

Planning Commissioners Present: Gray Allen, Donald Brewer, Sam Cannon, Rex Clark,
Kim Hoskinson, Audrey Huisking

Planning Commissioners Absent: Robert Dugan

Staff Present: Paul Richardson, Director, Planning & Redevelopment
Chris Burrows, Senior Planner
Mike Isom, Senior Planner
Eileen Bruggeman, Project Planner
Tricia Stewart, Associate Planner
Gina La Torra, Associate Planner
Wayne Wiley, Assistant Planner
Chris Kraft, Engineering Manager
Robert Schmitt, Deputy City Attorney
Carmen Bertola, Recording Secretary

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Led by Commissioner Cannon

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Vice-chair Allen asked if anyone wished to remove any of the items from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

ITEM IV-B WAS PULLED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR BY ROCKY YEE, UNION 76 STATION, 1119 GALLERIA BLVD. Mr. Yee stated that an agreement with Westfield has not been made regarding the Union 76 parcel and he was concerned that the developer was still moving forward with the Galleria expansion plans. He asked that any further approvals be delayed until a revised traffic plan has been approved.

Vice-chair Allen asked for a motion to approve the CONSENT CALENDAR as listed below:

IV-A. MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2006.

IV-C. DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION – 3251 MARKET STREET – WRSP WESTPARK VILLAGES W-10 & W-11 – FILE #2006PL-165 (DRP-000142). The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit for a Residential Subdivision to establish a development standard for Westpark Villages W-10 and W-11 to allow 40 percent lot coverage for one-and-one-half story house plans. Project Applicant: Pat Hanafee, Centex Homes. Property Owner: Centex Homes. (Lindbeck)

MOTION

Commissioner Hoskinson made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to approve items IV-A and IV-C of the Consent Calendar as submitted.

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Hoskinson, Brewer, Cannon, Huisking, Clark, Allen

Noes:

Abstain:

PULLED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR

IV-B. TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP –1151 GALLERIA BOULEVARD – NCRSP PARCEL 35 GALLERIA MALL - FILE#2006PL-113 (SUB-000062).

The applicant requests approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map for the Galleria at Roseville to merge nine (9) existing parcels totaling 52.9 acres and re-subdividing the property into nine (9) new parcels. The newly arranged parcels will facilitate the future expansion of the mall. As part of the Tentative Map, multiple private and public utility easements will be abandoned and dedicated. Project Applicant/Owner: Robert Nielsen, Omni-Means / Roseville Shoppingtown, LLC. (Lindbeck)

Mike Isom, Senior Planner addressed the Commission and responded to concerns brought up by Mr. Yee.

Vice-chair Allen opened the public hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Charles Robinson, Owner of Union 76, 1119 Galleria Blvd., addressed the Commission. He stated that Westfield had recently contacted Union 76, but an agreement has not as yet been reached. Mr. Robinson expressed his desire to cooperate, but wanted to make sure that whatever alternative plan that Westfield presents will respect their right to conduct business with adequate ingress and egress to their place of business.

Mark Perniconi, Vice President of Development, Westfield Corporation, addressed the Commission. He clarified that tonight's request is an application for a parcel line adjustment that does not have any impact on Mr. Robinson's parcel. He stated that Westfield is cognizant of Mr. Robinson's concerns and is currently studying ways to lessen the roadway development impact on the Union 76 station.

Mr. Yee disagrees with Westfield that the proposed roadway change is minor and asks that everyone be allowed to participate in the planning and discussion of the roadway changes.

There was discussion on the following:

- Ingress & egress of Union 76 station;
- General impact from the Galleria project to the Union 76 station.

Commission directed Staff to intercede with parties and work to amicable solution.

Vice-chair Allen closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

MOTION

Commissioner Clark made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Huisking, to adopt the three (3) findings of fact for the Tentative Subdivision Map; and Approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to the thirty-six (36) conditions of approval as submitted in the staff report.

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Clark, Huisking, Brewer, Cannon, Hoskinson, Allen

Noes:

Abstain:

NEW BUSINESS

Vice-chair Allen asked that Item V-A be moved to the end of New Business.

