



Planning Commissioners Present: Justin Caporusso, Julie Hirota, Bruce Houdesheldt, David Larson, Joseph McCaslin

Planning Commissioners Absent: Krista Bernasconi, Charles Krafka

Design Committee Members Present: Mike Motroni, Daniel Wesp

Design Committee Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Greg Bitter, Planning Manager
Derek Ogden, Associate Planner
Michelle Sheidenberger, Senior Deputy City Attorney
Robert Schmitt, Assistant City Attorney
Julie Pistone, Recording Secretary

WELCOME

ROLL CALL (Silent)

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS None.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION/REPORTS/WORKSHOPS

III-A. WORKSHOP ITEM 1 – ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 19.26 – PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENTS:

The City's Planning Commission has identified certain sections of the Zoning Ordinance related to parking that they wish to discuss. Specifically, the parking space requirements for personal service uses, schools and fitness facilities have been identified by the Planning Commission for review.

Associate Planner, Derek Ogden, presented the staff report and responded to questions.

Chair Larson opened the public hearing and invited comments from the audience.

The following resident spoke with questions or comments:

Loren Cook, President of Fiddymont Farm Neighborhood Association

There was discussion between staff, the Commission and the audience on the following:

- Parking issues at senior apartments
- Sienna Apartments density bonus change and the parking reduction
- Compliance with state density bonus law
- Parking issues in the neighborhood & the affect it has on adjacent properties
- Commercial development
- Consideration of adjacent properties when looking at parking exceptions
- Does staff monitor the condition of approval that the tenants are not to use their garages for storage at Sienna?
- Situations where Planning Staff works with Code Enforcement Staff to have discussions with Neighborhoods

Commission Discussion:

- Use vs. Tenant parking requirements
- Clarification of Palisades as neighborhood commercial or community commercial.
- Reciprocal Parking Agreements
- Clarification of the Parking Reduction Variance
- Parking standards for larger salons
- Retail Center use is Community Commercial and each business use is categorized separately
- Parking requirements for Neighborhood Commercial vs. Community Commercial
- Land use classifications
- Clarification of use for vacant tenant space
- Threshold for which salons are categorized.
- Personal services vs. General retail
- Palisades Plaza, Eureka Ridge, Century Theatre Center with similar parking constraints
- Monitoring centers to show that they are not going to have an impact on parking
- Ratio of parking vs. uses
- Other cities that categorize salons
- Businesses in Roseville with similar parking constraints
- Consideration of post development interest
- Not a good idea for policies to be based on the exception
- What was missing in the conditions of the Palisades? Property owner leased space to tenants that had competing demands
- Does staff perceive any necessity or recommendations? Staff feels comfortable with the parking standards within the code.
- Do all Parking Reductions come to the Commission? The only parking reductions that are required to come to the Commission are ones that are associated with restaurants.
- The Commission requests that Planning track how often parking reductions are being made, if it's a trend and why.
- Athletic facilities have the highest amount of parking requirements.
- Industrial facilities have the lowest amount of parking requirements.
- No need to define a new standard. Palisades has provided a precedence that needs to be recognized historically.
- As staff sees new patterns arise to keep Commission informed and come back to them with future recommendations
- Concerns that the next affordable housing project will have a density bonus problem again
- Approved specific plans have a certain amount of affordable housing sites identified
- Situations where Planning Staff works with Code Enforcement Staff to discuss with Neighborhoods

Chair Larson temporarily closed the public hearing.

III-B. WORKSHOP ITEM 2 – COMPACT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION DESIGN STANDARDS: Staff will provide the Planning Commission and the Design Committee an overview of the City's Community Design Guidelines regarding Compact Residential Subdivision design.

Planning Manager, Greg Bitter, presented the staff report and responded to questions.

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

Public Comment:

- None

Commission Discussion:

- Access required for fire department and refuse service in medium density homes.
- Residents that live in medium density home neighborhoods are pleased
- Difference between z-lots and garage front loaded
- Examples of neighborhoods in Roseville that are paseos or garage front loaded

REPORTS/COMMENTS/COMMISSION/STAFF

Reports from Planner:

- None

Commissioner Comments/Questions:

Assistant City Attorney, Bob Schmitt, addressed the commission and committee to report that this is his last Planning Commission meeting and that Senior Deputy City Attorney, Michelle Scheidenberger, will be covering future Planning Commission meetings and Senior Deputy City Attorney, Joe Mandell, will be covering future Design Committee meetings. He complimented the Commission on being engaged, efficient, prepared and cooperative. He expressed that it's been an honor to serve the Commission for the past 14 years.

Commissioner Houdesheldt congratulated Bob Schmitt on his achievements and on his appointment to City Attorney.

Chair Larson, on behalf of the Planning Commission, also thanked Bob Schmitt for his service on the Commission and congratulated him on his appointment to City Attorney.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Larson asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION

Chair Larson made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner McCaslin, to adjourn to the regularly scheduled meeting of February 12, 2015. The motion passed unanimously at 8:35 P.M.