



APPROVED MINUTES
January 9, 2025

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
6:30 p.m.
Council Chambers
311 Vernon Street, Roseville, California

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Brashears, Covington, Randolph, Unidad, Haggenjos, Prior
Absent: Jensen

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Prior led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

5.1. Minutes of December 12, 2024

5.2. North Industrial Plan Area Parcel CO-41 - COTC Shops 2 & 3 Extension, 290 Roseville Pw, File # PL24-0969

REQUEST

The applicant requests a one-year extension to a previously approved Major Project Permit Modification Stage 1 and Stage 2 (File # PL22-0120) for the COTC Shops 2 & 3 Extension project. The project would allow construction of two multi-tenant retail buildings (9,000 sf each) and related site work.

5.3. North Industrial Plan Area Parcel 50 – Roseville 80 Buildings 5 and 7 Modification Extension, 7901 Foothills Bl, File # PL24-1002

REQUEST

The applicant requests approval of an Extension for a Major Project Permit Modification (File #PL21-0227), which was a modification to the Roseville 80 project (original File # PL19-0363). The modification project revised Roseville 80 Buildings 5 and 7; removed Buildings 4 and 6; relocated the stormwater basin; and reduced overall project square footage by approximately 27,000 square feet. A previous one-year extension was approved by File # PL23-0296.

5.4. Southeast Roseville Specific Plan Parcel 5 - Office Condo Map Conversion, 2140 Professional Dr, File # PL24-1014

REQUEST

The applicant requests approval of a Tentative Condominium Map to create 14 commercial condominium units within an existing building and a request for a final parcel map waiver.

Motion by Commissioner Randolph, seconded by Commissioner Covington to approve the Consent Calendar.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Unidad (abstained item 5.2), Covington, Randolph, Brashears, Haggenjos, Prior

Noes: None

The Motion passed.

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Infill Parcel 183, 229, 305 – Sunrise Office Center, 705 Sunrise Av, File # PL24-0812

REQUEST

The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit to allow construction of a new 7,300 sf general medical office building and a Flood Encroachment Permit to allow site construction within the existing Cirby Creek floodplain. The project also includes a Tree Permit to remove three (3) protected Valley oak trees.

Associate Planner, Shelby Maples, presented the staff report.

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

Applicant representative, Michelle Layshot, with Millennium Engineering, stated that she had received a copy of the staff report and was in agreement with staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Discussion

- The Chair inquired as to whether alternative locations for building were discussed during the project evaluation, to avoid interference with the mature trees. Staff responded that there a variety of constraints on the property that resulted in the proposed building location. These constraints included, 1) the existing storm drain lines running across the property, serving the Terraces of Roseville and surrounding parcels, 2) the floodplain 3) the requirement to provide adequate parking and emergency vehicle turning movements, and 4) the adjacent medical office building and drive isle. Moving the building to the North or West would require relocation of the one of the two storm drain lines. Staff further elaborated that moving the building to the North and relocating the storm drain line would place the building further into the floor plain zone and trigger the need for significant re-engineering. Staff explained there are unknown implications of moving the storm drain lines, especially the 24-inch storm drain serving the Terraces. It would not be typical for staff to recommend an infill project be responsible for moving utilities that serve off site developments, or locating deeper in a floodplain area. These constraints led staff to the conclusion that supporting the tree permit was the appropriate course of action.
- A commissioner asked if there is an easement on the property for the existing storm drain lines and why the lines are located where they are. Staff responded that this parcel was likely under one ownership at the time the storm drain was constructed and therefore there wouldn't have been an easement.
- A commissioner requested further clarification on potential relocation of the storm drain and whether the Terraces would need to be involved. Staff responded that multiple parties affected by the relocation would need to be involved.

Public Comments

Jennifer Chapman, Sherry Bradley, Sheila Dorr-Las, and Gerald Fuller provided public comments.

- A commentator provided a petition signed by residents of the Terraces of Roseville asking for a 15-day extension to the public comment period for the environmental documents.
- A commentator stated the Terraces has individuals in both assisted and independent living with a wide variety of limitations, therefore they are requesting that the Public Comment period be extended to allow residents or interested parties nearby to express their opinions.
- A commentator noted they appreciate the appearance and design of the project but asked if an alternate design option allows for parking underneath the structure.
- A commentator stated that there is an issue with standing water in a portion of the area that isn't considered within the flood plain zone.
- A commentator expressed concern for the existing ecosystem that will be affected by the mature oak tree removal.

