

MINUTES
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA
MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2012 - 6:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

At 6:30 p.m. Chairman Kildoo called the meeting to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Schaible led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll:

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS: Jacoby, Kildoo, Minnery, Nelson, Norris, Schaible, Wedge

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: Maas (Alternate, replaces Jacoby in February), Flodine (Alternate)

ABSENT: Jones (Alternate).

Also present were: Planning Division Director, Jerry Backoff; Principal Planner, Garth Koller; Principal Civil Engineer, Peter Kuey; Planning Secretary, Lisa Kiss; Deputy City Attorney, Jim Lough; City Consultant/AECOM, John Bridges;

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 12/5/11

Action:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **Case No:** GPA 09-105 / EIR 11-44

Application of: City of San Marcos

Request: To adopt a comprehensive update to the City of San Marcos General Plan resulting in changes to General Plan policies, text and maps generally as described below:

Land Use Element and Community Design – addresses land use changes relative to various city-wide focus planning areas as well as adding a Community Design component to the element, establishes new mixed-use land use types along existing and future transit corridors and central to the City.

Mobility Element – emphasis placed on establishing complete streets criteria, changes to the adopted roadway network/classification system and incorporation of a multi-way boulevard, changes to level of service criteria, and discussion of mobility/circulation improvements, including provision for transit services.

Conservation and Open Space Element - establishing policies that address new regulations regarding air quality, climate change, energy use, reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and establishing new policies addressing watershed and water quality protection.

Parks, Recreation and Community Health Element – evaluation of a desired park ratio and expansion of the city-wide park system and adding a “Community Health and Family Enrichment” section aimed at addressing access to healthy foods, health care and promoting physical activity and community involvement.

Safety Element - updated to address law enforcement practices, emergency preparedness procedures, flood control improvements, and incorporation of procedures that address aircraft flight flyovers.

Noise Element – readdresses noise exposure levels and standards.

Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report and adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations relative to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts.

Location of Property: City-wide and Sphere of Influence.

Kildoo: Reminded audience that the hearing is being held three nights. They have the option to speak on any one of the nights, but won't have the opportunity to speak at all three, and may choose to withhold option and speak another night.

Backoff: Indicated that this is the culmination of over two years of work. Acknowledged and thanked the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) members, and those in the audience: Chairman Glen Winn, Eric Flodine, now a new Planning Commissioner being appointed in February, Dean Tilton and Rebecca Silva. City's consultant, John Bridges of AECOM, will give presentation. Thursday's meeting will be for questions and answers and on Tuesday, take public testimony, hear responses to DEIR comments and then make a recommendation to City Council.

Presentation (John Bridges, AECOM, City Consultant):

Commented that he'd be available at all meetings for any questions or to provide additional information. The City's General Plan had not been updated comprehensively since '87. PowerPoint presentation will give overview of the Plan and DEIR, discussing content, policy issues, summary of DEIR and Zoning Ordinance consistency. Both have been circulated from 11/21 – 1/5. Written comments have been received by the City.

The Housing Element was not updated as part of this process as it was previously done and will be incorporated. Indicated a set of Appendices go with the General Plan. There has been much growth in City, issues such as traffic and growth need to be addressed, and new environmental regulations. It's important to evaluate and strategize on local opportunities, trends and needs, and future, new development and design regulations need to be incorporated. Input was taken in many ways – via website, meetings, workshops, newsletter, survey, etc. The GPAC had 22 members who provided much input. Meetings were open to the public. Discussed the nine guiding themes developed through a public participation program. They defined long-term objectives of the community. Discussed seven chapter elements: Discussed Chapter 1-Introduction: Planning Area is 33.06 miles, City: 24.30, Sphere: 8.73. Chapter 2-Land Use & Community Design: Some areas of City are unlikely to change while other areas will. Discussed GP Land Use Designations/Classifications. Figures shown: Neighborhoods, Focus Area's. Concept of Mixed-Use has been incorporated into Plan, Four types, MU-1 & MU-2, include residential with differences in allowable density, MU-3 & MU-4 do not include residential. Study Areas / Mixed Use Urban Core Figure shown, where most mixed-use will occur. Discussed Land Use Designations. Color-coded Land Use Plan Figure shown. Discussed Goals & Policies and Implementation measures. Chapter 3-Mobility: Covers complete streets, vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians, etc. Chapter 4-Conservation and Open Space: Wildlife corridors, recreation, open space, agricultural, etc. Open Space Area Figure shown. Chapter 5-Parks, Recreation & Community Health: No significant changes to element. All parks and trails identified. 340 acres of existing parkland, trails and recreations facilities. 600 acres planned for the future. Minimum standard of 5 acres of land per 1,000 residents. Chapter 6-Safety: Focuses on hazards and safety issues. Color-code Hazard Zone Figure shown. Chapter 7-Noise: Includes more technical elements. Transportation vs. non-transportation, etc. City's Noise Ordinance will be updated. Chapter 8-Housing: Already adopted and certified in 2006. Has its own cycle with next update in 2013. Discussed Draft EIR: Pointed out that this is a Program EIR which examines implementation of the plan over the next 20 years. It examines at a much broader level than a project EIR. Plan is likely to have impacts over the next 20 years. Attempt to identify and analyze which are significant and require mitigation: Discussed impacts. Significant Unavoidable Impacts on Project Level include: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Tried to identify mitigation measures, but impacts are still significant. Significant Unavoidable Impacts on a Cumulative Level: Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Public Services, Utilities & Energy. CEQA requires evaluation of Project Alternatives: #1- No project, environmentally similar, #2- Increased Office Professional in Core, environmentally inferior, #3- Staff Recommended Land Use Alternatives, environmentally superior, #4- Transferred Density, environmentally superior. City is not required to adopt "environmentally superior."

