

COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

City Clerk Use Only

DATE:	March 8, 2005
TITLE:	Growth Management Visioning Committee Report and Recommendations
CONTACT:	Nela Luken, Sr. Planner, nluken@roseville.ca.us or Kathy Pease, Environmental Coordinator, kpease@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: April 20, 2005

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council by motion:

1. Commend the Growth Management Visioning Committee members and alternates for their seven months of work on behalf of the Roseville community;
2. Review and approve the *Growth Management Visioning Committee Report and Recommendations* (Attachment 1); and
3. Direct staff to develop and bring back a work program to implement the recommendations.

BACKGROUND

At the June 30th, 2004 joint workshop with the Planning Commission, the City Council supported the idea of using a focused Growth Management Visioning Committee (GMVC) to ensure community participation in reviewing existing growth management policies and making recommendations on growth in the City over the next 20 years. Given the significant growth pressures in the South Placer area and the number of pending large development applications, it is important to update and clarify the City's growth policies so that Council and staff can clearly articulate the City's vision for the future.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT VISIONING COMMITTEE

Committee Members

The GMVC membership was appointed by the City Council on September 1, 2004. The Committee included five City Council appointees, three Commission representatives and three alternates from the Planning Commission, Public Utilities Commission and Transportation Commission, and fifteen at-large representatives. The GMVC represented a cross-section of business professionals, retirees, long-time residents and new residents. For most of the members it was the first time they had formally served on a City Committee.

Committee members included:

Council Appointees – Teri Edwards, Pam Wilkinson, David Larson, Guy Gibson and Matt See.

Commission Representatives – Rex Clark (Gray Allen, alternate), Jerry Aplass (Richard Hipkins, alternate), and Sam Cannon (Larry Barkhouse, alternate)

At-Large Members – Krista Bernasconi, Ann Diamondstone, Traver Dougherty, Marilyn Festersen, Phil Goode, Sharon Manke, John Mason, Linda Mitsch, Jeff Ray, Janice Rosenthal-Rock, Bob Smith, Joe Velky.

Meeting Schedule

The Growth Management Visioning Committee met 13 times beginning in September 2004 on Wednesday evenings. Meetings typically lasted two hours and were facilitated by an independent consulting firm – MIG. GMVC members were mailed agenda packets with reading and “homework” prior to every meeting, adding to the time commitment by GMVC members. The GMVC hosted a Public Workshop on March 15, 2005 and additional time was dedicated by several GMVC members to assist in the preparation and presentation of the GMVC’s recommendations at the Public Workshop.

Community Survey. Parallel to the establishment of the GMVC, the City contracted with an independent consulting firm to conduct an on-line citizen survey. The survey asked over 700 residents about their perceptions of quality of life in Roseville, how big did they want the City to be, and what were the issues of greatest concern related to growth in the City. With 63 questions, the results of this comprehensive survey provide both a ranking of resident sentiment and insight as to what residents care about most. The survey included tabulations of responses and hundreds of individual written comments that further elaborate on responses. The survey allowed those residents who do not normally participate in their local government process, to let the City, and the GMVC, know what is most important. The results were used by the GMVC to help formulate their recommendations to the Council. A copy of the survey questions, results, and staff report are available on the City’s website for public viewing. A brief overview of the survey results are included in the GMVC Report and Recommendations (Planning Background – Overview of Fact Finding Process, Growth Management Survey p. 6).

Public Workshop. The GMVC hosted a Public Workshop on March 15, 2005 to update the public on the work they had completed to date including sharing their draft findings, vision, and recommended action steps. The meeting was very successful with over 200 people in attendance. Comments were provided by the public in several topic areas including traffic, schools, job/revenues/fiscal, regional links, open space, existing residents/infrastructure, specificity of recommendations and community involvement. In follow-up to the public workshop, the GMVC considered and discussed the comments in refining their final recommendations.

GMVC Purpose

The GMVC purpose was established in a set of Guiding Principles approved by the Council to clearly outline the GMVC’s tasks. The GMVC’s work program and efforts were focused on accomplishment of the Council-adopted Guiding Principles. The GMVC has addressed and completed this work as detailed below:

Principle #1: The purpose of the GMVC is to assess the City's 2020 General Plan Growth Management Policies and, in accordance with the Community Standards and Visioning Committee (CSVC) Long Term Community Vision Statement, provide recommendations to the City Council for modification, as the Growth Management Committee deems appropriate.

