



City of Davis
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, January 6, 2016
7:00 P.M.

Commission Members: Herman Boschken, Cheryl Essex, George Hague, Rob Hofmann (Chair),
Cristina Ramirez, Stephen Streeter, Marq Truscott (Alternate)

Absent: Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair)

Staff: Principal Planner Bob Wolcott; Community Development Administrator
Katherine Hess; Assistant City Manager/Community Development & Sus-
tainability Director Mike Webb

1. Call to Order

Chair Hofmann called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

C. Essex moved, seconded by H. Boschken, to approve the agenda.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hague, Hofmann, Ramirez, Streeter, Truscott

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hanson

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Principal Planner Bob Wolcott: Thank public for attending despite weather conditions.

Assistant City Manager/Community Development & Sustainability Director Mike Webb: Thank departing Commissioner Marq Truscott for service to City and community. Appreciate expertise in deliberations and discussions.

4. Public Comment

- Kemble Pope: Early comment on Nishi Gateway project item. Support infill densification. Support sustainable bicycle-pedestrian community. Background in environmental policy and land use. Served on OSHC. Chair of UC Davis Climate Action Team. Transportation largest cause for Greenhouse Gas emissions. Support building housing closer to University. Encouraged by announcement for connection to UC Davis. Planning for Nishi is 3-4 years in making. Encourage Commission to support.
- Hiva, UC Davis Student: Support Nishi project. Project will increase job market in community, benefit to students and local families.
- Paul, UC Davis Student: Support Nishi project. Strengthen economy and advocate long-term sustainability.

5. Regular Items

A. **Public Hearing:** Nishi Gateway. Planning Application #14-57: General Plan Amendment #08-14, Rezoning and Preliminary Planned Development #06-14, Annexation #2-14.

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: Provided brief summary of project and discussion at previous December 16, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. Gateway / Olive Drive Specific Plan Amendment; original plan assumed Richards tunnel undercrossing would be widened, specific plan amendment to no longer include widening of undercrossing. Overview baseline project features. Project commitments, not moving forward without connectivity and commitment from University. Financial and Sustainability Commitments, Community Facilities District (CFD) assumed for public infrastructure. Rezone & Preliminary Planned Development, fine-tuning boundaries. Staff will return to Commission with final details and subsequent actions. Project and Commission recommendations will go to City Council on January 12, formal public hearing on January 19, 2016.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing at 7:24 p.m.

Public Comments:

- Alan Hirsch: Oppose project. Not support rush to June ballot. Issues include I-80 interchange not to change until 2022. Tax-sharing agreement, conflicts present between County-City parties. Poses significant risks.
- Christina Blackman, Davis Chamber of Commerce: Letter to Council in December. Board adopted and supported project.
- Stuart Savage, Davis Downtown: Downtown Business Association does not have a formal position. Evaluating as project continues to develop. Support moving forward. Support work-live aspect, sustainable innovation park. Opportunity to encourage active lifestyle.
- Trish Price, Davis Bicycles!: Support infill densification. Offer expertise in design, and education to encourage bike-ped community.
- Lydia Delis-Schlosser: Support project. Many years of collaboration between entities to maximize land use. Achieves multiple policy goals for multiple agencies. Provide housing and safe-travel for residents, access to downtown, increased revenue for schools and City.
- Hannah, UC Davis student: Support project. University expanding student population with deficient housing would push student population out of community and increase traffic impacts.
- Dan Carson: Finance and Budget Commission (FBC) member, speaking as individual. FBC has spent a lot of time reviewing data related to economic and fiscal impacts of project. Will increase economy of community, direct net fiscal benefit to City. Took different approach than the City's fiscal analyst. Development Agreement still in the works. Missing specific financial mechanism to finance infrastructure.
- Alan Pryor: Not support rushing project. Not ready for ballot. Loose ends. Not sustainable. Developer can but resists making project zero net. Same transportation study as Hotel Conference Center. Currently in litigation. Inappropriate assumptions made in analysis.

- Daniel Parrella: Support project. Jump-start Davis founder. Many start-up companies in Davis. Provide employees with nearby housing and working space.
- Matt Williams: Government Relations Committee for Davis Chamber. Support concept, but do not support rushing project. SACOG plan 2022 for interchange development. Finance and Budget Commission can further review fiscal benefits.
- Eileen Samitz: Concerned with rush to approve project. Not support housing on project site. More residential with no additional parking. Missing agricultural mitigation. Loose commitments made by University. Housing not dedicated, student housing needs to be built on University land. Dr. Cahill comments on air quality issues, unmitigatable. Fiscal impacts, consultants did not include \$24 million for infrastructure, parking, and bridge.
- Nancy Price: Endorse previous statements. Innovation parks need to be innovative in design and sustainable. Have met with Council and staff from the beginning, have attempted to improve project to meet community values. Unclear that property is even developable as intended. Ballot language must be explicit. Location on edge of town, not true in-fill. 150 acres properly zoned within the City were not properly identified in EIR. Process issue.
- Tim Ruff, property owner: Nishi received grant for Putah Creek Parkway and Urban Greening Grant. In order to receive improvement grants, need timeline. Commitment to University access can be first step. Can phase connection to Richards until interchange is completed. Appreciate community member comments. Issues that have been raised have been addressed in EIR. Baseline project features have remained the same throughout. Mechanisms available to address fiscal concerns surrounding infrastructure.
- Rodney Robinson: Impacts to school district were not considered in project deliberations. Missing pieces. Table project, support waiting for all documents to be made available. Consider further review of EIR and Transportation Study.
- Elaine Roberts-Musser: Community is not opposed to project, but hesitant to move project forward without further review. Not support over-analyzing project, but still need to address major issues.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing. 8:08 p.m.

