

City of San Marcos General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

Meeting #5 Notes

May 24, 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. Discussion of Consideration Areas #7 through #10

CA7

Property Owner Comments:

- Understand Prezone (PZ) is Light Industrial (LM) – can't annex yet because LAFCO requires a pre-approved plan.
- Proposal would allow a mixture of uses.
- In the past the City allowed Zebra Zones.
- Mixed Use in this location doesn't fit since the site is not next to a transit corridor.
- Going to market place to determine what mixture of land uses will work to bring in more diversified uses in the area.

Public Comments:

None.

GPAC Comments:

- Q. How does the landfill relate / where in proximity?
- A. Described location adjacent to the site and showed location on the map.
- Q. Are there limitations on this property due to proximity to landfill?
- A. Light Industrial uses currently – anything allowed per Light Industrial Code.

- Q. But what about restrictions –methane gas, etc. – does city feel there are restrictions because of the landfill?
- A. Normal CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) process is required, Bio study and other technical studies would be prepared if necessary.
- Q. For Owner: How many acres is the site?
- A. Was 70 - now roughly 67 acres (gross).
- Q. What's the acreage of footprint – developable?
- A. About half - roughly 30 acres.
- Commented San Elijo Hills was a Specific Plan; and Old Creek Ranch SP, therefore design guidelines high.
- Supports Alternative 1 or 2, and being a Specific Plan so there are higher standards
- Concurs with Bieri (property owner) – Combo of land uses appropriate especially not knowing where the market will be in the future.

CA8 – S. Santa Fe

Property Owners Comments:

None.

Public Comments:

None.

GPAC Comments:

- Property is adjacent to liquor store – already headed in retail direction.
- Commercial is obvious for this site.

CA9 – Via Vera Cruz/Linda Vista

Property Owner Comments:

None.

Public Comments:

- Doesn't want to see zone changed.
- There is outside storage allowed now.
- Keep zoning as it is today.
- Important to keep Industrial property in the area.
- Many businesses need outdoor storage.
- As a person speaking on behalf of all manufacturers, some employ hundreds of people in San Marcos; down zoning is dangerous – down grading Industrial to Light Industrial (LM) makes lots of business owners lose our livelihoods; speaking out on behalf of all businesses, work hard and pay all our taxes.

Staff Comments:

- City is in the process of holding workshops with the Chamber of Commerce, EDC and the business community – provide opportunity to discuss in detail.

Public Comments:

- What's the purpose of going to Light Industrial (LM)?

Staff Comments:

- GP Update is the appropriate avenue.
- A lot of existing businesses out there talked about non-conformance.
- Talked about the Land Use changes in the area.
- Ability to re-evaluate Land Use and whether appropriate to change.

GPAC Comments:

- Commercial Manufacturing (CM)? That area, I'd forgotten it - it's been very successful as Industrial (M) Zone.

- Industrial Zone very successful in this city.
- Coverage ratios in past have been very generous.
- These old properties are the most successful industrial properties in San Marcos; vacancy factor very low, rents good.
- Industrial Zone very useful for “square peg uses” – churches, outdoor storage yards, etc., through CUP process.
- City’s concern about screening mitigated through CUP.
- Contends this is the very best zone for the property.
- When conflict with new hotels, there is lots that can be done to make for a peaceful coexistence.
- Industrial Zones in North County will be pushed out.
- Drove to site yesterday, can visually see this area produces money for San Marcos, it’s tucked away mid block and not visible from SR-78, hotels will not be resorts. Echoed comment about seriously consider keeping Manufacturing.
- There will be certain kinds of uses that will be “constantly under attack” – agriculture and manufacturing are good examples.
- To be consistent with guiding principles (viable and economic) – need to figure out how to make the City viable without sacrificing a square inch of industrial.
- Follow up question to earlier comment regarding non-conforming uses – can they expand use?

Staff Comments:

- Request to expand a non-conforming structure/use will need to be evaluated.
- May not be allowed to expand.
- Could continue use, but need to evaluate if in substantial conformance.

GPAC Comments:

- So in general too much of a risk for a business owner not knowing ability to use or expand business in the future – evaluate one by one?

Staff Comments:

- Subcommittee discussion (again) – re-emphasized purpose of business community workshops.

Public Comments:

- In researching this (Grand Ave Triangle GPA and Rezone) Statues does not allow the expansion except interior and minor exterior modifications.
- It is incumbent upon the GPAC to understand what is allowed per current statues when it comes to non-conforming.
- 20 year business owner - property is within the Mission Road study area not in CA9, Industrial zones allows outdoor storage; doesn’t want to down zone, not good to take away Industrial Zoning base in City.
- Industrial Development authority here in San Marcos still exists today, why doesn’t City consider using Industrial Development bonds.

