



**City of Davis**  
**Social Services Commission Minutes**  
**Monday, October 16, 2017**

---

**1. Call to Order & Roll Call**

*Members Present: Claire Goldstene, Donald Kalman, Tracy Tomasky, Bernita Toney, Kurt Wendlenner, R. Matthew Wise (Chair)*

*Members Absent: Ann Privateer, Georgina Valencia (Alternate)*

*Also Present: Robb Davis (Mayor), Ash Feeney (Asst. Community Development Director), Ike Njoku (Planner), Joan Planell (Social Services Consultant), Kelly Stachowicz (Asst. City Manager)*

*Wise called the meeting to order at 7:09pm.*

**2. Approval of Agenda**

*Move Plaza 2555 earlier in agenda.*

*Tomasky moved, with a second by Wendlenner, approval of the agenda as amended.*

*Motion passed unanimously.*

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

**A. Introduction of and Brief Comments by Ryan Collins, Homeless Outreach Services Coordinator**

*Joan Planell introduced Ryan Collins, and Collins explained what his position entails and what he's seeing in the homeless community. Work focuses on individuals who have gotten the attention of police officers and is focused on the most vulnerable individuals.*

*Wendlenner asked about linking to mental health and/or substance abuse services. Collins explained that he works closely in partnership with County staff and other service providers to try to link to appropriate services.*

**B. Staff Announcements:**

- *Recap of City Council Affordable Housing Workshop – Stachowicz provided overview of Council comments – variety of housing, beds v. units, integrate housing to the extent possible, determine long-term funding opportunities. Staff is also working with consultant on economic feasibility analysis.*

*Wendlenner asked whether 35% inclusionary requirement was a detriment to developers and staff explained city is working with consultant to look at this issue.*

*Mayor Davis – What are we incentivizing vs. disincentivizing? We haven't had market rate rental complexes built in a long time in Davis. Looking at whether 35% is the "right" number for inclusionary requirement.*

*Toney – Will new rental developments ease city's vacancy rate? Mayor Davis – Not likely because the vacancy rate is so low and because UC Davis continues to add students.*

- *Update on 2017-2018 HUD Funds – Stachowicz explained the City has received final word on amount of dollars and has submitted the annual CAPER, but we have not yet received contracts from HUD. Until we receive contracts from HUD, subgrantees spend at their own risk. We do not have a timeline as to when we will receive the contracts, but our regional HUD representative is aware that we are waiting anxiously.*

**C. Appointment of Chair and Vice Chairpersons of the Commission**

*Wise moved, with a second by Goldstene, to nominate Tracy Tomasky as chair. Motion passed unanimously in favor.*

*Tomasky moved, with a second by Toney, to nominate Claire Goldstene as vice chair.*

**4. Public Comment**

*Eileen Samitz: City is losing social services in various ways, such as Families First, and now have lost Sierra Convalescent Home. City is in need of such services. Don't want to trade services that are needed in community for housing. Also, vertical mixed use is a counterproductive type of development because City receives no in-lieu fees and no affordable housing. Should be eliminated, unless it's only located in the downtown.*

**5. Consent Calendar**

**A. Approval of Minutes – September 18, 2017**

*Tomasky moved, with second by Kalman, approval of the minutes. Motion passed by the following vote:*

*AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Tomasky, Wendlenner, Wise*

*NOES: None*

*ABSTAIN: Toney*

**B. Draft Critical Needs 2018-2019 –**

*Commission received the Critical Needs list as part of the consent calendar. Stachowicz explained difference between critical needs list and social services strategic plan. Commission would like guidance from Council.*

**6. Regular Items**

**A. Public Hearing: Lincoln40 Housing Development –**

*Stachowicz explained that since the Public Hearing was noticed, but the project is not ready to come forward. The Chair opened the Public Hearing.*

*Susan Ranier, architect and sustainability expert: save heritage trees. Concerned about bus stop because of trees. Davis is not upholding General Plan. UC Davis not doing what they are supposed to do (re: housing). Doesn't like masonry wall. Known toxic flume on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and near power plant.*

