



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

Commission Members: Herman Boschken, Marilee Hanson (Vice Chair), Stephen Mikesell, Darryl Rutherford, Stephen Streeter, David Robertson (Alternate)

Absent: Cheryl Essex, Rob Hofmann (Chair)

Staff: Assistant City Manager Mike Webb; Community Development & Sustainability Assistant Director Ashley Feeney; Planner Eric Lee

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 7:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

S. Mikesell moved, seconded by S. Streeter, to approve the agenda.

Motion passed by the following vote:

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Essex, Hofmann

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

None

4. Public Comment

- Jon Li: Lincoln 40— General Plan and CEQA are dysfunctional and should be replaced. Distributed charter city model based on communities over 10,000, map of Davis divided into 11 areas.

5. Regular Items

- A. Continued Public Hearing from July 19, 2017: Trackside Center Mixed-Use Project / 901-919 Third Street:** Planning Application #15-41 for Specific Plan Amendment #2-15; Preliminary Planned Development/Rezone #4-15; Final Planned Development #5-15, Design Review #15-15, Demolition #5-15, SCEA/Initial Study #4-17

Planner Eric Lee: Project summary— application to remove two existing one-story commercial buildings and construct a new four-story mixed-use building. The proposed 47,983 sq. ft. building will consist of retail space on the ground floor and 27 apartment units on the upper three floors, each ranging from 705 to 1,537 sq. ft. The building includes common areas for a manager's office, lobby, mailroom, bike storage, utility room, trash room, lounge and roof terrace. Site improvements include surface parking,

outdoor plaza, landscaping, drainage, sidewalks, pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Project site includes leased area along the west side from the Union Pacific Railroad Company. Project requires a Core Area Specific Plan amendment to allow increased density in a limited area, and clarification of the allowable floor area ratio. Project also requires Rezone of the site to a new Planned Development based on the existing Mixed-Use District but with project-specific development standards. Overview commission review process. Old East is a conservation district, not a designated historic district; project does not impair historical integrity of nearby resources. Traffic analysis— project would not exceed significance thresholds for intersections and road segments.

Community Development & Sustainability Assistant Director Ashley Feeney: Staff has determined the project is substantially consistent with guidelines.

Applicant presentation:

- Kemble Pope, project applicant: Owners are Davis residents. Property has been an active part of business scene. Outreach meetings, made changes in response— reduced number of resident units, reduced number of bedrooms, reduced height. Overview sustainability features. Showed 3D rendering of project.
- Steve Greenfield, applicant: One-way alley reconfiguration. Adding 6 new alley spaces, 1 new loading space. Opportunity site listed in land use policy. Project has 8' sidewalk, parking access from alley, activated ground floor retail, massing to the south and west as transition away from Old East Davis neighborhood.

Johnathon Flecker, KD Anderson & Associates: Traffic study consultant. Intersections in surrounding area. Future conditions based on Mace Ranch Innovation Center EIR set boundaries for intersections. Entire system operates acceptably. Third and Fourth Street intersections have a 5-6 second delay, level of service F; all others, C or better. Overview trip analysis and peak traffic conditions expected.

Jerry Hanson, SACOG: Support project. Broader regional perspective. Consistent with sustainable communities strategies and regional growth blueprint. Need infill projects in order to meet greenhouse gas reduction targets. Region is growing fast, housing in high demand but production is low. Aimed for 2/3rds of housing stock to be small lot or mixed use residential. Looking for these types of sites for walking/biking/enhanced access to train service. Encourage people to use other mode shares.

Vice Chair Hanson opened the public hearing.

