



APPROVED MINUTES

July 21, 2022

DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING

4:30 P.M.

Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 & 2
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California
www.roseville.ca.us

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Haggenjos called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL (SILENT)

Present: Clark, Poulsen, Haggenjos

Absent: None

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1. Minutes of March 17, 2022

Motion by Committee Member Poulsen, seconded by Committee Member Clark, to approve the Consent Calendar.

The Motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

4. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

4.1. WRSP PCL W-16 Multifamily Project, 3200 Pleasant Grove Bl, File # PL21-0373

REQUEST

The applicant requests a Design Review Permit for a 223-unit multifamily project on 12.16 acres in the West Roseville Specific Plan area. The development consists of 18 three-story, townhome-style buildings, including units with two-car garages, and one apartment/community clubhouse building. A total of 483 parking spaces, including 372 garage spaces, will be provided. Additional site amenities include an outdoor pool/spa area, and clubhouse building with lounge, fitness studio, offices, storage, and other facilities.

Associate Planner, Shelby Maples, presented the staff report.

Committee Member Discussion

- A Committee Member requested that staff further discuss the landscape plans and buffer that is proposed around the perimeter of the project. Staff responded that a masonry wall exists on the eastern boarder of the project site and additional landscaping would include trees to screen the property.
- A Committee Member asked staff about the trash enclosures. Staff responded that there will be both standard and organics trash enclosures throughout the proposed project for easy accessibility to tenants and for Solid Waste to easily and safely navigate through the site.
- A Committee Member asked if the EIR for this project included a traffic study. Staff responded that the proposed project is consistent with the specific plan land use, and is consistent with the West Roseville Specific Plan EIR and subsequent SPA 3 Supplemental EIR. The project proposes 223 units, which is fewer than the 250 units analyzed in the traffic study for this parcel. Staff also explained that the adjacent parcels will be developed with high density residential units, consistent with the Sierra Vista Specific Plan. Within the next 24 months there will be three (3) north-south connections that will help to alleviate traffic.
- A Committee Member asked when Santucci would connect to Baseline. Staff responded around 2025 / 2026.
- A Committee Member asked if the project would be phased or built all at once. Staff referred the question to the Applicant.
- A Committee Member asked for clarification on the requested height variance. Staff responded that it is only for a portion of the clubhouse.

Chair Haggenjos opened the Public Hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Applicants, Scott Canel and Jonathon Canel, stated they had received a copy of the staff report and were in agreement with staff's recommendation and they responded to Committee Members' questions.

Public Comment

Carl Franklin, Debbie Clark and Ed Clark provided comments:

- Would you live in this complex?
- Where are the trash receptacles?
- The masonry wall is only six (6) feet, which the future apartment residents will be able to see over easily.
- Appreciate that layout changes have made so that there are no residential window views into homes.
- Traffic concerns at Daystar Drive / Quartet Avenue that intersect with Pleasant Grove Blvd.
- Concern about burglaries during the construction phase.
- Traffic concerns.

- Renters come and go and don't have same level of investment in the community.
- Three-story building concerns.
- What is the time line for construction of the project?

Applicants Response

- Applicant will work with local police to determine what type of security is necessary to secure a construction site.
- Property Management team part of the company and can control what goes on and will respond appropriately and immediately.
- The plan is to break ground as soon as plans are approved by the City with an 18-24 month build out.

Chair Haggenjos closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

Committee Member Discussion

- A Committee Member asked if there were any operation or maintenance agreements as part of the Design Review Permit. Staff responded that the Design Review Permit does not allow staff to place operational conditions on a project that is principally permitted.
- A Committee Member requested clarification on what project area was being approved. Staff responded that only Parcel W-16 at 3200 Pleasant Grove Blvd is included in this application.
- A Committee Member requested clarification for the approval of the height exception for the club house as the height on the elevation (49-1/2 feet) is different than what is stated in site plan (39 feet). Staff responded that the note on the site plan is a typo, and the staff report explains that the height exception was part of the Design Review Permit. The building permit plans will need to be consistent with the plans approved by the Design Committee, which will be confirmed by Planning during plan check.
- A Committee Member stated that he likes the project and the use of materials. He appreciates the detail to design and the effort take for the proportions.
- A Committee Member commended the applicant for how they have positioned the project on the property and how they have addressed the concerns that have been raised.
- A Committee Member commented that the City is very attentive to traffic issues.

Motion by Committee Member Poulsen, seconded by Committee Member Clark, to:

1. Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to eighty-six (86) conditions of approval.

The Motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

5. COMMITTEE MEMBER / STAFF REPORT

Staff Report

- There will be an August Design Committee meeting.

Committee Member Report

- None

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ellen Debach-Riley requested that the Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association (HSVNA) be allowed to place a community identification sign on private property. An identity sign that had been placed on private property received a citation as it did not conform to the Sign Ordinance. The HSVNA was informed that an Appeal would need to be filed if they wanted to erect the sign. Staff responded that currently the identity sign that was erected is not allowed per Chapter 17.08 of the Municipal Code and that the Sign Ordinance has a provision that states that unless a sign is exempt from this title a sign permit must be attained prior to installation. However, there is no provision in the Sign Ordinance that allows for the type of sign requested by the HSVNA, and approval of the requested sign would require an amendment to the Sign Ordinance. This interpretation can be appealed by the HSVNA to the Design Committee.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Committee member Clark, seconded by Committee Member Poulsen, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed unanimously at 5:26 p.m.