

# City of San Marcos General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

## Meeting #18 Notes

January 31, 2011  
6:00 PM

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA), THE CITY WILL MAKE EVERY REASONABLE ATTEMPT TO ACCOMMODATE ANY ATTENDEE OR PARTICIPANT AT THIS MEETING NEEDING SPECIAL ASSISTANCE BEYOND WHAT IS NORMALLY PROVIDED. PLEASE CONTACT THE PLANNING DIVISION OF THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT AT (760) 744-1050 AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THIS MEETING TO INFORM US OF YOUR PARTICULAR NEEDS AND TO DETERMINE IF ACCOMMODATION IS FEASIBLE. PLEASE ADVISE US AT THE TIME YOU CALL IF SPECIAL ASSISTANCE IS REQUIRED TO ATTEND OR PARTICIPATE IN MEETINGS ON A REGULAR BASIS.

Start Time: 6:00 PM  
SAN MARCOS CIVIC CENTER (COMMUNITY SERVICES "MAIN HALL")  
3 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA

### **GPAC ITEMS:**

- 1. Welcome (6:00 pm)**  
Chairman Winn called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and requested that staff proceed with the presentation.
- 2. Discussion of Property Owner Initiated Areas**

### **PO1:**

**GPAC:** The west side of Las Posas Road remains "non-commercial" – the site is only ½ acre, not much to work with. It should remain as commercial on east side of Las Posas Road.

**Public:** No comments.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Industrial (I).

### **PO2:**

**GPAC:** What is the objection of having Senior Housing at this site?

**City Staff:** It is a difficult site to work with due to the topography, drainage, & potential environmental constraints.

**GPAC:** What if the site remains as agricultural? If you change to residential versus senior housing, it seems as if it would be a simpler approach.

**City Staff:** Senior Housing is typically located in the commercial zone – senior housing may not be deemed compatible with surrounding area.

**Public:** No comments

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

## **PO3:**

**GPAC:** Where's this site located?

**City Staff:** It is southeast of the San Elijo community. The 22 acre site is vacant and use for growing flowers.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

**Public:** No comments.

## **PO4:**

**GPAC:** Didn't the Property owner want to put a brewery and water plant on this site?

**Property Owners Representative:** The property owner agrees with recommendation of the GPAC/City Staff/Consultant –Preferred Land Use which would change the property to Mixed Use 3.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Mixed Use 3 (MU3).

## **PO5:**

**GPAC:** No comments.

**Property Owners Representative:** The property owner agrees with recommendation of the GPAC/City Staff/Consultant –Preferred Land Use which would change the property to Mixed Use 3.

**GPAC:** Why no residential on the site?

**Property Owners Representative:** There are environmental challenges on the site.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Mixed Use 3 (MU3).

## PO6:

**City Staff:** Staff pointed out that there was an error on the density along the Woodward Street frontage. Currently shown as residential 15-20 du/ac when it should indicate residential 12-15 du/ac as previously discussed and agreed on by the GPAC.

**GPAC:** Agreed that it should be the same as previous approved. However, should we re-consider a higher density?

**City Staff:** A higher density range would exceed the existing Royal Oaks senior housing project approved under density bonus allowing for 19 du/ac.

**GPAC:** Shouldn't this be MDR1?

**City Staff:** Yes.

**Public:** Concern that density is damaging going from residential 15-20 to 12-15 du/ac. The owner is concerned that the site plan can't meet density, even with a density bonus. The owner is willing to put a restriction on property to not request a density bonus.

**GPAC:** Has an application to be submitted.

**City Staff:** No application has been submitted. In comparison to the residential 15-20 du/ac, you can reach the same density with a density bonus @ 12-15 – density bonus will bump you up.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Commercial (C) / Medium Density Residential 1 (MDR1) (12-15 du/ac) (SH) (SP).

## PO 7:

**GPAC:** Is this site suitable for Industrial (I)? It's across from the mall.

**City Staff:** Yes, by keeping it Industrial (I), you would be still be allowed limited retail on site.

**GPAC:** Although, PO1 was recommended as Industrial (I), without help on this lot, if develop as Industrial (I), it would have less options.

**GPAC:** Would a gas station be allowed on that site?

**City Staff:** There are too many restrictions of this site.

**Property Owner Representative:** Our site is directly across the street from Grand Plaza Tower. It lends itself to retail, but limited due to size of site, 100' wide by 200' long. Access is perfect as a corner lot. Industrial (I) does not meet the components suited for Commercial (C).

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Commercial (C).

## **PO8:**

**GPAC:** Is there a lot size or density?

**City Staff:** Through a Specific Plan (SP) the standards could be established to address the lot size & density.

**GPAC:** Someone could develop a portion of this site allowing one acre lots or 2,400 S.F. lots?

**City Staff:** We need to analyze the site, such as where is access coming from? How do you cluster the site while minimizing grading impacts – it is premature to determine what the lot size might be at this time.

