



City of Davis
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, January 10, 2018

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

Absent: Darryl Rutherford

Staff: Community Development/Sustainability Director Ashley Feeney; Community Development Administrator Katherine Hess; Planner Ike Njoku

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

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

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Mikesell, Robertson, Streeter, Rowe

NOES: None

ABSENT: Rutherford

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Community Development/Sustainability Director Ash Feeney: Welcome Greg Rowe, new commissioner.

4. Public Comment

Jon Li: Viable System model. Downtown Plan Advisory Committee will tour downtown at its Thursday, January 25th meeting.

5. Regular Items

A. Public Hearing: Lincoln40 Project: Planning Application #16-01 for Gateway / Olive Drive Specific Plan Amendment #1-16 Relative to General Plan Amendment #3-16; Zoning Amendment #2-16, Affordable Housing Plan #3-16; Lot Merger #1-16; Vacation of Right of Way #3-16, Design Review #10-16, Demolition #4-16; Development Agreement; and Environmental Impact Report #3-16.

Planner Ike Njoku: Brief project summary— proposed residential 5.92-acre infill project, consisting of a 249,788-sq. ft., 130-unit apartment building with 708 beds, a bicycle parking, vehicle parking, swimming pool, various amenities and site improvements. The project would include a mix of two- to five-bedroom fully furnished units, primarily designed as student-oriented housing. Provided Site Plan overview— 5-story, single-

structure building; conceptual bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing; LEED Gold equivalency. Addressed in staff report public comments received— policy, land use, development standards, and site plan questions. Trees— mitigation measures to preserve trees.

Nick Pappani, EIR Consultant, Raney Planning and Management: Summarize environmental review timeline. Draft EIR consistency with Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) qualified for CEQA streamlining. Although not required to describe or discuss, City elected to discuss growth inducing impacts, alternative locations, densities, building intensities, aesthetics or parking impacts. No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified. Final EIR includes written responses to all comment letters received on Draft EIR. Master responses: Hazardous substances concerns in project vicinity— soil vapor assessment conducted, results indicate that hazard is present in deep soil beneath project site 40 feet, just above groundwater levels at site; due to low permeability of soil, actual concentrations will be shallow, calculated cancer risk less than CPA risk levels. Max depth of project excavation is 10-12 feet. Bike/Ped Overcrossing—Peak hour analysis for addition traffic generates, would not require additional bicycle or vehicle signals. Project will not have significant impact, cumulative build-out will impact at intersection. Potential mitigation to extend existing bike lane on Olive Drive, or to increase green time at intersection. Overview Consistency Analysis— transit priority project must meet criteria to be declared sustainable communities project.

Community Development & Sustainability Director Ash Feeney: Olive Drive Bike/Pedestrian Overcrossing— not intended as mitigation to any project impacts. Planned as part of Olive Drive Specific Plan. Developer contribution to construction. Future actions— apply for statewide grants, evaluate priorities for SACOG ATP grants. If project is not approved, City will still evaluate options for funding overcrossing construction. Community Enhancement Funds— negotiated through Development Agreement, looking at project impacts on city services; identified parks, open space, public safety, and general facilities. Student complexes city service demands less impact than multi-family complexes. Affordable Housing project— Lincoln Lift Program, fully integrated units, fully furnished apartment, same package as market rate units, full access to project amenities, no distinction between affordable and market rate units.

Applicant presentation:

Paul Gradeff, Highbridge Properties: Market trending toward rent-by-the-bed housing options for students and young professionals. Overview of the project, site plan, buffer from nearest surrounding single family homes; minimize impacts on surrounding homes. Project features— LEED Gold equivalency; EV charging stations, on-site ride share program, 14k sq. ft. secure access to building amenities and units. Roommate matching, students not responsible for maintenance of entire homes, etc. Full time management and 24/7 presence on the property. Affordable program— LincolnLift Program; project-specific affordable program that integrates 71 beds to be rented to students at affordable rates. 10% of total beds will be affordable in perpetuity; 50% market-rate rooms affordable by design. Sustainable Development, disincentivize automobile usage.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