CA10 (Removed from Analysis)

3. Discussion of Property Owner Initiated Areas (time permitting)

PO #1 – St. Germain

Public Comments:

None.

Property Owner Comments:

None.

GPAC Comments:

- Las Posas provides a clear delineation between industrial land on west side and commercial land on the east side, once you introduce Commercial there will be compatibility issues and sporadic GP requests; not in favor of Commercial on this parcel.

Public Comment:

- Minimum lot size – 20,000?
A: No smaller.
- Agrees with GPAC member, other industrial users/owners will ask for change to Commercial too (doesn't support Commercial).

PO #2 – Rancho Santa Fe

Property Owner Comments:

None.

Public Comment:

- Brighton Ridge resident, everyone here wants to improve San Marcos, wants to retain as Residential, to Melrose – 8 mi; to Rancho Santa Fe 1 ½ mi Commercial; vacant Commercial on San Marcos Blvd/Rancho Santa Fe Rd; Commercial incompatible with Rural Residential surrounding (in hundreds of acres); keep as zoned – not into Commercial.
- Another Brighton Ridge resident; Commercial use would be subdivided between Commercial and Residential; a number of people are concerned about it; submitted a petition; did GPAC get it? (Yes).
- Commercial brings traffic – Rancho Santa Fe Road is a race track with accidents.

GPAC Comments:

- Agrees with residents.
- Beautiful area of homes; Commercial would be a disservice to residents in area; keep as Residential; zoned now as Rural Residential, but it's quasi Commercial – nursery – Grandfathered in?
- Nursery has been there several years, I drive by everyday; residential doesn't make sense, especially the residential density; thinks the nursery is a good use, but Commercial makes no sense.
- Mentioned Senior Housing – there is a lot in the general vicinity.
- No Commercial that a senior could walk to.
- Just adding to traffic with Commercial.
- Would be inclined to support senior development – would be less ADT – less cars.
- 3 – 3 ½ acres, not going to argue Commercial – maybe 2 acres usable; 2 homes = 4 cars.
- From Rural Residential (.125-1 du/ac) to maximum 2 per acres = plus 2 homes plus 2 cars (Conclusion: if Residential, there would be minimal traffic impacts).

PO #3 - Donnelly

Property Owners Comments:

- 2 homes doesn't make it viable to develop.
- Close to San Eljio Hills; 1 mile from sewer line.
- Finest place to live in San Diego County is San Eljio Hills.

- 6-11 homes beautiful views to oceans (density).

Public Comments:

- A resident of Deadwood Drive - very familiar with property has concerns – he is a Civil Engineer; a lot of properties are inconsistent – zoning and GP inconsistent – from Venzano boundary to this property – inconsistent; propose whole area be rezoned/GP this lot plus all lots to west into San Elijo Hills; access issues – 16’ wide – one way in/out; brush clearance; if GP designation changed, he asks that secondary access be required; make Deadwood Drive public.
- Consider increasing density to north to San Elijo Hills (mentioned Torres property/TSM); Not talking SEH density; maybe 1 du/ac – keep Rural Residential feeling; enough development to get access.

PO #4 – Old School House Site

Property Owners Comments:

- Currently zoned Industrial (M) and M-2 Zoning to the west.
- Prospect of relocating Water Company to site; Mixed use (no Residential) – water bottling, restaurants, similar to Stone Brewery.
- Some adjustment to grades of existing knoll.
- Option #1 – but keeping some Industrial would be their suggestion – no Residential.
- Water bottling plant and brewery.

Public Comments:

- None.

GPAC Comments:

- Manufacturing bottling?
- Brewery with the high school right across the street; wonderful concept but don't think it will fly with parents in the District.
- Can understand District issues; good location – near college and brewery and baseball; High school kids can't go to Brewery; fine with access and baseball and brewery, but knoll too much to deal with.
- Overall in the City, do we have specific citywide needs/specific parcel sizes, etc. Answer: KMA study will give analytical information.

PO #5 – San Marcos Boulevard

Property Owners Comments:

- Property owner preference – Option #1 without Residential, next would be Options 4, 3, 2 – in that order; feel mixing Residential in that area will not work – Markstein in back, high school to west; mixture of land uses – appropriate; Light Industrial: building is obsolete – variety of users – church with CUP and French Bakery.

Public Comments:

None.

