

# City of San Marcos General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

## Meeting #17 Notes

January 26, 2011

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 at 6:15 PM and requested that staff proceed with the presentation.
- 2. Discussion of Consideration Areas**

## **CA2**

**Public:** Concerned with adding additional commercial in area.

**GPAC:** Keep the southwest corner of Borden Road & Twin Oaks Valley Road as Industrial (I).

**GPAC:** What are the impacts to the property owner?

**Property Owner:** There is already a lot of traffic in this area, we have just painted our building, so, no outdoor storage would be allowed?

**GPAC:** You do understand that it would allow for combining outdoor storage?

**City Staff:** You could still operate as you do today.

**GPAC:** Going from Industrial (I) to Light Industrial (LI) is down-zoning. There would be a motivation to redevelop if it were zone Commercial(C). Changing to Light Industrial (LI) doesn't get you

anything! The Industrial (I) should be retained. Need to leave this area alone until there is a better plan. If the property is appraised as Light Industrial (LI), the property would depreciate in value.

**Public:** I am a property near the Borden Road, where the bridge will cross. What are the advantages vs. disadvantages? There seems to be a lot of Commercial(C) property that is struggling in this area. Along Twin Oaks Valley Road there is the creek bed and the flood zone. I am concerned with becoming a nonconforming use in a flood plain. Can you rebuild?

**GPAC:** When will the Borden Road bridge connect?

**City Staff:** We are a couple months away from obtaining permits.

### **GPAC Voted: recommended approval of Commercial (C ) / Industrial (I)/ Medium Density Residential1 (MDR1) (12-15 du/ac) (SH)(SP)**

## **CA3**

**GPAC:** What was the preference of the property owner?

**Property owner:** Currently, the property is Light Industrial (LI) with .60 floor area ratio (FAR), this site should not be Industrial (I). The residential 20-30 du/ac was chosen, because I was asked to pick something. Residential 8-12 du/ac is too small, but residential 15-20 du/ac would be fine. You can transition between multi-family, if you take 20 du/ac that equates to 160 units at maximum density and if you put into 8 buildings covering 2.14 acres, or ¼ of the site. If you surface park and build to maximum 51.8% of the site would be built and the rest would remain as open space. I don't think you need to go down to residential 8-12 du/ac. That is not a good idea. CA1- is Mixed Use 1 (MU1) and PO31 is Commercial(C), next to residential. Let's see what residential 15-20 du/ac does.

**GPAC:** I thought that it was going to be 3-stories? Will two (2) stories work?

**Property owner:** I don't want to be restricted to stories.

**GPAC:** Would the City require or support a 2-story building?

**City Staff:** With the proposed residential density (15-20 du/ac), you're going to get three (3) stories. Developer must satisfy the required parking, design around the channel constraints, and end up with limited open space. The condos on Mission Park are about 18 units per acre on a major arterial. Can you place a residential density there of 15-20 du/ac here? Yes.

**Property Owner:** The only way to get to three (3) stories is by providing attached parking. Going to 3 stories would not be justified at this location.

**GPAC:** With residential 15-20 du/ac, how many total units would you get? 150 to 200 units

**GPAC:** It looks like the high density corridor along Woodward Street.

**GPAC:** I am trying to understand which density makes sense here.

**GPAC:** There is a big difference from residential 8-12 du/ac vs. residential 15-20 du/ac, but even using this same example, don't understand what the risk for a high density would be for this area?

**City Staff:** The owner would have a legal right to pursue the highest density possible.

**GPAC:** More concern with consistency. I don't feel it's a conflict with City.

**GPAC:** We are looking at a significant number of housing units. There will be a limit to what Woodward Street could handle. How does your idea fit into that?

**Property Owner:** I have not thought about it. Let me try.

**GPAC:** I think residential is a better call. The channel could be a huge expense to make the whole thing work out, if we could only have something to look at.

**GPAC:** Medium Density Residential1 (MDR1) (12-15 du/ac) would encourage the property owner to hit the high end. I support MDR1 12-15 du/ac.

**GPAC:** I didn't think we would be at this level of discussion.

**Property Owner:** Let's test residential at 15-20 du/ac to see if it works.

**GPAC:** If GPAC recommends a range, staff could still keep it at a lower range, correct?

**City Staff:** The City-Wide analysis as it relates to this site, may not be considered significant if this site goes to residential 15-20 du/ac. They can come forward with highest density and we would evaluate it per the standards.

