



Meeting Agenda

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, June 20, 2019

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Meg Arnold (Chair), Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Catherine Brinkley, Josh Chapman, Judy Corbett, Mary DeWall, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, Darren McCaffrey, John Meyer, Sinisa Novakovic, Ted Parks, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Randy Yackzan

Liaison Members: Matt Dulcich, Cheryl Essex, Matt Williams, Luby Vosheva

City Council Liaisons: Brett Lee, Dan Carson

City Staff: Ashley Feeney, Heidi Tschudin, Eric Lee, Brian Abbanat

Please note: The numerical order of items and estimated times on this agenda is for convenience of reference. Items may be taken out of order.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call (7:00 – 7:02 PM)

By the Chair.

2. Approval of Agenda (7:02 – 7:05 PM)

The Chair will ask the Committee to accept the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes (7:05 – 7:10 PM)

The Chair will ask the Committee to approve the draft minutes of:

- a. May 2, 2019.

4. Brief Announcements from Chair, Committee Members, or Staff (7:10 – 7:15 PM)

The Chair will ask if there are any announcements.

5. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda (7:15 – 7:20 PM)

At this time any member of the public may address the committee on items not on the agenda. Comments may be limited to 1-2 minutes per speaker. Speakers will be asked to state their name for the record.

6. Regulating Plan Map Edits (7:20 – 8:00 PM)

- a. Staff review of Regulating Plan Map edits.
- b. Staff review of DPAC comments about development intensity around Central Park and areas west of the downtown core.
- c. Public Comments (may be limited to 1-2 minutes per speaker).
- d. DPAC Comments.

7. Financial Feasibility Analysis Review (8:00 – 8:30 PM)

- a. Recap of BAE presentation and information from joint PC/FBC workshop.
- b. Public Comments (may be limited to 1-2 minutes per speaker).
- c. DPAC Comments

8. Downtown Parking Presentation (Brian Abbanat, City Transportation Planner) (8:30 – 9:00 PM)

- a. Presentation by Brian Abbanat on Downtown Parking Management Plan.
- b. Public Comments (may be limited to 1-2 minutes per speaker).
- c. DPAC Comments

9. Check in on Previous Meeting Items (9:00 – 9:20)

- a. Previous Items: Sustainability, Affordable Housing, Transportation, Parking
- b. Public Comments (may be limited to 1-2 minutes per speaker).
- c. DPAC Comments

10. Other Updates (9:20 – 9:25 PM)

- a. Historic Resources Section

11. Working Schedule (9:25 – 9:30 PM)

12. Adjournment (9:30 PM)

In compliance with Brown Act regulations, this agenda was legally posted at least 72 hours in advance of the listed meeting date. Any writing related to an agenda item for this meeting distributed to the Committee less than 72 hours before this meeting will be available online at <http://cityofdavis.org/city-hall/commissions-and-committees/core-area-advisory-committee> and will also be available for review at the Committee meeting. For additional information regarding this agenda or this committee, please feel free to contact Eric Lee, email elee@cityofdavis.org or telephone (530) 757-5610 ext. 7237.

The City does not transcribe its proceedings. Anyone who desires a verbatim record of this meeting should arrange for attendance by a court reporter or for other acceptable means of recordation. Such arrangements will be at the sole expense of the individual requesting the recordation.

As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special assistance to access the facility or to otherwise participate at this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, should contact the City Manager's Office at

*Agenda - Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting
June 20, 2019*

530-757-5602. Notification at least 24 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting.



