MINUTES

Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission

MONDAY, November 3, 2014
City Council Chambers
1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069

CALL TO ORDER

At 6:33 p.m. Chairman Flodine called the meeting to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Jacoby led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll:
PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE, JACOBY, JONES, MAAS, MINNERY, NORRIS, PENNOCK
ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: SCHAIBLE
ABSENT: KILDOO

Also present were: Planning Division Director, Jerry Backoff; Principal Planner, Garth Koller; Principal Civil Engineer, Peter Kuey; Deputy City Attorney, Avneet Sidhu; Office Specialist III, Lisa Kiss; City Consultant, Sophia Habl Mitchell

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Andy Lee, resident: Indicated he was an evacuee during the Coco's fire and has concerns with San Elijo and S. Twin Oaks Valley Roads. The road cannot handle the amount of traffic during rush hour, when school begins & ends and especially during a fire or disaster. There was an article with comments by San Elijo residents in the U-T. Asked what the City is doing about an evacuation plan, widening road, a cross bridge or anything, to alleviate the amount of traffic, especially during a disaster? He wrote a recent article for North County Sun in regards to the problem of the new Double Peak School being built on San Elijo Road. He feels it's the worst place to build a school, in a high fire risk zone, along a 10% grade two-lane highway, and 1,500 children will go there. When the fire broke out, he was working at his home and had 5 minutes to leave. As soon as he got outside the gate of his community, he couldn't go any further. It was complete gridlock and it was not even during school or rush hours. He can't imagine the disaster that could happen if it were during school hours and wants it on record that something needs to be done soon. The new school will open and there will be another 1,000 cars on that road. There are

AGENDA ITEM
#

three schools on one road, plus CSUSM is still getting built out and will have 20,000 students eventually. They're all within a 3-mile radius.

Flodine: Commented that he shares a lot of the concerns and understands that City Council has heard some as well. Asked staff what City is doing and what action can be taken?

Backoff: The City does an after-the-incident review with all agencies involved. It looks at ways to improve before the next disaster. The Fire Chief gave a presentation to Council last month about the incident. It can be viewed via the City website.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 10/6/14

Action:
COMMISSIONER JACOBY MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT CALENDAR AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MINNERY AND CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **Case No**: P14-0001: GPA 14-001, R 14-001, SP 14-001, MFSDP 14-001, TSM 14-001, CUP 14-016, ND 14-007
Application of: The Norman SM Project Owner, LLC (Mission 316)
Request: The Mission 316 Specific Plan proposes an attached multi-family, residential condominium project up to 93 units. The condominiums will range from 1,400 – 1,990 s.f. and feature 2-3 bedrooms in three stories with a maximum building height of 45 feet. A total of 213 parking spaces are proposed. This includes 2-car garage spaces for each unit plus an additional 23 guest parking spaces. Approximately 5.27 acres of common and landscaped open space areas are proposed. Discretionary actions include: A General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Specific Plan, Multi-Family Site Development Plan, Tentative Subdivision Map, and a Conditional Use Permit, to change the land use from Commercial to Medium Density Residential, and utilization of a rock crusher during the grading operation. The project also includes adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
Location of Property: E. Mission Road, between Woodward Street and Falcon Place, more particularly described as: A portion of Lot 3 in Block 52 of the Rancho Los Vallecitos de San Marcos, in the City of San Marcos, County of San Diego, State of California, according to map thereof No. 806, filed in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, December 21,1895, and, Parcel 2 of Parcel Map No. 10177, in the City of San Marcos, County of San Diego, State of California, according to map thereof, filed in the office of the County Recorder of said county June 27,1980 as instrument No. 80-204014 of official records, and, A portion of Parcel B of certificate of compliance recorded September 15, 1999 as instrument No. 99-0631820, being the westerly 140.00 feet of Lot 4 in Block 52 of the Rancho Los Vallecitos de San Marcos, in the City of San Marcos, County of San Diego, State of California, according to map thereof No. 806, filed in the recorder's office of said county on December 21, 1895. Assessor's Parcel No.: 220-210-10, 220-210-41 & 220-210-46.

Backoff: Introduced Principal Planner Garth Koller, who will do the presentation and indicated the Environmental Consultant and other sub-consultants, who prepared the environmental document, are available if there are any questions.

