



Clifford Haggenjos, Jr., Chair
Erich Brashears, Vice Chair
Bruce Hagler, Commissioner
Ed Kriz, Commissioner
Einar Maisch, Commissioner
John Prior, Commissioner
Kim Ryan Unidat, Commissioner
Lupe Nelson, Secretary
Greg Bitter, Liaison

DRAFT MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting January 22, 2026

6:30 PM

Roseville Electric Building, 116 S. Grant Street, 1st Floor

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Haggenjos called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Hagler, Kriz, Maish, Prior, Unidat, Haggenjos

Absent: Brashears

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Unidat led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Haggenjos opened the Public Comment period. Hearing none, he closed the Public Comment period.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Minutes of December 11, 2025

Motion by Commissioner Prior, seconded by Commissioner Unidat, to approve the Consent Calendar.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Maisch, Kriz, Prior, Unidat, Hagler, Haggenjos

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

VI. STAFF/COMMISSIONER REPORTS

1. Workshop - Planning Commission Training

The presentation was delivered by the Planning staff.

Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner asked when the next update to the General Plan would occur. Staff responded that there is no defined timeline, but they will begin preliminary work on the next Housing Element update later this year.
- A Commissioner asked whether compliance with the Housing Element will become more difficult as the City approaches buildout. Staff confirmed that meeting the required housing unit targets will become challenging.
- A Commissioner asked whether proposed changes to a specific plan are reviewed and vetted prior to being brought before the Planning Commission, and whether the public can comment on those changes. Staff responded that the Planning Division ensures that proposed specific plan changes are reviewed and vetted before consideration by the Planning Commission and that opportunities for public comments are provided.
- A Commissioner asked whether a developer may amend a Development Agreement (DA). Staff responded that amendments are allowed with City consent. However, a DA Amendment must provide a benefit to the City and cannot be initiated by the City. Any DA Amendment would come before the Planning Commission for consideration, and the Planning Commission would recommend that the City Council approve or disapprove the amendment.
- A Commissioner asked for an example of a condition of approval related to security measures. Staff provided a hypothetical example of a gas station/convenience market having conditions related to lighting, hours of operation, security systems (i.e. cameras with DVR recording), that would provide for enhanced security.
- A Commissioner asked if a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) expires. Staff responded that a CUP entitlement runs with the land. There is an option to review a CUP if the City is notified that it may be out of compliance with the originally approved conditions of approval.
- A Commissioner asked if a business has a CUP and if that business is sold would a new CUP be required and would it come before the Planning Commission. Staff responded that a CUP Modification may be applied for if there are slight changes to the originally approved conditions of approval.
- A Commissioner asked for examples of legally “grandfathered” establishments (i.e. legal nonconforming uses). Staff responded that Lambert Funeral Home and John Adam Academy are examples of legal non-conforming uses.
- A Commissioner asked for examples of transitional housing. Staff responded that rental housing for populations needing assistance on a short term (six months or less) basis. Assistance can include help with substance abuse. Rental housing facilities housing 6 or fewer clients are considered transitional housing and the City does not have the ability to regulate these establishments. The state licensing provides standards to prevent overconcentration of these facilities.
- A Commissioner asked if an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) can request a variance. Staff responded an ADU must meet state laws for development standards, such as setbacks.
- A Commissioner asked if a project meets all development standards must it be

approved. Staff responded that the design review process provides for staff and commission discretion regarding site layout and design and takes into account a projects compatibility with surrounding properties.

- A Commissioner asked if Planning staff analyzes projects so Planning Commission can make an informed decision. Staff responded that all projects coming before the Commission are reviewed by all pertinent City departments.
- A Commissioner asked about the average fees for planning projects. Staff responded that fees vary by entitlement and for most projects staff charges for time and materials.
- A Commission asked for direction on Commissioners attending neighborhood meetings. Staff responded that Commissioners may attend neighborhood meetings and that there is not a need to announce that they are a Planning Commissioner. Also, staff regularly attends neighborhood meetings in order to ensure the community understands the City's position and the process.
- A Commissioner stated that Public Hearings provide the community transparency in the decision-making process.
- A Commissioner asked for examples of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemptions projects. Staff provided examples of projects that qualify for various exemptions.
- A Commission asked if lawsuits begin with CEQA litigation. Staff responded that litigation related to CEQA is the most common form of project litigation.
- A Commissioner asked if staff respond to comments during the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process. Staff responded that public comments are collected during the typical 45-day public comment period for a Draft EIR and there is a legal requirement to provide responses to all comments within the Final EIR document.
- A Commissioner asked if the Final EIR contains all comments. Staff responded that it does. It doesn't address public opinions about a project, but does address all comments regarding the adequacy of the EIR.
- A Commissioner asked if it is okay to meet with people (developers and or neighbors). Staff responded that it is okay to meet with stakeholders, however the Commissioner should ensure that they do not have information that has not been shared with other Commissioners. Staff provided several methods to make sure all Commissioners have equal information regarding a project that is before the full Commission.
- A Commissioner thanked staff for the very informative presentation.
- A Commissioner thanked staff for their presentation as the information helps Commissioners make informed decisions.

Chair Haggenjos opened the public comment. Hearing none, Chair Haggenjos closed the public comment period.

Staff Reports

- There will be a February 12, 2026, Planning Commission meeting.
- A Design Committee alternate will be elected at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting. A Commissioner asked for the duties of the alternate. A Commissioner asked if

the time of the Design Committee meeting would change. Staff responded that it would remain at 4:30 p.m. on the third Thursday of the month.

- Staff reported that at their December 17, 2025 meeting, City Council approved the Zoning Ordinance amendment related to the definitions of kitchens, the Infill Objective Design Standards, and adopted a Resolution affirming the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan is adopted into the Safety Element of the General Plan.
- Staff is hoping to bring the Phillips Road project to the March 12, 2026, Planning Commission meeting in order to allow the public to provide oral comments on the Draft EIR.

Commissioner Reports

- None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Maisch, seconded by Commissioner Hagler, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed at 8:49 p.m. with a voice vote.