DRAFT Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, May 2, 2019

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Meg Arnold (Chair), Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Catherine Brinkley, Josh Chapman, Judy Corbett, Mary DeWall, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, John Meyer, Sinisa Novakovic, Ted Parks, Deema Tamimi, Randy Yackzan

Liaison Members: Matt Dulcich, Matt Williams, Emily Shandy, Eric Gudz

Not Present: Darren McCaffrey, Eric Roe

City Council Liaisons: Brett Lee

City Staff: Ashley Feeney, Heidi Tschudin, Eric Lee, Kerry Loux

Please note: The numerical order of items and estimated times on this agenda is for convenience of reference. Items may be taken out of order.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM. Parks attending as the new Chamber of Commerce representative, Shandy attending as the alternate Planning Commission liaison, and Gudz attending as temporary BTSSC liaison.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

The February 21, 2019 minutes were approved by the following vote of 11 to 1, with 1 abstention, and with the clarification that Opticos staff had stated the 4 stories in the Neighborhood Medium zone was a mistake and at the time City staff did not respond differently.

Yes: Arnold, Byars, Brinkley, Chapman, Corbett, DeWall, Granger, Meyer, Novakovic, Tamimi, Yackzan.

No: Guenther

Abstain: Parks

4. Brief Announcements from Chair, Committee Members, or Staff

None.

5. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

Public Comments were made by Ezra Beeman that the fiscal and economic impacts of the plan should be done and reviewed prior to releasing the plan.

6. Draft Downtown Specific Plan Discussion

A. Staff Overview of Discussion Items.

Staff provided an overview of the discussion items, reviewed the recommendations being asked, the reasoning behind the requested recommendations. Staff discussed the big picture considerations related to the downtown plan and the general purpose including predictability for development and CEQA clearance. DPAC asked clarification asked questions about where the project was in the CEQA process and batching of the public comment on the item instead separate public comment on each sub-item. There was a comment about the need to take another look at the plan and why it is financially important to the city. There was also a point of clarification about public comment being batched together and not being on each item. Response that the agenda is organized that way to facilitate the meeting.

B. Public Comments.

Anthony Ruebner: His family has owned 204 University Avenue for 30 years. He thinks it is important to include it in the study area. It would give the owner clarity as far as what is economically viable. Asks DPAC to support staff recommendation.

Ezra Beeman: Supports public comment after there has been presentation and discussion. Wonders where the 4-story change came from. There is an impact on neighbors and privacy and asks if we need a 4th floor.

Becky Hibbert: Family has owned property at 5th and G Street. The small homes on G Street are not included in the same zone and if they were included, it could make for a more effective project.

Mark Grote: City staff wants to take control of the process and direction. It includes changes to University Avenue neighborhood and the fourth story being presented as a clarification, not a change. Staff changes would create bigger buildings around the perimeter of the core and create a ring of tall buildings around the core. Asks DPAC to uphold intensity in the core with smaller buildings on the edge.

Cathy Forkas: Consultants emphasized the missing middle and stepping down buildings. If have 4-stories next to a 2-stories, there is no step up. Not against infill or densification.

C. Staff Comments

C. Granger: Appreciate having staff perspective on the table. DPAC never heard any comment that they should review other parts and need to take time and maybe more meetings and data.

For Recommendation #1, staff recommended increasing the intensity on G Street to Main Street Large. Staff noted it as an opportunity area with underutilized sites and cited examples of other cities with campuses with substantial research and business park development and coworking environments.

D. Tamimi: Clarification about Option 1 and 2 from previous meeting and the differences.

M. Williams: Clarification on proposed border going to 4th or 5th Street. Staff response that it would reflect the map and go to 5th Street.

M. Dulcich: Clarification about no minimum height required. Staff response that no minimum height is proposed.

For Recommendation Item #2, staff felt that it was prudent to include 3rd Street between A and B Street in the plan and clarified that it was just of the parcels fronting on 3rd Street.

M. Byers: Clarification on the current zoning and uses allowed for this area. Staff response that current zoning is a Planned Development and allows mixed uses. The properties are not currently in the plan area, but not currently changed by the plan.

For Recommendation #3, staff recommended including the entire Davis Commons site as Main Street Large or a combination with Neighborhood Large.