MOTION

Commissioner Hoskinson made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to move Item V-A to the end of New Business.

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Hoskinson, Brewer, Cannon, Clark, Huisking, Allen.

V-B. DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT, TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, AND TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP –4251 BOB DOYLE DRIVE – WRSP WESTPARK VILLAGE 26 - FILE#2006PL-035. The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit for 165 condominium units, a Tentative Parcel Map subdividing a 10-acre site into two parcels, and a Tentative Subdivision Map (Condominium Map) allowing 165 condominium units within 26 buildings. Project Applicant/Owner: Jennifer Skillings, PL Roseville, LLC. / Mark Kaushagen, PL Roseville LLC. (Stewart)

Associate Planner, Tricia Stewart, presented the staff report and responded to questions.

Vice-chair Allen opened the public hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Applicant, Jennifer Skillings, PL Roseville, 4196 Douglas Blvd., Granite Bay, addressed the Commission and responded to questions. She stated that she had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendations.

There was discussion on the following:

- Color palletete presented shows the base colors as too dull;
- Proposed street widths;
- Commission commended design concepts;
- Possible modification of condition to include use of bolder colors.

Vice-Chair Allen closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

MOTION

Commissioner Huisking made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Clark, to Adopt the three (3) findings of fact for the Tentative Subdivision Map; Approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to the sixty-two (62) conditions listed below; Adopt the four (4) findings of fact for the Design Review Permit; and Approve the Design Review Permit subject to the ninety-five (95) conditions, as modified below, as submitted in the Staff Report.

DRP-000107

3. All side and rear building elevations shall be enhanced by enhancing the base building colors to include bolder, jewel tone colors, and utilizing the colors from the front façade of the buildings on the side and rear elevations. Side and rear elevations shall also include more accoutrements such as window shutters and planter boxes to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. (Planning)

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Huisking, Clark, Brewer, Cannon, Hoskinson, Allen

Noes:

Abstain:

V-C. TREE PERMIT VIOLATION –1965 PARK OAK DRIVE – SRSP PARCEL 33, WHISPERING CANYON LOT 51 – FILE PL-001580 (ORIGINAL FILE #TP 03-06). Planning Staff is requesting Planning Commissions' review and enforcement of violations of the conditions of approval for the previously approved Master Tree Permit for Whispering Canyon, Lot 51. Project Applicant/Owner: Lance & Selesté Buriani. (La Torra)

Associate Planner, Gina La Torra, presented the staff report and responded to questions.

Vice-chair Allen opened the public hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Applicant, Lance Buriani, 748 Roscommon Dr., Vacaville, addressed the Commission and responded to questions. He stated that he had received a copy of the staff report and was not in agreement with staff's recommendations. He disagreed on the following points:

- Staff report did not address the health of the trees;
- Penalties are not fair and reasonable;
- Stressed his ignorance of Roseville's tree ordinance;
- Hired tree expert to evaluate trees and mitigate as needed;

- Trees removed in preparation for selling of lot.

Don Stitt, Prudential Real Estate, addressed the Commission on behalf of his client, Lance Buriani, and said that he did ask the arborist if they would take care of any necessary permitting and he was assured that they always do.

There was discussion on the following:

- Previous tree violation action;
- Evidence that the tree was ailing;
- Arborist report stating the tree needed removal;
- Review of process for emergency removal of trees;
- Review of condition requiring fencing and signage around protected trees;
- Commissioner reviewed evidence presented by Mr. Buriani that showed the condition of the removed trees along with his arborist report.
- Relief of fine for tree #1671;
- Extenuating circumstances can be considered when making a determination;
- Require penalty for tree #1669, restitution plus recovery of staff time.

Vice-chair Allen closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

MOTION

Commissioner Huisking made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Hoskinson, to adopt the finding that a violation of the Tree Ordinance has occurred; require restitution/remediation for tree #1669, in the amount of \$6,372.00; and require restitution for the recovery of staff time in the amount of \$569.62, as submitted in the Staff Report.

