

City of San Marcos General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

Meeting #8 Notes

August 23, 2010
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 "MAIN HALL")
3 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA

GPAC ITEMS:

1. **Welcome (6:00 pm)**
Chairman Winn called the meeting to order and requested that staff proceed with the presentation.
2. **Discussion on Preferred Land Use Alternative for Consideration Areas:**
Staff presented the latest GPAC input relating the Preferred Land Use Alternatives for the Consideration Areas. Staff discussed Consideration Areas #1-10 and then open it up for discussion with the GPAC and general public. Comments are provided below. Staff presented the Property Owner Initiated Areas #1-10. The meeting concluded with Property Owner Initiated Area #10 with the understanding staff would resume with this discussion on August 30th to complete the remaining Property Owner Initiated Areas #11-36.
3. **GPAC Comments for Consideration Areas:**
CA1:
 - Alternative 1 with Business Park would be a curse on the property owner.
 - Why not neighborhood commercial versus commercial?
 - Alternative 3 has too much commercial.**CA2**
 - Alternative 1: commercial & multi-family would be restricted to senior housing.
 - Isn't there a church in the area?
 - Why isn't Alternative 1 all the way up to the golf course?
Staff Response: This area was established by staff.
 - When will Borden Road go through?
Staff Response: Habitat permitting has been applied for and waiting for response.

CA3

- Isn't there a little creek running through this property?
Staff Response: Yes, future development would have to deal with the drainage through the property.
- Really need to consider density & compatibility.

CA4

- Alternative 2 Barham Drive from light industrial to office professional is good. Best chance for turning into a plus over the years.
- Property owner prefers to remain industrial.
- Asking for clarification of what the Property owner is asking for?
Staff Response: MDR 30-45 du/ac

CA5

- Is a high density necessary in CA 5?
Staff response: Proposed density matches what was approved on previous map for this site.
- How will Business Park fit in the middle of residential?
- Staff Response: Based on the propose park and a landscape buffer area, there will be a adequate space and visual separation. This would not be a detriment to single family residential

CA6

- All alternatives are subject to a Specific Plan approval. The density for each alternative is established under that SP.

CA7

- To clarify the owner wants a Specific Plan Designation?
- Staff Response: Yes.

CA8

- This one is easy, just makes sense to change to commercial.

CA9

- Need Clarification, is this property commercial manufacturing?
Staff Response: Yes.

4. **Public Comments for Consideration Areas:**

CA2:

- South of Borden Road & to the east of Woodward Street should be residential.

CA3

- Would strongly suggest Alternative 3 with single family to the north, west and east. There is a church and high school nearby. This area is not good for industrial development. It is not a viable industrial site. It is a variable residential site.
- What is the acreage for neighborhood commercial?
- Staff Response: About 8 acres on Alternative 1.

CA4

- Want Alternative 3 for assisted living/skilled nursing which would be the highest & best use.
- South side office on north side look at business park or light industrial not office professional.

CA5

- Surprised to see City's alternative includes business park. Hanson does not believe this is an appropriate site for business park.

CA6

- Keep the current General Plan density.

CA7

- Agree that property should have a Specific Plan designation. Just fit the regulations to be flexible and marketable.

CA10

- Haven't gotten any definition or details on zoning ordinance. Concerned that we don't know what business park means.

5. GPAC Comments for Property Owner Initiated Areas:

PO2:

- We received numerous signed petitions against intensification of property.

PO4

- Is this the site proposing a water plant?
Property owners response: There is an opportunity to move the Old Richland Schoolhouse to Walnut Grove Park. Going forward under a mixed-use concept would allow a water bottling company with a restaurant and commercial space.

PO5

- With High Tech High near site is there any precedence?
- Currently, there is a traffic nightmare along San Marcos Boulevard.

PO7

- Isn't access difficult to this site?
Staff Response: Yes, but these are the best options.

6. Public Comments for Property Owner Initiated Areas

PO#2

- Traffic along Rancho Santa fe Road is significant. There are a lot of accidents caused by speeding vehicles. Commercial or high density = traffic hazards. Would like something comparable to Brightenridge.

PO#5

- Mixed-Use without residential makes sense for this site.

7. Wrap Up and Adjournment

8. Next Meeting: #9, August 30, 2010, 6:00 pm (Preferred Land Use Alternatives for Consideration Area #10 and Preferred Land Use Alternative for Property Owner Areas).