

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

## Meeting #19 Notes

February 2, 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 "DINING ROOM")  
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. Final Discussion of Property Owner Initiated Areas**

GPAC member Dean Tilton requested that Mr. Hogue be allowed to speak at end meeting.

## **CA 7**

**GPAC:** No comments.

**Property Owner:** Asking for clarification of Business Park (BP) – GPAC agreed. Discussed potential orientation of site.

**Public:** Do any surrounding properties view into that area?

**Property Owner:** There may be limited views – again would you recommend Light Industrial (LI) versus Business Park (BP)?

**GPAC:** The Light Industrial (LI) is a viable look. Looking south, the view is the landfill. Business Park (BP) should be on a thoroughfare, not on a cul-de-sac. Recommend Light Industrial (LI).

**GPAC:** What was the argument for Business Park (BP)?

**City Staff:** It's near San Elijo and near high attraction area. San Marcos does not have that next move up option. We have plenty of Industrial (I), but not the next level.

**GPAC:** How many square feet of Business Park on this site?

**Property Owner:** Approximately 120K square feet.

**Public:** Between the uses as it relates to traffic, what is the difference in average daily trips between Light Industrial (LI) & Business Park (BP)?

**City Staff:** Site is near a major road – biotech/high technology does not rely on a lot of traffic.

**Public:** What would the night impacts be?

**City Staff:** Based on the location, very little if any impacts at all.

**GPAC:** Where are the power lines?

**Property Owner:** Identified on map.

**City Staff:** The biggest issue is Multi-Family in the area.

**GPAC:** With dense community nearby – schools are already full and roads are full.

**Property Owner:** Senior Housing is possible. We checked with the school. We asked them if they need a school site. Leave the residential component and the site may become a school site.

**City Staff:** Do we really need more dwellings? Don't specify acreage for any proposed land use.

**GPAC:** Agree – previous designated a zebra zone. I like not mentioning acreage.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Specific Plan Area (SPA) / Light Industrial (LI) / Commercial (C) / Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) (20-30 du/ac)/Open Space (OS).

## **PO 20-23:**

**City Staff:** We are not changing yield, rather through a Specific Plan (SP) you have better control.

**Property Owner:** Supports staff recommendation.

**Public presentation:** Identify the surrounding land forms, drainage corridors the SP is a good idea to develop this property. The density is too high when developed to creek; new storm water ordinance has a lot of restrictions. Define areas of development in white areas - larger lots to the west. (White areas are less than 25% slope).

**GPAC:** Hydro modification must be included.

**GPAC:** There is no lot size designated yet.

**Public presentation:** Indicated areas of steep slope (greater than 25%), wetland areas, Habitat evaluation model, Fire hazard severity zone. I do live nearby or adjacent to this site.

**GPAC:** Do we need to come up with a number?

**Public presentation:** Maybe 40-60 units with clustering, and preserve the open space. Agree with the Specific Plan (SP) approach – we will eventually work through this once a design is submitted.

**GPAC:** Is there an 89 lot entitlement?

**City Staff:** No, it will be determined through the design process.

**Public presentation:** Plan not realistic.

**GPAC:** Have had problems with speculative numbers; don't know if 60 is realistic. Passing it at 89 will not necessarily mean it will be built as 89 dwelling units.

**Public presentation:** Should look at land to determine what realistic density should be. You need to be realistic.

**City Staff:** When the College Community Plan was approved, it had a density that indicated potential yield for area. We may find a lower density.

**GPAC:** A lot of traffic.

**GPAC:** What about protection for wild life?

**City Staff:** There is known vegetation and wild life that needs to be evaluated. The City-Wide Park Master Plan recognizes the attributes to this area.

**Public presentation:** City approved a denser design at northern end of Santa Fe Hills.

**GPAC:** Good points, all concerns will be addressed.

**GPAC:** What else is allowed other than residential?

**City Staff:** Open space and a City Park.

**GPAC:** Concern with greenhouse gas impact.

**Staff:** This is a small area. It will be analyzed as a whole.

**GPAC Vote:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Specific Plan Residential (allow up to 89 single family residential units) / Open Space (OS) / Park (P).

## PO 24

**Property Owner:** Concerned with maxing out the site, presented a conceptual site plan demonstrating a potential layout. Showing 160 units and discussing concept. Setback ranges from 80 to 85 feet to the nearby residential neighborhood. This is a four-plex concept.

