



City of Davis
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, February 8, 2017
7:00 P.M.

Commission Members: Herman Boschken, Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair), Rob Hofmann (Chair), Stephen Mikesell, Darryl Rutherford, Stephen Streeter

Absent: Cheryl Essex

Staff: Assistant Community Development/Sustainability Director Ashley Feeney; Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. Swearing in New Commission Member (Rutherford)

Assistant Community Development/Sustainability Director Ash Feeney administered oath of office to Commissioner Rutherford.

3. Approval of Agenda

S. Mikesell moved, seconded by S. Streeter, to approve the agenda as listed. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Hanson, Hofmann, Mikesell, Rutherford, Streeter

NOES: None

ABSENT: Essex

4. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Assistant Community Development/Sustainability Director Ash Feeney: Provided update on UC Davis Long Range Development Plan. Meeting concurrently taking place with commission meeting. City Council submitted comment letter. Comment period closes February 17th. Provided greeting cards for messages to leaving commissioners.

Deputy City Clerk Bree Toller: City Council adopted updates to Commission Handbook, distributed to all commissions and available online. Provided update on commission member appointments to fill vacant alternate position, tentatively scheduled February 21st City Council meeting.

R. Hofmann: Welcome new commissioner.

D. Rutherford: Introduced self, provided brief background. Pleasure to serve City in role as commissioner. 13-year resident of Davis. Masters Community Development at UC Davis. Affordable housing advocate in professional career, diverse experience in community development.

M. Hanson: Request staff prepare list of all current housing projects; include information on unit types, current status, compare to University planning, etc. Request comprehensive overview of all projects in City and timing. Tutorial on SACOG housing requirements.

R. Hofmann: Will work with staff to determine when to schedule.

5. Public Comment

- Rhonda Reed, Old East Davis Neighborhood Association; Larry Guenther, Mark Grote, Alan Miller, Darik Hachati; Mary Hathenbach; and Steve Sherman shared Historical Resources Management Commission (HRMC) comments from December 20 regarding the proposed Traskside project. Comments included: Thank HRMC for diligence in review of project. Commission did not support recommended findings. Stressed importance of policies in place to protect traditional character of district and overlay districts. Project as proposed fails spirit of design guidelines. Community effort, City can enhance character and conserve neighborhood setting. Concerned with overall CEQA process. Death by a thousand cuts, cumulative effects of continuously moving standards line. Precedent-setting development. Residents welcome Traskside so long as it conforms to design guidelines. Request Planning Commission confirm and City Council reinforce current design policies.

6. Consent Calendar

A. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of August 24, 2016

S. Streeter moved, seconded by R. Hofmann, to approve the minutes.

7. Regular Items

A. Workshop: West Davis Active Adult Community

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: Preliminary workshop on proposed 75-acre site development located north of Covell Boulevard, west of Sutter-Davis Hospital. Proposal includes 325 for-sale units; 80 percent of the units, including 150 affordable units, are to be age-restricted for 55 and over. Workshop intended for Commission to provide suggestions to staff and applicant for consideration during review process. The Commission will have additional opportunities to review the proposal prior to making a formal recommendation to City Council.

Dave Taormino, Applicant: Project intended for active adults already living in Davis. Neighborhoods becoming dominated by people aged 55+, no children in some neighborhoods. Specific homes needed by singles. Ideal location for this type of development. Measure R vote required. High-density projects previously not approved by the voters. Confident project will be approved. Public outreach program— intend to have 16 focus groups, neighborhood meetings, political and specialty groups, service organizations and religious groups; 28 public hearings and meetings with commissions. Design philosophy, provide energy efficient homes that replicate and enhance current lifestyles. 80% active adults and seniors, 20% non-age-restricted. Expect interest of younger families to purchase homes. Meet current needs and future needs, age-in-place.

David Thompson, Neighborhood Partners: Thank Commission. Partner with Delta Davis Senior Housing Community. Overview site plan. Project will almost double required units for affordable housing. Provide overview on other development offered, Eleanor

Roosevelt Circle– 158 units of senior housing, able to offer social services and programs on site. Likelihood project will not be on market until 2021, many seniors on waiting lists who reside in other towns unable to find housing in Davis. Proximity to CommuniCare, Sutter Hospital, and other nearby medical facilities. All units and facilities are accessible. Energy efficient development, focus on affordable utilities. Last time City approved development for senior housing was in 2002.

