

City of San Marcos General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

Meeting #5a Notes

June 10, 2010

6:00 PM

SPECIAL MEETING #3

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

Chairman Winn called the meeting to order. Clarified that there will not be a business community subcommittee due to concerns from EDC and Chamber being viewed as sponsoring the General Plan update. Therefore, to address, additional meetings will be conducted to hold a business workshop with the GPAC.

2. Continued Discussions on Property Owner Initiated Area's (PO #11-33)

PO #11-15

Property Owner Comments:

Previously an avocado grove, later this was one of the first subdivisions in the area built in the 1970's with 20,000 square foot lots. Now, lots in the area are 5-7,000 square feet to the south. Indicated they'd like to split their property.

General Public Comments:

Incompatible.

GPAC Comments:

Asked if the property is on well water?

Property Owner Comments:

No, it's served by VWD, but we have septic on these properties.

GPAC Comments:

Asked staff to give a rundown on granny flats? What does the City allow now?

Staff: Granny flats are also referred to as secondary units. (Described granny flat Ordinance standards).

Asked if granny flats have kitchens? **Staff:** Yes. **GPAC:** Asked if City would allow larger granny flats? **Staff:** Will look at the sizes in the update of the zoning ordinance. Our Ordinance already allows larger secondary units than the State standard.

PO #16-17

Property Owner Comments:

Not present.

General Public Comments:

No comments.

GPAC Comments:

Seems to be a similar request to up the road with PO #3 and CA #6. Concern with the zebra zone impacts - prefer open space with low density yield. What is the size of the property? Is there a concern with significant grading? Is there a compromise with clustering leaving large open spaces while bringing sewer to site?

Staff:

These are isolated parcels – if the GPAC considers a change other surrounding parcels would also need to be considered.

GPAC Comment:

Why didn't staff show other surrounding parcels in this area?

Staff: See no need to change other properties in this area. Staff clarified that the White property (CA6) is being considered for a decrease in density, not increase as PO #16, 17 and PO #3

Should also indicate clustering is not allowed in this area.

PO #18

Property Owner Comments:

Site plan submitted to the City for a General Plan Amendment, but agreed to hold off until the City's General Plan Update process finished. Indicated they're asking for commercial.

General Public Comments:

What is the size of the lot? Doesn't make sense to change this parcel to commercial since it is surrounded by industrial; there's enough commercial further east.

GPAC Comments:

How do you divide commercial and industrial? **Staff:** Not proposing a split; alternatives include either industrial or commercial for entire parcel.

Think light industrial would be a great idea. This is a good segue with storefront and industrial in back. **Staff:** It could have a store front and support the industrial.

PO #19

Property Owner Comments:

In favor of Specific Plan with the ability to put in more than one use. It would be nice to have flexibility. Feels commercial, residential and business park will work on this site. Residential first, not sure about an office site, there may be other areas more appropriate for office use. There is sensitive habitat and I am fully aware of the issues. A Specific Plan is the best plan. He doesn't feel residential is incompatible. **Staff:** This property is located in the Sphere of Influence, is pre-zoned Light Industrial and must go in front of LAFCO for approval in order

to annex into the City of San Marcos. **Property Owner:** This is a good step for the plan to come forward.

General Public Comments:

Does this annexation rely on our approval process? **Staff:** No, the process being reviewed is the update to the General Plan and is a different process than the annexation process.

Property Owner: Think of it a four part process.

GPAC Comments:

None.

PO #20-23

Property Owner Comments:

Thanked staff in the spirit of completing this process. There is no debate on the 89 units and the Specific Plan gives better control. Was concerned about the earlier workshop opposing the project. There is no project. Not proposing any density increase.

General Public Comments:

No comments.

GPAC Comments:

Is this site off Las Posas Road? **Staff:** Yes. (Showed location on city-wide map).

If this were changed to Specific Plan, would there be other changes proposed? **Owner:** No.

PO #24

Property Owner Comments:

Designated industrial, not sold on light industrial due to location – this area is transition site. Exploring the residential market may be a better transition. This corner needs to be redone, it is tired. There is a school in the area, a church, a park, all of which is begging for residential. What is the height limit for light industrial? **Staff:** 60 feet.

General Public Comments:

No comments.

GPAC Comments:

Question about the creek going through the property and what proposed density; property owner replied 18-22 du/ac. **Staff:** 12-15 du/ac is probably too high due to adjacent single-family development.

Are we going to high medium density? **Property Owner:** I picked the highest density without a study. Our future residential development would not exceed the height of a light industrial building. **Staff:** Maybe a 6 to 8,000 square foot lot would make sense; we need to determine what is more compatible.

PO #25

Property Owner Comments:

No comment.

General Public Comments:

Leave this property as industrial property so it is consistent with all the properties on this side of the road.

It would be a recipe for disaster to put multi-family adjacent to Industrial uses along this area with all the traffic in this area.

GPAC Comments:

Richmar Avenue is going through allowing more traffic onto Woodward. – stay with light industrial. **Staff:** Borden Road will be constructed before Richmar bridge.