Staff Presentation (Garth Koller):
Described request and location. PowerPoint presentation shown. Project started with 95 units then reduced to 93. It also started out at 9.27 acres, but due to a legal mapping error along the northern boundary line, it will be corrected through a boundary adjustment reducing it to 8.98 acres. Discussed surroundings uses. The units range from 1,150 s.f. to 1,900 s.f. Two recreational lots include shade trellis, benches, BBQ's, picnic tables, tot lots with play equipment and internal trail system with paseo's. Architecture is Spanish, Ranch and Tuscan. It proposes 760 new ADT's per day. Traffic analysis concluded it will not create delays that meet the significant criteria to warrant additional mitigation. Project will construct a center median break on Mission Road to provide an eastbound left turn lane for inbound access to the easterly driveway. Project access is limited to Mission Road with two driveways. Wall/slope treatment pictures shown and discussed: Boulderscape on higher walls and Keystone on lower walls. Discussed & showed trees to be removed. Will be replaced 3:1 with 36-inch box trees. Median must have a safe line-of-sight and will include lower growing landscape instead. Staff provided a Memo with several changes to various resolutions and one on the Staff Report. Discussed all changes. Indicated staff missed one on the MFSDP that should be deleted, page 19, condition L.3.

Backoff: Clarified that the affordable housing condition should show a $9,300 fixed fee. As written, it's not accurate because it says a minimum of $9,300 per unit. Asked the Commission to add a new sentence that says the fixed fee is non-negotiable.

Flodine: Inquired how it will read?

Backoff: Staff will re-word it accordingly.

Flodine: Asked about wording for L.3. (westerly access)?

Backoff: Access is not limited to emergency only. It was designed in the revised plan to be a fully functioning secondary access and staff is agreeable to that.

Koller: Staff recommends approval to City Council of all entitlements, including Staff's Memo handout indicating changes and the additional new change and L.3. deletion.

Ninia Hammond, Applicant: 3-D Presentation shown. Mission 316 is a Smart Growth townhome project. It will provide much needed attainable housing, is within walking distance to Sprinter, retail, parks, the Civic Center, high school and easily accessible to the highway and Twin Oaks Valley Rd. Homes are set back a minimum of 30' from Mission Road. Landscape will soften the look. There's a custom monument to mark the entry, decorative walls with landscape, trails and paseo's throughout. Two and three story buildings are treated with rocks, stone, shutters, awnings & different elements. There are three elevation styles with multiple heights to create visual interest. There are dual recreation areas and units share common courts with pavers. Fire turnouts are provided on both upper & lower pads. Guest parking is evenly distributed and each unit has 2-car garages. Units will be 2-4 bedrooms.

Indicated they had a productive meeting with staff and resolved most items. Only remaining item they'd like stricken is "acrylic" stucco requirement.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Bert Ton, resident: Owns property just north of project. He wanted open space on the hill in a clean & pristine shape. He's not against the project or rezoning, but is concerned about the density. Thought area was less than 6 acres, which means 15 units per acre. Might be mistaken, not sure what the acreage is.

Flodine: Asked staff to clarify?

Backoff: Density is 10.3 dwelling units per acre, not 15.

Norris: People may move in under the guidelines of Smart Growth. Asked if they're including electrical vehicle charging stations? What kind of power sources into the houses?

Hammond: Indicated they're not planned at this time, but they plan on implementing a green build standard and that could be incorporated.

Norris: Any photo voltaic?

Hammond: Haven't gotten that far in the design but they're open to discussion.

Norris: Asked start date? Inquired how long to prepare site and use of the rock crusher?

Hammond: Start early next year. Rock crusher, 30-45 days; total grading & infrastructure improvements, 4-5 months.

Hammond: Flodine: Asked staff if there were any public comments on the MND other than Native Tribe?

Backoff: No.

Flodine: There's a disagreement on type of stucco.

Hammond: They would like acrylic struck from the resolution. They feel a standard stucco application is suitable for the project. It's in line with what's done in the industry. Acrylic is not common in the national standard. D.R. Horton, the nation's largest home builder, has never used it in a residential application. It's a concern to them because they aren't educated on how to apply & maintain it, and to then transfer that to a HOA.