D. Taormino: Provide site plan overview. University Retirement Center (URC) has not made commitment to expansion; second option is for memory care facility. Not enough facilities in state accommodate aging population. Right turn in/out, roadways planned for potential transportation connections in future. HOA provide and maintain amenities on site. Activity and Wellness Center– privately run health club, available to other Davis residents; privately run restaurant, also open for community use. Santa Fe style streetscape. Ag buffer– 2.6 miles walking paths, tree planting, and gardens; exploring possible urban orchard. Overview home designs– cottages, bungalows, and duplexes; all homes single-story. Homes facing greenways. Choices for garden area, terrace, patio, gates, etc. Ability to add second-story unit above garage in allowable areas. Able to purchase custom homes on small builder lots. Working with UC Davis, bring in technology to development.

Public Comments

- Alan Pryor: Needs better access to amenities across or along Covell, no crossings proposed. Seniors mobility restrictions, safety is critical. Fewer units proposed than Cannery site, criteria exists for higher density. Stacked-flat condos greater land use than single-story, single-family homes. Designed for market who can afford larger home in Davis. No guarantee current residents will move into site to free up housing elsewhere. Concerned Measure R vote in lieu of site map, development agreement, and CUP.
- Greg Rowe: Live across from site, support project. Meets community need. Proximity to nearby medical facilities and Marketplace. Safe crossing near project site. SACOG housing needs. Recommend avoid cul-de-sacs, DWR trucks difficult to maneuver. Recommend detailed project documents, need full disclosure before Measure R vote.
- Eileen Samitz: Process issue. Not recommend fast-tracking project to Measure R before development agreement, map, tax sharing, CUPs. Diminishes City's negotiating power in project features and agreement. SACOG fair share credit, anything built before 2021. Risk for City.

Commissioner comments:

- S. Streeter: Phasing and timing for sale of units, particularly affordable units. Single adults may not want larger units, opportunity for densification. How arrived at design? Consider less crossings. Wise to solicit comments as early as possible.
- D. Rutherford: Interested in affordable housing component. Timeline of permits pulled on single-family homes? Regional Housing Needs Allocation, development meeting City target-level? Impressed with project, interesting considerations of incorporating technology. Who is target market for 20% unrestricted units? Need exists in Davis for young professional families looking for single-family residences, market affordability? Urge applicant to consider.

- M. Hanson: Applaud affordable housing component. Affordable rental housing options need exists for individuals who make average of \$32k annually. Waiting lists for assisted living communities. No guarantee younger populations will buy other homes on site. Anyone 55+ will be able to buy units, not just Davis residents. Southern California, Bay Area, East Coast buyers; materials not forthcoming even if intended for current Davis residents. Estimate property and school parcel taxes? Desire to see more connectivity within project to greenbelt, bicycle safety, and accommodations for bike/pedestrian access.
- S. Mikesell: Anticipate what will be said in neighborhood meetings. City has many needs. Research park, student housing, senior housing, etc. Not opposed to senior housing, but is this the highest priority need in Davis? Project is low density. Densification is the unavoidable trend in housing today. Necessary reaction to Measure R development.
- H. Boschken: Site appropriate for development; not prime agricultural land. Market active seniors, amenities not listed. Overall design, very institutional. Form-based planning, appearance is important. Development may become reflective of “senior warehousing”. Curve-a-linear patterns can be used instead of cul-de-sacs. Segregated by housing type, may be more appropriate to create heterogeneous neighborhoods, intersperse throughout development, height variations, etc. Central activity center– synergistic reasons, intersperse other community centers throughout neighborhood. Consider access issues, pedestrian overpass to reach Marketplace.
- R. Hofmann: Ensure existing access compatible with emergency room access for Sutter Hospital. Number of trips for Ambulances to/from this type of development? Sutter employees marketable for housing? Consider improvements to access to Marketplace, crossings not reliable.

K. Hess: Environmental Impact Report topics include specifically addressing hospital access concerns/needs; including number of trips, can compare to existing senior developments in town. Recommendations expected in March. Will return to Planning Commission after.

8. Commission and Staff Communications

Assistant Director Community Development Ash Feeney: Commissioners Mikesell and Essex attended Planning Commission Conference, encourage attendance in future; valuable resources through CSU website. Requests for Qualifications issued for Core Area Specific Plan update. February 1 Cannabis workshop– Police Department, Mayor, and City Manager’s Office staffed, 80-100 attendees. Gauge community feelings about personal outdoor cultivation and commercial cannabis industry.

A. Upcoming Meeting Dates

A. Feeney: The next Planning Commission meeting tentatively scheduled to be held on Wednesday, February 22, 2016. Tentative movement on a couple of items scheduled next meeting. Cannabis ordinance to come before Planning Commission in March.

9. Adjournment.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.