

**San Marcos General Plan Workshop Series #2
Breakout Discussions on Land Use Alternatives
April 2010
(Identified Primary Issues per Discussion)**

STUDY AREAS

April 20, 2010: Twin Oaks Elementary School

- Improve public transportation, using shuttle buses
- How successful has mixed-use developments been?
- **(Need better definition for “Business Park”)**
- Zoning should be Inclusionary
- Zoning Code Update (people wanted to be involved with this)
- Develop a more inclusive description of allowed uses in the various zones.
- **(How would properties transition uses?)**
- How does the “Aqueduct Park” cross street?
- **(How would traffic congestion/circulation be improved?)**
- Incorporate alternative transportation corridors (bicycles/pedestrian)
- The plan should mix industrial/commercial/residential uses
- Define land use designations better
- When will changes happen?
- Can current uses intensify?
- The plan should have realistic expectations/visions
- Providing sufficient parking even in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is important

April 21, 2010: Senior Center

- **(What happens to non-conforming uses after the General Plan (GP) is adopted?)**
- How will the built environment of the industrial area off of Rancho Santa Fe Study Area transition?
- **(Will there be incentives for property owners to change the use of their properties to be consistent with the General Plan which benefits property owners?)**
- **(What is mixed-use?)**
- Encourage uses for physical activity to be developed easily. (e.g., Yoga studios, etc.).
- Guiding themes for Study Area’s:

Mission

- Changing the Mobile Home Park should not be considered
- Developing mixed-use
- Transit Oriented Development-

RSF

- Enhance the local economy and serve as an employment base

SMB

- Create a vibrant destination city

The above were responses to an exercise where residents were asked which “Guiding Theme” would apply to each Study Area.

- What happens to the Mission Mobile Home Park?
- Los Posas connection to north.
- Extend the multi-use trail south of 78 from the Creek District.
- Rancho Santa Fe is a “dead area,” so create an Artisan Industrial Area.
- **(Was there an analysis of economic demands for various land uses which are proposed in the Study Area’s?)**
- Bus/shuttle connections should be developed to connect Sprinter stations to the rest of the city.

April 22, 2010: CSU San Marcos, The McMahan House

- Consider grade-separated pedestrian crossings over Rancho Santa Fe Road.
- Make Palomar Sprinter station a pedestrian destination and provide east-west connections.
- Include High Density Housing in the Mission Road Study Area.
- Rancho Santa Fe Alternative 2, why intensify?
 - La Mirada/Pacific → Switch the Light Industrial and Industrial designations at La Mirada/Pacific
- Rancho Santa Fe and Pawnee is an alley now. How would it become a park?
- **(How would non-conforming use’s transition?)**
- **(The plan lacks public facilities (e.g. convention center, rec., etc.))**
- The creation of public spaces needs to be a priority.
- “Aqueduct Park” crosses several already developed properties. How will these businesses be changed to accommodate a new park?
- **(Industrial areas in the Rancho Santa Fe area are the economic core of San Marcos.)**
- “Aqueduct Park” a great idea.

April 28, 2010: San Elijo Elementary School

- **(Rancho Santa Fe alternatives should keep residential designations.)**
- **(Rancho Santa Fe plan provides good pedestrian access.)**
- No additional stop lights on Los Posas Road.
- More commercial around Los Posas (Mission Road Study Area)
- Positive feelings about Artisan Industrial at Descanso
- Northern area of the Mission Road Study Area needs more commercial opportunities rather than Artisan Industrial.
- **(How will property owners be motivated to create artisan industrial uses?)**
- The San Marcos Boulevard alternatives that bring activity to Restaurant Row is a good idea.
- Pedestrian bridge over San Marcos Boulevard is a good idea.

CONSIDERATION AREAS

April 20, 2010: Twin Oaks Elementary School

- Property owners seeking more info.
- Consideration Area 5 – Alternative 2 makes no sense.
- **(Lack of trust of the proposed land use changes).**
- Concern not all opinions are being recorded.
- **(Concern as to who wants this change: city, business owners, property owners? What are the motives?)**
- Why was the request to update the General Plan made?
- **(Concern that money is the only motive for the city – not traffic, air, environment, etc.)**
- People want all the information before they decide which options are best.
- Alternative 2 of Consideration Area 5 does not seem reasonable.

