



## **APPROVED MINUTES**

October 13, 2022

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

6:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street, Roseville, California

[www.roseville.ca.us/CORTV](http://www.roseville.ca.us/CORTV)

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

#### **2. ROLL CALL**

Present: Brashears, Jensen, Haggenjos, Prior, Randolph, Covington

Absent: Martin

#### **3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Covington led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

#### **5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

##### **5.1. Minutes of September 22, 2022**

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

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Randolph, Jensen, Prior, Brashears, Haggenjos, Covington

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

#### **6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS**

##### **6.1. WRSP PCL F-31 – Plaza at Blue Oaks Parking Reduction, 1950 Blue Oaks Bl, File # PL22-0337**

## **REQUEST**

The project is a request for an Administrative Permit for a parking reduction to allow a 14% reduction for shared uses located within the Plaza at Blue Oaks center.

Associate Planner, Kinarik Shallow, presented the staff report.

### Commissioner Discussion with Staff

- A Commissioner asked if the parking reduction would be permanent. Staff stated that changes to the proposed uses would require additional analysis and the mix of uses must meet the proposed parking reduction, otherwise another parking reduction entitlement could be required.

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

Applicant, Joseph Zawidski, Signature Homes, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

### Public Comment

Derek Pell spoke in support of the project.

- Mr. Pell indicated that this is the fourth parking reduction to come before the Planning Commission this year. He asked if the City parking regulations should be reduced for a wide variety of projects.

Chair Covington closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

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

1. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Administrative Permit subject to three (3) conditions of approval.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Randolph, Jensen, Prior, Brashears, Haggengjos, Covington

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

## 6.2. Commercial Corridor Plans, File # PL21-0383

### **REQUEST**

Staff requests consideration of three related and connected Specific Plans, also referred to as Corridor Plans, centered along older commercial corridors in developed areas of the City. The three Specific Plans are the Atlantic Street Corridor Specific Plan, the Douglas-Harding Corridor Specific Plan, and the Douglas-Sunrise Corridor Specific Plan. The purpose of these three Specific Plans is to encourage and facilitate the revitalization and redevelopment of the areas consistent with the vision for each plan. The project includes

land use and zone district amendments to correct inconsistencies, replace outdated zone districts with the City's current zone districts, and create logical land use and zoning patterns; water and sewer infrastructure studies to ensure there is sufficient available capacity to support up to 850 units of multifamily residential development across all three Plan Areas (up to 50 units in the Atlantic Street Corridor, up to 200 units in the Douglas-Harding Corridor and up to 600 units in the Douglas-Sunrise Corridor); conceptual streetscape plans; design guidelines and development standards for multifamily and nonresidential development; frontage improvement guidelines and standards; permitted use tables; and entitlement process streamlining. The project also includes land use corrections over areas adjacent to the three Specific Plans. These include correcting the land use designation over the Dry Creek open space area from the existing Low Density Residential designation to the Open Space designation and removing the land use designation over arterial roadways, because land use designations are generally not applied to arterial roadways elsewhere in the City.

The project includes a General Plan Amendment to amend General Plan text and exhibits to reflect the adoption of three new Specific Plans and amend the Land Use Diagram consistent with the three new Specific Plans, which includes changing land use designations to be consistent with the existing zoning or underlying use of the land and surrounding properties, correcting land use from Low Density Residential to Open Space over the Dry Creek open space area, and removing the land use designations over arterial roadways within and adjacent to the three new Specific Plans. The project also includes a Rezone to replace outdated Planned Development zone districts within the Specific Plans with one of the City's current zone districts, to change the zone district of specified properties to be consistent with the existing use of the land and surrounding properties, and to establish Special Area (SA) zone district overlay in each of the Specific Plan areas. The project includes an Ordinance Amendment to Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance), Chapter 19.18.030 Special Area District for the purpose of adding the three new Specific Plans to the list of Special Area Districts, adding new Chapter 19.33 Commercial Corridor Plans to establish the permitted uses (including non-conforming uses), development standards, parking standards, and entitlement and approval procedures for the three Specific Plans; amending Chapter 19.24.020 (Nonconforming Uses and Structures) to refer to the new Chapter 19.33 standards; amending Chapter 19.26.030 (Parking space requirements by use type) to refer to the parking reduction processes of the new Chapter 19.33; and amending Chapter 19.78.020 (Required public hearings, authorized Approving Authority and public notice) acknowledging the new approval procedures within the new Chapter 19.33.

