City of Davis
Planning Commission Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, July 9, 2014
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners: Mark Braly, Cheryl Essex, Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair), Rob Hofmann (Chair)

Absent: Herman Boschken, George Hague, David Inns

Staff: Principal Planner Bob Wolcott; Planner Eric Lee

1. Call to Order
   Chair Hofmann called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

3. Staff and Commissioner Comments
   Bob Wolcott: Next Council meeting will include Update on Nishi Gateway Project
   C. Essex: Cannery project demolition underway; many trees will be retained on site.

4. Public Communications
   None

5. Public Hearings
   A. Almeida Accessory Dwelling Unit - 1314 Cedar Place; Planning Application #14-29 - Conditional Use Permit #04-14

      Planner Eric Lee: Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow construction of a 750 sq. ft., 2-story detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) located in the rear yard of the property. ADU would consist of 600 sq. ft. on the first floor containing a living room/studio space, kitchen, bathroom and 150 sq. ft. on the second floor for an office/bedroom with a storage attic space. The project requires a CUP due to the proposed size (750 sq. ft.), height (20 ft.), and rear yard setback (10 ft.).

      Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

      Deladier Almeida, applicant: Offered to answer any questions from the commission.
Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

M. Braly moved, seconded by C. Essex, to:
1. Determine that the project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303; and
2. Approve the project (PA#14-29) for a Conditional Use Permit for an accessory dwelling unit based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the staff report.

Motion passed by the following vote:
AYES: Braly, Essex, Hanson, Hofmann
NOES: None
ABSENT: Boschken, Hague, Inns

6. Business Item
A. Accessory Dwelling Units Work Plan Item – Recommend Options to City Council

B. Wolcott: Commission work plan item to consider appropriate and effective ways to promote and streamline the processing of ADUs while ensuring compatibility with neighborhoods. Staff and the subcommittee have considered the objectives of the project and developed options for changes to the City’s ADU ordinance and programs.

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

Utilizing a table summarizing options and taking previously submitted written comments into consideration, commissioners provided comments for changes to the City’s ADU Ordinance and programs.

Commissioner comments included:
- **Issue 5 - Decision Making Body and Noticing of Neighbors:**
  - Planning Commission should still have a lot of discretion as decision making body.
  - Concern regarding 10-day notice for neighbors.
- **Issue 4 - Findings for a Discretionary Permit:**
  - Support Option 2: Establish new findings for a discretionary ADU permit: Compatible relationship; Privacy; Windows; Entrance; Parking; Open Space and Landscaping; Historic Resources and Natural Features; and Exterior Design.
  - Provide greater specificity compared to the current general findings for a CUP.
  - Some of these specific findings, if modified with objective standards, could be adapted to ministerial approvals.
- **Issue 1 - Maximum Floor Area:**
  - Support Option 2: Ministerial and CUP (would apply to all ADUs) a percentage of lot size, 7% to 10%, with an ADU size cap of 1,200 sq ft (or other cap selected)
o Not specify a percentage at this time.

- **Issue 2 - Maximum Height:**
  o M. Braly: Support Option 3, as follows:
    Ministerial: any ADU is permitted by right if it:
    - Complies with primary dwelling standards, regardless of attached or detached, OR
    - Complies with other reduced standards for ADU which link max height to min setbacks (Detached 1 story, 13’ height with 3’ side and rear setbacks);
    - Attached or detached 1-1/2 to 2 story: 22’ height with 5’ side and 10’ rear setbacks;
    - Height can be exceeded if design is attempting to match special roof features of the primary dwelling.
    CUP; any ADU not permitted by right above.
  o M. Hanson: Support Option 1, no changes. Potential impacts upon neighbors should be reviewed through a CUP.

- **Issue 3 - Minimum Setbacks:**
  o Support Option 2, as follows:
    Ministerial; minimum setbacks:
    - Front 20’ and street side 15’: No changes
    - Interior side: 5’ min and total 12’, 10’ for two-story portions: No changes but adding exception* below
    - Rear yard: 20’ for one-story portions and 25’for two-story portions: No changes but adding the following exception:
      The interior side and the rear setbacks above may be 3’ if the site adjoins an alley or a non-single family zone (multi-family, office, retail, commercial, industrial, park, greenbelt, agriculture, school, cemetery, or similar zoned site as determined by the Community Development Director).

- **Issue 6 - Other Possible New ADU Programs:** Many possible ADU programs and incentives for long-term; should focus on bringing forward ordinance first.

- **Overarching Question:** Support the City Council goal to promote/facilitate ADUs and consider changes to the standards/processes for ADUs?
  o Should be more holistic, narrow scope.
  o ADUs are one of many City goals. Support but not at expense of other goals.

- Request option for individual commission members to submit written supplemental comments.

  B. Wolcott: Request any additional comments be submitted in writing within 10 days.

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

8. **Informational Item**
   A. Schedule of Upcoming Meeting Dates

   B. Wolcott: Next meeting to be held August 27.

9. **Adjournment,**
   Meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.