

MINUTES
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA
MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 2011 - 6:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Kildoo led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll:

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS: Jacoby, Kildoo, Maas (Alternate), Minnery (Alternate), Norris, Schaible, Wedge

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: None. (Both seated on the dais).

ABSENT: Nelson.

Also present were: Principal Planner, Garth Koller; Associate Planner, Norm Pedersen; Associate Planner, Susan Vandrew Rodriguez; Principal Civil Engineer, Peter Kuey; Planning Secretary, Lisa Kiss; Deputy City Attorney, Jim Lough;

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Michael Hunsaker, resident: Stated he wanted to raise an issue that may come up in the General Plan Update. There's been a possibility raised of having an Indian Tribe Casino installed in San Marcos. This has a number of individual's very tethered as to whether it might happen. The local governments have very little control over this. Strong local community support or opposition has a big effect. Feels it is prudent for City to develop some sort of policy and state that.

Kildoo: Doesn't believe there's any Indian land within the City of San Marcos.

Koller: Correct.

Kildoo: The casinos are located in the County on Indian land. There is some County land on the south and north ends of the City. Indicated he has not heard anything about this.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 11/1/10

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:** CUP 10-835, MFSDP 10-51, TSM 479, R 10-146, GV 10-85, ND 10-806
Application of: San Marcos 7, LLC
Request: A Planned Residential Development consisting of 50 condominium units and 8 single family lots on a 7-acre property in the multi-family residential (R-3-10) and single-family residential (R-1-7.5) zones.
Location of Property: 258 Bougher Road, more particularly described as: Parcel 3 of Parcel Map No. 14571, in the City of San Marcos, County of San Diego, State of California, filed in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, December 4, 1986 as File No. 86-562568 of official records. Southwesterly half of Lot 9, in Block 23 of Rancho Los Vallecitos de 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, 1985. Excepting therefrom Lot 10 of City of San Marcos Tract No. 409, in the City of San Marcos, County of San Diego, State of California, according to the Map thereof No. 14118, filed in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego

Staff Presentation (Norm Pedersen):

Described request and location. Discussed case types and purpose. PowerPoint presentation shown. Site is approximately 7.17 acres consisting of two parcels. There's an existing single family residence on site with accessory structures. Condo complex would consist of 11 buildings, townhouse design, 4-5 units each with private balconies. Amenities shall include a pool, community patio/BBQ area, tot lots, open space & courtyards. Single family lots would range 7,100 -7,800 square feet. Discussed zoning & General Plan designation. 15.2 dwelling units per acre for the condo complex. Compatible with adjacent Mission Park complex of 18 du/ac. CUP is to allow for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) which allows for smaller lot sizes and requires at least 40% open space on site. TSM will create a 1 lot condo map and 8 single family lots. Grading variance to allow for manufactured slopes to exceed 20 feet. (Pointed out location of the 34 foot high slope, where it separates condos from homes). Project will lower the exiting site to create a pad area for the condos below Bougher Road. The single family lots will be located further down slope. Proposed roof line of condos will be lower than existing 2-story structure on site. Zoning would allow for 3-story. Discussed architecture, pop-outs, stucco & stone. Elevations shown. The architecture of the future single family homes will require approval by Planning Division Director. Those elevations are not proposed at this time. The estimated daily trips are 480 average. Contributes toward potential cumulative impacts to SR-78. Project shall financially

participate in the planned intra-City shuttle system. Pointed out emergency access from Woodland Parkway to single family subdivision. Project is required to install a stop sign at intersection of Bougher Road & Via Camelia. This will be the entry driveway. Discussed parking: 2.5 spaces per unit, with 27 guest spaces, which exceeds City standard. Single family homes will be required to have 2-car garages. Lots 7 & 8 have potential to be impacted by noise, so sound wall must be installed at their rear yards. Existing structures were built in 1945. No historical significance was found on site. Public workshop conducted 11/3/10 and 7-8 neighbors attended. Concerns expressed included traffic within the area, too much development in the area and potential obstruction of private views. Discussed in detail all of the additional changes/revisions made as per the Staff Memo/Handout that was released after distribution of packet and given to Commissioner's prior to meeting. Staff recommends approval to City Council.