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Huisking, Hoskinson, Cannon, Clark, Allen

Noes: Brewer

Abstain:

Commissioner Huisking asked that notice be posted on remaining lots in the Whispering Canyon subdivision to remind owners/builders of the Master Tree Permit governing the property.

V-D. DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT AND TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP – 1801 PFE ROAD – MARCH INDUSTRIAL PARK – FILE # 2006 PL-076 (PROJECT #'s DRP-000121 & SUB-000058 & TP-000085). The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit to allow construction of Phase 1 of the March Road Industrial Park; a Tentative Subdivision Map Modification to subdivide 22.75 acres into 16 parcels; and a Tree Permit to allow the removal of a native oak tree and to discuss the unauthorized removal of an additional native oak tree. Project Applicant: Lane Borges, Borges Architectural Group, Inc. Project Owner: Charles Smyth, PFE-March Industrial Partners. (Wiley)

Assistant Planner, Wayne Wiley, presented the staff report and responded to questions.

Vice-chair Allen opened the public hearing and invited comments from the applicant and/or audience.

Applicant, Lane Borges, Borges Architectural Group, Inc, addressed the Commission and responded to questions. He stated that he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendations.

There was discussion on the following:

- Condition that states that the trees are protected and the tree permit requires applicant take proper action to safeguard them.

Vice-chair Allen closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

MOTION

Commissioner Clark made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration; Adopt the four (4) findings of fact for the Design Review Permit; Approve the Design Review Permit with ninety (90) conditions of approval; Adopt the three (3) findings of fact for the Tentative Subdivision Map; Approve the Tentative Subdivision Map with sixty-eight (68) conditions of approval; Adopt the two (2) findings of fact for the Tree Permit; and Approve the Tree Permit with twenty-one (21) conditions of approval, as submitted in the Staff Report.

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Clark, Brewer, Cannon, Huisiking, Hoskinson, Allen

Noes:

Abstain:

Vice-chair Allen recused himself from Item V-A due to a possible conflict of interest. Commissioner Hoskinson was appointed as Acting Chair for this item.

V-A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT, REZONE, MAJOR PROJECT PERMIT MODIFICATION, DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT, PARCEL MAP AND TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP –10000 DIAMOND CREEK BOULEVARD – NRSP PARCELS DC-30, -31 AND -33 – DIAMOND CREEK REZONE – FILE#2005PL-161 (GPA-000021, SPA-000014, RZ-000026, MPP-000004, DAA-000023, SUB-000077 and SUB-000050).

The applicant requests the following entitlements: a General Plan Amendment to change a portion of the project site (Parcel DC-31) from Community Commercial (CC) uses, to a mix of residential and commercial uses; a Specific Plan Amendment to change the North Roseville Specific Plan to amend Parcel DC-31 from Community Commercial (CC) to Medium and High Density Residential designations; a Rezone to change Parcel DC-31 from Community Commercial to Small Lot Residential with Design Standards (RS/DS), Commercial Mixed Use/Special Area (CMU/SA), and Attached Housing (R3); a Major Project Permit Modification to reflect the above land use changes to Parcel DC-31, to increase the amount of Community Commercial development in Parcels DC-30 and DC-33 from the currently approved 97,673 square feet to 124,188 square feet, and approval of a revised off-street parking requirement for Parcels DC-31 and DC-33; a Development Agreement Amendment to modify the North Roseville Specific Plan Development Agreement to reflect the changes to the specific plan and identify both the obligations of the land owner and the City; a Large Lot Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide Parcel DC-31 (approximately 19.1 acres) into 4 large lots; and a Tentative Subdivision Map to create the residential parcels and single-family lots. Project Applicant: A.R. Associates, Jack Remington. Owner: Diamond Creek Partners, Ltd., Stephen Des Jardins. (Bruggeman)

Project Planner, Eileen Bruggeman, presented the staff report and responded to questions.

