

City of San Marcos General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

Meeting #4 Notes

May 13, 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 (COMMUNITY SERVICES "MAIN HALL")
3 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA

GPAC ITEMS:

1. Welcome

Chairman Winn called the meeting to order.

2. Overview of Public Workshop Series

3. Discussion of Consideration Areas

Comments by Property Owners/General Public/GPAC -

CA1 -

Property Owners Comments:

None

Public/nearby resident's comments:

- Business Park – afraid that Business Park may not be a bad idea if the project owners don't care. The Heart of the City was zoned Business Park. Although that vision had not matured. Not a fan of Business Park, which may be unrealistic in today's development needs. Not enough acreage. Light Industrial would blend in next to Vista.
- Represents area - beautiful park and the proposed uses don't mesh well with the park. Maybe commercial would be better. As it exists as agriculture, owner wants to add commercial for nursery. Don't see why we shouldn't add uses that are consistent and commercial near the park. Argues that Business Park is vague and out of place.

GPAC Comments:

- How do we determine how healthy the land use mixes are? Do we need more Office Professional/Commercial/Business Park? We need to know the balance before making

recommendations of changing uses. **Staff:** We are hiring a consultant to conduct a market analysis.

When will we get the market analysis information? Don't see the distinction for uses in Business Parks versus Office Professional. What's allowed in Office Professional versus Business Parks – what's not allowed.

- I like the idea of mixed use and like the Light Industrial with office in front and business operations in back versus Business Park.
- Do we have any information on businesses who want to move into San Marcos?
Staff: We get requests frequently – usually the requests are broader in nature. I really like the park and want it to stay the way it is – no more new development in this area that is different.
- It is currently residential; although the park is there, it may be a good idea to go residential as a land use alternative. Maybe go with something else adjacent to the park.
Staff: What does the committee want? Some retail with residential? Some residential, maybe a condo product type would be attractive.

CA2 -

Property Owners Comments:

- Stream changes location – you will reduce the wetlands – how wide is the creek? **Staff:** Wetlands will be preserved – no design established yet. Regulatory will require a “buffer” in area too. **Resident:** Will you keep the corridor open and connect to downtown? Yes.

Public/nearby resident's comments:

- Some businesses are doing well and others are not – don't think commercial would work.
- Concern with increase in density-wetlands and the valley in its natural state. **Staff:** Discussed preservation of creek area/high density.

GPAC Comments:

- Once the bridge is connected, there will be a lot of traffic and this will be a busy intersection – something to consider. A Senior Housing use would also compliment Royal Oaks. Near the existing Senior Center is convenient.
- What do the land use colors mean? **Staff:** Describes.
- Commercial is sorely needed in that area. In favor of Commercial and Medium Residential. Reduce Light Industrial. Not supportive of office professional.

CA3 -

Property Owners Comments:

- The market today is not viable for Industrial. Alternative #1 is more responsive as well as beefing commercial up. Property owner if they had to choose the density of 20-30? Proper density may be 15-20. Haven't studied any design concepts.
- It's not an industrial site. It needs to be residential, working with the City we take all the drainage from church – we would take the drain underground and mitigation would be done. Right now, in real estate community, there is no market for industrial – have own this site for several years – No Industrial Park – most logical is residential.

Public/nearby resident's comments:

- How will you mitigate the wetlands? **Staff:** Need to demonstrate that impacts have been avoided and must mitigate.

GPAC Comments:

- What is future of the Hollandia dairy? New buildings will be constructed and with improvements, it appears to be there for a long time. Milk brought in from trucks – what

routes do they take, and how many truck trips per day? There is other commercial/industrial in area. **Staff:** Tri-M Co./small retail/this property seems industrial. When you put Borden Road with Mulberry – it should reduce traffic and affect viability of commercial in this area. **Staff:** Mission Road is a major arterial.

- This area is within walking distance, to the school and fits in with the church and school. Residential would be a good fit although this area floods. **Staff:** You are looking at a small corner in an area mostly residential.
- Current environmental constraints – where is that? **Staff:** (Described area). Area hasn't been reviewed. Areas are becoming more restricted. Based on my knowledge, Alternative #3 makes sense. Concurred that density is too high.
- A flood box will need to be large - under constraints of floodway – there may be tall condos. Light Industrial and Commercial is interesting – businesses seem to be doing okay. If the site were expanded it may not be so different. Look at Alternatives 2 & 3.

