



APPROVED MINUTES

August 26, 2021

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

6:30 P.M.

Council Chamber
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California
www.roseville.ca.us

Members of the public were able to attend the meeting in-person or could view the meeting on Comcast Channel 14, Consolidated Communications Channel 73 and AT&T U-verse. The meeting was video streamed live on the City's website and YouTube channel. Members of the public were able to offer public comment in-person or by phone.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Martin called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Brashears, Covington, Haggenjos, Prior, Martin

Absent: Caporusso, Jensen

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Vice-Chair Martin opened the public comment period. Hearing none, Vice-Chair Martin closed the public comment period.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Brashears, Haggenjos, Prior, Covington, Martin

Noes: None

Motion passed.

5.1. Minutes of August 12, 2021

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. SVSP PCL FD-2, FD-5, FD-9, FD-40, FD-63, FD-64 – Solaire Phase 6, 1260 Westbrook Bl, File # PL21-0111

REQUEST

The proposed project will create 294 single-family residential lots within the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP). The project entitlements include a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of Parcel FD-2 from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR), a Specific Plan Amendment to reflect the land use change and to transfer units among several large lot parcels within the SVSP, a Tentative Subdivision Map to create single-family lots on parcels FD-2, FD-5, and FD-9, and a Major Grading Plan to allow rough grading for parcels FD-40, FD-64, and FD-63. Lastly, a Development Agreement Amendment is included to reflect the land use change and unit transfers.

Assistant Planner, Sean Morales, presented the staff report.

Vice-Chair Martin mentioned the Correction Memo that was sent to Commissioners and posted on the website. The staff report's project description incorrectly stated the proposed number of units within Parcel FD-2 and Parcel FD-5 of the Tentative Subdivision Map.

Vice-Chair Martin opened the Public Hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Applicant representative, Marcus Lo Duca, stated he was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Discussion with Applicant

- A Commissioner asked for the reasoning behind the requested transfer of units. Applicant responded that it allows for a greater range of housing which can adjust to meet marketplace demands.

Vice-Chair Martin opened the public comment period. Hearing none, Vice-Chair Martin closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

Motion by Commissioner Brashears, seconded by Commissioner Haggenjos, to:

- A. Consider the 5th Addendum to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR);
- B. Recommend the City Council approve the General Plan Amendment (Land Use Map);
- C. Recommend the City Council approve the Specific Plan Amendment (Text and Land Use Map);

- D. Recommend the City Council approve the Fifth Amendment of the Westpark Federico Development Agreement;
- E. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to eighty (80) conditions of approval; and,
- F. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Major Grading Plan subject to twenty-seven (27) conditions of approval.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Prior, Brashears, Covington, Haggenjos, Martin

Noes: None

Motion passed.

6.2. INFILL PCL 187 – Auto Repair & Car Wash, 106 Bonny Knoll Rd, File # PL21-0081

REQUEST

The project is a request for a Conditional Use Permit Modification and Design Review Permit Modification to convert two of the three existing car wash bays into auto repair uses, add one bay for auto repair, and modify the building exterior at 106 Bonny Knoll.

Associate Planner, Kinnie Shallow, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Discussion:

- A Commissioner asked if the noise, as conditioned, would be below the noise ordinance limits. Staff responded that the noise study determined that, based on the tools and equipment used in the service bays, noise would not exceed the noise ordinance thresholds if the roll-up doors were either up or down. However, staff is concerned that a change in operation or in ownership could create a situation where the noise levels did exceed the threshold. While the applicant has indicated the roll up doors would remain closed, there is no way to ensure they would not be open during business operations. There would be an enforcement obligation for the City.
- A Commissioner asked that if nothing were to be done to the site, the roll-up doors were to remain in place, what would preclude new ownership from doing something different with the building? Staff responded that without specific conditions of approval in the Conditional Use Permit, a change in operation is possible and that could lead to future noise complaints. Any such complaint would be referred to code enforcement.
- A Commissioner asked if the recent modifications to the building, specifically the addition of the roll-up doors, were completed without a permit. Staff responded that a Design Review Permit Modification should have been approved before the roll up doors, landscaping and fencing were installed.
- A Commissioner asked if there are other styles of doors that would be acceptable to the City. Staff responded that it is staff preference to have solid wall. The applicant has indicated that they plan to keep the doors closed and don't plan to use the doors to pull cars in and out of the bays.

