



City of Davis
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Wednesday, August 22, 2018
7:00 P.M.

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

Staff: Community Development & Sustainability Director Heidi Tschudin/
Planner & Historical Resources Manager Ike Njoku

1. Call to Order. Chair Hofmann called the meeting to order at 7p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

D. Robertson moved, seconded by S. Mikesell, to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

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

4. Public Comment. None.

5. Regular Items

A. Downtown Plan, Check-in Meeting

H. Tschudin: Questions for discussion: Do you generally support the planning concepts being presented at this stage of the planning process? Do you have any concerns, see any fatal flaws, or feel that significant changes in course direction are needed?

Dan Parolek, Opticos Design Inc.: Summary of public input process, guiding principles and major concepts developed at this stage of the planning process, prior to drafting a specific plan. Planning Commission comments will be provided to City Council for their check-in meeting on September 11, 2018. Urban Design recommendations and strategies: Establish a hierarchy of scales, network of unique sub-areas, think about incremental and big moves, E Street Plaza as Davis Town Square, public realm = universal design. Mobility and street design: introduce modal prioritization. Parking and transportation demand management, economics, sustainability, historic resources. Next steps: Council check-in, administrative draft specific plan distributed, public workshop/online questionnaire, public review and hearings on draft specific plan, form based code and an Environmental Impact Report.

Meg Arnold, Downtown Plan Advisory Committee Chair: Pleased with work of consulting team, excellent guidance about future of transportation. Support opportunities for community input and efforts to enhance vitality. Well designed increases in density will

serve us well. Generally support increased building heights in appropriate locations downtown. Universal design topic has recently arisen, essential to incorporate from beginning of planning efforts. Predictability and certainty—form based codes will benefit both neighborhoods and developers. Financial viability—needs to be for city as well as businesses, property owners and developers. Need more attention to economic strategy overall, flexibility to make projects economically viability. Interested in being sustainable leader. Prioritize parking management before adding new parking. Support creation of downtown center, expanding E Street Plaza to invigorate downtown. Street hierarchies makes sense. Possibility for near term action on 2 topics—bank branches, potential to change city's requirement to be located downtown; modify city fee structure to encourage small housing units downtown.

Commissioner comments:

- Sara Zimmerman, Civic Arts Commission: Will invite CAC to discuss and provide formal response to plan. Suggest better signage for bike paths; affordability for art, artists, and small businesses.
- S. Streeter: Consider pedicabs from outside locations. Support universal design.
- D. Rutherford: Generally support concepts. Concerns regarding financing, incentivize property owners to buy-in, how will phasing work, other resources—parking fees to be reinvested, etc.
- G. Rowe: Challenge with many small property owners. Need more density, higher buildings. Concern—housing need for people in lower paying jobs. Consider removing affordable housing exemption for vertical mixed-use buildings.
- D. Robertson: Concerned that city will accomplish broader improvements, such as Third Street, absent a financial mechanism to get property owners to contribute fair share contribution to project. Housing stock should meet needs of people that work here. Streets are in terrible condition and getting worse. Need to pay attention to infrastructure throughout town. Specific Plan should address more what baseline is.
- R. Hofmann: What is the vision? Existing downtown was developed over time, economic hub. Is that the continued goal? Banks located downtown was part of city ensuring that economics were centered downtown, retail hub. What is the current/future economic engine of city? Need more economic analysis.
 - Dan Parolek: Market analysis prepared by Bay Area Economics. Specific plan public review draft will be released January 2019.
- C. Essex: Hope to hear from Finance and Budget Commission—questions about economic viability. More thought to leveraging city assets—city parking lot bringing in revenue; if turn into plaza, will have maintenance costs and no revenue. Concerned about proposed innovation district on G Street. Will that make it harder for Planning Commission to make decisions? Suggest new public space at train station; depot park could also serve as a park for the Old East Davis neighborhood. Suggest heart of downtown and larger buildings radiate off train station. More large scale buildings, office uses, entertainment district after hours. Parking garage on southeast corner of Richards Blvd/railroad tracks. Car sharing and bike sharing facilities, support business community.
- H. Boschken: Process appears boiler-plate; creates compelling image for audience, but does not help to understand planning from comprehensive standpoint. Davis is a

unique city; should create of deliberate, comprehensive emphasis on situation analysis/context analysis. Not just economic or marketing, but also physical structure, socio-economic conditions, employment opportunities, etc. What context do we find ourselves in? How is that different from other cities?