**GPAC:** Staff can restrict it to the lower range.

**City Staff:** If we have a Specific Plan(SP) on the property, we can limit up to a certain number of units.

**GPAC:** Is anyone keeping track of traffic and population?

**GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Commercial(C ) / Neighborhood Commercial (NC) / Light Industrial(LI) / Medium Density Residential2 (MDR2) (15-20 du/ac)**

## **CA4**

**City Staff:** The existing on-ramp will be removed and area will be reverted to Light Industrial (LI).

**GPAC:** Why Light Industrial (LI) versus Office Professional(OP)?

**Public:** Area along freeway is very intense. The process will put the property owner into legal non-conforming use. If there is a major fire and the structure burns down, they couldn't rebuild. It's a major change. Consider a potential zone. This area is very functional, although it is not the most attractive appearance.

**City Staff:** There are a lot of uses in this area that are under Conditional Use Permits (CUP), which are not industrial (I) uses.

**Public:** You should table this discussion until you know what the zoning ordinance is going to say or until you know what you're going to approve under zoning.

**GPAC:** A building did burn down in this area and it was rebuilt. It's a good tax base. We need businesses. Go back and consider Light Industrial (LI).

**City Staff:** A nonconforming status would not put anyone out of business.

**GPAC:** We do not want to drive out businesses. How do you want it to look while supporting city staff?

**GPAC:** We haven't reached an agreement on the damage of a structure. Need to get a percentage of destruction to building, prefer going back to 75%. This area is the front door into our city. But, if we don't have this worked out, we should keep it as it is. It should remain as Light Industrial (LI).

**GPAC:** Agree that Business Park (BP) is very vague. A Business Park (BP) could accommodate a lot of uses that are currently within this area. They could still operate their businesses.

**City Staff:** Uses are comparable, but more of a corporate presence.

**GPAC:** Will the Business Park (BP) be incompatible with Light Industrial (LI)?

**City Staff:** A lot of industrial has moved to other areas with a Business Park (BP) setting.

**GPAC:** Seems like Business Park (BP) is a good thing. Business Parks (BP) are typically bigger development. The legal nonconforming code needs to be carefully done. I am going to change my mind on Business Park (BP) and go back to Light Industrial (LI).

**City Staff:** The zoning will be changed to match the general plan. Everything will be consistent with General Plan.

**GPAC:** Seems like to achieve the original goal, need to return to Light Industrial (LI).

**GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Commercial (C) / Office Professional (OP) / Light Industrial (LI) / Mixed Use3 (MU3)**

## **CA5**

**GPAC:** How many acres for Mixed- Use4 (MU4) are there?

**City Staff:** 22-24 acres.

**GPAC:** Before it was supported by staff as Business Park (BP)?

**City Staff:** The Mixed-Use4 (MU4) allows greater flexibility.

**GPAC:** Like the idea of having an area open for Business Park (BP).

**GPAC:** Will you need another road or traffic signal?

**GPAC:** Was the intent to allow more density, then the previous map?

**City Staff:** No, keep the same yield and increase park land acreage.

**Property Owner:** I am in support with staff's recommendation.

**GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Mixed Use4 (MU4) / Low Density Residential (LDR) (4-8 du/ac) / Low Medium Density Residential (LMDR) (8-12 du/ac) /Open Space (OS) / Parks (P)**

## CA6

**City Staff:** Directed the GPAC to the hand outs provided by the property owner.

**GPAC:** Can we hear from property owner.

**Property Owner:** We have owned this property for 40 years. We support position of GPAC with the current designation. It allows for Specific Plan (SP) flexibility. If an environmental impact report discusses a different yield, then that is what would be built. It's within the Ridgeline preservation area; we support the approved GPAC's recommendation.

**Public:** What is difference between GPAC and City staff?

**City Staff:** City Staff described the difference.

**Public:** Not a lot of top soil in this area, there would be significant cuts, just look at the current topography. You should try to maintain minimum alterations. Have you consulted with the wildlife agencies and the wildlife corridor?