- A Commissioner asked if the razor wire would be removed. Staff responded that the fence would remain.
- A Commissioner asked how the bays would be accessed. Staff responded that there is an opening in the fence along the rear portion of the property that would allow vehicular access to the service bays from this area of the property. .

Vice-Chair Martin opened the Public Hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

The applicant representative, Michael Wixon, stated they were not in agreement with the condition to install solid walls in place of the currently installed roll-up doors. Mr. Wixon explained that the roll-up doors were installed to secure the property and to prevent the bays being used by the homeless and drug users. He also stated that they felt it was an appropriate way to design the building as the roll-up doors would allow vehicles to be pulled through the bays and it was important to the operations of the building. Although the business is in a neighborhood, it is not on a corner lot nor highly visible commercial street nor in an existing center where it will interrupt traffic flow or impact other operations on the site. Mr. Wixon stated that the noise study found that with the roll-up doors open the noise levels are in compliance of the noise ordinance thresholds. He indicated that the current design is supported by the neighborhood watch group. If the roll up doors were replaced with solid walls, there would be an additional cost to the applicant these walls would need to be designed to allow for ventilation. He also stated that landscaping in the front would help screen the area.

Commissioner Discussion with the Staff:

- A Commissioner requested clarification on whether the roll-up doors would remain open or closed during business hours. Staff respond that the applicant indicated that the doors would remain close however, there is no way to ensure that the doors would remain closed.
- A Commissioner stated that if the roll-up doors are kept closed there would still be a ventilation issue.
- A Commissioner asked for clarification on how the operation of moving vehicles through the facility will occur. Will the vehicles drive through from the front or will the vehicles pull around the back of the building and then reverse out?

Commissioner Discussion with the Applicant:

- A Commissioner asked what the plan of operations would be. Would the doors be open or closed? What would be the flow of traffic? The applicant responded that originally they planned to keep the roll up doors closed, but after the noise study was performed they decided to change the planned operations and now cars would enter through the front in to the service bays, have the repair work performed and then exit out the back.
- A Commissioner asked about the landscaping design. The applicant responded that a 3 foot high shrub barrier could be added as a condition.

- A Commissioner asked if the building addition with the new bay would also have a roll-up door. The applicant responded it would.
- A Commissioner commented about various types of auto service bays. The Commissioner asked what type of lifts would be used. Applicant responded two-post lifts.
- A Commissioner stated that security was mentioned as to why the roll-up doors were installed. However, roll-up doors can be easily damaged compared to a solid wall. The staff recommended condition provides more security than a roll up door. The Commissioner indicated the difference between roll up doors and a solid wall came down to meeting the design guidelines.
- A Commissioner asked for clarification from staff regarding the operation and the use of the roll up doors. Staff responded that the testimony from Mr. Wixon was the first time staff had been made aware that the applicant intended to keep the roll up doors (facing Bonny Knoll) open during business hours and to access the service bays from the front of the building. It was staff's understanding that the applicant did not want to replace the roll up doors with solid walls, but they were offering to keep these doors closed. Staff pointed out that there are two entitlements before the Commission, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) which would allow the auto repair use to be located further into a residential neighborhood and the Design Review Permit for the site plan and design of the project. Staff indicated that when originally approached by the applicant there was concern about locating this use further into the neighborhood, but could support the CUP with the addition of landscaping along Bonny Knoll and closing up the openings facing Bonny Knoll, with the exception of the car wash bay. These two points were made clear to the applicant prior to the application being submitted to the City. Staff indicated that until the applicant's testimony, staff was lead to believe that vehicles would access the service bays from the rear of the building, pulling in and then backing out of the bays at the end of the service. Staff indicated their concerns were based on the location of this use on a residential street and the language in the Community Design Guidelines. Staff further indicated that based on the applicant's testimony, they could not tell the Commission if they could continue to support the CUP to allow auto repair at this location. The applicant's new description of the business operation would require additional review of the CUP. A Commissioner stated that the staff report was written to describe the operation as vehicles entering the service bays from the rear and then backing out to exit.
- A Commissioner asked if this Commission should consider to have this item continued so that staff and the applicant could "iron out" the door issue. Staff indicated that they would not change their position regarding the roll up doors and the need to replace these doors with solid walls with the appropriate ventilation.

