

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

## Meeting #20 Notes

February 10, 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 "DINING ROOM")  
3 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA

### GPAC ITEMS:

1. **Welcome (6:00 pm)**  
Vice Chairman Jones called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and requested that staff proceed with the presentation.

Backoff: PowerPoint presentation shown.

2. **Final Discussion of Consideration Area 6 (White-Attebury, LLC)**

## **CA 6**

**GPAC:** We have GPAC preferred 120 to 255. 163 ac., 130-244.

**Landowner:** Agrees w/staff "up to 68" units.

**Public:** Are you taken out the hills?

**City Staff:** Limited or no grading would complement existing topography. We need to review the technical studies that will be submitted by the applicant This will result in a substantial reduction in density.

**Public:** Who will have the final decision?

**City Staff:** First it will be reviewed by Planning Commission then final approval through City Council.

**Public:** Can we participate?

**Staff:** Yes, there will probably be a public workshop too.

**GPAC Voted:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is approved Specific Plan 2 with up to 68 residential units.

3. **Discussion of New Property Owner Initiated Areas (Late Request)**

## **PO 39**

**GPAC:** What was approved?

**City Staff:** There was a map approved for 7 lots that expired.

**GPAC:** This property is adjacent to PO 34, PO 35, & PO 36, right? We voted to keep those the same density and it would seem logical to pursue same line of thought.

**City Staff:** Yes you retained the existing land use.

**Property Owner:** 40 year ownership/claiming it all E-1-20, want to make it consistent. Based on slope density we are concerned with the cost for extending the sewer. Want land to be consistent with zoning.

**GPAC:** Why would sewer be brought up if the lots are one acre lots?

**Public:** This approval would help pay for sewer connection.

**Owner Representation:** Have done a lot of studies for this property. The smallest pad is 20,000 S.F.

**GPAC:** You're looking for 18.

**Owner Representation:** No, we are looking for E-1-20. There is 166 yards of extensive grading.

**Public:** How would sewer be installed?

**Owner Representation:** It would be installed by developers.

**GPAC:** Trying to understand the conflict.

**City Staff:** Clarified slope percentages & minimum lots size for E-1-20 & A-1.

**Owner Representation:** With zoning requirements, asking for consistency w/zoning all min. 1 ac. lot.

**City Staff:** There is an inconsistency in the Land Use versus the zone,

**GPAC:** I want to stick w/City GP designation.

**GPAC:** Could this be an SPA w/12 lots under an SPA?

**GPAC:** You're under a lot of scrutiny w/ a Specific Plan (SP).

**GPAC Voted:** GPAC Recommended Land Use is Specific Plan Area with up to a maximum of 12 Residential lots.

## **PO 40**

**GPAC:** What is the planned access?

**City Staff:** Twin Oaks Valley Road.

**GPAC:** Will there be a signalized intersection?

**City Staff:** We'll need to look at that. With the requirement of a Specific Plan extra standards for compatibility would be required.

**GPAC:** Can you shift buildings to north w/internal access keeping forklifts away from neighborhood?

**GPAC:** Why would we do this? People that bought houses did not know about the change. There is so much Industrial (I). Why here?

**GPAC:** These are late property owner requests correct? Is there a slope on this site?

**GPAC:** At night the lights are very bright from current industrial.

**GPAC:** Is property owner here? Is something planned?

**Owner Representation:** There has been confusion on the land use and zone for this property for some time.

**GPAC:** Does a family live on this lot?

**Owner Representation:** Yes.

**GPAC:** So, there's no specific plans for this site?

**Owner Representation:** No, but we would be happy to go through the process.

**GPAC:** Concern with pushing Industrial (I) too far north.

**Public:** Houses are 50 from this site. There is already noise in this area from existing industrial uses. I feel like we are living in an industrial park.

**GPAC:** Uses would continue.

**Public:** Already have problems with lights and noise, approving this doubles my problem.

**Public:** You need to understand noise/skateboarding and when more industrial buildings were built it got worse.

**Public:** Concern with 1 ½ day notice. What is the motive? It's a real nice buffer. Thought it would have less impacts. Google information regarding residential/industrial mix and didn't find one match. Hoping the GPAC understands this is a natural line. We do not want to listen to KRC study rocks and additional industrial noise. Need to draw a line.

**Public:** Biggest surprise, large lot with only one house and being zoned R-2 and being considered as Light Industrial (LI). Currently, this site looks like a park.

**Public:** Why wouldn't he put homes in? Seems it would be just as lucrative, but because it's next to industrial, maybe there would be similar issues.

**Public:** This must have an increase in traffic. The Chesapeake neighborhood is quite steep. Residential, would add more to area and economy.

