

City of San Marcos General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

Meeting #3 Notes

January 7, 2010
6:30 PM

REGULAR MEETING

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: 6:30 PM
SAN MARCOS CIVIC CENTER (VALLEY OF DISCOVERY ROOM)
1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA

Meeting notes: (2nd GPAC meeting)

GPAC ITEMS:

1. Welcome

Chairman Winn called the meeting to order. AECOM provided a quick project/schedule update to the GPAC.

2. Overview of Planning Land Use Focus Areas by City Staff

The Planning Director presented an overview of Land Use Focus Areas to the GPAC. The presentation covered the **Study Areas** (Rancho Santé Fe Road/San Marcos Boulevard/Mission Road), the **Consideration Areas** (West City Area/Twin Oaks Valley Road/Mulberry Drive/Dolphin Industrial Park/Barham Drive/Fenton/Heart of the City/Sphere), and **City-Change Areas** (Hotel Grand/Richmar Specific Plan Area). Each area was represented by a map with a brief description to help familiarize the GPAC with each location.

The Principal Planner gave a quick overview of the Ridgeline Overlay Zone, with a brief description of the history up to the adoption. Ridgeline Overlay Zones #1, #2, & #3 were presented defining the primary & secondary ridgeline locations.

GPAC's comments:

- Was the Ridgeline adopted by ballot to protect the ridgeline?
- Areas outside the City Limits, can we control of what's there before it is developed?

- GPAC members voice their disappointment in not being involved with the selection of the Considerations Areas. There seems to be a lack of comprehensiveness, it seems too limited at this point.
- The Consideration Area's should have been presented to the GPAC before the first series of workshops.
- What parameters were use to determine these areas? This must affect 1,000's of property owners.
- Does the City own any property in these Consideration Areas?
- Asked if the Twin Oaks Valley Sphere is not in the City? Will we re-evaluate these land uses?
- Can you describe what parameters were used to describe the study and consideration areas? How were people notified?
- Were other properties rejected?
- Is the City 85% built out?

3. Survey Results

A presentation was given by True North Research with an opening statement that they were very impressed with the "Overall Satisfaction" rating of: satisfied at 49.1 percent and very satisfied at 43.4 percent. True North explained the Methodology of the Survey, Ratings for Quality of Life, Direction of Government, What People like Most about the City, Changes to Improve the City, Overall Satisfaction, Opinion of Growth, Environmental Practices, Spending priorities, and Satisfaction with Communication.

4. Youth Project Results

AECOM gave a brief overview of the Youth Program that was conducted at the Jack's Pond Community Building on November 16, 2009. The purpose of the exercise was to hear the hopes, aspirations and perspectives from the youth of San Marcos. Approximately 40 local children between the ages 5 to 8 participated giving their views in a graphic/text format. It was a fun and productive exercise.

5. Workshop Series #1 Discussion

AECOM gave a brief overview of the first series of Public Workshops which covered a presentation on "What is the Purpose of the General Plan?" "Why is the General Plan being updated?" AECOM described the current elements with the San Marcos General Plan. Discussed the timeline for the General Plan. Present definition and examples of Healthy Communities, Sustainable Communities, Integrated Mobility, Infill Development, understanding of the Sustainable Systems Integrated Model and Planned Focused Areas. AECOM included a couple activities seeking input from the public regarding "Our City, Our Future."

6. Guiding Themes Discussion

AECOM gave a brief presentation regarding the "Draft Guiding Themes" as it relates to discussion from the survey, GPAC meetings and public workshops. The Guiding Themes were reviewed with the GPAC which covered subjects such as: Creating a Vibrant Destination City, Creating a Strong Local Economy & Employment Base,

Connecting People to Places, discussing an Educational and Academic Hub, discussing a City with Choices, Sustaining Environmental Quality, Building a Greener Community, a Healthy and Safe Community and Continuing Our Agricultural Heritage.

GPAC's comments:

- The local agriculture and open space are very special and unique to San Marcos. A lot of communities have lost theirs.
- Agree with the direction of the City to focus on agriculture and greenhouse retention.
- How much is built out in these areas? Looking at the results make sure development is green.
- Water is a big deal right now.
- How will the guiding themes address utilities?
- Open space and encouraging economic growth. Attractive open space integrated with the economic development.
- How will the zoning get changed? Zoning Implements the General Plan, what should we be looking at and what policy should be developed to get to that level.
- In Colorado there are preserved green belts – San Marcos is in a perfect time to consider this.
- Why would the survey make an issue of safety or not a safe community?
- Does the General Plan impact other policies and codes that compliment development?
- Calling the Sheriff's, it has taken 20 minutes to respond – is that good?
- Are people aware of all the capital funding being spent?
- The sustainable modeling – what is it and how does it relate to environmental?
- Population Cap – the City has grown from 15,000 and continues up to 150,000? Discuss ways to minimize growth cap.
- Is a population cap something that could be given in the General Plan? Should consider synchronizing population growth with infrastructure improvements.
- Years ago, San Marcos use to have a building permit cap or allotment – then it was changed to infrastructure contributions which provided a fair approach as a public facility plan.
- Is it the intent to expand agriculture?
- How will the City handle these issues?
- Strong economy and employment base – hoping we don't focus on the theme that will be an expense of another.
- These are ideas from the survey/workshops that will be establishing priorities to be presented to the City Council. Although we have a long way to go to identify the balance between high & low priority.
- Building a green community –asking for clarification – does it mean more oriented for new development but need to add requirements for existing residential and businesses?
- The County and the City should work together for North County to reduce water consumption to Southern California.
- Not sure how the Guiding Themes will be used for the General Plan Update? They seem to be integrated, but there needs to be a way to clearly demonstrate the relationship.

7. Public Input

- Give an example of how Building a Greener Community will be addressed in the General Plan.
- Will the GPAC add or subtract from the potential land use change areas? How will you notify – if there are areas to look at to determine their potential before it arrives at the Planning Commission.
- If you build something they will come. The Forum in Carlsbad is an upscale shopping center and is very popular – maybe we should consider the Forum to provide a destination for the public to come to. Right now San Marcos loses a lot of sales tax due to local competition. People need a lot of choices.
- Exploring life in North County – disagree with the “big box” concept – a destination does not have to consist of 500 parking spaces. Smaller venues may be more desirable – or multiple destinations may be better.
- If San Marcos is 85% built out, there is only 15% development left to go green? Unless you have some kind of incentive to become greener, it will become a challenge.
- Asked the committee members to review the areas and identify additional areas to be included in the Study Area. Also, the City needs to quickly notify potentially affected property owners.
- The zoning ordinance should consider a green building concept within the City.
- Does the General plan impact other City codes that regulate development?

8. Wrap Up and Adjournment to Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned 8:45 p.m.