- Michael Beckman, Mitch Tsui, Betty Woo, Elaine Roberts-Musser, Jeff Stromberg, Susan Kirby, George, Carson, Joseph, and Salma spoke in support of the project. Comments included: Design will strengthen vitality of downtown. Design guidelines are not as restrictive as code, meant to outline choices. Project meets guidelines. Project will improve blighted corner downtown. Project is sustainable. Unsustainable rental crisis affects all. Trackside is good start to address downtown housing needs. Density makes infill work, builds a vibrant downtown. Opportunity for young entrepreneurs. Support applicants local Davis residents, alternative is outside investors

come in and push weight around. Developers have tried to work with neighbors to address concerns. In danger of throwing away good projects in pursuit of perfect. Projects must pencil out for developers, city must either build up or out. Most don't want urban sprawl, but neighbors oppose infill projects. Development in Davis has become exceedingly difficult. Adhering to rigid guidelines is not a reasonable approach. Single-family residences will continue to become student dorms if we don't approve denser housing. Downtown core is exact area where density is appropriate. Time to move project forward.

- Ezra Beeman, Ken Gebhardt, Larry Guenther, Mark Grote, and Rhonda Reed, Old East Davis Neighborhood Association; Kyriakus Kyriakou; Lois Sherman; Anita Chai; Ashley Hill; Dan Rabin; Raymond Burdick; David Kreiger; Patty Kreiger; Rodney Kreiger; Alisha Kurich; Eileen Samitz; and Mary Kaltenbach spoke in opposition to the project. Comments included: Reports are cursory, vague, erroneous and incomplete. Staff did not acknowledge city intentions to encourage development north of the project. SB375 sustainable community strategy—does not supersede exercise of land use authority of cities and counties. Planning Commission should not take any action on the project, precedent-setting impacts. Neighbors have invested in purchase and maintenance of historic resources in district. Frustrated that project has pit neighbor against neighbor over past 2 years. Concerned about troubling pattern of planning in Davis. Guidelines are promises to neighborhood. Zoning ordinance is meant to assure that projects compatible with the community are approved. When language in municipal code and design guidelines conflict, more restrictive standard shall prevail. Building must appear to be in scale with traditional single-family houses along the street front. Project fails to make harmonious transition between Old East Davis and downtown. Creating density does not mean having to lose character of city and quality of life. Project should be redesigned to fit guidelines. Neighbors support mixed use 3-story building with a step-back design. Initial study inadequately analyzes indirect and cumulative impacts of mass and scale. Traffic, lights, smells, noise and fumes are significant adverse impacts on neighbors. No affordable housing in project. Toxic issue—remedial grading will be required, yet no mitigation measures are discussed in initial study. Traffic study is insufficient, did not consider number of trips by trucks using loading and unloading zones. Oppose new loading/unloading and parking on alley.
- Marilyn Underwood, Old North Davis Neighborhood Association: Presented OND-NA motion: Very few historical neighborhoods in Davis. Ask that City adhere to and enforce downtown design guidelines, following DMC 40.13A.02(b). Engage applicant in collaborative redesign. City should support neighborhoods by addressing concerns regarding infill development.

Vice Chair Hanson closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission recessed at 9:26 p.m. and reconvened at 9:34 p.m.

Commissioner comments:

- H. Boschken: Lack of information to make full decision. Would be prepared to vote yes if have proper information. Otherwise would be a well-designed project.

- M. Hanson: Not enough evidence in record to make findings. Finding that project is consistent. Not clear based on discussion. Finding of adequacy of initial study. Issues. Finding about compatibility, issue of surrounding neighborhood and if lease land is lost. Haven't heard evidence that finding harmonious in character with surrounding neighborhood. Circulation and traffic analysis focused on level of service rather than compatibility in use of alley, safety concerns. Neighborhood bought properties thinking the guidelines meant something. Should require people to abide by them or get rid of them. Pattern of bringing projects with inadequate information. City shouldn't break the rules for additional housing. Developer should work with neighborhood to come up with project that is acceptable. Legal concerns about railroad lease. Need to evaluate what happens if lease is lost. No guarantee.
- S. Mikesell: Support receiving comments from staff. If Commission is to provide input, should have full information that will be presented to Council. City Council should revise or clarify intention of Neighborhood Design Guidelines. If guidelines are enforceable, then project is in violation of standards in place.
- S. Streeter: Would support project. Concerned about some sightlines. Suggest screening of upper windows to address privacy impacts. Would like to know more about hazard issue in vicinity.
- D. Robertson: Concern over inconsistency in planning documents, more restrictive standards apply. Staff responses to citizen comments should have been prepared in time for commission deliberation. If going to densify, project is well designed. Have problem with procedures. If confident that have flexibility to go to 4 stories, could recommend project. Not ready to recommend anything on environmental review. Hard to recommend a project when have concerns about environmental review.
- D. Rutherford: Landscaping. Drought tolerant. Native pollinators. Beneficial to living in ag region. Hazardous plume. Doesn't just affect future residents. Type of project that is potentially the future of Davis. Project is precedent setting. Appreciate good project, but some of the procedures are unsettling.