For Recommendation #4, staff recommended combining Neighborhood Medium zone and Neighborhood Medium-Open zone to simplify and avoid creating non-conforming uses.

For Recommendations #5 and #6, staff recommended including several properties located in the University Avenue neighborhood in the downtown plan and discussing including the other properties in the neighborhood containing aging multifamily complexes. Staff believes that the Neighborhood Medium zone would be appropriate with substantial 4th story stepbacks.

For Recommendation #7, staff recommended discussing greater development on the Hibbert Lumber Block, which presents an opportunity site.

L. Guenther clarification that the staff report references G Street between 4th and 5th Street, but it should be between 5th and 6th Street.

D. DPAC Discussion and Recommendations – Regulating Plan Map

D. Tamimi: What about Central Park area? Why are we not increasing density there?

C. Brinkley: Add Central Park to the discussion.

M. Byers: Is it Central Park or East vs. West?

Motion to add as Item #8 on the Regulating Plan a discussion of development intensity west of the core area and around Central Park. Motion passes by consensus.

Recommendation Item #1 Discussion – G Street Flex District Area

L. Guenther: It's more than investment return – sense of place. Does not follow principle of transition in height and size. Why emphasis to east and not to the west?

J. Meyers: You can do 4 stories by Central Park now. Properties by tracks should be cut out as peace offering to Old East and to provide them with certainty. Provide good will and keep to 2 or 3 stories. Development facing tracks should not be a backdoor – should have appropriate architectural treatments.

M. Byers: Look at downtown as a whole – not piecemeal. Need transitions.

M Dulcich: Support recommendation #1. Parcels support higher development.

C. Granger: Critical to step down on backside of buildings. Respect community “organics.” Proximity to train station should matter – higher there makes sense, but not closer to 5th Street.

M. Williams: BAE analysis that less than 4 stories is not feasible. Pay attention to sight lines, 5 stories behind 3 stories would be less brutal viewpoint.

J. Chapman: DPAC task to jumpstart downtown and create economic opportunity. Supports recommendation #1.

J. Corbett: Supports recommendation #1.

D. Tamimi: Supports recommendation #1.

A. Feeney: 4-sided architecture will be addressed in form based code.

M. Williams: Suggestion to create transition zone with 3 stories.

]

S. Novokavic: Why is staff cherry picking changes. Plan has gone through a process and consultant talked about respect for transitions. Not fair. The recommendation from consultant was to leave the Planned Development alone.

R. Yackzan: This is disrespectful. Concern about these late changes.

A. Feeney: Trying to set things for the EIR. Draft plans will be released with public review and DPAC review.

M. Arnold: Reminder that the draft plan has not been released and is not finalized.

L. Guenther: Neighborhood Medium at 4 stories eliminates whole idea of transition. Motion that Neighborhood Medium have a 3 story maximum and detached buildings.

S. Novakovic: Seconded.

J. Meyer: It would downzone everything by Central Park.

M. Arnold: Neighborhood Medium on the margins of downtown shall be 3 stories maximum instead of 4 stories? Alternate motion?

M. Williams: Substitute motion to create new designation of 3 stories – transitional neighborhood attached and detached.

A. Feeney: Can direct Opticos to create transitions where there is residential. Motion needs to come from voting DPAC members. M. Williams motion dies.

D. Tamimi: Motion to create new neighborhood medium transition zone.

L. Guenther: Motion withdrawn. Seconded.

Motion passes by consensus.

C. Granger: Are we being asked to increase the height or elevations of the large form?

A. Feeney: No increase in size of form. Staff recommendation for G Street area as Main Street Large.

M. Byers: Opposed. Don't want it to block the central area.

R. Yackzan: Does it change the flex district concept.

A. Feeney. No.

C. Brinkely. In favor.

M. Arnold. Motion supporting staff recommendation.

C. Brinkley. Seconded.

Motion passes by majority.

Recommendation Item #2 Discussion - 3rd Street in University Ave. Neighborhood.