Gary Jakobs, Ascent Environmental: California addressing Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission issues. Must balance between transportation sources and GHG. All risk measured in 70 years, considered a lifetime exposure. Accumulate exposure. Placement of Rental housing closest to transportation sources minimizes risk. Measured in air quality, drinking water, exposure to any risk factor, etc. State Office of Environmental Health standard measurement.

Bob Graney, Fehr and Peers: Hotel Conference Center project took over analysis of existing trips above the existing uses, came back with little impacts. Significant impacts were found with Nishi project. Multiple analyses and mitigation measures were studied. Interchange improvements originally identified with intent to improve bicycle access, safety and capacity benefits. Nishi is first project that identified impacts in interchange, and impacts on campus. Mitigation measure identified to widen road and put in traffic signal. Campus traffic mitigation would decrease traffic impacts on First Street. Trend in many areas to reduce parking but simultaneously providing alternate modes of transportation.

M. Webb: Commission can deliberate motions. Suggest commission take a separate motion on certification of EIR. Package entitlements together.

Commissioner Comments:

- H. Boschken: Incremental planning model, much of what is done as planners occurs in a world of complexity and fluidity with what information is available. Unnecessary to stop the process in order to search for answers. Subsequent changes to be made down the road. Opportunities to make minor modifications later as more information arises. Reasonably convinced the project is doable. Satisfied that recommendation for approval should be made.
- C. Essex: Project can play into development of additional housing and jobs. Good proximity to downtown and University. Need safe, affordable housing near downtown and University; provide more customers locally. Air quality concerns; read Dr. Cahill's report, have reviewed staff reports and EIR documents, concerned whether the development will be a healthy place to live. Community needs residential component, benefits to have residential near campus. Tree planting is not a fast solution, not a proven mitigation measure. Request Finance and Budget Commission review of project.
- G. Hague: Project large, complex and important. Majority of the comments received. Unresolved issues: Air quality with residential units. Transportation plan assumptions are unrealistic. Emergency vehicle access and proposed circulation is inadequate. Believe property should be developed, but needs further review of how it is developed.
- R. Hofmann: Thank Commission for thoughtfulness and input. Arguably the best infill site in the community in regards to proximity to City and University. Considerable objections to project. Economically. For consistency, oppose proposed mitigations in regards to air quality. Future residents will have expectation that these issues will have been addressed. Concerns not questioning analysis in EIR, but policy determinations related to project based on analysis.
- C. Ramirez: Recently did an analysis project specifically on Nishi proposal for class. Echo commission member concerns. Support project and benefits to community. Concerned with transportation circulation. Building a new museum near University corridor, already poses traffic issues. Support project and development in area, but need additional traffic analysis.
- S. Streeter: Reality of development process, timing of CEQA information. Interest in City's practice for EIR Amendments. 650 or 780 units. Not known. Thank staff and consultants for additional information on air quality, and studies in relation to Cannery.
- M. Truscott: Air quality, proposed community outdoor lifestyle and residential areas. Not support if unable to mitigate.

H. Boschken moved, seconded by R. Hofmann, to certify the Nishi project Environmental Impact Report.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hague, Hofmann, Ramirez, Streeter, Truscott

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hanson

C. Essex moved, seconded by C. Ramirez, to recommend the City Council approve the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Amendment (West Olive Drive).

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Ramirez, Streeter, Truscott

NOES: Hague

ABSENT: Hanson

G. Hague: If the Nishi project is not approved, request Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan return to commission for further review. Commission consensus.

C. Essex moved, seconded by S. Streeter, to recommend approval of the General Plan Amendment with the following recommendations in regard to the baseline project features:

1. The Nishi project should not be occupied until connections to both UC Davis and West Olive Drive are constructed; and
2. Residential units shall not be sold (may be rented, however) until the outside air quality improves to acceptable levels, to a standard to be determined.

M. Truscott moved a substitute motion, seconded by R. Hofmann to recommend adoption of the General Plan Amendments, striking language allowing residential in UC Davis R&D district. Table baseline project features.

Alternative motion failed by the following vote:

AYES: Truscott, Hofmann

NOES: Boschken, Essex, Hague, Ramirez, Streeter

ABSENT: Hanson

Main motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hague, Ramirez, Streeter

NOES: Truscott, Hofmann

ABSENT: Hanson

S. Streeter moved, seconded by H. Boschken, to recommend approval of the Nishi property Development Agreement, including Baseline Project Features, as required by Chapter 41 of the Davis Municipal Code.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hague, Ramirez, Streeter

NOES: Truscott, Hofmann

ABSENT: Hanson

G. Hague moved, seconded by S. Streeter to recommend approval of the Rezoning and Preliminary Planned Development for the Nishi property.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hague, Ramirez, Streeter

NOES: Truscott, Hofmann

ABSENT: Hanson

K. Hess: Workshop on applications next week to Finance and Budget Commission and City Council.

6. Commission and Staff Communications

A. Upcoming Meeting Dates

B. Wolcott: The next Planning Commission meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held on Wednesday, January 20, 2016. The January 13 meeting has been cancelled.

B. Update on January 4, 2016, Subdivision Committee Review of The Cannery Farm

M. Truscott: Thank Commission for opportunity to serve.

B. Wolcott: Subdivision Committee approved lot line adjustment. Unless Planning Commission requests review, staff will move forward.

7. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 9:46 p.m.