H. Boschken moved to determine the findings are incomplete, and the Planning Commission has insufficient information to make a recommendation to City Council. No second.

Eric Lee: Applicant is working with consultant on a response to water flow hazard concerns. If lease space is lost, Planned Development has requirements to address parking, open space, loss of lease land, etc. Initial study addresses majority of comments received. Staff is preparing responses relative to technical issues, such as toxics question. Will include additional analysis and responses to the City Council.

A. Feeney: Request commission make decision tonight. Can provide comments on environmental issues. Substantive issues that commission wants to have Council address. Would be helpful for staff to finalize documents with input from commission.

Assistant City Attorney Ethan Walsh: Council is looking for a recommendation on the CEQA document and project itself. Provide commission insight so that when complete array is in front of them, they can make a decision.

D. Robertson moved, seconded by M. Hanson, to recommend that the City Council not adopt the SCEA/IS for the stated reasons: lack of staff responses to comments, hazardous materials issues, and points of uncertainty.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Hanson, Mikesell, Robertson, Streeter

NOES: Rutherford

D. Robertson moved, seconded by H. Boschken, to recommend the City Council approve the planning applications for the project, including the Specific Plan Amendment Resolution and Rezone/Planned Development Ordinance.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Robertson, Rutherford, Streeter

NOES: Hanson, Mikesell

D. Robertson moved, seconded by H. Boschken, to recommend the City Council approve the project planning applications for Final Planned Development and Demolition.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Robertson, Rutherford, Streeter

NOES: Hanson, Mikesell

D. Robertson moved, seconded by S. Mikesell, to recommend that the City Council not approve Planning Application project Design Review based on concerns of consistency with prior application of the design guidelines in regards to other projects.

Motion passed by the following vote:

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

NOES: None

Planning Commission recessed at 11:03 and reconvened at 11:04

B. Public Hearing: Grande Village (formerly known as Grande School Site, located at the south side of Grande Avenue near Intersection of Mercedes Avenue): Planning Application #16-08: Revised Final Planned Development #01-16

Community Development & Sustainability Assistant Director Ashley Feeney: Request for approval of a Revised Final Planned Development to allow modification of previously approved zoning standards on 17 of the 41 Grande Village lots as they relate to lot coverage, floor area ratio, usable open space, second-story side setbacks, and first-story rear setbacks.

Don Fouts, applicant: Looking for refinements. Accommodate more desirable floor plans; accommodate homebuyer's requests for single-story houses. Greater flexibility in living space designs. Keep integrity of original setbacks with minor exceptions. Indicative of craftsman bungalow style.

Vice Chair Hanson opened the public hearing.

- Mike Dugger: Disruption occurs in neighborhoods during development. Need to be aware of how much it affects the neighbors.

Vice Chair Hanson closed the public hearing.

S. Streeter moved, seconded by S. Mikesell, as follows:

1. Determine that the proposed project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15305 as minor alterations in land use limitations that do not result in any changes in land use or density, and that Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the subdivision in 2008 adequately addressed the environmental impacts of developing the subject site with 41 single-family residential homes and no adverse information or changes in condition have been identified or associated with the proposed project to warrant additional review.
2. Approve Revised Final Planned Development #01-16, subject to the findings and conditions of approval.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Mikesell, Boschken, Streeter, Rutherford

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hanson (recuse), Robertson (recuse)

6. Commission and Staff Communications

None

A. Upcoming Meeting Dates

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled to be held on September 13, 2017. Anticipate Lincoln 40 EIR on October 25.

7. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 11:21 p.m.