

**CITY OF ROCKLIN
MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**November 7, 2017
Rocklin Council Chambers
Rocklin Administration Building
3970 Rocklin Road
(www.rocklin.ca.us)**

- 1. Meeting Called to Order at 6:32pm**
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Vass.**
- 3. Roll Call**

Chairman Martinez
Commissioner McKenzie
Commissioner Sloan
Vice Chairman Whitmore
Commissioner Vass

Others Present:

DeeAnne Gillick, Assistant City Attorney
Dara Dungworth, Senior Planner
Marc Mondell, Economic & Community Development Director
Laura Webster, Director of Long Range Planning
David Mohlenbrok, Deputy Director, Public Services
Dave Palmer, City Engineer
Sharon Cohen, Environmental Services Specialist
Corrine Heisler, Environmental Services Specialist
Terry Stemple, Planning Commission Secretary

About 60 others

- 4. Minutes –**
 - a. None
- 5. Correspondence - 4th Blue Memo, 2 additional handouts from Denise Gaddis**
- 6. Citizens Addressing the Commission on Non Agenda Items – None**

CONSENT ITEMS

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

7. SIERRA GATEWAY APARTMENTS DESIGN REVIEW, DR2015-0018 OAK TREE PRESERVATION PLAN PERMIT, TRE2016-0001

This application is a request for approval of Design Review and Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit to construct a 195 unit multi-family project on an approximately 10.2 acre site, including site design, architecture, and landscaping. The subject property is generally located on the southeast corner of Sierra College Boulevard and Rocklin Road. APNs 045-161-014, 045-161-015, 045-161-016. The property is zoned Planned Development 20 dwelling units minimum per acre (PD-20). The General Plan designation is High Density Residential (HDR).

Notice is hereby given that the City of Rocklin Planning Commission will consider making a recommendation for adoption of an Environmental Impact Report for the development project described above.

The applicant and property owner is Rocklin Sierra Apartments II, LLC.

David Mohlenbrok, Deputy Director Public Services, introduced Rick Jarvis, CEQA counsel, and then presented the Environmental portion of the staff report.

Dara Dungworth, Senior Planner, presented the project staff report.

The Commission had questions for staff regarding:

1. Waterlily Lane – public or private street
2. EVA access
3. Conflicts with HOA road/easement
4. Options with EVA access
5. Flooding issues on project
6. Buildings 5 and 9 height – reduced from original 2015 project
7. Summary versus list approach in NOP
8. Prior Zoning
9. Reduced footprint
10. Housing stock – RHNA requirements
11. Density calculations – panhandle
12. Blue memo #4 – Loomis School District additional 10 days for EIR certification
13. Oak tree mitigation amount

The Commission took a recess at 7:43pm and reconvened at 7:52pm

Chairman Martinez allowed the Loomis School District to make their public comments prior to the applicant presentation to accommodate a time issue.

Megan Macy, Lozano Smith Attorneys at Law, on behalf of the Loomis Union School District, addressed the Commission stating her concerns included mitigation of school related issues, impacts related to traffic, interim housing and communication between the City and the Loomis School District. Asked for the hearing to be continued so that negotiations between the school district and the developer could be completed.

Gordon Medd, Loomis Union School District Superintendent, addressed the Commission about the lack of communication between the City and the school district regarding this project. He also asked that the decision on the project be delayed until the negotiations are complete with the developer.

The Applicant, Roy Brewer, addressed the Commission and thanked staff for their efforts. He gave a brief history of the project and asked the Commission to recommend approval to the City Council. He introduced his team and gave a presentation to the Commission.

The Commission had questions for the applicant regarding:

1. Architectural Review Committee concerns about seeing building 9 coming from the top of Sierra College Blvd.

The hearing was opened to the public for comment.

1. Richard Burton, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
2. Mike Mattos, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
3. Kim Steinjann, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
4. Robert Steinjann, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
5. Chris Wiegman, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
6. Kali Hetrick, Rocklin, spoke in support of the project
7. Rowena Yeseta, Loomis, spoke in opposition to the project
8. Roger Smith, Loomis, spoke in opposition to the project
9. Alex Tyshkevich, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
10. Denise Gaddis, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
11. Irene Smith, Loomis, spoke in opposition to the project
12. David Vickers, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
13. Sue Hoppe, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
14. Jim Lofgren, Rental Housing Association, spoke in support of the project
15. Kent Zenobia, Rocklin, spoke in opposition to the project
16. Steve Matthews, St. Francis Woods, spoke in opposition to the project

The Applicant, Ron Brewer, reiterated his original statements and asked for approval of the project.

At 9:20pm the Commission took a recess and reconvened at 9:27pm.