April 21, 2010: Senior Center

- Concern over timeline for road improvements.
- **(What will happen to zoning (M-1, M-2) for industrial businesses?)**
- Samples of heavy industrial? Where do these uses fit in?
- **(Concern over locations for heavy industrial. Where will the uses go with zone change?)**
- **(Is noise evaluated as part of review?)**
- Concern over timeframe to process CUP.
- Consideration Area 5 – concern over Business Park integration – most favor Alternative #1.
- What is the plan for park around the South Lake?
- Will research and development be included with business park?
- Any changes along Twin Oaks Valley Road?
- Re-write definition of Business Park?
- West City – has a community garden or preserving agricultural component to area been considered by city? (Consideration Area #1)
- Sunset Park – views being obstructed a concern.
- Street improvements along La Mirada – when will these take place?
- Byron White – alternatives unclear – would the city consider a hillside cluster development for this area?
- **(Concern over protection of ridgelines.)**

April 22, 2010: CSU San Marcos, The McMahan House

- Pawny Street – outdoor storage of vehicles (industrial) – where will the uses go?
- **(Concern over transfer of businesses, ownership change, expansion of business that were legal prior to zone change.)**
- **(Recognition of legal nonconforming uses if burned down.)**
- GP update effect on existing legal - nonconforming businesses.
- Difference: neighborhood commercial vs. commercial?
- Implementation of land use changes – city initiated or private?
- Consideration Area 9 – verify designated land use (current).
- Consideration Area 5 – concern – Business Park land use into area – impact too great.
 - Intersection of (SW corner) of Village Drive & Twin Oaks Valley Road.
 - Office park with attached and detached single family residential recommended

- Ridgeline Overlay Zone (ROZ) zone – voter initiated?
- Consideration Area 5 – Business Park not a good fit, residential recommended (previously considered for residential).
- Is the deadline to request a zone change (property owner-initiated area) over?
- **(If one can keep their existing business operating with a zone change, why public input?)**
- **(Zone change effect on existing businesses – MAJOR CONCERN – specifically with industrial).**
- Consideration Area 4: desire to keep the area Medium Density Residential - Commercial may be too much.

April 28, 2010: San Elijo Elementary School

- How does adoption of General Plan affect zoning?
- What is acreage for Business Park uses in Consideration Area 5?
- Verify density of Business Park in Consideration Area 5.
- **(How were alternatives identified?)**
- How were these areas initiated by City?
- Possibility of other alternatives?
- What types of businesses will be in the Business Park in Alternative # 5 → concern over noise, traffic, etc.
- Consideration Area 4 – where is Industrial going? Is industrial only playing a small role in city transformation?
- Where will industrial go?
- Consideration Area 4 – redevelopment?
- **(What is city's stance on eminent domain?)**
- Are consideration areas seen as “less likely” to occur than Study Areas?
- Consideration Area 5 – if land use designations change, will existing businesses have to move if they don't comply?
- **(Are these areas market driven?)**
- Consideration Area 5 – how tall will buildings be within Business Park?
- **(What drives the city to make a decision on the alternatives?)**
- Is the Planning Department looking into the impact of students utilizing housing in the area (Hanson – Alternative 5)
- **(Where will affordable housing be for students?)**
- **(Residents don't want a SDSU situation with housing → major concern.)**
- Does the city intend to purchase areas designated as “Park”?
- What type of “park” is planned for Consideration Area 5 (basketball courts, play area, etc.) → “Miramar Lake” a good example of desired park.
- Students in houses a major concern in Consideration Area 5.
- Trail that's paved is seen as good fit for park area in Consideration Area 5.

PROPERTY OWNER-INITIATED AREAS

April 20, 2010: Twin Oaks Elementary School

- **(Q – Evan PO 3 – Why were no alternatives considered? Maybe consider in-between alternatives – with land use density).**

- PO 6 – Clarification question as to commercial along Twin Oaks Valley Road Road /Alkazin
- **(PO 8 – Question re: TET Environmental Trust property relative to site (north of site) would need to comply with any conservation requirement.)**
- PO 24 – Light Industrial now – question of decision making process request for multi-family explained as to next steps toward preferred land use alternative.
- PO 28 – representative of property owner – Question regarding land use, SPA.
- Cons. Area 1 – BP Q Conf. of Good LT IND.
- Mulberry & Olive – question as to consideration of any Annexation areas – to allow similar density to the City areas.
- Question re: land end of Las Posas .
- #23 – status quo.
- P.O. #4 – complaint – Old Mission Road/Woodland Pkwy, Old Richland School House site.
- **(Concern with homes in SM left with historical significance and moving).**
- Question PO 20-23 – What was being requested for density? Response: status quo – Approximately 89 dwelling units consistent with existing General Plan yield – may be a SPA designation.

April 21, 2010: Senior Center

- PO 19 – property use is SPA to allow Mixed Use (maps/info inconsistent)
- **Property Owner desire**
 - **Balance**
 - **(Have stakeholder, community input and then decision makers consider all info)**
 - **(Alt. Consideration)**
 - **(needs to make sense/compatible)**
- **PO #2**
 - **(Others in area opposed to commercial in this area)**
 - **(Concern re: traffic/safety)**
 - **(Concern with impact to drainage through property and beyond)**
(Response: Will consider what makes sense for any change to this area.)
 - **(Lot sizes of Brighton Ridge relevant to the requested change to nursery comment – leave as residential for 1 to 2 homes)**
- Residential change request – 6, 10 and 29. Question as to senior only versus other multi-family residential
- **(Traffic question as to impact consideration of MF (Senior) already determined road as hazardous with prior development to the north.)**
- **(What about traffic on Twin Oaks Valley Road?)**
 - **(Already in plan to widen TOV Rd. to six lanes.)**
 - **(Borden crossing)**
- Las Posas Road on Circulation Element to extend to Buena Creek Road.
- By doing segments (Borden) to assist in the circulation.
- Senior housing question versus congregate care (senior), primary as ambulatory housing as discussed here.
- Twin Oaks Valley Road transition from Borden Road back to existing road.
- **(Traffic consideration).**

- Question – Twin Oaks Valley Road/Woodward / density (Multi-Family/senior safety)Via Cancion Land Use.

