

**CITY OF ROSEVILLE
COMMUNITY DESIGN VISIONING COMMITTEE MEETING (CDVC)
MEETING SUMMARY
September 19, 2007**

Committee Members Present: Rex Clark, Don Brewer (alternate), Naaz Alikhan, Anna Robertson (alternate), Mark Marvelli, Lane Borges, Stephen Des Jardins, Valerie Hoff, Joe Velky, Rita Brohman, Darin Gale

Committee Members Absent: John Tallman

Meeting Facilitators: Paul Downs, Vikrant Sood, Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc., (MIG)

Staff Present: Paul Richardson, Planning & Redevelopment Director
Mike Isom, Senior Planner
Chris Burrows, Senior Planner
Carolyn Alexander, Deputy City Attorney
Gina LaTorra, Associate Planner
Darci Frank, Administrative Analyst

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Paul Richardson welcomed the Committee members and thanked them for their participation. Paul introduced staff, and then introduced Paul Downs of MIG as the Committee facilitator and Vikrant Sood as the assistant facilitator, who would be writing the wall notes.

I-A. Meeting Purpose and Organization

- Paul Downs welcomed the group

I-B. Agenda Overview

- Paul Downs provided an overview of the agenda

I-C. Committee Member Introductions

- Committee self-introductions

I-D. Brown Act Overview

- Carolyn Alexander provided an overview of the regulations of the Brown Act, explained that committee meetings are open to the public, and explained the rules that accompany that status.

II. Committee Purpose

II-A. Purpose

- Paul Downs asked the Committee for their thoughts on the purpose of the CDVC.
- Stephen Des Jardins reaffirmed that the Council asked the CDVC to focus on three areas: design guidelines for neighborhood commercial, multi-family residential, and compact residential.
- Paul Downs explained that the City is experiencing new growth and development and the existing design guidelines may need to be adapted or fine-tuned, per the Council's direction. Compact Residential is not currently addressed in the City's guidelines.

II-B. Guiding Principles

- Paul Downs summarized the six Guiding Principles adopted by the City Council to guide the work of the Committee that were listed in the handout in the CDVC binder. Paul stated that the Committee should review the existing design standards and reaffirm or recommend changes to the design guidelines. The Committee will report their recommendations to the Council in February 2008.
- It was highlighted that the responsibility of the Committee is to represent the entire community of Roseville. The Committee should work toward a group consensus, with a focus in three areas: Neighborhood Shopping Center, Compact Residential Development, and Multi-Family.
- Vikrant Sood drew a table showing the existing design guidelines structure: I. Site Design, II. Architecture, III. Lighting, IV. Art.

II-C. Timeline

- Paul Downs reviewed the meeting schedule in the CDVC binder and the topics for each meeting. In November, staff will update the Commissions and City Council on the CDVC progress. The CDVC will draft and finalize their recommendations in December and will present to Council in February.

II-D. Desired Outcomes

Paul Downs asked the Committee what will make this a successful process for them. The following is a list of recurrent themes from the comments:

Learn from Existing Developments—Examine what is currently built in the City to clearly identify what we want.

Focus on Design Goals and End Results—Provide a clear and broad description of good design, as opposed to focusing on highly specific standards. Keep the focus on quality design and aesthetics.

Promote Good Design in a Range of Demographic and Economic Conditions—Provide guidance on good design for areas with less advantageous economic conditions. Consider approaches that vary across areas of the City while still maintaining fair and equitable treatment. Address cost-effectiveness.

Consider Subsequent Uses—Address potential future uses of development sites so that developments remain desirable and functional.

Use a Flexible Approach—Facilitate the use of a range of design solutions and approaches to meet unique site and market conditions. Minimize the use prescriptive "formula-driven" guidelines.

Address Rehabilitation in Older Areas—Address older areas where owners may propose rehabilitation. Develop guidelines that promote market-feasible improvements and are not barriers to achievable enhancements.

Promote Consistency and Predictability—Develop guidelines that facilitate consistent design quality in comparable circumstances, while promoting predictability for owners and builders.

The specific comments from each Committee member are listed below:

- Naaz Alikhan expressed interest in examining what is currently built in the City; looking at the good, bad and ugly and identify current issues.
- Rita Brohman expressed interest in looking at areas where there are deficiencies, how the standards can be more specific to reduce discrepancies, study construction costs and make more realistic recommendations. Rita Brohman also expressed that it was important to ensure consistency. The outcome is important for the good of the City.
- Lane Borges stated that sometimes standards are too specific. The guidelines should consider old areas that need upgrades. Standards should be unique to each area of the City and should be flexible to respond to demographic differences with a sense of fairness to all.
- Naaz Alikhan stated that the guidelines should consider the existing areas, encouraging renewal, in addition to new development.
- Paul Downs affirmed that the CDVC wished to add mixed-use and infill as an area of focus.
- Mark Marvelli stated that he did not want the guidelines to lose sight of design/aesthetics to fit a formula. He does not want formula-based design guidelines. The guidelines should look at the design end result, not just the standards.
- Stephen Des Jardins stated that the last big review of community design was in 1995 and that they need to look long-term. He has seen the same retailer do well and not do well in two parts of town. The guidelines should address longevity while maintaining high standards. Predictability makes for a fair playing field.
- Lane Borges asked that the Committee review what hasn't worked and learn from those examples and look for ways to adapt.
- Rita Brohman asked if things will be removed from the design guidelines if the committee recommends the removal and can look at the entire Community Design Guidelines and make recommendations.
- The Committee will have the ability to make recommendations. It was discussed and clarified the Council's expectations of the Committee is to focus on the areas of Neighborhood Shopping Center, Compact Residential Development, and Multi-Family design and review. The Committee should review all guidelines applicable to the target areas and make recommendations accordingly. The Committee will be writing new sections of Design Guidelines and will have the ability to edit the entire document.
- Stephen Des Jardins hoped all design guidelines were composed in one document.
- Valerie Hoff hoped the guidelines would include consideration for subsequent users so that developments remain desirable and functional.
- Joe Velky hoped that the update would incorporate new areas of the City to make sure that they are relevant and there is consistency.
- Darin Gale hoped the guidelines would consider the market and would include cost effective recommendations. He would prefer guidelines instead of standards. The guidelines should not stymie future development.
- Mark Marvelli expressed interest in looking at the rehab of older centers and how the guidelines can assist and not have standards that serve as barriers.
- Darin Gale used Freeport Boulevard (Sacramento) as an example of guidelines that don't work because they are too rigid. Guidelines need to fit context and be responsive.
- Stephen Des Jardins stated that cost falls in two categories: public versus private ownership. Consider the public and private costs in the public character.

- Rex Clark hoped that the guidelines recognize technology advancements and future materials that may be developed. He also wanted to encourage public art.
- Darin Gale stated he works for the Building Industry Association. He had concerns about the recommendations being too specific as a result of the Committee's work.
- Rita Brahman requested a copy of the meeting notes and wall notes.

III. Design Policy Framework

- Mike Isom gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the written report provided in the CDVC packet and showing examples of existing developments in Roseville (the PowerPoint is available on the CDVC website). Mike Isom opened the discussion for questions.
 - *What is Medium Density?* Medium density is a range between 7 units/acre to 12.9 units/acre
 - *Currently is there no design review for Medium Density or Low Density?* Not unless it is required per the Specific Plan.
 - *What was the driving force behind the approval of the building shown on page 6 (Panda Express shopping Center)?* Staff can only ask for so much beyond what is the minimum standard listed in the design guidelines.
 - *Did the projects with more detail have a developer that wanted the buildings that way?* Yes, however staff battled for what they got.
 - *Does Crocker Ranch have specific criteria?* The project was developer driven, but there is always a lot of back and forth in the process.
 - *Why wasn't the Nugget Market cited as a "high end" example and photos shown in the presentation?* The Nugget is included on the bus tour and small picture was shown in the presentation.

IV. Strategic Issues Framework

- Paul Downs facilitated an interactive discussion to validate the existing issues.
- Committee had preliminary conversation about content and issues components. Key points and topics of discussion are reflected in the "Wall Notes" captured by Vikrant Sood. (See attached document titled "Wall Notes 9-19-07").

V. Summary and Next Steps

- Paul Downs thanked the Committee for their participation. The next meeting is a bus tour. Maps were provided showing the bus tour route. Committee members were encouraged to visit the sites on their own time as well.

VI. Public Comment

- No public comments were received.

ADJOURNMENT

6:10 pm