**GPAC:** What about the water?

**City Staff:** This area needs a water tank to service the site.

**GPAC:** So the developer would be responsible to build tank?

**City Staff:** Most likely, the developer would wait until Vallecitos Water District installs a water tank.

**GPAC:** Is the access off of Borden?

**City Staff:** Yes, but one option shows concept of access off of Twin Oaks Valley Road.

**Property Owner Representative:** I was part of the Ridgeline Task Force – losing the ocean view lots decreases the value of the property by 60%. There will be issue – we are asking for a Specific Plan (SP). The access off of Twin Oaks Valley Road suggested by staff is not possible. There is no access. We have worked out a deal to establish access with Vallecitos Water District road easement to reduce impacts to existing hillside.

**GPAC:** Although there is design issues to work out with the City, those issues do not need to be brought in front of GPAC. The GPAC does not want to get into this.

**GPAC:** Is there some commitment?

**City Staff:** There is no commitment. We will work with the property owner through a Specific Plan (SP). The 25 residential lot exhibit does not accurately show the impacts to site and amount of grading necessary that will be viewed by the surrounding property.

**Property Owner Representative:** All we ask is to have a chance to demonstrate a good design.

**GPAC:** The land use will include a Specific Plan (SP) overlay?.

**City Staff:** Yes, it will be approved under a Specific Plan (SP) with a description of up to number of residential units.

**GPAC:** If we designate to 25 residential units, they can do it, right?

**City Staff:** Before the adoption of the Ridgeline Overlay Zone, this area was identified with an existing conservancy area.

**GPAC:** Can you leave out the number of residential units?

**City Staff:** No, you have to have a density range.

**Property Owner Representative:** The owner would be willing to dedicate the rest of the undeveloped area as ecological preserve.

**Public:** The flat map is very deceiving. The concept doesn't represent the site. Why just test things? You should support City staff's recommendation.

**Public:** The City gets a huge benefit to pick a number, go with a real study. Don't be arbitrary.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Specific Plan Residential - up to 25 single family residential lots (4-8 du/ac) (SPA / LDR).

## **PO 9:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Medium Density Residential1 (MDR1) (12-15 du/ac)(SH).

## **PO 10:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Medium Density Residential1 (MDR1) (12-15 du/ac) (SH) (SP).

## **PO 11-15:**

**GPAC:** Support retaining ½ acre lots. Hate to see how that affects adjacent lots.

**Property Owner Representative:** Would be happier to leave to 1-2 leaving an option for a minimum 15,000 square foot lots.

**GPAC:** Can owner come forward with a variance?

**City Staff:** You could submit for a variance. It would be hard to establish findings to support the variance.

**GPAC:** How many lots?

City Staff: Five

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Rural Residential (RR) (1-2 du/ac) .

## **PO 16 & 17:**

Public comments – none.

**GPAC Break 7:55 p.m. Resume at 8:08 p.m.**

GPAC: No comments.

Public: No comments

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

## **PO 18:**

GPAC: This was covered in Consideration Area 10.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Commercial (C ).

## **PO 18**

**GPAC Continue item for February 2, 2011**

## **PO 20-23**

**GPAC Continue item for February 2, 2011**

## **PO 24**

**GPAC Continue item for February 2, 2011**

## **PO 25:**

GPAC: No comment

Public: No comment

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Industrial (I)

## **PO 26:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Mixed Use 3 (MU-3).

## **PO 27:**

**GPAC:** No comment

**Public:** No comment

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Mixed Use 3 (MU-3).

## **PO 28:**

**GPAC:** Concern is that due to economic reasons, the San Marcos Studios probably will not happen.

**Staff:** There is no other use other than what's allowed.

**GPAC:** Can it be Specific Plan (SP) area or a Business Park (BP) or movie studio? Let the market dictate.

**Property Owner Representative:** You can't get a movie studio to this site. It would be hard to compete with existing industry. Earlier, there were different land uses that were changed to current proposal. The site is not benefitting anyone sitting vacant. Light Industrial (LI) and office uses are allowed.

**GPAC:** You want to make productive use of this site.

**Property Owner Representative:** Yes.

**GPAC:** Would Business Park (BP) be a better plan?

**Property Owner Representative:** Business Park (BP) is consistent with what is in the General Plan.

**GPAC Continue item.**

## **PO 29:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Medium Density Residential 1 (MDR1) (12-15 du/ac) (SH) (SP)

## **PO 30:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

## **PO 31:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Neighborhood Commercial (NC).

## **PO 32:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Country Rural Residential (County RR) (.125-1 du/ac)

## **PO 33:**

**GPAC:** Is there an elementary school nearby?

**Staff:** There are a couple schools in the area.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

## **PO 34:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

## **PO 35**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

## **PO 36**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

## **PO 37:**

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125-1 du/ac).

3. **Public Comment / Input**
4. **Wrap Up and Adjournment**
5. **Next Meeting: #19, February 2, 2011, 6:00 pm**