Commissioner Martin called for a recess at 7:18 p.m. as the Council Chamber alarm went off. The meeting resumed at 7:26 p.m.

- A Commissioner asked about the status of the building since the self-service car wash had stopped operating and the roll up doors were installed. Staff indicated that only the one existing car wash bay was being used and the two remaining bays were vacant, with no current active use.
- A Commissioner asked if the noise study was based on the current use. The applicant responded that the noise study modeled anticipated noise based on the tools and equipment proposed to be used for auto repair services.
- A Commissioner stated that the real concern with noise is what could potentially occur if there was a change in the proposed operation. Staff confirmed that is the concern.
- The applicant asked to address the Commission and indicated he had conferred with the owner and they are willing to keep the roll up doors in the closed position during business hours.
- A Commissioner asked if the applicant was opposed to replace the roll up doors with solid walls. The applicant indicated they would prefer to keep the roll up doors.
- A Commissioner asked about the operation of the two properties, the auto service facility and the former car wash site. George Yandolino addressed the Commission. He gave a thorough history of the properties and how he has operated the existing auto repair facility on Douglas for many years and has recently purchased the current project site. My Yandolino described how he intends to operate the business across the two properties.

Vice-Chair Martin opened the public comment period.

Neil Clayborn spoke in support of the project. He stated Mr. Yandolino has been a good neighbor. We have enjoyed their service and like the proposal.

Vice-Chair Martin closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

Commissioner Discussion:

- A Commissioner indicated that they understood the installation of the roll up doors as a stop gap measure to provide security for the site.
- A Commissioner indicated that Mr. Yandolino is providing a valuable service to the neighborhood and the City of Roseville.
- A Commissioner indicated that they have observed that the property is well maintained and clean.
- A Commissioner indicated that the razor-wire in a residential area is not very inviting and not really compatible with a residential neighborhood.

Motion by Commissioner Haggenjos, to:

- A. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Conditional Use Permit Modification subject to six (6) conditions of approval; and,

- B. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit Modification subject to fifty-one (51) conditions of approval.

The motion failed as there was not a second.

Motion by Commissioner Prior, seconded by Commissioner Haggenjos, to:

- A. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Conditional Use Permit Modification subject to six (6) conditions of approval; and,
- B. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit Modification subject to fifty-one (51) conditions of approval with a condition that requires the razor wire to be removed.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Covington, Haggenjos, Prior, Martin

Noes: Brashears

Motion passed.

7. COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT

Staff Reports

- There will be Planning Commission meetings on September 9, September 23, and October 14, 2021.
- On September 18, 2021, the City Council approved the 2021-2029 Housing Element, the amendments to the Creekview Specific Plan and vacated several easements necessary to move forward with the Green Acres project that the Commission had approved earlier this year.
- As the regularly scheduled November Planning Commission meetings fall on holidays, Veterans Day (11-11-21) and Thanksgiving (11-25-21), staff will be polling Commissioners for availability to attend a November 18, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.
- On April 21, 2021, the Roseville City Council adopted a resolution to establish Objective Design Standards (ODS) to streamline the construction of qualified affordable housing projects. Qualified projects that comply with the ODS are subject to a non-discretionary ministerial permit process and can bypass the standard design review process and proceed directly to building permit and engineering permit review. Projects that meet the ODS standards will not be subject to a public notification and hearing process. Currently one (1) project has completed the process.

Commissioner Reports

- A moment of silence was observed to honor the 13 service members who gave their lives on August 26 in Kabul, Afghanistan.
- If Commissioners receive questions regarding the Objective Design Standards to whom should the individuals be directed to. Staff responded that a web page has been dedicated to ODS or individuals can be directed to contact the Planning Division.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Brashears, seconded by Commissioner Prior, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously at 8:01 p.m. with a voice vote.