



Planning Commissioners Present: Donald Brewer, Sam Cannon, Robert Dugan, Gordon Hinkle, Kim Hoskinson, Audrey Huisking, David Larson

Planning Commissioners Absent:

Staff Present: Paul Richardson, Director, Planning & Redevelopment
Nela Luken, Senior Planner
Chris Kraft, Engineering Manager
Robert Schmitt, Assistant City Attorney
Carmen Bertola, Recording Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Led by Commissioner Dugan

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Cannon asked if anyone wished to remove any of the items from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Chair Cannon asked for a motion to approve the CONSENT CALENDAR as listed below:

IV-A. MINUTES OF DECEMBER 10, 2009.

MOTION

Commissioner Huisking made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Hoskinson, to approve the Consent Calendar as submitted.

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Huisking, Hoskinson, Brewer, Larson, Dugan, Cannon

Noes:

Abstain: Hinkle

Commissioner Hinkle abstained from the minutes due to his absence from the meeting of December 10, 2009.

OLD BUSINESS

V-A. LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT, REZONE, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT- O'BRIEN ANNEXATION PROJECT (STEP 2) - 2850 WESTSIDE DRIVE AND 4401 WESTPARK DRIVE - FILE# 2009PL-112 (LLA-000062, RZ-000052, GPA-000058, SPA-000039, AND DA-000043). The City requests approval of a Lot Line Adjustment to modify the property lines of three properties (two City-owned and one privately owned parcel) to create more developable sites with improved access. As it relates to the PL Roseville property, the following entitlements are requested: a Rezone to change the zoning from Light Industrial Special Area (M1/SA) to General Commercial (GC) and Light Industrial (M1); a General Plan Amendment to change the land use from General Industrial (IND) to Community Commercial (CC) and Light Industrial (LI); a Development Agreement Amendment to update references in the Development Agreement related to zoning and land use and to modify the agreement as needed to accommodate the property line adjustments; and a Specific Plan Amendment which will bring the O'Brien property into the West Roseville Specific Plan Area and will allow for updates to the specific plan document as it relates to mapping and zoning and land use references. Project Applicant: City of Roseville. Property Owner: City

of Roseville (2850 Westside Drive) and PL Roseville, Greg Van Dam (4401 Westpark Drive) (Stewart) **THIS ITEM IS CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF JANUARY 28, 2010.**

V-B. ANNEXATION, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, SPECIFIC PLAN, ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – SIERRA VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN – 6810 FIDDYMENT ROAD – FILE #2007PL-044 (ANN-000002, GPA-000034, SPA-00024, RZ-000037 & DA-000029).

The applicant requests approval of an amendment to the City's Sphere of Influence boundary of approximately 373 acres and an Annexation of approximately 2,064 acres of vacant land generally located west of Fiddymment Rd. and north of Baseline Rd. The applicant also requests a General Plan Amendment and adoption of a new Specific Plan to establish residential, commercial, parks, open space, and public land use designations, a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to establish development standards for each parcel and to amend the City's RS Development Standards, and Development Agreements between the City and each of the six property owners to provide the infrastructure needed to support the proposed development. The applicant also requests that the Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council that they certify the EIR. The Planning Commission will also consider these requests at the following scheduled public meeting: **January 28, 2010**, or soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. Owner/Applicant: Sierra Vista Landowner Group. (Luken, Pease, Lindbeck)

Commissioner Dugan addressed the Commission to clarify comments he made at the December 10, 2009 meeting regarding questions he raised concerning school district boundaries. He stated that it is not the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to address the issues of finding ways to normalize school district boundaries to fit city boundaries. He feels his issues have been addressed regarding the 'bigger picture'.

Senior Planner, Nela Luken, presented the staff report and responded to questions from the Commission.

Planning Commission requested additional information on:

- School District Boundaries (presented by Nela Luken)
- Roundabouts (presented by Chris Kraft)

What are the options to correct split neighborhoods?

- Move school district boundary and/or change the land use plan;
- School Districts open to minor boundary adjustments.

Process to Change District Boundary

- Difficult & Involved – needs approval of County Committee for School District Reorganization;
- Most successful if school districts are in agreement;
- Not likely to change if school districts don't agree.

Land Use Plan Considerations

- Road "A" Alignment;
- Watt Avenue Alignment.

Conclusion

- Alignment of Road "A" and Watt Avenue with school district boundaries was not possible;
- Based on our discussions, the School Districts are open to the idea of minor adjustments;
- The process to adjust district boundaries requires mutual agreement by the districts;
- Commission may include a recommendation to Council to support minor boundary adjustments that prevent neighborhoods from being split by district boundaries.

Since staff report went out the school districts are continuing to meet to see if they can come to a mutual agreement.

Pause in presentation

Open for comment from the Applicant and the Public on:

- School District Boundaries

Marcus Lo Duca, Lo Duca & Avdis LLP, representing the Sierra Vista Property Owners (applicant), addressed school district boundaries. All are in agreement that it would be preferable to not divide neighborhoods; however, it really is an issue for the three school districts to address. It is ultimately for them to come to agreement.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

- Scott Loehr, Superintendent, Center School District, continuing to work with other affected districts. Confident that they will be able to work out a solution. He responded to questions from Commission.