Senior Planner, Lauren Hocker, and Associate Planner, Jessica Lynch, presented the staff report.

#### Commissioner Discussion with Staff

- A Commissioner asked, that in light of the new streamlined process, how a member of the public would request a public hearing for a project. Staff responded that there

is no formal process. A public hearing can be requested by email, letter, phone, or in person.

Chair Covington opened the Public Hearing and public comment period.

### Public Comment

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the project: Eric Eisenhammer, Barbara Haig, Michael Ryan, Jeff Dodge, Derek Pell and Chris Ewers.

- An individual asked if a survey has been conducted to determine whether the community supports the proposed new units.
- An individual indicated that the proposed units will cause increases to traffic, public safety, crime, and noise.
- An individual asked if the proposal was connected to state law. Are there other options available to address these state laws, specifically SB 9 and SB 10?
- An individual was concerned with environmental impacts on water, lack of parking, creation of food desert, and lack of schools for the proposed units.
- An individual asked if solar will be required so that the need for power will be mitigated?
- An individual asked if Roseville has a 1% for art requirement. If so, what is being done to allocate that money to artists in the local community?
- An individual commented that notification to the public was lacking.
- An individual asked about the timeline for the project.
- An individual was concerned that portions of the public outreach were conducted during Covid.
- An individual indicated that Roseville's ordinance regarding lighting is inconsistent. There are guidelines for businesses but not residential.

The following individuals spoke in support of the project: Derek Pell and Chris Ewers.

- An individual asked if the cost of the Design Review Permit remain the same.
- An individual indicated they thought the plans lacked vision for the multi-modal transportation network and focused on the vehicular network.
- An individual stated that a complete streets program is needed.
- An individual asked what private property owners need to do once the plans are approved?
- An individual asked for consideration of alternative modes of transportation.
- An individual pointed out that there are issues with traffic, specifically with vehicle and bike/pedestrian conflicts.

### Staff's Response to Public Comments:

Staff provided a broad response to the comments from the public.

- The City studied the infrastructure capacity that would allow an additional 850 units, spread throughout the three plan areas. There is no guarantee that all of these 850 units will be developed in the near future. There has been interest in a large multi-family project at the southeast corner of Lead Hill and North Sunrise, however any other multi-family project will most likely be developed on smaller parcels and contain a relatively small number of units. The majority of properties within the plan areas are currently developed and new residential development would replace existing uses.
- The plans are aspirational and depict the types of facilities the City wants to encourage. There is no funding associated with the approval of these plans and the development of improved bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure will require future funding. The plans provide a basis for the City to implement the vision as funding becomes available.
- Development in the plan areas will most likely be slow and the plans provide a long term vision to guide growth and development for the three specific plans.

#### Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner pointed out that the City is not planning to develop the 850 residential units, but the specific plans provide a streamlined process and incentives for the private sector to develop these units over time. It is anticipated that development in these corridors will be a long term process. The Commissioner indicated there has been talk among interested community members that these plans will result in the City condemning land and developing these residential units and pointed out that that is not the case, development within the specific plan areas will be as a result of private investment and private development and could take many years to occur. The commissioner asked staff to confirm his understanding. Staff confirmed that the main purpose of the three specific plans is to provide a vision that can be implemented by the private sector through private investment. The standards apply to new development projects.
- A Commissioner stated that after following the Corridor Planning process, there has been a robust public process and that the staff has responded to public comments and has adjusted the plans based on public feedback. The Commissioner stated that the final work product was very reasonable and very understandable and will be a benefit to those taking advantage of the plans. The Commissioner pointed out that these plans are looking into the future 20 or more years with a vision of how these corridors should develop in the future.
- A Commissioner asked if there is an expectation that existing property owners must make improvements to their properties. Staff responded that the standards and processes within the plans will only apply to future development applications.
- A Commissioner pointed out that the discussion did not include development of any one specific property or projects, but put in place a vision, standards, regulations and a process for future development, and that that process would be subject to a discretionary review that could be subject to a public hearing, if requested. Staff responded that that was correct.

