



**City of Davis**  
**Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616**  
**Wednesday, June 14, 2017**  
**7:00 P.M.**

Commission Members: Herman Boschken, Cheryl Essex, Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair, arrived 7:08 p.m.); Rob Hofmann (Chair), Stephen Mikesell, Darryl Rutherford, Stephen Streeter

Absent: David Robertson (Alternate)

Staff: Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess; Planner Cathy Camacho; Planning Technician Tom Callinan

---

**1. Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 7:02 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

D. Rutherford moved, seconded by S. Streeter, to approve the agenda as listed.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex; Hofmann, Mikesell, Rutherford, Streeter

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hanson, Robertson

**3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons**

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: Ace Hardware Planning Commission action appeal going to City Council on June 20. Lincoln40 Draft Environmental Impact Report to be released, Planning Commission hearing scheduled on July 26.

**4. Public Comment**

- David Krieger and Mark Grote, Old East Davis Neighborhood Association (OEDNA) spoke in opposition to the proposed Trakside project: Upcoming Planning Commission item. Neighbors concerned with mass and scale of Trakside project, does not meet design guidelines. Traffic and street safety concerns—narrow alley to be converted into busy street. Project has not been adequately vetted for impacts. Submit letter outlining neighborhood concerns.
- Colin Walsh: Mace Ranch Innovation Center EIR refers to project proposal and master owners association; references documents that cannot be reviewed without a project.

M. Hanson arrived at 7:08 p.m.

**5. Regular Items**

**A. Public Hearing: Appeal of Administrative Approval for New Multi-Family Housing Development / 820 B Street and 822 B Street:** Planning Application #17-30, Appeal #2-17 of Planning Application #16-43: Design Review #15-16, Minor Modification #1-17.

Planner Cathy Camacho: Provide overview— proposal to merge two adjacent parcels into a single parcel for development of a three-story, 11-unit multi-family building of approximately 15,749 sq. ft.. A Minor Modification was requested to increase the maximum allowable height of the building by 3 ft. to provide peaked roof for improved building aesthetics. Administrative approval based on findings of compatibility with existing properties and anticipated future developments within the vicinity, and consistency with permitted uses under current zoning. Appeal was filed during the 10-day appeal period. Overview staff responses to issues raised in appeal. Applicant neighborhood outreach efforts began in Spring 2015, modifications made in response to comments. First proposal for increased density and incentives under new state law.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

- John Wolfe; Beth Foraker; Nancy and Richard Chadwick; Leon Caripelli; Wendell Range; Wendy Silk; John Foraker; Dave DeYoung; and Susan spoke in opposition to the project. Comments included: Process issue, project should not have been approved administratively. Currently not the project neighbors initially met about. Façade does not fit neighborhood. Property value impact concerns. Project may meet City zoning requirements, doesn't mean project is appropriate for neighborhood. Not true to infill guidelines. Neighbors not against infill, concerned with over-crowding. Density of project makes up more than the number of units within 6 blocks of site; will likely be more than 16 residents on site. Building is too tall; higher than any building on the street. Project will impact traffic, B Street is a speedway since removal of on-street parking, resident issues exiting driveways. Decision for extra affordable unit was not made in good faith. Applicant is taking advantage of process.
- Leon G: Address interests of the neighborhood residents. Developers must also look at quality of life impacts on neighborhood. History of crime between number of units of developments, important consideration that has not been raised.
- Betty Woo, architect: Property shape did not allow for original townhome proposal. Proposed project is same one proposed at neighborhood meetings, has been reduced and modified. Intent was for project to fit in current zoning. Have done many projects that fall within 10% modification, subject to administrative review. Project proposes higher setback than actually required. On-site parking provided for all units, 13 spaces altogether. Overview open space area and landscaping. Architecture chosen for diversity.
- Kemble Pope, Applicant: Provide property/project history. Project has been re-designed a number of times. Submitted arborist report with application— largest Valley Oak on site to be preserved; two oak trees in poor condition will be removed to accommodate additional parking spaces. Will pay into City fund for removal of trees. Roofline choice intended to mirror residential aesthetic. Overview neighborhood outreach efforts. Not intended for student housing. Thank commission and neighbors for meeting.
- Dana Stokes: Serving professionals, envision two cars per unit. Where will residents park, where will overflow parking be?
- Colin Walsh: Bicycle parking lockers that could be used as extra storage rather than as bicycle amenities should not be considered toward parking incentive.
- Pastor Jeff, Davis Lutheran Church: Concerned with project utilizing church parking lot as overflow parking.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

Commissioner comments:

- S. Streeter: Apartment buildings located near site. Three story is better fit than original proposed four stories. Street delineation between high density and single-family residences. Increased density may be appropriate.
- S. Mikesell: 41 bicycle spaces proposed compared to 16 required by City; proposed to meet incentives for reduction in parking spaces and affordable unit. Davis must inevitably face infill development. Project consistent with zoning requirements, but qualitative judgements must include review of compatibility and appropriateness with neighborhood. Support appeal.
- M. Hanson: Ability to provide specific project features do not mean such features are necessary or appropriate. Infill guidelines— concerned that City did not uphold responsibility to mitigate size and scale. Plenty of projects in Davis set better examples. Project does not fit neighborhood. Acknowledge need for housing, but better project can be proposed for site. Support appeal.
- D. Rutherford: Lack of growth in City, many long-time residents used to small town. Need to consider how City will accommodate future growth through infill. Appreciate project applicant proposal of affordable unit. Architectural design could better fit neighborhood. Support denial of appeal. Commission will likely see similar projects of this scale in the future.
- R. Hofmann: Surrounding uses residential neighborhood. Site is in transitional cutout zoned Residential High Density. Zoning requires compatibility with neighborhood. Transitional zone, inclusion of mixed-use. Concerned that project did not come before the commission prior to administrative approval.
- C. Essex: Suggest retain three valley oaks, and coast live oak on site. Consider preservation of the trees. Concerned project design does not fit neighborhood. Does not mitigate for mass, scale of project. Support infill, density, addition of affordable unit, and additional housing near core area. Urge City to address neighbor concerns regarding B Street traffic.
- H. Boschken: Clash of history with new development. What does commission have authority to do in relation to project appeals? Specific rules related to Transitional districts. Recognize staff for working within parameters. Can appreciate concerns raised by neighbors who have lived in neighborhood for many years. Infill, future development changes are inevitable.