- A commentator stated that traffic is an issue in the surrounding areas, particularly from Dutch Bros and the left turn lane on Sunrise.
- A commentator who lives on Sunrise expressed additional concern regarding dangerous traffic in the area and elaborated a staff member had been in an accident in the area during their tenure.
- A commentator mentioned the high volume of traffic entering and exiting the Terraces and expressed concern for the additional traffic that 80 parking spaces would generate.
- A commentator requested a traffic break like the one on Madden Lane at Regency.
- A commentator stated that when turning left driving to Cirby Way they have almost been hit several times.
- A commentator asked that aesthetics and quality of life for nearby residents be taken into consideration. They further explained that approximately one fourth of Terraces residents cannot drive, and their only modes of travel put them in danger with the current traffic conditions so additional traffic may be hazardous.
- A commentator expressed the area's nearby wildlife in the proposed project area is enjoyable to Terraces residents.
- A commentator stated the high-volume traffic from Dutch Bros sometimes backs up into the street, so additional traffic is a concern.
- A commentator said that many fire trucks and ambulances visit Terraces daily so additional traffic in the area will lower safety for residents.
- A commentator stated that it took a family member 9 minutes to exit the Terraces after visiting, which they feel is a long span of time.
- A commentator explained that some Terraces residents cannot afford taking an ambulance to the hospital so family members must take them and adding additional travel time due to increased traffic is concerning.
- A commentator asked that existing residents and community members be considered when making the decision to approve the project and that they visualize what it would look like for 80 parking spots worth of incoming traffic to be added.
- A commentator stated there is an issue with debris near the creek including fallen limbs and standing water and that the City will need to perform extensive maintenance.
- A commentator mentioned they feel the current information about the proposed project is not adequate to estimate incoming traffic volumes after the project is completed.

Chair Prior closed the public comment period and Public Hearing.

Commissioner Discussion

- A commissioner asked about the initial traffic study that was done in the general plan update and what potential traffic associated with this parcel was accounted for. Staff responded that in the EIR and general plan update, land uses for the area were

identified and an estimated number of trips was designated appropriately. This previously completed traffic model accounted for the land use consistent with the proposed project. Staff also mentioned that the Fire Marshall the driveway leading from Sunrise Avenue to the project site and the Terraces and determined it to be safe and adequate per their standards.

- A commissioner asked about an existing path adjacent to the project and whether it would be affected. Staff stated that the path is an existing access area that will not be touched by the project.
- A commissioner asked whether the possibility for implementation of a U-Turn had been investigated for the following location: left turn lane onto Coloma from heading North on Sunrise. Staff responded that it is unlikely there is adequate room at this intersection to allow for U-Turns.
- A commissioner inquired what research went into the traffic study for the nearby Dutch Bros. Staff responded traffic generation for coffee shops is heavily investigated, and the nearby Dutch Bros project was developed to have a dual drive-thru lane to reduce spillover traffic onto the roadway.
- A commissioner asked staff for an estimate of the incoming traffic for a dental office of the proposed size. Staff responded that it would generate about 26 additional trips (both ingress and egress) in the peak hour for a dental office of this size.
- A commissioner commented on the length of time it took them to turn left on Sunrise Avenue when visiting the proposed project site and asked about the possibility of a traffic break. Staff responded that Public Works determined this was not a necessary change to make at this time.
- A commissioner asked about the possibility of a parking variance or incentivization of the use of alternative transportation due to the good condition of the trees as stated in the Arborist report. Staff responded that an entitlement would be required to complete a parking reduction, and that the two types of parking reductions (individual use parking reduction and shared parking) would not be appropriate based on the available information for the project. Staff elaborated that reducing the number of parking spaces has the potential to lead to long term on and off-site parking issues in the long term. Before supporting a parking reduction, staff typically requires a detailed operation plan for all tenants to insure there is no off-site parking impacts.
- A commissioner asked for clarification on whether reduction in the total number of parking spaces would create the need to reduce the building footprint and staff responded yes, unless a parking reduction entitlement was approved.
- The applicant added that reducing the building footprint and the number of parking spaces would not safely allow for a firetruck turnaround without utilization of the road in front of the Terraces.
- A commissioner mentioned they observed parking shortage at the Terraces and that reducing the number of spaces for the proposed project does not seem plausible due to the already present shortage in the adjacent lot. They also suggested the Terraces explore the possibility of increasing the total number of parking spaces in their lot.

Motion by Commissioner Brashears, seconded by Commissioner Covington, to:

1. Adopt the Sunrise Office Center Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (SCH # 2024120281) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and
2. Adopt the four (4) findings of fact and approve the Design Review Permit subject to sixty-five (65) conditions of approval; and
3. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Flood Encroachment Permit subject to twelve (12) conditions of approval; and
4. Adopt the two (2) findings of fact and approve the Tree Permit subject to six (6) conditions of approval.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Brashears, Haggenjos, Covington, Randolph

Noes: Unidad, Prior

The Motion passed.

7. COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT

There will be no Planning Commission Meeting January 23, 2025.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Vice Chair Haggenjos, seconded by Commissioner Brashears, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion passed unanimously at 7:36 p.m. with a voice vote.