



City of Davis
Social Services Commission Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Monday, September 25, 2018 at 7:00 P.M.

Commission Members: Claire Goldstene, Vice Chair; Donald Kalman; Ann Privateer; Tracy Tomasky, Chair; Bernita Toney; Georgina Valencia; R. Matthew Wise; and Alternate (Vacant)

Council Liaison: Brett Lee, Regular; Dan Carson, Alternate

Staff: Ginger Hashimoto, Administrative Analyst, City Manager's Office

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Members Present: Claire Goldstene, Donald Kalman, Ann Privateer, Tracy Tomasky, Georgina Valencia, and R. Matthew Wise

Members Absent: Bernita Toney

Also Present: Lisa Baker, CEO Yolo County Housing; Ginger Hashimoto, Administrative Analyst; Brett Lee, Mayor; Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager; and Heidi Tschudin, Deputy City Manager/Community Development and Sustainability Director

Tomasky called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Kalman moved to approve the agenda with a second by Goldstene.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Hashimoto shared that Commissioner Toney suffered a workplace injury and may be out for several months. As a result, she may request a leave from the Commission or resign.

4. Public Comment

None.

5. Consent Items

A. Approval of Minutes – August 20, 2018

Privateer moved to approve the August 20, 2018 minutes with a second by Goldstene.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, and Tomasky

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Wise and Valencia

B. Revised Mobile Home Relocation Impact Ordinance

Commissioner Goldstene requested to pull the revised ordinance off the consent agenda so the Commission could discuss the item. Goldstene also underscored her desire to see the City explore the legality of rezoning the Olive Drive parks to include a mobile home designation. Staff assured the Commission that it will seek Council direction for the rezoning as well as other options when tentatively returning to Council in October. Following the discussion, Goldstene moved the following with a second by Valencia:

- *Amend the language on page 5, section h to read as follows: “The City shall a schedule a public hearing before the Planning Commission, the Social Services Commission, as well as the Senior Citizen Commission, if the park under consideration has a large senior population”*
- *Reiterate a State law provision requiring park owners to issue legally valid notices to residents in advance of a rent increase*

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

6. Regular Items

A. CAPER Public Hearing and Approval

Baker explained staff is seeking the Commission’s approval to submit the City’s 2017 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).

Public Comment:

None

Commission Discussion:

The Commission asked Baker several clarifying questions.

Valencia asked for clarification regarding a section in the CAPER referencing Housing Trust Fund bridge funding for the Berry Bridge affordable housing development. Stachowicz and Baker clarified the City allocated \$200,000 in Housing Trust Fund money to serve as bridge funding.

Ultimately, Valencia moved to approve submission of the 2017 CAPER as presented with a second by Kalman.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

B. Plaza 2555 Revised Affordable Housing Proposal

Tschudin introduced the item, explaining that the applicant revised their affordable housing plan in accordance with the City's affordable housing ordinance amendment. The applicant further described the differences between the original plan versus the revised plan, summarizing the components as follows:

- *Estimated 32 bedrooms (5% = 32.3 / 646) of integrated, permanently affordable extremely low income bedrooms*
- *Estimated 10 micro units (5% = 10 / 200) of integrated permanently affordable very low income units*
- *Estimated 32 bedrooms (5% = 32.3 / 646) of integrated, permanently affordable low income bedrooms*

Public Comment:

Merline Williams: Williams expressed her disappointment with the University for not providing enough on campus housing. Williams urged the City to refocus its efforts on building housing for families, workers, and seniors. She proceeded to share a story about her 75-year old friend who is experiencing homelessness. Williams concluded by requesting that the Commission to reject the Plaza 2555 proposal in favor of affordable housing that will help a more diverse set of residents.

Miranda Villanueva: Villanueva voiced her concerns regarding the project proposal including the close proximity to the freeway; the noise problems; the lack of desirability for families; and the affordability levels.

Eileen Samitz: Samitz expressed several concerns regarding the proposed project including significant noise impacts given the project's close proximity to I-80 and the overabundance of four and five-bedroom units. Samitz also questioned the appropriateness of using the site as residential. Ultimately, she urged the Commission to hold off issuing recommendations until staff returns with the economic feasibility report.

Stephen Streeter: Streeter introduced himself as a Planning Commissioner and expressed his opinion that the project site is better suited for a commercial use such as a restaurant. He also expressed concerns over air quality and noise impacts given the site's close proximity to the freeway and the site's far proximity to the University.

Commission Discussion:

The Commission engaged in a robust discussion regarding myriad concerns related to the project including what type of residents the project will serve, the large number of three, four, and five bedroom units, and whether the project site is a suitable location for a residential housing project.

Valencia issued the following motion with a second by Privateer:

- *Reduce the number of four and five bedroom units*
- *Focus on floorplans that prioritize serving a diverse residency, specifically for seniors and families*
- *Consider making all 20 micro units affordable instead of the 10 micro units currently proposed without reducing the other affordable units/bedrooms*

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Kalman, Privateer, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: Goldstene and Tomasky

ABSTAIN: None

The Commissioners who voted no explained their preference for no four and five bedroom units. The Commissioners also expressed concern approving an affordable housing plan that seems to be targeting students, given the plethora of recently approved student-oriented projects.

C. Downtown Plan Check-In Feedback

Commissioner Goldstene and Valencia provided a summary of the Downtown Plan check-in presentation.

Public Comment:

None

Commission Discussion:

Staff asked Commissioners for feedback related to the following questions:

- *Do you generally support the planning concepts being presented at this stage of the planning process?*
- *Do you have concerns, see any fatal flaws, or feel that significant changes in course direction are needed?*
- *How aggressively does the City want to pursue affordability if it serves as a constraint on development?*
- *Under what circumstances, if ever, does a vertical mixed-use affordable housing exemption make sense?*

The Commission's discussion centered on the following notions:

- *Accept the concepts in general terms, but the Commission does possess some concerns*
- *Need to address affordable housing, specifically, the plan should:*
 - *Strive to provide a diverse housing stock*
 - *Avoid relying on the concept of “affordable by design” because it lacks regulation and therefore does not truly meet community need—should instead prioritize deed-restricted affordable housing*
- *Prioritize affordable housing as equally important to sustainability*
- *Difficult to assess affordability and vertical mixed-use affordability exemption without truly knowing the developer costs*
- *If pursue district notion further, examine whether having differing affordability requirements for differing districts makes sense*

In addition, Commissioner Valencia discussed the memorandum she submitted regarding her thoughts:

- *Need to update affordable ownership policies and limit the opportunity for first-time homebuyers*
- *Need to update the affordable ownership policies to require financial qualification prior to the selection process*
- *Reevaluate the ways the City collects revenue as well as expends money from the Housing Trust Fund*

7. Commission and Staff Communications

A. Development Project Update.

Staff provided the following development updates:

- *Creekside*
 - *Expected to close escrow in mid-October and begin construction shortly thereafter*
 - *Anticipated opening in late winter/early spring of 2020*
- *Paul’s Place*
 - *Hired a consulting firm and conducted a feasibility study to determine whether private fundraising was possible*
 - *Received favorable results and the Collaborative is determining next steps*

B. Social Services Commission Work Plan.

The Commission reviewed its upcoming work plan and requested no changes.

8. Adjourn

Tomasky adjourned the meeting at 9:36 p.m.