April 22, 2010: CSU San Marcos, The McMahan House

- Q: C.A. #6 – White property – SPA 2
- Q: Number of acres up to 15, up to 30, up to 130
- #3 – Cliff Sumrall – requesting to double the density
No alternate but staff will consider in-between existing and to RR 1-2
- **(#27 - Q residential close by - High density residential seems overkill for area – maybe medium would be more appropriate).**
- Q: as to the density breakdown of very low, low, medium, and then high.
- **(#27 – Prop. High Density – staff explanation of density category. Concern with High Density and Commercial at this location).
(Also being considered in larger consideration area to include office as well).**
- #8, #20-23 P.O. #8 – now Rural Residential and within Ridgeline Overlay Zone, slope density now 14 → up to 25 Du/AC from P.O. → Alt 18 DU.
- General Point – how would changing #8 support guiding themes by increase on density
 - **Think property should stay as-is for change in density**
 - GPA not proposing to change the adopted Ridgeline standards
 - #20-23 – P.O. requesting to retain existing density yield of 89 D.U., would request SPA to allow retention of 89 D.U.
 - Can City propose to change to O.S. (create). Is City going to consider?
 - **(Will Las Posas Road change as P.O.'s are against Las Posas Road extension? Change to open space).**
 - **(Question support to the guiding themes with changes to land use for higher densities).**
 - 20-23 – change of Land Use does not include Las Posas Road extension.
 - Question of if intent for extension with signal at Fire Station #4 – what is long term plan?
 - Recap of #27 to respond to question
OPT 1: Mixed Use/Commercial
OPT 2: Commercial
OPT 3: Medium density residential

April 28, 2010: San Elijo Elementary School

- PO #3 – Request something in-between 10-15 DU/AC.
- PO #7 – Clarification of location only.
- PO #8 – Now with existing slope up to 14 dwelling units - req. for up to 25 dwelling units. Staff alternative - 18 - not up to but 18 TOTAL dwelling units/with comply w/ROZ.
- PO #8 – Also comment as to Open Space Presentation to Chang - cultural sites and fire consideration with dwelling units up on the slope.
- Comment as to fire consideration for all new development.
- Might suggest density transfer to retain value for property owner concern with 33 sites (cultural) Brad Thornburgh (TET) willing to meet with property owner.
- #28: What was allowed before on land?

- **(#8 Lower density -the better/ fire safety/retention of open space)**
- **(#20-3 Avoid hillside development).**
- **(28 & 19 Clarify if within city or county – what’s there now and what can it go to).**
- #19: Adjacent site to 28; in county and in our Sphere of Influence – mixed use request by Property Owner — Business Park (clean up)/office professional area would be preserved as open space.
- Q – When are changes approved as explained in development stages of General Plan update – important to obtain comments?

Comments:

- Staff will hold more GPAC meetings open to public and then will come back at next series of workshops with preferred alternative/land use plan.
- Comment regarding bike path trail from Old Creek Ranch to San Elijo Hills – request for contact information in front of #28 – travel with children to cross from Old Creek Ranch to San Elijo Hills.
- 20 # 23 – question as to the change in use: no change Property Owner request to retain existing Land Use (89 DU).
- Staff: More than likely we’re to have greater open space. Explanation of existing land use where dwelling units vs. open space – will determine the yield.
- Concern: Ridgeline area.
- Property owner asked by City to submit request; nearby owner concern with Ridgeline Overlay Zone and cleanup; had photo to demonstrate view area of concern with new development.
- Staff: Explanation of overall review process and notification to land owners when a project is proposed during review.
- #20-23 - questioned when development will occur. Property owner responded directly – not for a few years.
- #8 – Comment that the lower the density, the better.
- Staff: Behind “P” Mountain. Development will be clustered which makes best sense will need to consider in context of Ridgeline Overlay Zone - would have a SPA.
- Fire concern would be evaluated during development. Fuel. Modification Zone would be considered.
- 24’ maximum height in Ridgeline Overlay Zone.
- #28 – Working for property owner
What does the SPA (Specific Plan Area) mean in terms of development?
Staff: Explained that the SPA (Specific Plan Area) document identifies the Land Uses Now movie studios permitted. Proposed Light Industrial /Office Professional.
City has alternatives: Mixed Use/Commercial/Office Professional.