Planning Commission recessed at 8:55 p.m. and reconvened at 9:02 p.m.

B. Public Hearing: 525 Oak Avenue Residential Construction: Planning Application #18-20; Conditional Use Permit #7-18; Variance #1-18; Administrative Use Permit #2-18; Design Review #7-18; and Certificate of Compliance #2-18

Community Development & Sustainability Director Heidi Tschudin: Holding two meetings on this item. First meeting = conduct public hearing. Second meeting will focus on responses to concerns raised and recommended action.

Planner & Historical Resources Manager Ike Njoku: Proposed new residential construction on two vacant lots; a single-family house with a detached accessory dwelling unit on the front lot and a duplex on the back lot for a total of 18 bedrooms, each with its own bathroom. Back parcel is land-locked, but a legal parcel that can be developed. Certificate of Appropriateness will allow backlot to be developed.

Chair Hofmann opened the public hearing.

- Paul Barger, Applicant: When purchased property, agreed to demolish existing cottage because not up to code. Determined that highest, best use is university housing. Designed to look like single family home from street frontage. Enough parking for every bedroom to have a car.
- Jay Solnick: Neighborhood is primarily owner occupied. Neighbors concerned about noise, traffic, etc. Lack of due diligence and consistency from applicant.
- Tracy Kaplan: Project out of character for neighborhood. Residential low density on three sides. Not consistent with General Plan. Back lot should be lower density than proposed.
- Tobias: Read correspondence from neighbor Andrew King—concerned with idea of student rental housing next door.
- Anne Apple: Do not want street to turn into series of mini-dorms.
- Geraldine Boyce: Would have liked notification of proposed project even though a block down. Questioned process—who does city notify? Many residents are not in town during August and September.
- Phyllis York: Project too dense. Traffic, parking, noise, nuisance and disturbance.
- James Carr: Project violates purpose, intent and motive of residential restricted zoning. Permitted use is 5 bedrooms or less.
- Linda Farr: Most rental houses on Oak are single-family homes. Once dormitory built, will never again be used as single family home.
- Scott Carole: Increased traffic and speed of travel on Oak; concern regarding pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Feeling disconnected from neighbor across the street. Concerned that mini-dorm development is step in opposite direction.

- Henry Bennett: Mini-dorm erodes character of street. Lose sense of community. Should require university to build housing on campus.

Chair Hofmann closed the public hearing.

Commissioner comments included:

- Request staff number parking spaces on plan.
- Project not a good fit for neighborhood character.
- Suspicious of any project that requires number of variances proposed.
- Request information on adjacent Cal Aggie housing complex. Experience of neighbors. Police calls? Want to hear about differences. Also, request arborist report.
- Project could meet housing needs. Ideal location for student oriented development.
- Transition area. Conventional neighborhood to the north. Non-residential or multi-residential to the south.
- Concerned about precedent. Losing single family housing stock.
- Request staff provide information on previous fraternity on Russell that was sold and divided

Chair Hofmann continued the item to September 12, 2018.

6. Commission and Staff Communications

A. Davis Downtown Liaison Update

B. Upcoming Meeting Dates

H. Tschudin: Consultant Bay Area Economics currently conducting analysis on occupancy of student housing.

D. Rutherford: Status of affordable housing ordinance?

H. Tschudin: Additional technical analysis currently under review. Temporary ordinance will expire in December.

D. Rutherford: Concerned over exemptions. Look at City of Sacramento—changed rules and no affordable housing is being built. Davis needs better mix of market rate with affordability included. Goal of creating inclusive healthy community.

D. Robertson: Sterling apartment project. Status?

H. Tschudin: Will bring back update.

R. Hofmann: Additional meeting August 31. Not able to attend.

D. Rutherford: Possibly not able to attend.

C. Essex: City Council/Downtown Plan Advisory Committee meeting September 11. Next DPAC meeting September 20.

7. Adjournment. Meeting was adjourned at 10:58 p.m.