M. Dulcich: Neighbors were promised no added commercialization on 3rd Street.

S. Novakovic: This would let 1-story houses on 3rd Street go to 4 stories. That is too much. Does not provide transition.

E. Shandy: Recommendations #5 and #6 would be piecemeal exceptions. Creates neighborhood inequities. Neighborhood should be looked at as a whole.

J. Chapman: We have already discussed this area.

L. Guenther: DPAC didn't leave University Avenue area out, we opted to not include it.

M. Byars: Not opposed to it but already addressed and decided.

S. Novakovic: Motion - Follow Opticos' plan and leave "as is" for recommendations #2, 5, 6. Motion dropped.

J. Meyer: Parcels are perfect for redevelopment but adjacent to residential. Need to be "one offs."

M. Byars: This is a process problem.

M. Arnold: Can we discuss one at a time and address only #2 here. Motion - DPAC does not support Recommendation #2.

R. Yackzan: Seconded.

Motion passes by consensus.

Recommendation Item #5 and #6 Discussion - University Avenue neighborhood multifamily building parcels.

R. Yackzan: How can this property be developed? Currently the multifamily site would have to be developed as single family or request a new planned development and coordinate with neighbors separately from the downtown plan.

M. Arnold: Issue of fairness to property owner. Trying to create certainty. There is an existing multifamily building that is declining in quality.

J. Chapman: We can't pick and choose properties. Need to look at whole area.

C. Granger: This part of town is messy and will bog down plan. Should leave as it is and let Council decide.

S. Novakovic: Want respect for people who live there.

M. Byars: Motion - Do not support staff recommendation #5 and #6.

L. Guenther. Seconded.

Motion passes by majority.

Recommendation Item #3 Discussion - Davis Commons site.

E. Shandy: Would put 5 story next to 2 story cottages.

A. Feeny: Form Based Code will address step back requirements.

C. Brinkley: Going up makes sense. Site is near arboretum and open space.

L. Guenther: This is entrance to town and is the first impression for visitors.

C. Brinkley: Motion - Accept staff recommendation.

D. Tamimi: Seconded.

Motion passes by consensus.

Recommendation Item #4 Discussion - Combining Neighborhood Medium Zones.

L. Guenther: Why constrain commerce?

A. Feeny: Concern about downtown being dispersed. Staff thinks the two zones are too granular and it creates non-conforming uses.

M. Williams: Helps with parking problem.

R. Yackzan: Motion - Support staff recommendation. It increases options for downtown commerce.

C. Brinkley: Seconded.

M. Byars: Does this undermine existing single family.

L. Guenther: No, it increases options for commercial.

Motion passes by consensus.

Recommendation Item #7 Discussion - Hibbert Lumber block.

A. Feeney: Staff is asking if there is support to allow greater intensity on the parcels located on the Hibbert Lumber block for consistency on the block.

J. Meyer: Prior Option 2 was a problem. This makes sense in the long view of the east side of G Street which offers a great opportunity. Neighborhood Small remains on the west side of G Street. The east side can be higher. But also need to consider architectural treatment on the backside facing the tracks. It is an opportunity to look at the Hibbert block as one entity, but look at tiering and setbacks.

A. Feeney: Staff will coordinate with Opticos for the best approach. Can peak exceed 4 stories?

C. Granger: Do you match across the street or maximize opportunity?

L. Guenther: We should not hold back on this site based on what is across the street.

J. Meyer: Motion - Move staff recommendation. It is a big site with lots of opportunity.

M. Byars: Keep like to like. 3 stories on west for transition?

M. Arnold: Substitute Motion - West side to be Neighborhood Small; Consolidate east side to be same as Hibbert parcels and allow 4 stories, but Opticos can look at more with thoughtful transition.

M. Byars: Seconded.

Motion passes by consensus.