**GPAC:** I thought you were leaning more towards 15?

**City Staff:** 2-4 dwelling units per acre is next to this site.

**GPAC:** Is this viable with the water drainage?

**Property Owner:** Larger density would pay for drainage expense.

**GPAC:** The density may not matter and it will serve as a buffer.

**Public:** How large units?

**Property Owner:** it ranges from 1,000-1,200 square foot units with 1, 2, 3 bedroom with club house and pool.

**GPAC voted:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Medium Density Residential 2 (15-20 du/ac).

## PO 28

**GPAC:** Did the Property Owners representative suggest combining SP with various uses.

**Property Owners Representative:** Yes.

**GPAC:** Why not Business Park (BP)?

**Property Owners Representative:** Originally, the definition of Business Park (BP) was too restrictive, but sounds like definition is more flexible at this point.

**GPAC:** Why would you not want an specific plan designation?

**Property Owners Representative:** It's too restrictive and with existing building, it would be easier to start with vacant land.

**GPAC:** Does the City think that a movie studio is a viable site?

**Staff:** Yes.

**GPAC:** It hasn't been used as one.

**Staff:** The building could be utilized.

**Property Owners Representative:** Light Industrial would work with this building.

**GPAC:** Without further information, it will not work. It has not been utilized.

**Property Owners Representative:** Would be receptive to Light Industrial (LI) and Business Park (BP) pending changes to the Business Park (BP) definition.

**GPAC voted:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Specific Plan Area Business Park (SPA/BP)

### 3. Discussion of New Property Owner Initiated Areas (Late Requests)

## PO 38

**GPAC:** Didn't know that the Twin Oak Community was limited to 5 acres of commercial. Maybe we should consider other properties from previous request?

**City Staff:** At one point, Twin Oak Community Plan had 10 acres, and then it was reduced to 5 acres. Need to limit retail.

**Property Owner:** Identified his parcel, indicated road improvements will take some additional property. The Twin Oaks valley Community wants to keep the commercial on the west side of Twin Oaks Valley Road.

**GPAC:** You want to make the whole piece commercial.

**City Staff:** The Debit property has a feed store and limited retail.

**Twin Oaks Association Representative:** The association supports the property owners idea – the association does not support Dutch Growers. The Twin Oaks Valley Road is very busy. Plus the current owner is now a new owner of Dutch Growers. If you expand the commercial, what does that mean...another Walmart? Mr. Patton communicates with Twin Oaks Association.

**Property Owner:** Would communicate with neighborhood, no commercial past 10:00 p.m.

**Public:** This is the only store we have in ½ mile. If we have any smart growth, it could be nicely done here.

**GPAC:** For the Debit property – more difficult to build a grain store, because one has been built north of site.

**GPAC voted:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is GPAC to establish Commercial Boundary to match Bob Patton's property thereby reducing from approximately 5 acres to approximately 3 acres. The remaining area outside of the three (3) acres would revert back to Agricultural Residential (AG) (.125 -1 du/ac).

GPAC directed staff to return with the remaining "late" property owner request at the next GPAC meeting.

4. **Final Discussion of Removed Properties From Study Areas: SA1 (1-5), SA3 (3-3)**

**Study Areas**

**SA 1 – Section 1-5**

**GPAC:** Drove around area, difficult access. What is the % of slope?

**City Staff:** Maybe a higher density, 4-8 with townhome. Slope runs up from east to west.

**GPAC:** How many acres?

**City Staff:** Approximately 5 acres.

**GPAC:** Mixed Use 1 at ground floor may not be productive, maybe 12-15 as a townhome.

**GPAC:** We can just have one use in a Mixed Use right?

**City Staff:** We are debating that, staff feels that you have a true mixed use, not a single use.

**GPAC:** Maybe Mixed Use1 with commercial on corner with residential to west.

**GPAC:** Will the Sprinter double in size?

**Staff:** It is planned for a double track within the current R.O.W.

**GPAC voted:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is define SA1 Section 1-5 as Mixed Use 1 (MU1).

**SA 3 – Section 3-3**

Staff presented the area to the GPAC and recommended that the Markstein property land Use designation become Industrial (I) and the remaining properties to the east of Markstein remain as Light Industrial (LI).

**GPAC voted:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is approve Marksteins property to become Industrial (I) with a Specific Plan (SP) and the remaining properties east of Marksteins to remain as Light Industrial (LI).

5. **Public Comment / Input**

6. **Wrap Up and Adjournment**

7. **Next Meeting: February 10, 2011**