Garth Koller: Continued with PowerPoint presentation. Discussed staff's recommended land use alternatives (Table 5.0-6): Focus Area (FA) #1 – initially this was concern from Industrial community. They wanted to avoid a non-conforming status and loss of employment base. GPAC sub-committee was created. Through the process a "transitional" zone was created. It recognizes existing Industrial and allows them to continue operating as they are today and into the future. If they later want to expand or sell to someone who wants to continue the business, they're allowed to do so. They also have the option to transition or re-zone property. Recommended by GPAC: I,

Industrial, Staff: MU-4, Mixed Use 4. Staff feels MU-4 along the existing SR-78 frontage would be more viable and more consistent with new adjacent land uses.

Backoff: If retained as staff recommends, it would be "I/MU-4." The current land owners and uses could stay as they are or expand. Currently, they cannot expand a non-conforming use. This approach takes away the non-conforming stigma. Until such time as they want to redevelop and rezone per new General Plan, it gives them the best of both worlds.

Norris: Asked if new designation would apply if sold?

Backoff: New buyer could stay the same existing industrial zone or rezone to the new zone.

Nelson: Inquired if they could expand next door if they were to buy that property?

Backoff: Yes.

Nelson: Asked why not making it all Industrial/MU-4 over there?

Backoff: A lot of areas are still being retained as Industrial. Only areas we're considering are developed Industrial that have a different land use designation on the General Plan.

Koller: FA #6 – Richmar Neighborhood, Twin Oaks/Borden Road, about 9 acres in size. Currently occupied by Industrial buildings. Recommended by GPAC: Retain Industrial, Staff: Light Industrial. It would still allow some Industrial with light retail and would be a transition zone, "I to I/LI." FA #11 - South of San Elijo, across from San Marcos Studios. Property is vacant, approximately 70 acres. Recommended by GPAC: SPA (LI) / C / MHDR / OS, Staff: MU-4. Staff feels there's enough multi-family in the area and it's not desirable to add more. Transition zone would not apply as no buildings are on site.

Backoff: Property owner wanted maximum flexibility. There's 15,000-20,000 population in that area now, didn't feel appropriate to add more high-density residential. City needs more business park, commercial and office possibilities. Light Industrial is in nearby La Costa Meadows Business Park.

Koller: FA #21 - Las Posas Road, Recommended by GPAC: C, Staff: I, same as existing. Already surrounded by Industrial, it's a half acre parcel with challenges to the development. Staff recommends no change to current designation. FA #22 - Chang property between TOV & Borden Roads, beyond P Mountain. Adjacent to Santa Fe Hills. There was a lot of discussion on this property. Recommended by GPAC: SPA/up to 25 single family lots, Staff: SPA/up to 18 lots. Staff recognized challenges of slope, ridgeline overlay zone, etc. Developer would need to demonstrate they have sufficient water pressure, minimize grading impacts, establish brush/fire management, etc. When doing the slope ordinance assessment, it yields 13 residential lots. Could possibly be a cluster development.

Backoff: Specific Plan would set the number of units. Staff is trying to set an upper threshold and doesn't feel 25 can be realized. 18 lots are more realistic.