There being no further comments, the public hearing as closed.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the applicant:

1. Water drainage
2. Flooding from Rocklin Manor
3. List of approved projects that were not included in the EIR
4. Uniform Building Code's definition of building height
5. Fire truck requirements
6. Applicant paying the City for the preparation of the EIR
7. Loomis Union School District's noticing issues and traffic issues
8. Reduced traffic as a result of students/teachers living at project
9. Page 120 of the FEIR – trees of varying health; dead trees being left causing dangerous conditions
10. EVA – right in/right out only
11. Tool for achieving trees/balancing – Oak Tree Mitigation

Commission Deliberation/Discussion:

Commissioner Whitmore stated that unequivocally it was a mistake on his part to rezone the property from commercial to PD-20 several years ago. He felt at the time that a residential project's footprint could be done to preserve some of the natural beauty of the site. He expressed that he would really like to see a design review package with every rezone so that they can understand exactly what it's going to look like. He does not feel the project is consistent with all of the findings. Feels it is not, and never will be an award winning project. The project is too dense. It is not a good fit for the residents to the south. He does like the architecture and stated that it is much improved from the architecture from before and it's consistent with the design review guidelines the City is trying to create for that collegiate vision for the area. He stated that he cannot support the project. Commissioner Whitmore added that he had exparte communications with the applicant.

Commissioner Sloan stated he sees the project differently than Commission Whitmore. He agrees that it isn't a perfect fit for the residents to the south but feels the rezone was to create synergy with the college, the mixed use and the retail commercial surrounding it. He stated the EIR as prepared is the correct document for this project. Would like a condition included that the developer complies with the ARC recommendations and that the EVA be emergency access only.

Commissioner Vass feels that it is a tight fit for this corner. She likes the architecture but feels it is too big for the corner. She supports an EVA only. Thinks it is a great opportunity for residential especially for the community college and providing more housing opportunities for the students and those who work and live on that side of town. She would like the project to come back to the Planning Commission again. Commissioner Vass added that she had exparte communications with the applicant and several of the neighbors.

Commissioner McKenzie thanked the public for coming out and participating in the process. He stated he had exparte communications with the applicant and the opposition. He feels if you are going to develop this site it should be developed intensely and make sure it has the best synergy with Sierra College. He had concerns with traffic and oak trees, but those issues have been satisfied. He stated that the design has improved immensely. He supports the EVA only access to the south.

Chairman Martinez stated he also met with the applicant. He feels that this location makes sense for high density development. He is pleased that the applicant listened the first time around and tapered down the building closest to Water Lily Lane. He feels they have exceeded the development standards as far as setbacks go. He believes the architecture is consistent with the vision for that area going forward. The environmental analysis is more than adequate. He agrees with adding the condition of approval regarding the ARC's recommendations and doesn't have a strong opinion about the EVA.

On a motion by Commissioner Sloan and seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, Resolution Of The Planning Commission Of The City Of Rocklin Recommending Certification Of A Final Environmental Impact Report, Recommending Making Findings Of Fact And Statement Of Overriding Considerations And Recommending Approval Of A Mitigation Monitoring And Reporting Program (Sierra Gateway Apartments / DR2015-0018 And TRE2016-0001) was approved by the following vote:

AYES: Sloan, McKenzie, Vass, Martinez
NOES: Whitmore

ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

On a motion by Commissioner Sloan and seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, Resolution Of The Planning Commission Of The City Of Rocklin Recommending Approval Of A Design Review And Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit (Sierra Gateway Apartments / DR2015-0018 And TRE2016-0001) was approved by the following vote with the following amendments:

3. Improvement Plans

3. h. vi. *The vehicle access off of Water Lily Lane shall be an Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) only and shall include signage and appropriate access hardware, to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief. (FIRE)*

19. Special

- 19.d. *The developer shall work with staff to revise the architecture consistent with the direction of the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to provide additional elements on the upper stories of Buildings 5 and 9, to the satisfaction of the Economic and Community Development Director: (PLANNING)*
- i. *Add Hardie panel siding, or other acceptable material, and/or vary the paint colors to further break up the large expanses of plain, solid wall.*
 - ii. *Add sturdy decorative metalwork in the walkway openings that mimic the proportion and pattern of the divided lights in the windows on the lower stories.*

AYES: Sloan, McKenzie, Martinez
NOES: Whitmore, Vass
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

NON PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 8. Informational Items and Presentations – None**
9. Reports and Discussion Items from Planning Commissioners – None
10. Reports from City Staff – None
11. Adjournment

There being no further business brought before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Terry Stemple
Planning Commission Secretary

*Approved at the regularly scheduled
Meeting of December 19, 2017*