City of Davis
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, June 28, 2017
7:00 P.M.

Commission Members: Herman Boschken, Cheryl Essex, Rob Hofmann (Chair), Stephen Mikesell, Darryl Rutherford, Stephen Streeter, David Robertson (Alternate)

Absent: Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair)

Staff: Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess

1. Call to Order
Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda
S. Mikesell moved, seconded H. Boschken, to approve the agenda as listed.
AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Mikesell, Rutherford, Streeter, Robertson
NOES: None
ABSENT: Hanson

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons
None

4. Public Comment
   - David Carlson: Thank Commission for work on commercial cannabis ordinance. Blessed Extracts application for tenancy and conditional use permit. Will come before the commission. Share contact information, available for questions/comments.
   - Mark Grote, Old East Davis Neighborhood Association: Invite commission to neighborhood meeting on Trackside proposal. Neighborhood is requesting time to meet. Shared contact information.

5. Consent Calendar
A. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of May 24, 2017
C. Essex moved, seconded by S. Streeter, to approve the minutes, as amended to include Essex comments regarding Mace Triangle property.
Motion passed by the following vote:
AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Mikesell, Streeter, Robertson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Rutherford
ABSENT: Hanson
6. Regular Items

A. **Public Hearing: Modification: 1111 Richards Boulevard Hotel with Meeting Room:** Planning Application #17-33; Conditional Use Permit #2-17, Design Review #14-17

Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess: Introduce City Attorney Harriet Steiner. Provide project overview. Proposed four-story, 110-room hotel on 2.82-acre parcel. Revised previously approved project as reviewed by the Planning Commission in March. The current application reduces building height from five to four stories and 74’6” to 65 feet, retains the meeting room and top-floor lounge, reduces the number of rooms by 17 percent, and replaces a 15-space parking area with a 14,000 sq. ft. courtyard and pool area. Increased meeting room size for additional event space uses. Overview design components, parking, solar, etc. Planning analysis—consistent with Olive Drive Specific Plan, requires CUP and Design Review approval by commission. Environmental review analysis—lesser or equivalent significant impacts from previous review.

Chair Hofmann opened public hearing:

- Mike Levis, applicant team: Thank staff for efforts. Significant upgrades, Tapestry brand is one scale up from Embassy Suites. More opportunities, courtyard will make up for decrease in rooms. Hospitality suites and meeting rooms. More options, will distinguish from other hoteliers in town. Revenue projecting 10% increase, higher daily rate and occupancy rate. Market rate expected to be $20-25 more per room than previous proposal. Initial approval photovoltaic (PV) requirements, can look at adding panels to rooftop as an alternative. Can analyze during construction planning, to add solar on rooftops—space area on two-story side of building. Estimate 300-400 capacity in conference/meeting room space. Panel walls available to divide rooms, and additional hospitality suites directly upstairs. Olive Drive property behind parcel may be used for overflow parking. Acquired adjacent property with intent to provide additional uses in relation to proposed hotel use.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

D. Rutherford: Encourage applicant to work with local union representatives. Consider community enhancements. Request that applicant consider willingness to work with Yolo County Housing, for short-term housing vouchers.

C. Essex: Disappointed at size reduction in proposed project. Solar panels between the trees, not productive location placement as compared to on the roof? Southside of parking lot is highly vegetated.

K. Hess: City third party verification for PV uses. City is not a party to solar requirements, outlined as part of settlement agreement. Standalone PV on an awning along with rooftop panels may be feasible. City will require checklist and third-party evaluation of solar efficiency in order to meet LEED Gold equivalent standards. Condition 12 — parking management plan must be reviewed and/or modified as necessary. Self-correcting
problem if event parking. May need to return to Planning Commission to modify CUP, if significant issues arise.

D. Robertson: Concerns with enforcement mechanism in place, particularly if event parking is unmanageable. No guarantee for enforcing off-site parking on Olive Drive. Complaint-based system.

K. Hess: Conditions of approval include parking management plan, can include valet parking, shuttle. Meeting uses are accessory uses to the hotel use. Mechanism for shuttle or ride-sharing business conditions.

H. Steiner: requires on-site off-site parking, required to be periodically reviewed. Prior to occupancy things may be changed. Does not mean will not occupy. Room for modification, modify parking management plan and management of on-site events. Least number of cars, used in most efficient way possible - encourage attendees to use sustainable, efficient modes of transportation.

S. Streeter: Request status update of off-site parking lot, 25-30 spaces, previously proposed. Possibility for lot to be utilized for overflow parking?

K Hess: City will be releasing bid for lot surfacing and striping. Potentially proposed as X-permit parking for downtown employees. Ultimately will be City Council determination as to how lot will be used.

H. Boschken moved, seconded by S. Mikesell, to:
1. Approve Conditional Use Permit application #02-17 for revisions to the previously-approved hotel at 1111 Richards Boulevard, permitting a hotel with up to 110 rooms, with approximately 6,500 sq. ft. meeting room and courtyard;
2. Approve Design Review application #014-17 for revisions to the previously-approved project site plan and architecture, based on the findings and subject to the conditions; with minor adjustments for consistency with approved changes.

D. Rutherford: Request applicant consider comments. If project returns to commission, request follow-up to comments made.

Motion passed by the following vote:
AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Mikesell, Rutherford, Streeter, Robertson
NOES: None
ABSENT: Hanson

7. Commission and Staff Communications
D. Rutherford: Joint meeting with City Council— disappointed in timing of meeting and items up for discussion. Large focus on housing, not adequately addressing needs for mechanisms in Davis for young families to enter into home ownership. Request staff effort to allow teleconference participation in discussion. Concerned that focus primarily lies on student housing rather than young working families. Will negatively impact quality of life in Davis if mechanisms are not in place to allow young professionals to enter into home ownership.
D. Robertson: Request input for discussion pertinent to existing needs in City. Minimize dialog on topics already known, need straightforward discussion of conflicting policies in place currently in City. Need an established partnership between commission and Council, understanding of policy direction, expectations and Commission’s role in nexus discussions. Open dialog to assist in making more effective recommendations.

R. Hofmann: Considering purview of commission, may be in best interest to request multiple joint discussions with the Council. Potentially review other mechanisms to receive additional policy direction from Council.

S. Streeter: Would like to understand what commission can do about recommending projects provide community enhancements? Concur with previous comments regarding mechanisms to receive additional policy direction. Suggest periodic communication with Council liaisons.

A. Upcoming Meeting Dates

Adjournment.
Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.