Two GPAC members: It seems wise to go with residential on the east side of the creek with senior housing. Also concern with the loss of industrial. Not a good mix and needs to be buffered.

The noise along Twin Oaks Valley Road, if there was more industrial, would be is too loud next to senior housing.

Public Comment: Industrial was there long before senior housing, you need to remember that; keep property as industrial.

PO #26

Property Owner Comments:

Recognizing that this property is within the Mission Road Transit Study, this property deserves some consideration for mixed use. Although it is bounded by industrial – awkward situation – there seems to be a circulation connecting the transit experience that should be considered here. Thinking long term, we will eventually get out of our cars and into transit.

General Public Comments:

Concerned about encroachment into industrial zone. To put a different use in the industrial zone will be a challenge. Concern that the industrial remain intact. It will become more valuable to San Marcos and the region as industrial property

Artisan is a good idea but may lead to other problems; live/work spaces good idea.

Owner of adjacent property – industrial use is not compatible with residential.

GPAC Comments:

I agree that when you mix industrial with anything else – you're looking for trouble. Example: I know of an industrial business in this area that works 3 shifts around the clock 5 days a week. You need to keep residential as far away from industrial. Need to be careful when you mix things together.

Feels there is a shortage on industrial and we should try to keep industrial.

This is not a good site for commercial and this is not a true corner parcel in which you would be restricted to right in right out turns. Don't want to see a lost in industrial grounds. The idea of an artisan with the ability and incentives to create an artisan version will happen over evolution – my experience – renting small and big spaces in which most probably cannot pay their rent. Maybe a live work but not sure it could be proven. There would need to be some incentive – I don't think it will work.

How close is this to the train station? **Staff:** It is across the street aligned with the Palomar Junior College entrance. ¼ mile, within walking distance.

Support the preservation of industrial space – but when you have a rail line, you want to develop business to compliment the area. It might be sacrificing some industrial space – just a little. Mixed-use is a good idea; to have ground floor industrial and residential on top.

Staff: That is a different variation than proposed by property owner.

Property Owner: Concerned in changing industrial and jeopardizing existing industrial. Artisan is a good idea, live work is a good option. It may be economical for them to live where the work.

PO #27

Property Owner Comments:

Part of CA4 with properties combined on both sides of SR78. This is a specific request. Good feedback regarding senior housing, but there are four levels (Active senior; assisted living; skilled living; and hospice) why consider affordable housing? Specific request is for assisted living and skilled nursing. It may be financially difficult to accommodate this

particular use – but it would provide a service to the community. Main benefit – a senior development generates the least traffic.

General Public Comments:

No comment.

GPAC Comments:

Would be a wonderful facility in this area. These are limited facilities in San Marcos.

PO #28

Property Owner Comments:

Asking for support of land use and have exhausted the move of the movie industry to come down here. This site does not have the infrastructure it needs for the movie industry.

General Public Comments:

No comment.

GPAC Comments:

How do you want to use the property? **Owner:** Light industrial or office use.

How many acres? **Owner:** Two buildings on site: 166,000 s.f. more conducive to light industrial and 65,000 s.f. office building.

There are houses in the area – you need to create a use that fits in with this area.

(Break)

PO #29

Property Owner Comments:

No comment.

General Public Comments:

How large is property? **Staff:** 3.28 acres

GPAC Comments:

No comment

PO #30

Property Owner Comments:

No comment.

General Public Comments:

No comments

GPAC Comments:

No comments other than clarification of location.

PO #31

Property Owner Representative Comments:

Property owner has been there for 40 years and watched this area grow. Would like the opportunity to develop Neighborhood commercial and we feel we deserve that opportunity because the owner has been there for a long time. Please consider approving neighborhood commercial. Should not be denied opportunity because the City is changing land use across the street to commercial.

General Public Comments:

No comments

GPAC Comments:

This area is adjacent to businesses in Vista that would provide a sales tax base in San Marcos. Commercial site is okay; hope flower stand stays.
Question about what kind of neighborhood commercial services/goods would be offered at this location.

PO #32

Property Owner Comments:

No comment.

General Public Comments:

No comment

GPAC Comments:

How large is this property? **Staff:** Between 5-8 acres combined. Are these properties vacant?

Would the City annex this isolated area into the City? **Staff:** LAFCO probably would not support only annexing these two parcels.

Two members: This does not make sense to me.

Q: Are the surrounding property owners supportive of change?

General Question:

- When will we get to the zoning? **Staff:** Still early in the process. We need to get further in the preferred land use plan; should get started in less than 6 months.
- Mentioned there will be no subcommittee to discuss business community concerns; The General Plan Advisory Committee will have on-two additional meetings in July for economic discussion – waiting for market study which should be done by the end of this month.
- How much longer will this process take? **Staff:** We are about a year away from completing this process.

3. Summary and Next Steps

- Discussed next meeting time
- Announced to GPAC to review the meeting notes from past meetings in order to take action at the next meeting on June 17th.

4. Public Comment / Input

None.

5. Wrap Up and Adjournment

Meeting adjourned 8:45 PM.

6. Next meeting

Thursday, June 17, 2010 at 6 PM.