- A Commissioner asked how the public could continue to engage with staff regarding any concerns with the corridor plans. Staff responded that the project email and phone number would be available for the public to use when contacting staff. The Commissioner then pointed out the following topics the public could contact staff for further information: water concerns, sustainable materials, permeable paving, solar installations, public art, schools, residential lighting, traffic, parking and safety. Staff responded that the City looks at water demand on a city wide basis to ensure there is an adequate water supply at buildout, sustainable development is typically required through building and development codes, the City does not have a formal public arts requirement and public arts programs are not applied to private development, staff did coordinate with the school districts, who had no concerns with additional residential units, there are no specific standards for residential lighting and issues related to residential lighting are subject to nuisance criteria and subject to code enforcement, and traffic, parking and safety will be reviewed on a project by project basis as new development applications are submitted.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. Consider the Addendum to the 2035 General Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2019080418, certified on August 5, 2020) and 2021 Housing Element Addendum. (Exhibit A)
2. Recommend City Council adopt a resolution for a General Plan Amendment to amend General Plan Land Use Element text to reflect the adoption of three new Specific Plans; amend Land Use Element Figure II-1 (Planning Areas) to add the boundaries of the three new Specific Plans; and amend Figure III-3 (Pedestrian Districts) and Figure VIII-3 (Land Use Designations with City's Regulatory Floodplain) because these figures include the boundaries of the City's Specific Plans or land use map as background information on the figure; and amend the General Plan Land Use Map (Land Use Element Figure II-2) consistent with the three new Specific Plans, to correct land use from Low Density Residential to Open Space over the Dry Creek open space area, to remove the land use designations over arterial roadways within and adjacent to the three new Specific Plans, and other minor changes. (Exhibit B.1 – B.7)
3. Recommend City Council adopt one finding of fact and adopt a resolution to approve the Atlantic Street Corridor Specific Plan. (Exhibit C)
4. Recommend City Council adopt two (2) findings of fact and approve a Rezone to change the underlying zone districts as shown in Exhibit D and apply the Special Area (/SA-AT) overlay zone to property within the Atlantic Street Corridor Specific Plan. (Exhibit D)
5. Recommend City Council adopt one finding of fact and adopt a resolution to approve the Douglas-Harding Corridor Specific Plan. (Exhibit E)
6. Recommend City Council adopt two (2) findings of fact and approve a Rezone to change the underlying zone districts as shown in Exhibit F and apply the Special Area (/SA-DH) overlay zone to property within the Douglas-Harding Corridor Specific Plan. (Exhibit F)
7. Recommend City Council adopt one finding of fact and adopt a resolution to approve the Douglas-Sunrise Corridor Specific Plan. (Exhibit G)

8. Recommend City Council adopt two (2) findings of fact and approve a Rezone to change the underlying zone districts as shown in Exhibit H and apply the Special Area (/SA-DS) overlay zone to property within the Douglas-Sunrise Corridor Specific Plan. (Exhibit H)
9. Recommend City Council adopt two (2) findings of fact and approve a Rezone to change the underlying zone districts on specified properties in the Infill Planning Area as shown in Exhibit I.
10. Recommend City Council adopt two (2) findings of fact and approve an Ordinance Amendment to Title 19 of the Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance), Chapter 19.18.030 Special Area (SA) District for the purpose of adding the three new Specific Plans to the list of Special Area Districts; adding new Chapter 19.33 Commercial Corridor Plans to establish the permitted uses (including non-conforming uses), development standards, parking standards, and entitlement and approval procedures for the three Specific Plans; amending Chapter 19.24.020 (Nonconforming Uses and Structures) to refer to the new Chapter 19.33 standards; amending Chapter 19.26.030 (Parking space requirements by use type) to refer to the parking reduction processes of the new Chapter 19.33; and amending Chapter 19.78.020 (Required public hearings, authorized Approving Authority and public notice) acknowledging the new approval procedures within the new Chapter 19.33. (Exhibit J)

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Prior, Haggenjos, Brashears, Randolph, Jensen, Covington

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

## **7. COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT**

### Staff Reports

- The Commercial Corridor Plans project is scheduled to be heard at the November 16, 2022 City Council meeting.
- Lozeau Drury has appealed the decision of Planning Commission on the Blue Oaks Commerce Center project. The appeal is scheduled to be heard at the November 16, 2022 City Council meeting.
- There will be Planning Commission meetings on October 27, November 10 and December 8, 2022.

### Commissioner Reports

- None

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Brashears, seconded by Commissioner Prior, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed unanimously at 8:00 p.m. with a voice vote.