Flodine: Inquired why City inserted the condition?

Backoff: City incorporated it as a standard they've been using on many recent projects. City feels it's a higher standard & better application. Understand it costs more, but lasts longer. City used to stipulate

fine acrylic, but now just acrylic. The last project had a different conclusion but also had different architectural styles.

Flodine: He imagines the Commission will get asked this request at multiple hearings. Indicated he's unclear about the consistency of the application. Don't remember it being required at last hearing for the church/gym addition. It would be easier to make decision if they knew what the consistency is between residential or land use types. Understands economics and maintenance but need to understand what the regulations are.

Jones: Recalls the acrylic stucco discussion. There was a number or arguments suggesting there were problems and it cracks easier. Commission overrode staff and didn't require it. If not required on that project, it wouldn't make sense to require it on this or others in the future. Agree we need better understanding of consistency of application.

Minnery: Agreed. Commission didn't think it was necessary on last project. It doesn't seem to be set firmly enough.

Jones: Asked if a building code issue?

Backoff: No, it's aesthetics. It's a smoother, better applied stucco treatment that looks nicer. Staff is trying to put a standard out there. Have done in the past.

Maas: Inquired how long ago the acrylic stucco requirement started? Only recalls two.

Backoff: Several projects along Mission Road & some City projects have it.

Maas: Asked if it's relatively new?

Backoff: Yes.

Flodine: City staff is looking for long-term quality. Maybe there's more than one way to do it. Perhaps reach out to architect? Appreciates what staff is trying to achieve. He didn't hear the word affordable, heard attainable, so units will be a lower price point. Indicated he is okay with not having acrylic stucco on this project.

Hammond: Requested that architectural conditions be struck since they came to agreement with staff.

Backoff: Most are in MFSDP. Staff eliminated those reflected in revised plans. Others are still there until a revised plan is provided to show those changes. Staff can make edits before City Council if revised plans are provided.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Action:

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO APPROVE (ALL RESOLUTIONS IN ONE MOTION):

GPA 14-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4436; R14-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4437; SP 14-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4438; MFSDP 14-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4439; TSM 14-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4440; AND, CUP 14-016 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4441; WITH *MODIFICATIONS: 1). INCLUDE CHANGES AS PER STAFF MEMO HANDOUT DATED 11/3/14; 2). DELETE L.3. ON PAGE 19 (MFSDP); 3). DELETE REQUIREMENT FOR "ACRYLIC" STUCCO; 4). WESTERLY DRIVEWAY IS A SECONDARY ACCESS NOT JUST EMERGENCY ONLY; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JACOBY AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE:

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE, JACOBY, JONES, MAAS, MINNERY, NORRIS, PENNOCK
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSTAIN:	COMMISSIONERS: NONE

*Modifications: MFSDP 14-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4439 WITH MODIFICATIONS: (Page 9) F. 6. a. Developer shall apply **a** ~~an acrylic~~ stucco finish to all elevations. (Page 13) I.9. The applicant/developer shall pay an in-lieu affordable housing fee fixed at ~~a minimum of~~ $9,300 per unit. **The fee is non-negotiable.** Notwithstanding, the Developer could provide suitable onsite or offsite mitigation as approved by the City. Should the requirement for affordable housing be absolved prior to the issuance of any one building permit this condition would be waived. (Page 19) *Delete* ~~L.3. The proposed westerly driveway entrance from Mission Road shall be for emergency access only. Appropriate signage, striping and barrier shall be installed to prevent daily access.~~
TSM 14-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4440 WITH MODIFICATIONS: (Page 5) 13. Direct access rights abutting Mission Road must be relinquished to the City on the Final Map, except where the project takes its main access and **secondary** ~~emergency~~ access as depicted on the tentative map.
(Page 5) 15. . . . for use of the westerly driveway for, at a minimum, **secondary** ~~emergency~~ access.

PLANNING DIRECTOR COMMENTS

None.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

Flodine: Encouraged everyone to vote.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:20 p.m. Commissioner Flodine adjourned the meeting.

ERIC FLODINE, CHAIRMAN
SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTEST:

LISA KISS, OFFICE SPECIALIST III
SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION