



## **DRAFT MINUTES**

August 27, 2020

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

6:30 p.m.

311 Vernon Street  
Roseville, California  
[www.roseville.ca.us](http://www.roseville.ca.us)

Commissioners teleconferenced pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20. Members of the public viewed the meeting on Comcast channel 14, Consolidated Communications channel 73 and AT&T U-verse. The meeting was video streamed live and was available on the City's website and YouTube channel.

Members of the public were able to offer public comment by phone or email.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ROLL CALL**

Present: Caporusso, Krafka, Librea, Martin, Jensen, Brashears

Absent: Prior

**3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Brashears led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chair Brashears opened the Public Comment period. Hearing none, Chair Brashears closed the Public Comment period.

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Motion by Commissioner Caporusso, seconded by Commissioner Martin, to approve the Consent Calendar.

The Motion passed.

Roll Call votes:

Ayes: Martin, Librea, Krafka, Jensen, Caporusso, Brashears

Noes: None

- 5.1. Minutes of August 13, 2020
- 5.2. Third Amendment to the Westpark Federico Development Agreement, 1701 Westbrook Bl, File # PL20-0105
- 6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS**
- 6.1. DTSP PCL DT-4 – Belvedere Townhomes, 510 Lincoln St, File # PL20-0050

Associate Planner, Charity Gold, presented the staff report.

Chair Brashears opened the public hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Representative for the applicant, Marcus LoDuca, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Discussion:

- Was the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan (DTSP) EIR open for public comment?
- Were any comments received on the DTSP EIR?
- Was a traffic study done for the area?
- Were there any concerns raised in the traffic study?
- City is required to meet certain amount of housing.
- Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP) vision is to draw young professionals and empty nesters to an urban setting.
- DTSP took four (4) years to develop.
- DTSP included nine (9) public meetings and had a 27 member steering committee. It was a partnership between landowners and the City.
- The site has been visited by Commissioners.
- The Belvedere Hotel building in disarray, the foundation is damaged and dry rot is found throughout the building.
- In the cultural analysis was it determined if the building could be preserved?
- The additional steps taken by the applicant go above and beyond what is required.
- Appreciate effort of staff and community outreach.
- No concerns with traffic.
- This is not an affordable housing project. It is a market-rate site.
- Building is owned by a private party.
- The rights of applicant must be recognized.

Public Comment:

The following individuals are in opposition of the project: Sandy Bryant, Ellen Debach Riley, Andrew Waldrop, Caryl Fenton Gadbury, Alexa Roberts, Marya

Bohannon, Ann Newberry, Leslie Summerill, Mia Hipkins, Mike Hazen, Dianne Lee Bendix, Brian Louderback, Lyndsey Hazen, Danielle Silveira, Debbie Silveira, Shelbey Martin, Nadine Martinez, Cyndi Hale, and Susan Gadberry Dickinson.

- Traffic concerns.
- Roseville Historical Society was not included in discussions.
- The City has deemed other sites as protected that were not included in the DTSP EIR.
- Traffic by Crooked Bridge is a nightmare and will get worse with the proposed project.
- This is the only way for high school students to get to Roseville High School.
- Traffic study is needed.
- Few sidewalks in area.
- Belvedere Hotel is important to the City of Roseville.
- Belvedere Hotel has a rich history.
- Why does affordable housing need to be built in the Historic District?
- Library is needed in this area.
- Demolition of the Belvedere Hotel is not the only option.
- Belvedere Hotel has not been vacant for years.
- The proposed housing does not fit in the area.
- There have been inaccuracies in the reporting.
- Moose Lodge's late night fundraisers will be impacted by the proposed project.
- Parking issues in Old Town already exist.
- Skyline views will be lost.
- Repurpose the building.
- Bring the building up to code.
- Proposed townhome design is out of place.
- Railroad noise impacts on project.
- Market values will be hurt.
- The City should assist in restoring the building.
- Homeless population has not been addressed.
- Do not like the architecture of the proposed building.

Eric Crane spoke in support of the project.

- Adds housing.
- Historic Roseville area will benefit economically from the proposed project.
- Proposed project adds value to the community.
- Belvedere Hotel is a hazard to the community due to its neglect.
- It will cost too much to restore.

*Chair Brashears called a recess at 8:11 p.m. The meeting resumed at 8:17 p.m.*

Motion by Vice-Chair Jensen, seconded by Commissioner Martin, to:

- A. Consider the Addendum to the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan EIR,
- B. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Minor Design Review Permit subject to seventy-two (72) conditions of approval
- C. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to fifty-six (56) conditions of approval.
- D. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Tree Permit subject to nineteen (19) conditions of approval.

The motion included revisions to the following conditions of approval (COA):

Minor Design Review Permit COA #35

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit or approval of Improvement Plans, the grading plans shall clearly identify all existing water **and** sewer ~~and recycled water~~ utilities within the boundaries of the project (including adjoining public right of way). Existing utilities shall be identified in plan-view and in profile-view where grading activities will modify existing site elevations over top of or within 15 feet of the utility. Any utilities that could potentially be impacted by the project shall be clearly identified along with the proposed protection measures. The developer shall be responsible for taking measures and incurring costs associated with protecting the existing water **and** sewer ~~and recycled water~~ utilities to the satisfaction of the Environmental Utilities Director. (Environmental Utilities)

Minor Design Review Permit COA #37

Water and sewer infrastructure shall be designed pursuant to the adopted City of Roseville Improvement Standards and the City of Roseville Construction Standards and shall include:

- Utilities or permanent structures shall not be located within the area which would be disturbed by an open trench needed to expose sewer trunk mains deeper than 12 feet unless approved by Environmental Utilities in these conditions. The area needed to construct the trench is a sloped cone above the sewer main. The cone shall have 1:1 side slopes.
- Water **and** sewer ~~and recycled~~ mains shall not exceed a depth of 12 feet below finished grade, unless authorized in these conditions of approval.
- All sewer manholes shall have all-weather, 10-ton vehicle access unless otherwise authorized by these conditions of approval. (Environmental Utilities)

Tentative Subdivision Map COA #25

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit or approval of Improvement Plans, the grading plans shall clearly identify all existing water **and** sewer ~~and recycled water~~ utilities within the boundaries of the project (including adjoining public right of way). Existing utilities shall be identified in plan-view and in profile-view where grading

activities will modify existing site elevations over top of or within 15 feet of the utility. Any utilities that could potentially be impacted by the project shall be clearly identified along with the proposed protection measures. The developer shall be responsible for taking measures and incurring costs associated with protecting the existing water **and** sewer ~~and recycled water~~ utilities to the satisfaction of the Environmental Utilities Director. (Environmental Utilities)

The motion included deletion of the following condition of approval (COA):

Tree Permit COA #5

~~A \$10,000 cash deposit or bond (or other means of security provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Division) shall be posted to ensure the preservation of all remaining trees during construction. The cash deposit or bond shall be posted in a form approved by the City Attorney. Each occurrence of a violation on any condition regarding tree preservation shall result in forfeiture of all or a portion of the cash deposit or bond. (Planning)~~

**7. BOARD MEMBER / COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT**

Staff Reports

- There will be a Planning Commission meeting on September 10, 2020. The Johnson Ranch Self Storage proposed project is scheduled to be heard at this meeting.
- There will be a Planning Commission meeting on October 8, 2020.

Commissioner Reports

None

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commission Caporusso, seconded by Vice-Chair Jensen, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion Passed unanimously at 8:53 p.m. with a voice vote.