- Alan Pryor: Calculation should be 248 beds as affordable low-income by current standards. Applicant is not consistent with City ordinance. Should have larger solar or commitment to purchase City energy.
- Robert Canning, Old East Davis Neighborhood Association: Neighborhood has been part of process and signed a non-binding MOU with applicant.
- Eric Gudz: Active citizens of community forced to move outside of City and find housing elsewhere. City must do its part.
- Susan Kirby, Davis Chamber of Commerce: Support Lincoln40 project. Davis General Plan supports adequate supply of housing.
- Connor Gorman: Davis and UCD both need increased, dense housing. Project needs additional affordable units.
- Nicole, Josh Dalavai, Alice, Isaiah Moore, Emma Shipman, Jake Segly, ASUCD Senator, Roy Tgai, De la Rosa, Jaqueline, Francis Montano, Smi Methra, Kevin Colber, Alex Meyer, Brittney, Alyssa Burns, Niko, Aaron Ladduck, and Don Gibson, ASUCD housing Task Force: Support Lincoln40.
- Tim Hoban: Piecemeal planning. Not support Lincoln40.
- Adam Hatafi: Regular affordable housing does not apply to students. Affordability will increase once housing supply increases.
- Ellie White: Protesting housing crisis. Want to see income-based affordable model for housing.
- Emily Frankle: Lincoln40 project will displace individuals.
- Maya: No incentive for developers to provide more affordable housing. Support project in hope of future projects.
- Veronica Thompson: Student housing is minimal and not affordable.
- Taren Swolland: Davis College Democrats unanimously voted to support student-targeted housing projects in Davis.
- David McGlocklin: Affordability component needs to be addressed.
- Elizabeth: Former president DCD. Support Lincoln40. Project needs additional affordability and sustainability components.
- Susan Ranier: Some aspects of project need to be corrected. Submitted comments—health and safety concerns; not support cul-de-sac design; emergency vehicle access and pedestrian/bicycle safety concerns. Risk Management—public safety issues.
- Elaine Roberts-Musser: Support Lincoln40 if meets net neutral, no cost for City. Addresses student housing needs; good infill project. Project can bring vitality to area; affordable rentals are added benefit to project.
- Connor Ben: Dense infill housing projects will free up multi-family complexes and single-family homes in Davis. Support affordable component of project.
- Dan: Housing is at critical point in community. Support housing projects in Davis. Inclusionary housing policy in City is onerous, massive tax on components that are most needed in community. Only way to alleviate the costs associated with housing crisis is to build more housing.
- Eileen Samitz: Developer impact fees still need to be worked out. Mega-dorm models do not provide housing for everyone. Project still needs to be fleshed out.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

Meeting recessed at 9:34 p.m. and reconvened at 9:46 p.m.

Fred Choa, Fehr & Peers: Traffic analysis— AM Peak hour, 120 additional bike trips expected with project. Estimated 40% of all students cycle, 30% walk, 8% transit, remainder would take vehicles.

A. Feeney: Palmer legal case, inclusionary housing requirements challenged. Ruling that inclusionary housing is impediment to production of multi-family housing. Council looking at multi-family inclusionary program ordinance, in process. Overcrossing cost analysis— area of benefit to recuperating costs for overcrossing.

I. Njoku: Lexington Apartments also required to pay a percentage into overcrossing fund. Natural Resources Commission discussed photovoltaic issue. Meets LEED Gold equivalency. Most of the equipment to meet energy efficiency standards to be placed on roof, may be planned in design phase.

Commissioner comments:

- D. Robertson: Concerned that City is so far behind on housing, large developments do not make a huge dent in the issue. 1800 units added housing units will meet 45% of existing students. Concern with legality to restrict units to student-only.
- G. Rowe: University should be providing housing for students. UC Davis Long Range Development Plan— 6,200 students, proposing 90% of increased enrollment will be housed by 2030. Concerned that burdening developer with additional requirements will only delay process further. May be some need for some studio and 1-bedroom units in the future.
- C. Essex: Feel that benefits of the project to provide needed housing outweighs loss of ornamental and native trees for this site. Affordable Housing program, support Social Services Commission statements.
- H. Boschken: Linear layout of the building in relationship to South and West would be ideal location for photovoltaic options for rooftop and/or parking areas.
- R. Hofmann: Concern with pursuit of LEED Gold equivalency. Concerns with affordable housing program. Not support lower impact fee multiplier. Would like to see bike loan program.