GPAC Comments:

- Since this is within San Marcos Blvd study area, why isolate property owners when entire corridor being studied. Staff Response: The property owner has requested a land use change so it is being evaluated.
- Serious traffic problem in area especially when school is in session; San Marcos Blvd regional cut through; low density cemetery would be great; HTH and San Marcos Blvd adjusting to each other – too much traffic; agree should look at entire corridor.
- Feels it is a good spot for a Business Park - students get in, and businesses come in after students arrive.
- Other medical offices in area; good idea to add to business ambiance of area.

PO #6

Property Owners Comments:

- San Marcos Creek run through half way mark.
- Twin Oaks Valley side minimizes property – they have approved SDP with extensive amount of parking and trails.
- Would prefer it be Commercial / plus office (want Commercial).

GPAC Comments:

- Proposed building sits on what side of creek?
Answer: West side.
- East side OK with senior designation.

Public Comment:

- No Commercial along Twin Oaks Valley Road – 7/11 doing poorly.
- Should stay Light Industrial.

GPAC Comments:

- Q. How much coverage Commercial?
- A. About 20% because of environmental constraints – an almost 10,000 sq. ft. building on this site.
- Got the impression Borden Road will give people opportunities to access Commercial.

Staff Comments:

- Future Borden Road will provide connection between Twin Oaks Valley Road and Woodward.

GPAC Comments:

- GPAC member watched the development review process for Alkazin – very nice design – no roll up doors – 5:1 parking ratio; LM Zone does allow professional uses; supports whatever the owner wants – Commercial or LM – should go with how he wants to go.
- Resident of Windy Way – Twin Oaks Valley Road - lots of traffic; Commercial doesn't fit there; college traffic will use Borden Road and a one acre Commercial lot doesn't fit with this area.

Staff Comments:

- Parcel is within CA2 – larger Commercial area being considered, not just this parcel.

PO#7 – Grand / Las Posas

Property Owners Comment:

None.

Public Comments:

None.

GPAC Comments:

- Very difficult to get any Commercial traffic into this site.
- This site has a lot of traffic.

PO #8

Property Owners Comments:

- Public member stated he was the Ridgeline Overlay Chairperson – Chang property has designation of primary ridgeline; Chang wanted to put dwelling on top of ridgeline – flat area.
- City Council said not condemning – “Equitable Exchange.” Has legal access off of Borden Road. Property owner requests 25 dwellings. Wants some specific designation because of change – people change, Councils changes, things get lost in translation.

GPAC Comments:

- Water tank – will it have to be moved?
- One-story structures? Yes (property owner representative response).
- Question about access road location – is it in VWD access road?
- Q. All proposed development on west side?
- A. Yes (property owner response).

PO #9

Property Owner Comments:

None.

Public Comments:

- Restrictions on Creek?
- Future development not allowed in flood way and flood plain?
- Environmental constraints – mitigation buffers similar to Royal Oaks?
- How much development can occur? Answer: 100-125' from Woodward based on Royal Oaks.
- A representative of Alkazin Property PO #6 is in support of senior housing; 15 per acre puts into 3-story / property is low – taller structures could be less impactive because lower than street elevation.
- Pointed out Royal Oaks (just to north).
- The whole area is within the FEMA floodplain; too challenging to develop.

PO #10 – Aliberti

Property Owner Comments:

None.

Public Comments:

- Failed to understand this is Industrial; in favor of zone change / no Industrial uses; on one will want to develop this site surrounded by Residential.
- All residential surrounding is Single Family? Answer: To east is 8-12 du/ac, SF to North.

GPAC Comments:

- At what point in analysis will an explanation of whether what is being requested by Property Owners is realistic for development.
- Staff remarked Royal Oaks (12-15 du/ac) was built with a density bonus.
- How do we know if 12-15 or 15-20 works?
- Comment from GPAC member that all GPAC members should be familiar with their neighborhoods.
- It's clear Property Owners want high density housing which equals cumulative impacts, traffic, etc.
- How do we address these issues in this forum?
- At beginning of GP process someone asked about capping population in City – we have a lot of apartments and condos; should be focusing on medium density; there are traffic impacts to SR78 high; San Marcos Blvd, etc.; agrees high density is not compatible with this area.
- High density senior housing will not cause a lot of traffic; this town is getting a lot of seniors; good for City to plan for seniors – we spend money and vans shuttle people, not as much traffic generated.
- Agrees that senior housing is OK, but GP land use description does not specify “senior” only can be developed.
- What will go up Woodward? GPAC must decide. What will go on Twin Oaks Valley Road? Need to figure out if we want Woodward to be Industrial or Residential.

- Aliberti wants to develop in same vain as Royal Oaks, not Light Industrial.
- Highest allowable would be Royal Oaks because of constraints of property.

4. Summary and Next Steps

- Discussed next meeting time
- Next meeting will continue Property Owner requests

5. Public Comment

None.