**City Staff:** With lower density, you could achieve fewer impacts. The 15 residential lots proposed by staff show custom lots, minimizing grading impacts. The current Specific Plan (SP) would require significant grading. This is a very tough site to develop. There is no longer the option to transfer densities into the San Elijo development. The cost of grading would be substantial – the 15 residential lots would most likely be on a septic system.

**Public:** Will all the exhibits be on city web page?

**City Staff:** Yes.

**Property owner:** In regards to the report by the Planning Commission, that was a recommendation, not a carried motion.

**Property owner:** Sent extensive exhibits up to 60 units to the City for review, don't know where they have gone?

**GPAC decided to continue CA6, until City Staff & property owner has an opportunity to further discuss project.**

## **CA7**

**Property Owner:** I agree with GPAC recommendation. Mixed Use 4 (MU4) is extremely difficult to do. There is 1.4 million square feet of office space within the San Marcos Creek Plan. It doesn't make sense that additional office is proposed in this area. Commercial is a good idea. Business Park (BP) sounds nice, let's test retail / light industrial / residential. If no market, they won't come. Suggested Light Industrial (LI) could be located ¼ mile off of the site. I don't know if/when the City's Market Study report will be available - the Keyser Marston Report.

**GPAC:** How many acres – 43% developed, 57% open.

**City Staff:** When SDGE owned this site, there was a conservation area and above ground utilities.

**Public:** There should be less residential and more job opportunities for San Elijo residents.

**GPAC:** This area is already crowded. Schools are already impacted. If more developing in area occurs, where will they go?

**GPAC:** Where will access be allowed?

**City Staff:** Access will be off of San Elijo Road.

**Property Owner:** Let it be tested.

**GPAC:** Does the project have to include residential?

**Property Owner:** We would submit all necessary designs to demonstrate there are no line-of-sight issues and provide X-sections to demonstrate there would be no visual impacts.

**GPAC:** So, no offices would work in this area?

**Property Owner:** In industrial, you can have a 2-story office. The rents for office are all going out by the freeway.

**GPAC:** What about local driven businesses?

**Property Owner:** If there is a demand for it, if there is a market, we will build it.

**Public:** What about senior housing? Can you do congregate care in commercial?

**City Staff:** How much population does the city want? We are looking at the 20-year horizon.

**GPAC Voted:** **GPAC Recommended land Use is Specific Plan Area (SPA) / Light Industrial (LI) / Commercial (C ) / Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) (20-30 du/ac) / Open Space (OS)**

## CA8

**GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Commercial (C )**

## CA9

**GPAC:** Splitting the Light Industrial (LI) and Industrial (I) seems reasonable.

**Public** – No comments.

**GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Light Industrial (LI) / Industrial (I)**

## CA10

**GPAC:** I have called some of the owners. The thought was because property was a controversial property, Business Park (BP) has greater floor area ratio. But, I am concerned with what property owners representative's thoughts are on this proposal.

**GPAC:** Don't want to contradict owner. A Business Park (BP) does not make sense in this area. Why give up Industrial (I) property? People who locate in Business Park (BP) usually have high paying jobs. The neighborhood is fairly Industrial (I).

**City Staff:** Business Park (BP) makes sense here, because it's along the 78 freeway.

**Property Owners Representative:** Do not agree that this should be a Business Park (BP) project. Currently, a project is being processed and the potential nonconforming use identified and how that would affect his client is a concern. Mini storage is a very lucrative business that won't change by owner. Keep it Industrial (I).

**GPAC:** When you have several properties changing to Business Park (BP), it may not be large enough area to support this use.

**City Staff:** Here is an opportunity looking into the future to allow a change.

**GPAC:** This area is changing. You have the Hotel site and Grand Plaza. If there is separate land use and one owner doesn't want to move, why go Business Park (BP)? Should it be Light Industrial (LI)?

**GPAC:** I think Commercial (C) would allow some options.

**Public:** The owner would support that.

**GPAC:** What would the city's thoughts be on going towards Commercial (C)?

**City Staff:** I think it would be fine.

## **GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Commercial (C)**

### **3. Discussion of Property Owner Initiated Areas**

### **4. Wrap Up and Adjournment**

Staff: Indicated no meeting tomorrow night. Instead, it will be continued to Monday, 1/31/11, same time and location.

### **5. Next Meeting: #18, January 31, 2011, 6:00 pm {Discussion of Property Owner Initiated Areas}**