CA 4 -

Property Owners Comments:

- Site would be best served for senior housing/skilled nursing as permitted in other communities - main benefit traffic generation is the lowest ADT.

Public/nearby residents comment's:

- Majority of Industrial in Rancheros Dolphin Industrial Park won't qualify as Light Industrial.

GPAC Comments:

- The 10-acre (Schriber property) site has a gradual slope. This area symbolizes the gateway to the City. Land Use with San Marcos on both sides would support senior housing with higher structures. Mixed use on both sides. **Staff:** How about the church?
- Enjoyed the comment the entry to City. Potential for training for Padres, which will impact the General Plan and becoming a baseball town is an exciting opportunity.
- Will Highway 78 be widened? Will the development on Rancheros be condemned? **Staff:** It could happen in a number of ways working with Caltrans - Mobility Discussion. Should be able to widen within existing right-of-way. Alternative #3 – over time M zone would be the best use for the City. Unless there is a significant zone change in this area, it will not change. If this is a key entry point, it needs to be thought out. Many of these land use changes do not make sense to me. **Staff:** Area has visual constraints – here is a chance to improve this area.
- Hard to remember all the slides - legend is difficult to read – and consistency with colors. CA4 – don't know what it's proposing. **Staff:** Will provide a colored copy and provide a legend.

CA 5 -

Property Owners Comments:

- Existing TSM put on hold – now General Plan underway. I wanted to participate, don't agree with Business Park, want it to remain in keeping with what was proposed to property owners. I understand City's desire to add the Business Park. The zebra zone was ultimately converted to residential. Alternative #3 is proposed. **Staff:** Intent of Business Park is to use as buffer; whereas, the Business Park is further removed from residential by the proposed park configuration.

Public/nearby resident's comments:

- Just looking for a tightening up of land use descriptions. If we had a better definition, we could participate better. Currently, definitions are too vague.

GPAC Comments:

- How many lots were approved? What was the logic in changing this use? **Staff:** describe previous project – we are looking at the best land use mix.
- Is there any consideration in devaluing the property? How would the property owner be compensated? **Staff:** Because park land goes beyond what is required for typical development requirements. The City would pay through redevelopment funds and the property owner would be made whole.
- Opposed to 2 and 3. What about owners request? **Staff:** It's good to have a mix. You don't have to decide on any single option. We are thinking outside the box. Ultimately, we will get to a preferred land use alternative.
- So now there is an alternative #4, it is a marriage of the property owners suggestions. Alternative #3 didn't see Business Park as an appropriate use. Alternative #4 puts residential on the north and west end of site and contiguous to Twin Oaks Valley Road, next to the University.
- Open space and park land 210-240 acres versus Hanson is 130 acres. Would love to see as much park space and open space as possible in this area.
- Area is a jewel. Area is desirable for residential. Industrial would lower value of residential next to proposed use.
- This is a nice area. Impressed with residential in area. Offices and other non-residential take away from the park. There is a lot of open land where Business Park could be located.

CA6 -

Property Owners Comments:

- Not owned by Byron White, it's White-Attebury, LLC. Current legal actions. Repair existing disputes as currently stated.
- What to discuss with staff and discuss other possibilities. Option listed in letter presented to GPAC. Want to talk to staff & CSU about other opportunities – bio medical / medical / hospital on property.
- Property owners need to have this process finished.

Public/nearby resident's comments:

- Industrial uses in Zoning Ordinance – a lot of questions and getting to this may be beneficial to the Zoning Ordinance.

GPAC Comments:

- When did purchase, 1970? Agree with concerns of density decrease. Since 1970 and ridgelines protection. Suggest Alternative #3 (130 den) does not take any land use away, depending on what Ridgeline Ordinance states. Owner areas in ridgeline would be avoided.
- San Elijo is first development in this area - then goes to rural to development and to rural again. When you get into the more density and schools, etc. roads not designed for high traffic that cannot accommodate traffic. Concern with high density at the top. **Staff:** Current SPA - alternative 1 before SPA 2 – it was zone A1 (1-8 acre lots) based on 30-40% slope – density allowed 15 lots. Due to more recent development requires a lot of grading.
- Discuss establishment of Business Committee Subcommittee made up of EDC and chamber members allowing forum for business owners. What will the sub-committee address? Issues with Commercial and Industrial will be addressed under subcommittee to address these issues under a business-oriented discussion. Could be used to discuss zoning, signs, etc.
- Concerned with status of notes.