Result: The GMVC reviewed, discussed and validated the six current Growth Management Core Policies of the General Plan. The GMVC recommended three additions that include Maintaining Roseville's Community Character consistent with the GMVC Vision, promoting Stakeholder Involvement and Accountability in shaping growth in the region, and Work Aggressively to Address Traffic Outside of Roseville by seeking regional traffic solutions. The GMVC spent a considerable amount of time discussing and crafting a 20-year Vision. This can be used by the City to review and update the City Mission and Vision for the future.

Principle #2: Assume that the City's 2020 General Plan policies related to the provision of existing level of service standards will be maintained.

Result: The GMVC Report and Recommendations assumed that the current General Plan Policies and development standards currently used by the City would not be changed. The GMVC based their recommendations on this assumption and also understood that it may be an increasing challenge to maintain current City standards given regional growth influences projected to occur over the next 20-50 years. The GMVC included a recommendation to stand firm on Roseville's vision, principles, and standards in their recommended action steps.

Principle #3: The timeframe for the growth management policies strategy is a 20-year horizon.

Result: The GMVC considered a variety of factors and developed recommendations that, in concert, formed their recommendations for a 20-year horizon. These factors included: fact finding for historical context, a set of assumptions or Findings related to growth, a review, validation and additions to current Growth Management core policy concepts, a vision of an ideal future, and a set of recommended action steps.

Principle #4: Make policy level findings and recommendations regarding the future size of the City.

Result: As part of the GMVC's recommended action steps, they included a recommendation to study a possible sphere of influence extension and annexation. The GMVC thought the future size of the City should be decided following this analysis since it is not certain how far the City could grow and still maintain the assumption that Roseville's development standards would not be affected as stated in Principle #2 above. The GMVC's recommendations reflected a thorough analysis of five potential development scenarios west and north of the City. Based on the likelihood that one or any combination of development scenarios could occur, the GMVC structured its recommendations so that they would be valid, regardless of which scenario or combination played out. In this way, the GMVC hoped to position Roseville to have influence in future growth decisions regardless of the ultimate size of the City.

Principle #5: Present written Findings and Recommendations to the City Council at their March 2, 2005 meeting.

Result: The GMVC was mindful of the schedule and in this spirit, worked diligently to meet it by adding meetings during the seven-month process. The GMVC also felt, however, that it was necessary to accommodate GMVC member meeting conflicts in order to insure maximum attendance and participation of all GMVC members over the course of their meeting schedule.

The work of the GMVC represents significant discussion and energy invested to prepare recommendations in a reasonable timeframe given the complexity of the issues and importance of on-going dialogue in developing final recommendations. Therefore, it was deemed more important for the schedule to be flexible so all issues could be adequately addressed.

Principle #6 Committee members are charged to consider the entire Roseville community in preparing findings and recommendations and to limit focus on areas of special interest.

Result: Through reviewing the Community Online Growth Survey results, holding the public workshop March 15th, and considering oral and written public communication, the GMVC took their role seriously in considering the desires of the entire community when preparing their findings and recommendations.

Principle #7 Recognize that from diverse points of views, new opportunities and ideas come forth. The Committee should seek consensus in developing its Findings and Recommendations, while recognizing that consensus on every issue may not be possible, and a majority of the Committee can forward a recommendation to the City Council.

As noted in the attached report, the GMVC Recommendations were reached by group consensus. The facilitator used various techniques from preparing individual homework which was compiled, to small group discussion, to voting by color coded dots to allow the GMVC the opportunity to express opinions, but reach a consensus on recommendations included in the report. The members of the GMVC represented varied opinions and the information from the community survey and public workshop offered broader perspectives on which to base the final recommendations.

As the Council can surmise from the summary above, the GMVC did indeed fulfill the expectations adopted by the City Council and the GMVC Guiding Principles adopted on July 21, 2004.

GMVC RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings, Vision, Growth Management Policies, and Recommended Action Steps

The GMVC worked diligently to consider the perspectives of the entire community, not just their individual opinions when drafting their final recommendations. The recommendations contain four key elements that combine to make up their full set of recommendations to the City Council: Findings, Vision, Growth Management Policies and Recommended Action Steps.