Schaible: Asked if emergency access is designed for the seven residents or fire department?

Pedersen: Primarily for emergency vehicles only.

Kildoo: Pointed out there have been previous parking issues caused by people who don't always use their garages for vehicles. Inquired if there is a requirement in the CC&R's where residents have to park vehicles in garage?

Koller: Staff will review CC&R's to ensure that is clear.

Norris: Asked about 5 foot sidewalk?

Pedersen: Typically for multi-family.

Norris: Inquired if anyone could submit a plan for a house?

Pedersen: Will be the same builder for all, reviewed/approved by staff, must be architecturally compatible and comply with setbacks.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Brian Litchfield, nearby resident: Indicated he attended the workshop and pointed out the farm house where he has lived for past 12 years with his family. Used to have a dairy farm nearby and now there's an \$85 million new high school. More people in the neighborhood now but has gotten used to it. The land has been open space for 65 years. Feels project is moving too quickly. Just saw two hawks nesting in the tree. Tree will be cut down and they won't be back. Feels project is being force fed and he has no good action to stop it. Believes there's a fair argument for an EIR. Planner has done good job going through the steps, but just too quick. Was told traffic & noise would be mitigated. They'll be 960 vehicle trips. He'd like a safe area for his children.

Maas: Asked if his concern was for any development in this area or the multi-family portion?

Litchfield: The magnitude of it. Project is so large. It's hard to get on Mission Road now. People will run the new stop sign.

Jacoby: Asked where his house is?

Litchfield: On left, highest point.

Norris: Commented that he'd look over the project and wouldn't see it from his yard if he has a 6-foot fence.

Litchfield: Fence is five feet. Indicated they hear the high school noise now and this will be a different noise.

Norris: Asked if it's a noise or view issue?

Litchfield: Both. Not aesthetically pleasing.

Norris: Asked who owns the barn?

Litchfield: Not sure, heard they passed away. Released to whoever is in the will.

Jim Simmons, Consultant representing Applicant: Pointed out that project could build 64 multi-family units and be 3 stories, but decided not to do that. Stated they have some issues with staff over architecture, amenities, and the cost of CFD for the intra-city shuttle. Don't believe Commission can address but want concerns on record. Have not been able to come up with a number that relates to what each project will have to pay into. Was advised earlier, it would not be more than .25% of the total tax, which would be about \$875.00/year which is significant. This is too high. Need a more accurate number attached to it prior to Council - a cap to not go over. The ends of four units show on Bougher Road. They're two story, Spanish theme units with varied roof lines and pop-outs. There's a lot of articulation. Conditioned for seven units to be affordable housing without City subsidizing. They'd like to put fireplaces in only the end units. They're the largest at 1,800 s.f. If required elsewhere, there'd be no wall for a big screen TV. Believe fencing is adequate, will work with staff. End caps have storage area for trash cans. Units range 1,500-1,800 s.f., comparable to houses in area. Site is to be lowered 9 feet and built into contour of area. Mr. Litchfield will still be able to see the high school and mountains. Understand a grassy field is obviously nicer than a development. The stop sign will be a 4-way and will benefit the neighborhood. Asking that pool requirement be eliminated. Feel that pools aren't being used and are a nuisance. Proposing a covered area, fireplace, BBQ, seating area/picnic tables, all purpose turf for volleyball & badminton. Looking for ways to make project affordable and pencil out.

Jacoby: Inquired about price range?

Simmons: \$330,000-\$360,000. Single family homes will be higher. Condos are ready to go with construction in September.

Minnery: Asked if the pool was a condition from day one or added later?

Simmons: Pools are always a condition with the City. Don't think it's the right thing to do. Want to provide something the residents will use. The tot lots are twice as big as required with covered areas.

Minnery: Asked how they came to the determination that pools don't get much use in owner-occupied units?

Simmons: Several projects they've done. They're a financial difficulty for most. Don't get used as much as people think they do. Indicated he's aware of other projects in town that are suffering from this. Project to the south came to them and asked if they'd be interested in joining their association to help pay for theirs. They can't afford to keep it open.

