



## **APPROVED MINUTES**

September 10, 2020

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

6:30 p.m.

311 Vernon Street  
Roseville, California  
[www.roseville.ca.us](http://www.roseville.ca.us)

Commissioners teleconferenced pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20.

Members of the public viewed the meeting on Comcast channel 14, Consolidated Communications channel 73 and AT&T U-verse. The meeting was video streamed live and was available on the City's website and YouTube channel.

Members of the public were able to offer public comment by phone or email.

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Brashears called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

#### **2. ROLL CALL**

Present: Krafka, Librea, Martin, Prior, Jensen, Brashears

Absent: Caporusso

#### **3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Brashears lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chair Brashears opened the Public Comment period. Hearing none, Chair Brashears closed the Public Comment period.

#### **5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Motion by Commissioner Martin, seconded by Commissioner Librea, to approve the Consent Calendar.

The Motion passed.

Roll call votes:

Ayes: Prior, Martin, Jensen, Krafka, Librea, Brashears

Noes: None

5.1. Minutes of August 27, 2020

5.2. NERSP PCL16 – Golfland Sunsplash Bumper Car Arena, 1893 Taylor Road, File # PL20-0108

5.3. SVSP PCL FD-1 – Tentative Subdivision Map, 2751 Silver Spruce Dr, File # PL20-0113

## **6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS**

6.1. SERSP PCL 81 – Johnson Ranch Storage, 1851 E. Roseville Pw, File #PL18-0355

Associate Planner, Shelby Vockel, presented the staff report.

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

Applicant's representative, Marcus LoDuca, stated he had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

### Commissioner Discussion:

- Boundary to include masonry wall.
- Emergency access fencing type.
- Zoning has stayed the same.
- What can be allowed with the current zoning?
- Distance from property lines to RV storage?
- Explain why condition of approval #2A was modified to a masonry wall.
- Describe the incentives being offered by developer.
- Appreciate the outreach, concessions made and incentives offered by developer.

Public comment period was opened.

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the project: Kathleen Jones, Shannon Allen speaking on behalf of Sandy Allen, Russ Towne, Noel Jones, Jennifer Jones, Helena Letunic, Heather Clemmer, Susan Caffrey, Doug Herrenschmidt, Leah Koukol, JJ Stiff, Leah Snyder, Scott Vaughn

### Comments:

- Residents were told a nursery would be built on the site.
- Location of other storage project nearby doesn't warrant this project.
- Concerned with crimes that occur at storage units.
- Commissioners should consider the community.
- Storage units are usually located in commercial areas, not neighborhoods.

- Currently outdoor parking and storage is not an allowed use on the street within the neighborhood.
- Project description in the initial study is not comprehensive - broad statements.
- Initial Study does not comply with grading and draining.
- Six foot tall wall will enclose residential backyards.
- One neighbor prefers a four foot tall wall.
- Height of trees in line with power lines.
- Landscape on buffer area.
- Add conditions requiring notification of construction 1 month prior and 1 week prior so neighbors can adjust plans, if necessary.
- Prefer eight foot tall wall.
- Visual impacts of RVs and boats.
- No EVA access to site from Wringer.
- All ingress / egress from E. Roseville Parkway.
- Full study on the effects on air quality from cars.
- Full noise study.
- Independent confirmation that the traffic impacts are not significant.
- Would like requirements in writing on how to appeal the project.
- Independent analysis on the Zoning compatibility
- Not pleased meeting is being held virtually.
- Objects to format of public outreach.
- Property values will decrease.
- Quality of life will decrease.
- Project will be an eyesore.
- Concerns with heat being reflected off metal and fiberglass of units.
- Crime issues will rise with the proposed project.
- Traffic issues will come with the proposed project.
- Project will bring strangers to the neighborhood.
- Project will make neighborhood less safe.
- Fire risks due to unsafe land conditions around utilities.
- SMUD, WAPA do not allow structures around utilities.
- Grading will occur within 20 feet of towers - requirement is 30 feet.
- There are already 4 storage facilities within 3 miles.
- Homeless living in RV.
- Vehicles coming in and out of the proposed facility will not be safe.
- Vehicles coming in and out of the proposed facility will be loud.
- RVs will be visible.
- No community benefit.
- Not compatible with surround area.
- Storage units are not moveable.
- Decrease the number of RV and boats allowed.
- Not consistent with the zoning requirements for community commercial.
- No permanent structures under the power lines are allowed.