Public comment period temporarily closed, open to Commission discussion:

No additional discussion from Commission.

Presentation Continued.

Roundabouts (Chris Kraft)

Overview from Previous Meeting

- Safer-reduces conflict points
- More efficient – less delay time
- Provides Interface with Pedestrian Uses
- Meets Blueprint Objectives: Aids in traffic calming, reduces air emissions
- Adds character to the Plan Area
- Improves Aesthetics

Land Owner Concerns:

- Adds to the cost of the project
- Larger footprint – consumes developable land

- Research Findings
- Insurance Institute for Highway Safety
- National Cooperative Highway Research Program
- US Department of Transportation – Federal Highway Administration
 - Overall Safety
 - Safer for Pedestrians
 - Safer for Bicyclist
 - More Efficient Than Stop Signs/signals
- Meeting Warrants (Review of Intersections A, B, and C)
 - Reduced Traffic Delays
 - Reduced Vehicle Emissions
 - Reduced Fuel consumption
 - Reduced Noise Levels
- Interim Demand considerations
 - LOS/DELAY at Intersection A

Roundabout Conclusions

- Meets Certain Objectives
- Safer intersections
- Benefits Interim Traffic Demands
- Costs are off-set from the cost of installing a traffic signal
 - Only 3 roundabouts proposed in whole project – two don't require any additional land and third location has a cost off-set compared to cost of installing a traffic signal

Presentation concluded.

Chris Kraft responded to clarifying questions from the Commission:

- Concerned with no starting or stopping points for vehicles; drivers may have trouble seeing pedestrians/bicyclists crossing;
- No official vehicle starting/stopping point does not equate to a safer pedestrian crossing;
- Questioned data showing safety of pedestrian crossing;
- Clarification and reasons for placement of roundabouts at designated locations;
- Potential cost of adding signal after the fact; cost comparison between installing a signal at a four way stop vs. a roundabout shows a savings of approximately \$100,000;
- The estimated speed limit on Market Street and road A may be 35 mph on both streets; the roads were narrowed to slow traffic down.

Open for comment from the Applicant and the Public on:

- Roundabouts

Marcus Lo Duca, Lo Duca & Avdis LLP, representing the representing the Sierra Vista Property Owners (applicant), reviewed the developers objections to roundabouts; additional cost is not something they can afford. Feels the cost factor is off and pedestrian/bicycle safety is an issue. They don't believe pedestrians/bicyclists are safer with the proposed roundabouts than they are using traditional 4-way stops at all three locations.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

No comment from public

Public comment period temporarily closed, open to Commission discussion:

There was discussion on the following:

- Personal experience with roundabouts and the disregard drivers have with pedestrian/bicyclist attempting to cross in roundabouts;
- Drivers don't know how to use roundabouts; they have a use but not around the pedestrian/bike trails;
- Roundabout near La Provence, pedestrians are confused;
- Things the City can do to make them safer for pedestrians;
- Acknowledge that roundabouts do move vehicles;
- Would like to see roundabouts more as part of a development plan, rather than a specific plan;
- Would like an option that roundabouts not be included as part of the specific plan;
- Finding the balance between roundabouts and 4-way signaled intersections in regards to safety, traffic, and cost;
- Staff to come back with responses to Commission issues;
- Roundabouts are not part of the land plan, they are proposals only;
- A description was mailed out to public on how to navigate a roundabout;

The applicant, Marcus Lo Duca, was invited to return and respond to comments made by Staff and Commissioners.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

No comment from public

Public comment period temporarily closed, open to Commission discussion:

Commission Discussion

- Incorporation of paseos design is an attractive element that offsets the need for the consideration of roundabouts, kind of balances it out;
- Roundabouts work nice in large volume areaa, keeps backlog of vehicles from happening, but do not see it in this specific plan.

Chair Cannon temporarily closed the public hearing and asked for a motion to continue this item to the meeting of January 28, 2010.

MOTION

Commissioner Hoskinson made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Dugan, to continue this item to the meeting of January 28, 2010.

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Hoskinson, Dugan, Brewer, Hinkle, Huisking, Larson, Cannon

Noes:

Abstain:

REPORTS/COMMENTS/COMMISSION/STAFF

A. REPORTS FROM PLANNER

No updates.

Commission Comments:

- Thanked staff for hard work on these issues, appreciates all the work to bring answers and information for the Commission.
- Appreciation to staff for their availability to discuss difficult issues and providing enough information to look at different considerations. Thank you City staff for cleaning up island on Eureka Road and re-landscaping the median.
- Compliment Planning and Public Work staff on Blue Oaks for the correction of soil slippage.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Cannon asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION

Commissioner Hoskinson made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Huisking, to adjourn to the meeting of January 28, 2010. The motion passed unanimously at 8:31 PM.