino, applicant: Very small amount of infill sites left in Davis. Four lots in original proposal were larger, estate-sized lots. Current development proposal embraces new policies: innovative neighborhood, universal design, energy efficiencies. Proposed alternative plans for consideration; prefer Plan A, however, Plan B preserves more trees. Developer will maintain trees for first 5 years. Proposal to purchase drainage site.

Commissioner comments included:
- Concerns over traffic circulation with proposed design. Current proposal potentially dangerous for bicycle and pedestrian circulation.
- Concerns regarding removal of so many trees, placing trees at Legacy soccer field is not a long-term mitigation solution.
- Concerns regarding City’s lack of policies and process for elimination of greenbelt parcels.
- Support proposal regarding energy efficiency features, universal design, and ADUs. Addresses community values and unmet needs, consistent with City policies.
- Lot sizes are consistent with others in neighborhood. Need infill at reasonable densities.

D. Inns moved, seconded by G. Hague, as follows:
1. Determine that Alternative Plan B is supportable for further consideration
2. Given the potential collaboration between the Paso Fino development team and the director of the UC Davis Western Center for Efficient Cooling and Heating relative to evaluation of advanced renewable energy and energy efficient technologies, such as hybrid solar thermal photovoltaic which would provide both electricity and hot water, representatives of the Valley Climate Action Center, Cool Davis and the City’s Natural Resources Commission could participate in and learn about these innovations as they are considered in the Paso Fino project.

3. The applicant/developer shall provide the City with documentation that would provide a better understanding of how to evaluate how projects, such as Paso Fino, are in compliance with the State Title 24 sustainability code. This requirement is because of the applicant’s proposal to provide energy performance that is 15% above Title 24. Such documentation shall be provided prior to submission of the first Building Permit in the subdivision. The documentation shall answer questions that include:
   A. What does it really mean to provide energy performance that is 15% above Title 24, as this project claims?; and
   B. What improvements provided this performance?

Motion passed by the following vote:
AYES: Braly, Hague, Inns
NOES: Essex, Hanson
ABSENT: Boschken, Hofmann

M. Braly moved, seconded by D. Inns, to recommend approval of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration #5-14 prepared for the project pursuant to Section 15070 (a) of the CEQA guidelines. Motion passed by the following vote:
AYES: Braly, Hague, Inns
NOES: Essex, Hanson
ABSENT: Boschken, Hofmann

Planning Commission recessed at 9:28 p.m. and reconvened at 9:34 p.m.

6. **Staff and Commissioner Comments** (continued as needed)
   None

G. Hague left the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

7. **Business Items**
   A. Accessory Dwelling Units Work Plan Item – Check-in on Preliminary Concepts

   B. Wolcott: Planning Commission work plan item to consider appropriate and effective ways to promote and streamline the processing of ADUs while ensuring compatibility with neighborhoods. Approximately six ADUs approved per year. Conditional Use Permits issued for majority of them, mainly to due to exceeding size limits for ministerial approval. There may be an opportunity for a review process between the current ministerial actions and Planning Commission review that provides adequate notice to neighbors, simplifies the process for a homeowner, and reduces staff time.
Staff and the Commission Subcommittee have considered the objectives of the project and developed options for changes to the City’s ADU ordinance and programs. The options are outlined by the following issue categories:
1. Maximum floor area
2. Maximum height
3. Minimum setbacks
4. Findings for a discretionary permit
5. Decision making body and noticing of neighbors
6. Other possible new ADU programs

8. Informational Item

   The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m.