- Wringer will be used as a cut through to get to proposed project.
- People may try to use the fire access gate.
- Illegal activity will occur.
- Home would not have been purchased if it was known that a storage project was going to be built.
- Disingenuous to change land use 35 years after plan adoption.
- By granting amendment, giving developers special privilege.
- Rezone is discriminatory against community.
- Catalytic converter thefts have occurred at Treelake Self Storage.

The following individuals spoke in support of the project: Jill Sanchez and Paul Chapman:

Comments:

- Homeless camps will be removed.
- Sanitation issues will be removed.
- Project will mitigate fire hazard.
- Dust and dirt from open field, storage use will be more maintained.
- Restricted business hours.
- Limited noise on paved driveways.
- A few jobs will be created.
- Storage facility a quieter neighbor.
- Nursery would be worse than a storage facility.

Chair Brashears closed the public comment.

Marcus LoDuca responded to public comment.

Chair Brashears closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Discussion:

- Describe security measures.
- PG & E approval?
- WAPA approval?
- Zoning clarification.
- Don't live the virtual meetings, forced due to restrictions imposed by State, but it allows the City to continue its business.
- Rezones are difficult and rare.
- Compare the proposed projects - nursery versus storage unit - which would be less impact?
- Vehicles parked 60-feet away is less than street to front door.
- Background of current zoning.
- Applicant is being a good neighbor.
- Thank you for the effort by staff and applicant.

- Thank you to residents for their diligence.
- Nursery and storage units both have pros and cons.
- Many chemicals are used at a nursery.
- This specific plan was one of the first specific plans completed by the City.
- Does the property owner pay property taxes?
- Unique property - only one use is allowed on site.
- Site has been vacant for 30 years.
- Do not see significant difference between nursery and storage facility.

Commissioner Martin made the motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Jensen, to:

- Adopt the Johnson Ranch Storage Mitigated Negative Declaration;
- Recommend the City Council adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Rezone;
- Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to seventy-five (75) conditions of approval;
- Adopt the three (3) findings of fact and approve the Conditional Use Permit subject to four (4) conditions of approval;
- Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Lot Line Adjustment subject to nine (9) conditions of approval;
- Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Tree Permit subject to twenty (20) conditions of approval.

Motion included italicized text.

#### Design Review Permit Condition #2

This project is approved as shown in Exhibits B-G and as conditioned or modified below.

(Planning)

- Project fencing along Wringer Drive shall be a masonry wall. Improvement plans shall be accompanied with engineered structural calculations for all walls greater than 4 feet in height. All walls shall be constructed of either split faced masonry units, keystone type construction, or cast in place concrete with fascia treatment. In addition, the fencing adjacent to the Park Preserve Parcel (SERSP Parcel 62) shall be ornamental wrought iron fencing, also consistent with Exhibit D. (Planning, Engineering)*
- One month prior to the commencement of any site work, and again one week prior to beginning of said site work, the project developer shall be responsible for the mailing of notification to all adjacent residential owners and tenants. This notice shall include a project schedule and the name and contact numbers for the project's general contractor. The City of Roseville Planning Division shall also be copied on this notice to ensure the timeliness and completeness.*

#### Design Review Permit Condition #9a

- All parking stalls shall be double-striped. Parking stalls adjacent to sidewalks, landscaped areas or light fixtures, and all Accessible stalls shall have a 6-inch raised

curb or concrete bumper. *All recreational vehicle and boat storage parking spaces shall be paved.* (Planning)

Design Review Permit Condition #13i

- i) *A dense, double row of screen trees (a mix of evergreen and deciduous) shall be installed and maintained in the landscape setback adjacent to Wringer Dr. The tree species shall be consistent with the requirements in the SERSP Landscape Guidelines and will be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division prior to the approval of the project Improvement Plans.*

Design Review Permit Condition #22

The driveway access to Wringer Drive shall be restricted to emergency vehicle access only. *This emergency access gate shall screen views into the site, to the satisfaction of the Planning Division.* (Planning, Engineering, Fire)

The Motion passed.

Roll Call vote:

Ayes: Jensen, Prior, Martin, Brashears

Noes: Krafka, Librea

**7. BOARD MEMBER / COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT**

Staff Report:

- There will not be a Planning Commission meeting on September 24, 2020.
- There will be a Planning Commission meeting on October 8, 2020.

Commissioner Report:

None

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Vice-Chair Jensen, seconded by Commissioner Martin, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion Passed unanimously at 8:55 p.m. with a voice vote.