7. Affordability, Sustainability, Transportation, Parking Items

Staff briefly spoke to the issues and the information and draft recommendations provided in the meeting packet. Encouraged DPAC to provide feedback to staff by email on the items. DPAC expressed interest in another meeting to follow up on items, address the financial feasibility of the plan, and discuss development around Central Park and west of downtown.

8. Working Schedule

Staff briefly reviewed the current schedule for possible draft plan in July and a 90-day public review period. Question about students. Staff responded that City can consider extending the review period.

9. Future Meeting Dates

To be determined.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 PM.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 20, 2019

TO: Downtown Plan Advisory Committee Meeting (DPAC)

FROM: Ashley Feeney, Assistant City Manager
Eric Lee, Planner

SUBJECT: Overview of Meeting Items

Opticos Design and the technical subconsultants are in the process of drafting the downtown plan based on the comments and edits which have been provided to date. That includes the recent recommendations from DPAC on the Regulating Plan Map. This memo highlights tonight's meeting topics and includes attachments or links for DPAC's information. The draft Downtown Specific Plan and Form Based Code are currently expected to be available for public review starting in late August or early September. At that time, the public will have 90 days to provide comments on the draft plan and there will be additional public meetings scheduled providing ample opportunities for the public and City commissions to fully review and comment on the draft plan. In the meantime, while City and Opticos staff welcome discussion about the plan, further revisions prior to the release of the draft plan cannot be expected to be incorporated based on the schedule. However, staff is happy to share any DPAC comments from tonight's meeting with Opticos staff for their information and will note it as information for a future DPAC meeting when the draft plan is available.

It should be noted that areas of the Opticos draft plan differ from recommendations made by the DPAC or City staff. Staff will ensure these differences will be noted in future staff reports when the plan is reviewed by City commissions prior to finalizing a project description for CEQA review. It should also be noted that, the project description that is evaluated in the EIR can be modified for adoption of a plan with less intensity should that be the will of the City Council at the end of the planning process. Conversely, should there be a desire to adopt a project with greater intensity than was evaluated under the EIR, further CEQA analysis would be required (additional time and cost). Staff wishes to highlight this point as a reminder that changes after the 90-day review period can be made and evaluated in the project EIR, and that even after the project EIR is complete, changes to the plan can still be made as long as they are less intense than what was evaluated in the EIR. At this point, staff feels the community would be best served to get a draft plan released for public review and comment. As described above, modifications can still be addressed through the public process.

1. Regulating Plan Map Edits

At the May 2, 2019 meeting, DPAC supported several recommendations for adjustments to the Regulating Plan Map, which included:

- A. Allowing greater intensity in the G Street flex district;
- B. Allowing greater intensity in the Davis Commons site;
- C. Allowing greater intensity on the Hibbert Lumber block;
- D. Combining the Neighborhood Medium and Neighborhood Medium Open zones; and
- E. Consideration of a new zone to address 4-story height concerns in edge transition areas. The recommendation for this zone was for a 3-story Neighborhood Medium transition zone where the boundaries of the plan abut traditional single-family zoning.

The recommendations included direction to address the transition between higher intensity and lower intensity areas. Staff shared these recommendations with Opticos who took the edits to the Regulating Plan Map into consideration. Opticos produced an updated map that they felt captured the intent of the DPAC comments. There are some areas of the map that differ from the direction staff and DPAC provided. Considering this approach, staff requested Opticos Design prepare a memorandum providing a brief rationale of the changes, how the recommendations were incorporated or addressed, and a summary of the Form Based Code Zones which are included as attachments. Opticos retained some of their original zoning recommendations but added some additional intensity opportunities in specific areas (i.e. G Street Flex District) rather than changing the designation to Main Street Large, and Opticos continues to feel that DPAC transition concerns can be addressed with a 30-foot setback requirement for fourth stories among other considerations on properties adjacent the residential neighborhoods and additional building and massing standards.