H. Boschken moved, seconded by S. Mikesell, to recommend that the City Council certify the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the project and adopt the Findings of Fact and Mitigation Monitoring Plan. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Mikesell, Robertson, Streeter, Rowe

NOES: None

ABSENT: Rutherford

H. Boschken moved, seconded by D. Roberston, to approve the following Lincoln40 project planning applications, subject to the findings and conditions of approval, as amended by staff:

- a. Gateway / Olive Drive Specific Plan Amendment that consists of General Plan, Specific Plan, Zoning, and Design Guidelines;
- b. Development Agreement;
- c. Affordable Housing Plan;
- d. Lot Merger
- e. Vacation of Hickory Lane Right of Way (ROW)
- f. Design Review; and
- g. Demolition.

C. Essex proposed Friendly Amendment: Recommend support the Social Services Commission recommendations that affordable housing program should be given considerations as follows:

- Upfront money into the Housing Trust Fund;
- The marketing period should be changed from 30 days to 60 days; and
- A higher number of affordable beds should be required.

Not accepted.

D. Roberston / S. Mikesell / S. Streeter: Social Services Commission recommendation should go forward separately from Planning Commission recommendation.

R. Hofmann proposed Friendly Amendment: Increase impact fee multiplier. Not accepted.

R. Hofmann proposed Friendly Amendment: Encourage the applicant to evaluate feasibility of instituting a bike loan program as part of on-site amenities offered to prospective residents. Accepted by mover and second.

D. Robertson: Concerned that costs for program may be passed through to the students.

Motion as amended passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Mikesell, Robertson, Streeter, Rowe
NOES: None
ABSENT: Rutherford

G. Rowe moved, seconded by R. Hofmann to continue meeting.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Boschken, Essex, Hofmann, Mikesell, Robertson, Streeter, Rowe
NOES: None
ABSENT: Rutherford

B. West Davis Active Adult Community Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Community Development Katherine Hess: Proposed development on 74-acre site to include 332 for-sale units; Activity and Wellness Center; and University Retirement Community expansion. 80 percent of the units, including 150 affordable units, are

proposed to be age-restricted (55 and over).

EIR Consultant Elise Carroll, De Novo Planning Group: Overview Draft EIR topics. Significant and unavoidable impacts— aesthetics, scenic vistas; agricultural resources adjacent ag conflicts; air quality exceedance of emissions threshold for particulate matter; transportation/circulation issues. Comments received at this meeting will be summarized by staff for inclusion in the Final EIR (FEIR).

Public comments:

- Eric Gudz: Address EIR process; additional considerations to growth boundary of the City.
- John Taylor: The concerns of the current University Retirement Community residents have not been addressed.

K. Hess: Transportation/circulation impacts have potential mitigation, but are not within control of the applicant. City would need to work with CalTrans and/or Sutter Hospital for mitigation. Applicant will pay into mitigation fund, as a result.

G. Rowe: Suggest transportation/circulation impacts, would appreciate some diagrams of concerning areas of impact.

6. Commission and Staff Communications

A. Davis Downtown Advisory Committee Liaison Update

S. Streeter: Attended inaugural meeting of the DPAC in place of Hofmann and Essex. Introduced consultant team. Presentation on form-based planning. Members have been asked to submit words/phrase/photos that reflect individual visions for downtown at the next meeting.

A. Feeney: Staff can send the commission a schedule of meetings if commission members are interested in attending as private citizens.

B. Upcoming Meeting Dates

A. Feeney: The next Planning Commission meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held on Wednesday, January 24, 2018; Cannery marketplace, Nishi project entitlements and addendum to EIR. City Council must take action for June 2018 election by February 6th. Several design review projects coming to the Commission on February 14. Cannabis dispensary CUP applications tentatively coming forward on February 28 and March 14.

7. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 11:31 p.m.