



## **DRAFT MINUTES**

March 24, 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 Martin called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

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

Present: Brashears, Caporusso, Covington, Haggenjos, Prior, Martin

Absent: Jensen

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

Vice-Chair Martin led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

Vice-Chair Martin opened the Public Comment period.

Judd Stiff asked about types of roofing materials permitted in the City and asked a general question regarding parking restrictions within the City.

Vice-Chair Martin closed the Public Comment period.

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

##### **5.1. Minutes of March 10, 2022**

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

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Brashears, Haggenjos, Prior, Covington, Caporusso, Martin

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

## 6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

### 6.1. SERSP PCL 80 – Johnson Ranch Pickle Ball Courts, 2600 Eureka Rd, File # PL22-0027

#### **REQUEST**

The applicant requests approval of a Conditional Use Permit Modification to convert seven (7) existing tennis courts into 24 pickle ball courts.

Associate Planner, Shelby Maples, presented the staff report.

#### Commission Discussion with Staff

- A Commissioner asked if the noise consultant was present at the meeting. Staff responded that he was not.
- A Commissioner asked for an estimate of the attendance for a pickle ball tournament. Staff indicated this would be better answered by the applicant.

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

The applicant, Larry Gilzean, Johnson Ranch Sports Club, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation. Mr. Gilzean indicated that a pickle ball tournament could have approximately 100 participants and that they would be playing a staggered schedule.

#### Public Comments:

Judd Stiff spoke generally in support of the project.

- He had concerns with the possible increased trash from tournaments on the street and throughout the neighborhood.
- He had concerns with parking on tournament days.
- He stated that the lights of the club shine into surrounding homes.

#### Bill Montague

- Mr. Montague expressed public safety and accessibility concerns when swim meet attendees park along both sides of Wringer Drive, stating that he did not believe there was enough space for emergency vehicles to safely maneuver. Staff responded that the width of Wringer Drive is wider than the standard street and that there is adequate room for emergency vehicles to travel safely when vehicles are parked on both sides of Wringer Drive.
- He also expressed concerns with increased trash along Ashland Drive and Johnson Ranch Road after events.
- He asked if the west gate would be left open for ingress / egress of pedestrian traffic.

#### Commissioner Discussion with Applicant

- A Commissioner asked if the conversion from tennis courts to pickle ball courts would cause more trash. Staff responded that the operational plan for the pickle ball courts was revised to include language about trash pickup following events.

- A Commissioner asked if the lights remain on past the hours of operations. Staff responded that the conditions of approval designate operating hours for lights and that if residents have complaints, Code Enforcement should be contacted.
- A Commissioner asked what the access point would be for tournaments. The applicant responded that participants would be directed to enter through the main doors of the facility.

Vice-Chair Martin closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner expressed appreciation that the applicant is addressing the concerns of residents.

Vice-Chair Martin closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Commissioner Caporusso, seconded by Commissioner Brashears to:

1. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Conditional Use Permit Modification subject to three (3) conditions of approval.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Caporusso, Brashears, Covington, Haggenjos, Prior, Martin

Noes: None

Motion passed.

6.2. Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Amendments, 3884 Westbrook Bl, File # PL21-0184

**REQUEST**

The project includes a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment to the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP) to reallocate units throughout the Specific Plan, and modify the land use on Parcels AR-21, AR-25, AR-32, and AR-37 from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR). No changes will be made to the overall unit count for the ARSP. The project proposes minor adjustments to the acreages of large lot parcels, which will require minor revisions to the General Plan and Specific Plan land use designations. The project includes a Rezone to adjust the acreages of zoning designations consistent with the acreage adjustments proposed with the map modifications. Additionally, the project proposes the second Amendment to the two ARSP Development Agreements by and between the City of Roseville and Brookfield Sunset, LLC and Jennifer M. Amoruso to reflect the project modifications, as well as modify language regarding water facility construction requirements and timing. A Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map Modification is proposed for Phase A1 of the ARSP to align with the revised land use designations, and a Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map is proposed to create 481 single-family residential lots, 14 open space parcels, three (3) park parcels, one (1) public/quasi-public parcel for city utilities, as well as landscape and right-of-way parcels. A Design Review for Residential Subdivisions (DRRS) is requested to modify development standards for the Small Lot Residential with Development Standards (RS/DS) zone.

Associate Planner, Shelby Maples, presented the staff report.

#### Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner asked for the proposed typical lot width dimensions of the Medium Density lots. Staff responded that the applicant is proposing typical Medium Density that are 40 feet by 80 feet, which is found throughout the West Roseville Specific Plan, the Creekview Specific Plan and the Sierra Vista Specific Plan.
- A Commissioner asked if typical setback requirements are being met. Staff responded that they are.

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

Applicant representative, Marcus Lo Duca. Law Office of Marcus J. Lo Duca, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

#### Public Comments

Judd Stiff expressed concerns with the trend of smaller back and side yards and lack of garages.

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

Motion by Commissioner Haggenjos, seconded by Commissioner Brashears to:

1. Consider the second Addendum to the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report,
2. Recommend that the City Council approve the General Plan Amendment,
3. Recommend that the City Council approve the Specific Plan Amendment,
4. Recommend that the City Council adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Rezone,
5. Recommend that the City Council adopt the five (5) findings of fact and approve the second amendments to the two (2) Development Agreement Amendments,
6. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map subject to five (5) conditions of approval.
7. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map subject to eighty-two (82) conditions of approval with revised condition #15 which reads: *The applicant shall provide a temporary emergency vehicle access (EVA) as part of Phase 1 (Subphases A1 and A2). The Subphase A1 EVA will consist of a 24' wide paved roadway (min T.I. 5) from Westbrook Blvd./Road A to the northern property line of AR-52, continuing west to Road F. The Phase A1 EVA will be temporary and ~~completely removed prior to~~ **replaced/upgraded** for the construction of Westbrook Boulevard. The Subphase A2 EVA will provide 2-way paved public access from Westbrook/Road A north to Road C, continuing west on Road C to Road F. See the Amoruso Infrastructure Phasing Plan as part of this entitlement.*

8. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Design Review for Residential Subdivisions subject to seven (7) conditions of approval.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Covington, Caporusso, Brashears, Prior, Haggengos, Martin

Noes: None

Motion passed.

### 6.3. SVSP PCL KT-40A & KT-40B – Estia, 6350 Baseline Rd, File # PL21-0256

#### **REQUEST**

The proposed project is a Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide the 23-acre property into three parcels (KT-40A, KT-40B, and KT-40C), a Tree Permit to remove two native oak trees, and a Design Review Permit to allow construction of 209 multi-family residential units on parcel KT-40A. In addition, a Specific Plan Amendment is requested to reflect the subdivision of the site and to modify the applicable Commercial Mixed Use/Special Area (CMU/SA) description in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan. The two Development Agreements (“Baseline P&R DA” and “Baybrook DA”) applicable to the property will be amended so that the property is covered under one Development Agreement (Baseline P&R DA).

Associate Planner, Kinnie Shallow, presented the staff report.

#### Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner asked how the condition requiring the use of garages for parking instead of storage would be enforced. Staff responded that this condition is enforceable through Code Enforcement.
- A Commissioner opined that the design concept was interesting.

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

Applicant representative, Chris Dickinson, Towne Development of Sacramento, stated he had received a copy of the staff report, was in agreement with staff’s recommendation, and responded to questions from the Commissioners.

#### Commissioner Discussion with the Applicant

- A Commissioner asked if vehicle headlights would shine into the homes. The applicant representative responded that landscaping would provide screening and that parking is situated so that headlights would be directed to the portion of the units where the kitchen is located and that windows are placed higher in these locations, so that vehicle lights will not be directed into the units.
- A Commissioner asked applicant representative where the developer has constructed other similar communities. The applicant responded tht they are building similar communities in Florida and Arizona.

- A Commissioner asked about the possible rent price points. The applicant responded that rents would start between \$1,800 to \$2,200 a month.

#### Public Comment

Judd Stiff expressed concerns with the trend toward denser communities. He asked if the Engineering Division had looked at traffic models. He noted that the designs looked modern and attractive.

Vice-Chair Martin closed the public comment period.

#### Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner appreciated that the project meets the needs of the public.
- A Commissioner stated that the project is interesting and unique.
- A Commissioner stated that he was happy to see a that a variety of home styles with various price points have been approved over past several months.

Vice-Chair Martin closed the Public Hearing.

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

1. Consider the 7th Addendum to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report;
2. Recommend the City Council approve the Specific Plan Amendment;
3. Recommend the City Council adopt the five (5) findings of fact and approve the Development Agreement Amendment (“Baseline P&R DA”);
4. Recommend City Council adopt the five (5) findings of fact and approve the Development Agreement Amendment (“Baybrook DA”);
5. Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to ninety-three (93) conditions of approval;
6. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to forty-seven (47) conditions of approval; and,
7. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Tree Permit subject to twenty (20) conditions of approval.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Haggenjos, Prior, Caporusso, Brashears, Covington, Martin

Noes: None

Motion passed.

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

#### Staff Report

- The Planning Commission meeting on April 14, 2022 will be canceled due to a lack of a quorum.
- Planning Commission meetings are planned for April 28, May 12 and May 26, 2022.

- The City Council approved the Sierra Vista Specific Plan - Parcel KT-20 and KT-30 - Affordable Unit Transfer on March 16, 2022.
- The ProHousing Designation resolution was also approved by the Council on March 16, 2022.

Commissioner Report

- None

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Prior, seconded by Commissioner Caporusso, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed unanimously at 7:36 p.m. with a voice vote.