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

Owner, Stephen Des Jardins, Diamond Creek Partners, Ltd., 130 Diamond Creek Place, addressed the Commission and responded to questions. He presented the Commission with an additional hand out stating what he would like approved. He asked for Stage 2 on the single family residential. Diamond Creek partners would like to spend more time with the neighborhood residents in addressing the proposed condominiums. He expressed his excitement with this project and its fulfillment of the blueprint guidelines; walkable and somewhere to walk to; a place to live and work. He expressed one disagreement with staff regarding the air quality issue requiring an attachment to air conditioning units and photovoltaic tiles. He emphasized the change in the project reduces the asphalt surface from 9 acres to 3.2 acres and a 33% reduction in traffic.

Don Rickey, Dahlin Group Architects addressed the Commission regarding the proposed SFD for this project and responded to questions.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

- Gordon Hinkle, 9073 Pinto Canyon Way, appreciates the designs, concerned with the increase in the density over what was originally planned for the area and the impact on current infrastructure and services. Impact on quality of life.

- David Larson, 3220 Mt. Tamalpais, Compliments to Diamond Creek with neighborhood outreach program. Weakness in the project is the increased density to an already densely populated area. Currently medium to high density exists in neighboring parcels, i.e., Villas, Diamond Creek Parcel 7, and Eskaton; add them to the density proposed in Diamond Creek and it may be a problem. Strengths: curbside appeal along Blue Oaks, possible lower traffic volume; follows SACOG guidelines, as far as blueprint goals; proactive to future. Supports project.
- Alex Dyer, Vice-President Bent Tree HOA, attended one meeting and has studied project objectively. Concerned models used to make findings not applicable to Roseville. Asked Planning Commission why established standards should be changed for this project.
- Ed Silva, 2432 Bent Tree Dr, bought in community in 2001 and appreciated what was in the original plan, feels that this proposed project destroys both. Arguments counter common sense; challenges models used for traffic study. Parking under estimated. Please do not approve rezone.
- Sam Ziour, 201 Bent Tree, Purchased home in 2001 because of planned parks, walkable retail and commercial, walkable community, and schools. Shortly after things started changing, rezoning with mixed use residential/commercial-retail. Everything turning into high density homes. Opposed to any rezone to residential. Rush to introduce residential into commercial area. Opposed to this project.
- Sharon West, 308 Cordero Ct, lived 5 years in Diamond Creek; currently the Diamond Creek School is special. Past promises to make Diamond Creek a walking village have not happened yet. Current traffic problem at roundabout. Higher density residential will impact the already crowded schools. Employment/commercial/residential good for closer to HP & NEC not here. Opposed to project.
- Paula Davie, Parkside Way, resident, first saw and concerned with project, attended meeting, learned that changes are positive. In favor of the project.
- Daphne Rank, 109 Starwood Ct., Asked Commission what is the current high density rate per acre in Roseville. What is the proposed density with this project. How many negative responses were received. She agrees with other speakers in disagreeing with traffic models used in study; feels that the proposed numbers are unrealistic; as well as the estimated school impact. Opposed to project.
- Carrie Newton, 2524 Waterford Glen Cir, agrees with other speakers in concern for increased traffic; asked Commission to take more time to look at impacts; biggest concern are the tall buildings, blending 4 story buildings with single story homes and Eskaton's impact on traffic in the area. Looking for walkable community that was proposed originally. Asked Commission to deny project and developer to go forward with what is already approved
- Rick Tranchina, 2781 McCloud Wy, agrees with others against proposed project; asks to also consider impact of other developments in the area. Came to Roseville to get away from high-density in San Jose. 54 units per acre too high. Against project.
- Annie Wamsat, 116 Starwood Ct., one of the first residents in the Diamond Creek area, currently everything that was originally proposed when the homes were sold has been modified to the negative; asks Commission to deny project at this time. Homebuyers were sold a certain lifestyle but it is now being changed. Life style of area looks to change quite drastically. Cascading brook was once promised then declared by City unfeasible. Information being given to residents is continually degrading. Opposed to project.
- Jeff Allen, Neighbor. In favor of a walkable community, this new project delivers better than the previous plan. The reduction of asphalt is much more advantageous to family. In favor of project.
- Amy Brailley, bought the home based on the presented quality of life and disappointed that what they bought into no longer exists. Disappointed by project. Concerned with what it will do to the housing values. Against project.
- Melissa Allen, approves of project considers it positive to have a mixer of residential. They are different but not degrading to the SFD. In favor and likes proposed walkable community.

