



APPROVED MINUTES

August 18, 2022

DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING

4:30 P.M.

Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 & 2

311 Vernon Street

Roseville, California

www.roseville.ca.us

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Haggenjos called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL SILENT

Present: Clark, Poulsen, Haggenjos

Absent: None

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1. Minutes of July 21, 2022

Motion by Committee Member Clark, seconded by Committee Member Poulsen, to approve the Consent Calendar.

The Motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

4. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

4.1. CSP PCL C-41 & C-42 – Winding Creek Apartments, 3338 Blue Oaks Bl, File # PL22-0077 **REQUEST**

The applicant requests a Design Review Permit for a 216-unit multi-family project on an 8.6-acre High Density Residential parcel in the Creekview Specific Plan area. The development consists of nine (9) three-story garden-style walkup buildings, with units ranging from one to three bedrooms, and an approximate 5,300-square-foot clubhouse building. A total of 414 parking spaces will be provided and 160 of the spaces will be covered with carports. The clubhouse building will consist of site amenities including a game room, gathering room, fitness studio with an outdoor yoga area, and outdoor pool area.

Associate Planner, Kinarik Shallow, presented the staff report.

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

Applicant, Kevin Sheley, Anthem United Homes Construction LP, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendations. He responded to Committee members' questions.

Committee Member Discussion with Applicant

- A Committee Member asked if the NE corner of the property could provide space for vehicles to turn around. Applicant responded that in order to provide a space to turn around, parking spaces would be lost and the project would not comply with the parking regulations. However, they would take the suggestion into consideration.
- A Committee Member asked if the carports would be assigned. Applicant responded that it has not been determined yet.
- A Committee Member expressed his like of the color scheme.
- A Committee Member expressed his appreciation for the project.

Public Comment

Hearing none, Chair Haggenjos closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

Motion by Committee Member Clark, seconded by Committee Member Poulsen, to:

1. Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to seventy-five (75) conditions of approval.

The Motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

4.2. Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association Community Identification Sign, 515 Tahoe Avenue, File # PL22-0258

REQUEST

The Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association (HSVNA) wishes to locate a community identification sign on a parcel of land in the Single-Family Residential (R1) zoning district. The Director has determined that the community identification sign is prohibited pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Section 17.08.610(C), which states "any type of sign not expressly permitted in this title is prohibited and erection and maintenance of such a sign is considered a violation of this title." Title 17- Signs does not include any provisions to allow a neighborhood identification sign on a parcel of land in the Single Family Residential (R1) zoning district. The HSVNA wishes to appeal this interpretation of the Roseville Municipal Code.

Planning Manager, Greg Bitter, presented the staff report.

Committee Member Discussion with Staff

- A Committee Member asked what the process is to get a sign approved. Staff explained how sign permits are approved and that this particular sign is not allowed and would not be subject to the approval process.
- A Committee Member asked who would be responsible for upkeep and repair of the sign. Staff responded that it would be the property owners' responsibility.

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

Applicant, Ellen Debach-Riley stated she was not agreement with staff's recommendation. Ms. Debach-Riley reiterated the points made in the appeal document.

Public Comment

Donovan Gibson, Donald Gould, Patrick Morrison, Cynthia Engel, Glenda Hay, Krissy Holst, Ellen Tresidder, and John Cartoscelli spoke in opposition to staff's recommendation.

- A commenter indicated Sierra Vista Park was on the official map on October 15, 1906.
- A commenter indicated the current location of the sign is an ideal location.
- A commenter indicated they do not like that the area off of Baseline Road was also named Sierra Vista.
- A commenter opined that it is a lovely sign.
- A commenter indicated the Ordinance states that the sign cannot be on a R1 zone property. Does that mean the property or whole district?
- A commenter indicated they hope the Committee can find a way to exempt the sign.
- A commenter indicated that some properties have sidewalk easements but not sidewalks. Would it be possible to place the sign on a sidewalk easement?
- Residents are proud of their neighborhood.
- A commenter asked if the City looked at provisions for older neighborhoods to have identification signs.
- A commenter opined that the sign is classy and unique.
- A commenter opined that the current placement of the sign is a great.
- A commenter indicated that Historic Sierra Vista has a vibrant and active neighborhood association.
- A commenter indicated that the sign provides a strong neighborhood identity.
- A commenter indicated that in 2010, they spoke to City Council to object that another development be named Sierra Vista.
- A commenter indicated that having two Sierra Vista neighborhoods causes confusion.
- A commenter indicated that the neighborhood renamed the Sierra Vista neighborhood to Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood to avoid confusion.
- A commenter requested an exception to the ordinance.
- A commenter indicated that because neighborhood associations are recognized by the City, the City should allow those neighborhoods to be recognized with signage and be exempt from the ordinance.
- A commenter indicated that the homeowner would be responsible for maintaining the signage and could have action taken against them if they do not maintain the sign.

Chair Haggenjos closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

Committee Members Discussion with Staff

- A Committee Member asked if there is a distinction between temporary and permanent signs. Staff responded that there are provisions for temporary signs and that some do not require permits.
- A Committee Member expressed their appreciation for the neighborhood participation.
- A Committee Member asked what the process for an amendment to the Sign Ordinance would be. Staff responded that it would be brought to the Design Committee for a recommendation and to City Council for approval.
- A Committee Member stated that the Historic Sierra Vista neighborhood is not the only neighborhood that is affected by the Sign Ordinance. Staff responded that the Public Work's proposed Sign Identification Program would have helped with these types of situations.
- A Committee Member asked if the property owner could create a parcel of their property to dedicate to the City so that the sign could be on public owned land. Staff responded that if the City determined this was in the best interest of the City, a covenant or deed restriction would need to run with the land and that a provision for long-term maintenance of the site would be need to be included.
- A Committee Member stated that if the appellant did not agree with the decision of the Design Committee it could be appealed to the City Council.

Committee Member Clark made the following motion:

1. With regard to the Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association Community Sign appeal, I move that the appeal be denied, and further move that his matter be referred to the City Council with the strong recommendation that the staff be directed to prepare appropriate language to modify or amend the Sign Ordinance to allow community identification signs, with reasonable conditions, for the City Council's consideration for discussion and or adoption.

The Motion failed.

Chair Haggenjos made the motion, seconded by Committee Member Poulsen to:

1. Deny the appeal of the Director's determination that the Historic Sierra Vista Neighborhood Association community identification sign is prohibited pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code Section 17.08.610 C. and to have staff forward the Design Committee's comments to the City Council.

The Motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

5. COMMITTEE MEMBER / STAFF REPORT

None

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Committee Member Clark, seconded by Committee Member Poulsen, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed unanimously at 5:43 p.m.