2. Development intensity around Central Park and areas west of the downtown core

DPAC members previously raised comments about the development intensity around Central Park and west of the downtown core, but the topic has not been discussed in any depth. In general, staff believes that the Neighborhood Medium (N-M) zone, which is proposed in this area, is appropriate. Staff does not recommend increasing the development intensity for the several reasons:

- The urban form and building hierarchy being created by the downtown plan focuses the larger buildings in the traditional downtown area. Smaller and medium form buildings are located towards Central Park and other outlying areas.
- The N-M zone already allows more intense development (up to 4 stories) than currently allowed in the Mixed Use (M-U) zone, which is generally limited to 3 stories.
- Recent projects around Central Park (Pizza 101, Crepeville building, Phi Delta house, the Henderson's building) and the historic Davis Community Church limit the likelihood of additional new development.

3. BAE Financial Feasibility Analysis Summary

On May 22, 2019, Matt Kowta of BAE Urban Economics presented his economic analysis on the feasibility of downtown private development at a workshop for the Planning Commission and Finance and Budget Commission. The workshop presentation and meeting video are available online at:

- [05B Downtown Plan Workshop](#)
- [05B Downtown Plan Presentation](#)
- <https://cityofdavis.org/city-hall/city-council/city-council-meetings/meeting-videos> (See Planning Commission meeting video archive for May 22, 2019 meeting)

In his presentation, Matt Kowta noted that the pro-forma analysis and modeling represents a snapshot in time (2018 conditions) and does not predict feasibility over the anticipated life of the Plan. Highlights from the presentation slides include:

Feasibility Takeaways

- Small lot residential projects not feasible as modeled.
- Economics improve with density.
- For-sale residential may be feasible on larger lots and at higher densities.
- Office over retail may work in very unique circumstances.
- Incorporating parking and/or affordable housing challenges economics further.
- In the current environment, owner-users may develop but returns are unattractive for investor/developers.

Not All Projects Are Created Equally

- Owner-users view feasibility through a different lens.
- Some developers have different cost structures (e.g., low basis in land for long-time property owners).
- Some developers have different feasibility thresholds (e.g., locally rooted developers may view risk differently or believe strongly in long-term upside).
- Lower-cost capital and lower profit requirement for a project with a credit tenant signed to a long-term lease.
- Projects that achieve scale may be better able to absorb costs by spreading land and soft costs over great square footage.

Strategies to Improve Financial Feasibility

- Modify projects to optimize
- Economics
- Leverage publicly-owned land
- Take a stake in the project
- Invest in public improvements
- Reduce time and risk for developers by providing certainty

4. Downtown Parking Presentation

To provide background and a better understanding of downtown parking, Brian Abbanat, the City's Transportation Planner, will provide a presentation. Additional information and documents are available online at the Downtown Parking page: <https://cityofdavis.org/city-hall/public-works/transportation/transportation-planning/downtown-parking-management-plan>.

5. Previous Meeting Items

For attachments and information related to previous meeting items on sustainability, affordable housing, transportation, and parking, see the May 2, 2019 materials packet:

<http://documents.cityofdavis.org/Media/Default/Documents/PDF/CityCouncil/Downtown-Plan-Advisory-Committee/20190502/DPAC%20Meeting%20Packet%202019-05-02.pdf>.

6. Historic Resources Section Update

Staff is reviewing the administrative draft recommendations from Garavaglia and Architecture, Inc. on the historical resources section of the draft Downtown Specific Plan.

7. Working Schedule

The draft Downtown Specific Plan and Form Based Code documents are being completed and are currently expected to be available for public review starting in late August or early September. Meetings will be scheduled to present the draft plan to the public, DPAC, and other City commissions within the first few weeks of the 90-day public review period. Updates will be provided to DPAC as soon as information is available.

Attachments

1. Draft Regulating Plan Map with Edits
2. Opticos Memo
3. FBC Zone Summary