Findings. The Findings represent a set of assumptions that were used as a basis for GMVC discussion related to growth issues. The Findings are included in the *GMVC Report and Recommendations* beginning on page 9. Findings were made in the areas of: expectations of regional growth, demographic changes in the next 30 years, land use development patterns affecting transportation (and vice versa), community housing price and influence, benefits of a strong and diversified economy, environmental and infrastructure limitations (sewer, water, storm-water, storm drains, power, roads) and regional interdependence.

Vision. Using the City's Mission, Vision and Values Statement and the Community Standards and Visioning Committee's report as background, the GMVC developed a Vision of the ideal future as it relates to growth that includes the perspectives of all the GMVC members and reflects the City's location in a dynamic metropolitan region expected to experience significant

growth. The Vision and corresponding detail can be found beginning on page 13 of the *GMVC Report and Recommendations* attached.

The Vision includes eleven characteristics that define the preferred future:

- A Distinct Community Identify
- Well Planned Neighborhoods & Communities
- A Vibrant Downtown
- A Balance of New Growth and Revitalization
- Abundant Parks and Open Space
- A Diverse Range of Housing Types
- Mobility and Transportation Choices
- Economic Vitality
- Convenient Access to Higher Education
- Innovative Design and Land Use Planning
- On-going Partnerships with Neighborhood Communities

Growth Management Policies. The GMVC received and reviewed a copy of the General Plan Land Use Element (see GMVC working binder) containing the City's current Growth Management Goals and Policies. The General Plan Goals and Policies were summarized for the Committee into six core policy concept areas: maintain an open space transition buffer; ensure fiscal sustainability; encourage high quality infrastructure, programs and services; promote comprehensive large scale planning, the use of performance (development) standards to manage growth; and ensure a community benefit from growth. The GMVC reviewed, discussed and validated these policy concepts and recommended the addition of three new policies (*GMVC Report and Recommendations* p. 17). New policy recommendations include: 1) Maintain Roseville's Identity and Character – to ensure Roseville remains consistent with the GMVC Vision; 2) Promote Stakeholder Involvement & Ensure Accountability – to initiate dialogue between stakeholders in South Placer to define and shape a vision for growth west and north of the City; and 3) Work Aggressively to address Traffic Generated Outside of Roseville – to ensure that traffic through Roseville is mitigated with regional improvements and supported by land use and design policies that increase transportation alternatives.

Recommended Action Steps. Since the City does not currently have land use authority for lands west and north of the City, the GMVC's recommended action steps were structured so they would be useful under a variety of potential development scenarios. In this way, the GMVC hoped to position Roseville to influence future growth decisions that could impact the City, regardless of whether development occurs inside or outside the City. The recommended action steps are as follows and described further in the report (p.19): 1) Advocate Roseville's vision of balanced and well planned growth; 2) Initiate dialogue in southwest Placer County on an overall planning concept to guide sub-regional development; 3) Conduct a study of possible sphere of influence extension and annexation; 4) Act quickly to preserve Roseville's ability to influence growth in southwest Placer County; and 5) Stand firm on Roseville's vision, principles and standards.

FISCAL IMPACT

Depending on the direction the City Council chooses to take, City staff anticipates that implementation of the GMVC recommendations will require continued dedication of staff resources to implement the policy direction and tools to achieve the recommendations. Some of the possible work effort that could result includes preparation of a work program to implement the GMVC recommendations including but not limited to:

- General Plan amendment - to incorporate the policy recommendations of the GMVC into the City's General Plan;
- Update the City's Mission, Vision and Values - to reflect the GMVC vision statement;
- A Sphere Study - to study an expanded sphere of influence to the west and north to determine the City's ultimate boundaries;
- Establishment & on-going participation in a sub-regional partnership – a dialogue to include stakeholders in southwest Placer County.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

None Required.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council by motion:

1. Commend the Growth Management Visioning Committee members and alternates for their seven months of work on behalf of the Roseville community;
2. Review and approve the *Growth Management Visioning Committee Report and Recommendations (Attachment 1)*; and
3. Direct staff to develop and bring back a work program to implement the recommendations.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nela Luken,
Senior Planner

Paul Richardson
Planning Director

APPROVED:

W. Craig Robinson
City Manager

ATTACHMENT: Growth Management Visioning Committee Report and Recommendations

C: GMVC
Planning Commission
Transportation Commission
Public Utilities Commission