D. Rutherford moved, seconded by H. Boschken, to deny Planning Application #17-30, Appeal #2-17 appealing the administrative approval of Planning Application #16-43, Design Review #15-16, Minor Modification #1-17 for a new multi-family housing development located at 820 B and 822 B Street.

C. Essex proposed a Friendly Amendment: If appeal is denied, and project moves forward, request add condition to retain the four trees on site. Accepted by mover and second.

Motion failed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Rutherford, Streeter

NOES: Mikesell, Essex, Hanson, Hofmann

Meeting recessed at 9:14 p.m. and reconvened at 9:22 p.m.

**B. Continued Public Hearing from May 24, 2017: Davis Gas and Shop / 4480 Chiles Road:** Planning Application #14-79: Negative Declaration #3-17, Rezone #8-14, Lot Line Adjustment #2-14, Conditional Use Permit #10-14, Design Review #27-14, Demolition #4-17.

Planner Cathy Camacho: Provide project overview— applicant request for entitlements for improvements to site, construction of a new 2,800 sq. ft. convenience food store with fast food service and seating area; installation of photovoltaics on the existing fuel canopy; accessibility upgrades; additional vehicle parking spaces and installation of bicycle racks; landscaping improvements; and new trash enclosure. The bathroom structure on site will be demolished, and the carwash and kiosk on site will be retained. New trees on site and landscaping to add greenery to site. Staff determines project consistency with General Plan and Zoning; appropriate conditions address standard City requirements; proposal will enhance and update the overall appearance of site. Applicant proposes a lot line adjustment with the adjacent property to the south, to be approved at a later time.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

- Robert Egan, Applicant: Thank commission for opportunity.
- Chuck Ryles, represent University Honda: Honda owns rear lot, used as overflow lot for storage. No intention to rezone or develop rear yard. Easement allows Honda to transport dealership vehicles to/from overflow lot.
- Connor Gorman: Removing previous bathroom structures. In all similar projects moved forward, should be public, gender-neutral bathrooms.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

S. Streeter moved, seconded by C. Essex, to recommend that that the City Council take the following actions:

1. Determine that Negative Declaration #3-175 prepared for this project adequately addresses the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.
2. Adopt the Ordinance amending the zoning designation on land to be transferred to 4480 Chiles Road from 4601 Cowell Boulevard through a Lot Line 8-adjustment from “PD #1-77” to “Commercial Mixed Use.”
3. Approve the following entitlement applications, based on the findings and subject to the conditions:
  - a. Conditional Use Permit for auto service station and accessory uses.
  - b. Design Review of site plan and building design for new convenience store.
  - c. Demolition of existing bathroom structure.

Add two conditions of approval:

- Electric Vehicle charging station
- Landscaping to attract local pollinators.

Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting recessed at 9:35 p.m. and reconvened at 9:41 p.m.

**C. Public Hearing: New Building Construction / 612 Cantrill Drive:** Planning Application #17-27; Final Planned Development #03-17; Design Review #11-17.

Planning Technician Tom Callinan: Provide project overview. Final Planned Development and Design Review for construction of a 9,680 sq. ft. single-story commercial building for warehouse uses on an existing 21,780 sq. ft. vacant parcel. Building will have three overhead bay doors for loading and open floorplan with no interior partition walls except for a bathroom and potential vestibule for front entryway. Proposed parking area at the rear of the building to provide 11 parking spaces. Future tenants limited to low-intensity uses, applications to be reviewed on case-by-case basis. Overview site plan, elevations, proposed building materials and landscaping. Access easement shared driveway with adjacent site. Staff proposing revision to Condition #15 (Building Materials).

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

- Dwayne Thompson, architect: Designed project to meet Davis standards. Provide background of project plans and design. Materials and design intended to mirror agricultural heritage of community. Building will be insulated to meet Title 24 standards, building code requires solar ready design. Solar not currently proposed. Owner will use part of the building, will lease another portion of the building.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

S. Mikesell moved, seconded by C. Essex, as follows:

1. Determine that the proposed project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(c) as new construction of a commercial building not involving the use of significant amounts of hazardous substances and not exceeding 10,000 square feet in an urbanized area on a site zoned for such use where all necessary public services and facilities are available and the surrounding area is not environmentally sensitive; and
2. Approve Planning Application #17-27 for Final Planned Development #03-17, and Design Review #11-17, to allow the construction of a new commercial building at 612 Cantrill Drive based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval, with the following amendment:
  - Revise Condition#15 Building Materials to read: “shall provide secondary building material on frontage of building”.

Motion passed unanimously.

**6. Commission and Staff Communications**

**A. Upcoming Meeting Dates**

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: June 28—next meeting will be held. July 11— City Council/Planning Commission joint meeting.

**7. Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 10:01 p.m.