Engineering Manager, Chris Kraft, addressed concerns regarding the traffic studies:

- Existing land uses are studied prior to all rezones;
- How decreased traffic impacts are predicted; then verified after projects are built;
- Fehr and Peers Traffic Consultant hired by City to do traffic studies;
- Criteria used for traffic studies;
- Frontage improvements occur as properties are developed;

There was discussion on the following:

- Concern with additional density impact on services, utilities, and resources;

- Water supply for project;
- Building heights and how they will blend in with the surrounding neighborhoods;
- Parking and pedestrian safety in the mixed use residential/retail;
- Communication between public/developer/City;
- Retail/Office reduction from existing plan;
- Formula for calculating park standards is 2.54 people per household;
- How schools calculate student yield in single-family residential and multi-family residential;
- Reasons for demise of promised cascading brook using recycled water;
- Rivermark project statistics;
- Why specific HVAC parts required by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District;
- CEQA requirements for air quality mitigation;
- Project satisfies City Council's direction for following the Blueprint plan;
- Safety issues regarding underground parking;
- Consideration for postponing decision to allow more time for study;
- Approval would include entire project with the return of the condominiums for Stage 2I;
- Possible Workshop with PC/Developer/Neighborhood prior to making a decision;

Acting Chair Hoskinson closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

MOTION

Commissioner Clark made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Cannon, to Continue Item V-A to a later date and hold a Public Workshop for Commissioners/Developer/Public in order to allow more time for study and comment prior to making a final decision.

The motion was denied with the following vote:

- Ayes: Clark, Cannon
- Noes: Huisking, Brewer, Hoskinson
- Abstain:

The motion failed to pass.

Commissioner Huisking made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to Adopt the Addendum to the NRSP EIR and the Diamond Creek Commercial Center Mitigated Negative Declaration; Recommend that the City Council adopt the applicable findings of fact and approve the General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Development Agreement Amendment for NRSP Parcels DC-30, -31 and – 33; Adopt the two (2) findings of fact for the Major Project Permit Modification; Approve the Major Project Permit Modification subject to twelve (12) conditions of approval with modifications as listed below; Adopt the three findings of fact for the Tentative Parcel and Tentative Subdivision Maps; Approve the Tentative Large Lot Parcel Map subject to thirty-seven (37) conditions of approval; and Approve the Tentative Subdivision Map subject to eighty-two (82) conditions of approval with modifications as listed below, and as submitted in the Staff Report.

MPP-000004

2. The Stage 1 and 2 of the entire project is approved as shown in on Exhibits D and E and Stage 2 for the office and retail buildings, medium density residential town homes, and single family detached units is approved as shown on Exhibit E, as conditioned or modified below. (Planning)

SUB-000050

~~49. Residential dwelling units that do not meet the limited setback required in the provision of the CBC shall be protected with the installation of fire sprinklers in accordance with the RFD's fire prevention standard on automatic fire protection system installation for one and two family dwelling units. (Fire)~~

~~72. The Environmental Utilities Department shall make a determination that there is adequate conveyance and treatment capacity in the City sewer system to handle the newly created Lot/Parcels. (Environmental Utilities)~~

~~81. c. (ii) HVAC units shall be equipped with PremAir (or other manufacturer) catalyst system if available and economically feasible at the time building permits are issued. The PremAir catalyst can convert up to 70% of ground level ozone that passes over the condenser coils into oxygen. The PremAir system is considered feasible if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the base HVAC system.~~

The motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Huisking, Brewer, Hoskinson

Noes: Cannon, Clark

Abstain:

REPORTS/COMMENTS/COMMISSION/STAFF

A. REPORTS FROM PLANNER

ADJOURNMENT

Acting chair Hoskinson asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION

Commissioner Clark made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Huisking, to adjourn to the special meeting of December 7, 2006. The motion passed unanimously at 10:23 PM.