*Eileen Samitz: 4-5 bedrooms cause a problem for affordable housing (city doesn't receive as many). Need to ask how many bedrooms there are. Lincoln40 shoehorns in 700 students on a cul-de-sac. It's exclusionary by design for students. Should not ask for in lieu fees for entire project. Build the affordable units. How encourage conservation when each bedroom has its own bathroom. Discourage 4-5 bedrooms and encourage 1-2 bedrooms.*

*Public Hearing continued to November 20, 2017.*

**B. Plaza 2555 –**

*Planner Ike Njoku provided a brief update on the project. Proposal to construct up to 200 units from microflats to 5 bedrooms in south Davis. Proposal at this time is to look at the steps of entitlement to allow for a residential project on the site, since this project is a two-stage process. The first step is to get preliminary planned development on the site so they have entitlements to present a full project. Project still subject to the city's affordable housing program.*

*Assistant Community Development Director Ash Feeney: This is a pre-zoning v. a fully vetted project to move to high density residential. How does their affordable housing proposal resonate?*

*Applicant Richard Harris: This is preliminary plan for land use to make sure this is good location to locate housing. Excellent location because of transportation options. Limit is for 200 units. Have talked with neighbors.*

*Aimed primarily at students but believe other people will live here as well.*

*Micro-units not represented in community inventory and good "next step" for certain demographics; they are affordable by design.*

*They also have a transfer credit from Oakshade development where developer built over and above their requirement and have credit for 15 units. Land went to CHOC at end of Albany.*

*No price yet for micro-units (360 sq. ft.) Will probably be located in/near the townhomes.*

*The 10 very low income units would be 1-2 unit apartments.*

*Kalman – Why one in-lieu fee? Harris: Just provide a mix. Feeney: one in lieu fee still allows for 200 units to be built onsite.*

*Public Comment: Koyun Choi (spelling?), resident: Traffic impact is a concern, especially with buses. Historically, south Davis has a high percentage of apartments and low income housing. Montgomery has highest percentage of low income children and lowest scores.*

*Eileen Samitz: Concern re: 4-5 bedroom units – how many? What is a unit? How many beds is this project proposing? Suites of no use for families and workers. Why put large number of students on south side of highway when UC Davis across highway?*

*Commission Discussion:*

*Goldstene: How typical is a two-phased process? Would it come back to commission with more developed proposal? Would like more information on credit for 15 units.*

*Feeney: typical in other communities, less typical here. Most recent example is Creekside proposal. This would be to get affordable housing proposal entitled as part of land use decision. Credit discussion still needs to take place. It's allowable but not required.*

*Tomasky: How many 4-5 bedroom units?*

*Feeney: Majority larger units. City requirements based on units not beds or rooms. Will look further into larger units when we look at inclusionary study.*

*Harris: Proposing a lot of 4-5 bedrooms but that's based on final design. Want to integrate housing. Number of rooms is likely to be about 600 but we're not renting by the bedroom.*

*Wise: What needs is project filling for city? Feeney: Simply, there is a need for housing in Davis.*

*Goldstene: Questions process. Likes site for apartments.*

*Hard to provide responses without level of specificity. Could commission say conceptual support of parts of proposal now and can't comment on percentages until more fully fleshed out. Not comfortable with percentages because only 5% of the units are truly affordable. Wise agrees.*

*Goldstene moved, with a second by Kalman, the following recommendations:*

- 1) As many permanently affordable units be integrated as possible.*
- 2) Micro flats an interesting concept worthy of consideration for credit.*
- 3) If the transfer of credits was not allowed, reassign them to doors. Permanently affordable followed by micro flats.*
- 4) Prefer units over in-lieu fees.*
- 5) Consider affordable unit requirements in the context of the overall bedroom count.*
- 6) Building units in Davis is important, concept is supportable and this proposal has some attractive features, including private funding and no real neighborhood issues.*

*Motion passed unanimously.*

**C. Update on Social Services Strategy –**

*Joan Planell explained process and explained updated report. Explained that adult day health is not asking City for funding or other operation of center, but is helping adult day task force with looking for grants. Have asked City to consider whether transportation options are available.*

**D. Homebuyer Education – Hold over to a future meeting.**

**7. Commission and Staff Communications**

*None*

**A. Social Services Commission Workplan**

*Add times to future agendas.*

**8. Adjourn**

*Meeting adjourned at 9:50pm*

---