Koller: FA #30 - Mulberry/Borden Road. Recommended by GPAC: MDR2, 15-20 du/ac., Staff: LMDR, 8-12 du/ac. Staff feels this is a better transition between single-family and industrial. Would not be transition zone as its vacant property. FA #34 - San Marcos Studios: 12.5 acres. Recommended by GPAC: SPA (BP), Property owner requested this and GPAC supported. Staff: SPA (Movie Studio), same as existing. Over the course of time, City has received calls inquiring about a movie studio and the nearby community supports it. By retaining movie studio, it ties in with the Guiding Theme: City as a destination point, provide employment opportunities and strengthen the economic base.

John Bridges: Discussed revisions/clean up items to Appendix D, "Land Use Special Conditions," to add refinements to Plan. Discussed FA #2, Linear Park Policy: East of Rancho Santa Fe Road, needs better description and policy language. Errata revisions, *administrative clean up shown*. Entire document will be modified once Council adopts. Zoning Ordinance is also being comprehensively updated, a major overhaul, to be consistent with the GP. It will go to hearing in the near future. There's a need for consistency between the two documents and adopting the Plan first is recommended. Discussed other Commission and City Council meeting dates and locations.

Wedge: Asked why they're having Council meetings at three locations?

Backoff: Council desired it. They wished to have more informal, neighborhood-type meetings. They will still be televised and the final action will take place in Council Chambers.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Stephen Bieri: Commented that he attended all the workshops. Kudos to staff and a job well done. Wishes to speak at a later meeting.

Michael Hunsaker: Indicated he is representing *three different organizations and himself* as a citizen. Postponing his speaking until Thursday as a citizen and next Tuesday as the Twin Oaks Valley group.

Kildoo: Clarified that would be 3 minutes for individual and 15 minutes for the group.

William Smith, resident of Santa Fe Hills: Indicated he'd speak later.

Ron White: Only wish to speak if there's opposition on Staff's recommendation or questions regarding CA6-White Attebury property.

Kevin Mecum, resident of Santa Fe Hills: Commented that his family and neighbors are against building in the PO #20-23 area. Would have commented earlier if he'd known about it. This is one of the most scenic areas of the neighborhood and includes a lake. (Handed out picture of lake from City website). Their area is quiet, safe and has manageable traffic. Indicated they purchased there because of natural surroundings. There's no other way out and there would be too much traffic. Elementary kids shouldn't be walking through traffic. Asked for recommendation on how neighborhood can better voice their opinion.

Kildoo: Indicated he should have attended the 20 + GPAC meetings that went on for the last two years. Concerns can be voiced at Commission and Council meetings.

Backoff: Staff recommended a change to SPA because of the canyon and lake area. It was identified for 89 units. The picture shown includes open space/park master plan area and the intent is to retain it. The graphic gave impression that entire site would be developed, which is not the case. If a Specific Plan project goes forward, it would be subject to a workshop, they'd have to show how they could build 89 lots and would include both Planning Commission and City Council public hearings.

Kildoo: Recalls that greenbelt area would be retained and houses would be clustered. Website is misleading as its three separate parcels. There would be an extensive public process and public notification would occur based on proximity to site.

Backoff: Aside from public hearings, if recommendation holds as SP, when map comes forward, City would send notices to a 500' radius and sometimes it's expanded further. Mr. Bieri, who owns property, is present. Not sure when it would develop, depends on market. Other resident, Mr. Smith, also raised same concerns.

Wedge: Pointed out that the land was bought by someone as an investment and designation was on it. They haven't fenced it and stopped people from enjoying it. It's their property and it's great others can enjoy it. If it's ever built, you'd still have it but with some houses there. You can't tell someone not to do something with their property. Understand it's disheartening to find out, but they do have rights.

Mecum: Indicated he understood.

Wedge: Suggested that whenever someone buys property, they should go to the City Planning Division and learn what may happen near them.

Mr. Bieri: Commented that he will have three projects to discuss. Asked if he'd have 15 minutes as a group or three minutes each?

Kildoo: Commission will allow three minutes for each property.

Backoff: Added that Staff is still responding to public comments.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Kidoo: Hearing continued to Thursday, 1/12.

Wedge: Commented that Staff's presentation was very clear to them because they've read the documents, heard previous presentations and discussed with staff. Suggested to audience that they let staff know if they have any questions.

PLANNING DIRECTOR COMMENTS

Backoff: None.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:56 p.m. Commissioner Kildoo adjourned the meeting.



Steve Kildoo, Chairman
SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTEST:



Lisa Kiss, Secretary
SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION