



APPROVED MINUTES

December 16, 2021

SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

6:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us/CORTV

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Covington

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

5.1. Minutes of November 18, 2021

Motion by Vice-Chair Martin, seconded by Commissioner Prior, to approve the Consent Calendar.

Roll call vote:

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

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Sierra View Subdivision Map Project (File # PL21-0162) and SVSP PCL WB-41 Rezone Project (File # PL21-0161)

Item 6.1a: General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Tentative Subdivision Map, Tree Permit – 360 Diamond Oaks Road – INFILL PCL 3 & 100 – Sierra View Subdivision Map – File # PL21-0162

The project will allow the construction of 75 single-family homes on Infill Planning Parcels 3 and 100, located to the east of the Sierra View Country Club. The entitlements include a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of Parcel 100 from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR) and a Rezone from Multi-Family Housing (R3) to Small Lot Residential (RS). Infill Planning Parcel 3 will be rezoned from Single-Family Residential (R1) to RS. A Tentative Subdivision Map is requested to subdivide the parcels into 75 single-family lots. Lastly, a Tree Permit is requested to remove native oak trees on the site in order to facilitate development of the lots. The remaining 93 units allocated to Infill Parcel 100 will be transferred to Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) Parcels WB-41 (+63 units) and WB-31 (+30 units).

Item 6.1b: General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Rezone, Development Agreement Amendment, and Tentative Subdivision Map – 3301 Pleasant Grove Boulevard – SVSP PCL WB-41 – Rezone – File # PL21-0161

The proposed project will allow the construction of 63 single-family homes on SVSP Parcel WB-41 and an additional 30 units on SVSP Parcel WB-31. The project entitlements include a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of Parcel WB-41 from Community Commercial (CC) to MDR and a Rezone from CC to Small Lot Residential/Development Standards (RS/DS). The SVSP will be amended to reflect the 30 additional units transferred to High Density Residential Parcel WB-31 from Infill Parcel 100. A Second Amendment of the Westbrook Development Agreement will be made to reflect the proposed land use changes, unit transfers, and to include dedication of a portion of West Roseville Specific Plan Parcel W-60B to the City. Lastly, a Tentative Subdivision Map is included to subdivide Parcel WB-41 into 63 medium density residential lots.

Associate Planner, Kinarik Shallow, presented the staff report.

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

Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner asked about the projected loss of trees with the Sierra View subdivision project. Staff directed to the Commission to the Arborist report regarding

the number of trees proposed for removal and the estimated in-lieu fee that would be collected to compensate for the loss of trees.

- A Commissioner asked for clarification of how the in-lieu payment into the City's tree mitigation fund is used. Staff responded that the funds within the Oak Tree Preservation fund are used by the Parks Department to implement tree planting programs throughout the City.
- A Commissioner asked what the current land use designation is. Staff responded that the current land use designation is Medium Density Residential.
- A Commissioner acknowledged and appreciated the public outreach conducted for the projects.
- A Commissioner expressed concern with the land use change on Parcel WB-41, from commercial property to residential property.
- A Commissioner asked for an explanation of the state's "no net loss" housing law. Staff explained that the land use change proposed for the Sierra View subdivision would decrease the potential number of units that could be developed on the property. State housing law requires that this potential "loss" of units be made up for, somewhere in the City. By transferring units to the Sierra View parcel to WB-31 and WB-41, there would be no citywide "loss" of units and the combined projects would be consistent with state housing law. A Commissioner acknowledge that the transfer of units allows for more flexibility.

Applicant representative Marcus Lo Duca, Law Offices of Marcus Lo Duca, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation. He responded to Commissioners' questions and provided a rebuttal to the written public comments that were provided in the staff report.

Chair Jensen opened the public comment period.

Public Comment

Jane Maccione and Zach Siviglia spoke in opposition to the projects.

- Ms. Maccione provided the Commission with photos of a truck and backhoe on the Sierra View Subdivision project site. She stated that the backhoe dug into the area of and/or surrounding the tree-sheltered wetlands, seasonal lakes, seasonal streambeds, and vernal pools, with the intent of destroying them by draining them of all or part of their water supply.
- Ms. Maccione urged the Commission to conduct its own environmental studies for the Sierra View proposed project.
- The Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Sierra View was questioned.
- Mr. Siviglia questioned the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis of the project and stated that it should not have been looked at as a comparison against the original zoning of the project

Gray Allen spoke in support of the project.

- Mr. Allen indicated that he thought the proposed Sierra View Subdivision project will add to the neighborhood.

Applicant representative Marcus Lo Duca, Law Offices of Marcus Lo Duca, provided a rebuttal to the public testimony. Mr. Lo Duca stated that the backhoe, seen on the property was digging test holes for soil analysis in order to support the environmental review. He stated that there has been no disturbance of the wetlands, or drainage areas on the property. Mr. Lo Duca disagreed with the public comments regarding the VMT analysis. The only logical baseline to use for VMT comparisons is the existing land use designation.

Staff responded to the comments regarding VMT. Staff reminded the Commission that revised citywide traffic model, including a VMT analysis was completed and adopted with the General Plan update in summer of 2020. The baseline VMT for the Sierra View property was included in that analysis. The project specific VMT analysis prepared for the Sierra View project compared the 2020 baseline information with the proposed project. This analysis was conducted appropriately.

Chair Jensen closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

Commissioner Discussion

- A Commissioner expressed concern with setting a precedent by transferring units. Staff responded that this is a unique situation. It would be rare for staff to support a residential land use change from a higher density land use to a lower density land use. The Sierra View project includes a combination of factors, such as native oak trees, seasonal wetlands and community concern regarding density, that support the land use change from medium to low density.
- A Commissioner expressed appreciation for the unique solution to the situation.
- A Commissioner could not support Ms. Maccione's proposed finding shown in the picture. It was impossible to tell if the backhoe was adjacent to any drainage areas.

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

- Adopt the Sierra View Country Club and Sierra Vista Specific Plan Redesignation and Rezone Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program and Consider the 6th Addendum to the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

For the Sierra View Subdivision Map Project, as described above (File # PL21-0162):

- A. Recommend the City Council approve the General Plan Amendment (Land Use Map);
- B. Recommend the City Council approve the Rezone;
- C. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to sixty-five (65) conditions of approval; and,
- D. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Tree Permit subject to twenty (20) conditions of approval.

For the SVSP PCL WB-41 Rezone Project, as described above (File # PL21-0161):

- A. Recommend the City Council approve the General Plan Amendment (Land Use Map);
- B. Recommend the City Council approve the Specific Plan Amendment (Text & Land Use Map);
- C. Recommend the City Council approve the Rezone;
- D. Recommend the City Council approve the Second Amendment of the Westbrook Development Agreement; and,
- E. Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to fifty-six (56) conditions of approval.

Roll call vote:

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

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

7. BOARD MEMBER / COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT

7.1. SENATE BILL 9 - Informational Item

REQUEST

This is an informational item. Staff requests that the Planning Commission receive an informational presentation regarding the adoption of Senate Bill 9 (SB 9). SB 9 changes the number of units allowed on parcels within single family residential zones, and requires amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance.

Senior Planner, Lauren Hocker, presented the staff report.

Staff Reports

- There will not be a January 13, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.
- There will be a January 27, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Reports

- A Commissioner requested that a bus tour be scheduled for March, April or May to review current and proposed projects.
- The Commission wished staff a Merry Christmas.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Brashears, seconded by Commissioner Caporusso, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion Passed unanimously at 8:08 p.m. with a voice vote.