**Public:** City needs to look at quality of life, bright lights, and noise pollution.

**Public:** I drive on Windy Way and the trucks block the route. Can you give us more information?

**Public:** Is it possible to consider commercial rather than industrial?

**City Staff:** We can look at it. It may be difficult due to market, history. Concerns from public at that time were asking for more light industrial, rather it went to a college use. People felt Saint Augustine's is a good neighbor.

**Owner Representation:** We would be happy to work with the City.

**GPAC:** Doesn't make sense to me to back up light industrial to property line. You have slope constraints.

**Owner Representation:** Maybe we could go with senior housing at two (2) stories or go to a residential at 4-6 du/ac?

**City Staff:** Chesapeake was approved under PRD. You can get to smaller lots with lower density.

**GPAC:** Seems the Legacy has larger lots 1/3 acre and Chesapeake lots are smaller. The suggestion that an Specific Plan Area with a little higher density, effects of noise and activity, will be more pronounced to new homes with design cleverness.

**Staff:** Still could go to 4-8.

**GPAC:** Sometimes, it's a negative when you change land use. Maybe senior housing would be better. There is plenty of industrial, keep it residential.

**GPAC:** It was nice to be presented with a compromise. Next time we meet, there should be a better solution. Maybe applicant can work with staff.

**City Staff:** Would like to hear from neighborhood.

**Public:** High density would be a concern unless it is senior housing.

**Public:** Chesapeake is higher and Legacy is lower. It seems its going towards light industrial or apartment. I would not have purchased my home. Nearby, there is open space. Higher density does not make sense.

**Public:** I like San Marcos, but it seems like an afterthought that you need to recognize you're a suburban community. This gets everyone stuck in a bad situation. Make it consistent with the neighborhood. Who is going to build and willing to buy houses?

**Public:** When you build new houses, it increases your value. What are statistics if you build something else and how it affects the value?

**Public:** Would like to see the density match. Don't see senior housing. I thought older buildings in this area were being beautified? You're going the other way. No smaller lots as Chesapeake.

**GPAC:** 80 residents prefer density closer to Chesapeake or Legacy.

**GPAC:** This is an infill piece. A Specific Plan (SP) would give the flexibility.

**Owner Representation:** Site is very flat if you go to 2-4. It's going to be 4 if it's going to go to 4 to 6. It will be built as 6. The Specific Plan would allow to work it out with City and neighborhood.

**City Staff:** Have talk about Specific Plan being a good document. Senior housing is a higher density, but under Specific Plan (SP) we could work with neighborhood at 4-8 with a Specific Plan.

**Public:** Senior Housing – concern with heights.

**Staff:** You could structure the Specific Plan to transfer density away from residential and still have a 2-story building.

**Public:** Want to see it stay at 2-4.

**City Staff:** Chesapeake has smaller lots. You could be compatible in lot size.

**Public:** It is a disservice to change zoning and GP. I am concerned with preserving property value.

**Public:** If you go with Specific Plan, can you guarantee the maximum number of lots? Need a cap on density.

**City Staff:** Yes.

**GPAC:** This is too close to a hearing. We have heard the community.

**GPAC:** I have heard; "Let's keep it the way it is."

**City Staff:** The 2-4 with Specific Plan (SP) for flexibility on lot configuration. It doesn't need to be 4-6.

**GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Specific Plan Area (SPA) / Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (2-4 du/ac).**

**PO 41**

**GPAC:** Currently designated as Light Industrial (LI) per General Plan – however, it is zoned Industrial, should kept it as Light Industrial (LI).

**City STAFF:** Once the City Council approves the land use city-wide, all the zoning will be changed to be consistent with General Plan.

**Property Owner:** GPAC, if land use changes to Industrial (I), can they continue their use?

**City Staff:** To change to Industrial, they could engage in heavier uses.

**Property Owner:** The Industrial zone creates a higher value. We would stay the same use. I don't know when it became Light Industrial (LI)? We have the buffer, willing to put plants on fence. There are 24 businesses that work in area.

**GPAC:** This area is very noisy, hearing it as early as 3:00 a.m.

**GPAC:** What affect will change it from Industrial (I) to Light Industrial (LI)?

**Public:** If you sold it, it may become more intensive if a facility needs to grow. We are surrounded by Light Industrial (LI). Noise could be the similar to K.R.C. Rock.

**Property Owner:** Willing to work under the Specific Plan.

**Public:** Outdoor is a certain percentage - seems that outdoor storage at your site exceeds allowance.

**City Staff:** They could continue to operate as they do today.

**GPAC:** Would that be inconsistent? The processing of the Specific Plan (SP) would be open to public involvement, correct?

**Public:** Still argument that PO 40, too much noise and traffic.

**GPAC:** Trucks have access from where?

**Owner:** Borden and Windy Way.

**GPAC Voted: GPAC Recommended Land Use is Specific Plan Area (SPA) / Industrial (I)**

**4. Wrap Up and Adjournment**