Minnery: Asked if there's been any recent comparable project where stone has not been required?

Simmons: Yes, San Elijo Hills project. (Showed pictures on overhead). Feels their project is better looking, with more articulation.

Schaible: Asked difference in affordable housing vs. low income? Who qualifies?

Simmons: Indicated it's all the same, based on various categories of income, moderate, low and very low. In a for sale product, it's the moderate income you're able to do. The City has not been able to accomplish this.

Schaible: Asked if those units are any different?

Simmons: No, just deed restricted for 55 years.

Schaible: Asked about chimneys shown on elevations?

Simmons: An error. There are only two chimneys at end units.

Wedge: Asked the difference in association fees with and without the pool?

Simmons: About \$160/month with the pool, \$95.00 without. Single family homes would be included.

Wedge: Asked about adjoining project and joining their association pool?

Simmons: They indicated their residents aren't using it and are refusing to pay for it. Other properties have pool problems also. The Woodland Park Pool is within walking distance.

Bonnie Moody, nearby resident for over 20 years: Concerned with how large project is and losing her view. Aware there is a lot of bedrock and is wondering how much blasting it will take to get to grading level? There have been recent flooding issues. During heavy rains, some living rooms in her condo complex have 3-6 inches of water in them and 12 inches in the garages. Significant drainage will need to go in. Asked how much work went in to developing this? Indicated there's a youth and graffiti problem in

the area. Stated the kids are running through the three condo complexes. Graffiti people are always coming out to sandblast/repaint. This will add more families and children. The kids get out of school and try to figure out what to do with themselves. Youth have broken into their pool and dive off the roof. Indicates she calls police weekly regarding road problems and accidents.

Maas: Asked if area is prone to flooding?

Schaible: Live nearby for 34 years and have never seen that property flood.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Schaible: Indicated he supports what staff has recommended except the pool.

Jacoby: Doesn't agree with the pool or stone.

Wedge: Doesn't see a need for the stone, the pool, or extra fireplaces. Appreciate Mr. Litchfield's demeanor and working with staff. Understand his concerns as she had the same issue in her area. Bought home across from a horse pasture, then it was turned into a subdivision. Doesn't want Mr. Litchfield to feel it's pushed down his throat. The Commission is not trying to develop all of San Marcos, but this is a good project. We can't just say it's so much prettier the way it is, even though it is. Property owners have legal right to develop their properties.

Minnery: Doesn't feel stone is needed. Indicated he's back and forth on the pool. Fireplace is a non-issue.

Norris: Thinks age group of purchasers might be first time home buyers or more likely, retired. Retired people might not use a pool and may like a clubhouse more. Not against stone.

Maas: Stone should be developer option. Pools sometimes invite unwanted guests.

Norris: Asked about hiding venting pipes with faux chimney?

Koller: Original intent was to provide a fireplace in each unit.

Kildoo: Doesn't see need for stone. Suggested a couple of faux chimneys and fireplaces in end units are sufficient. Pools are costly to HOA's and they're not water efficient. He'd like to see the pool not included in their cost. Understands how the neighbors feel and appreciate their courtesy. Pointed out that he's lived in City since '64 and many views have changed over the years. He feels this community is the nicest in the County. The City's projects have gotten better over time. It must all be balanced with the rights of property owners to develop their properties. Some architectural requirements help sell the project. Want to make sure City provides "work force" housing.

Wedge: Asked which resolutions have changes?

Lough: Discussed changes. 1st item: PC 10-4195, page 3, F. 7. Take out swimming pool reference. Not sure what Commission would like to do with the badminton/volleyball. Suggested asking staff. 2nd item: Pg. 4, G. 3. & 4. Remove stone material reference. H.2. Change to all end units. There was some discussion regarding architectural details to include chimney features. Staff input?

Koller: Sounds reasonable. Additional faux chimneys could be added to roof line for final review and approval by Planning Division Director. It's important to have a balance and not overwhelm the roof.

Norris: Asked if actual fireplace could be added later?

Kildoo: No.

Wedge: Most people now would choose the large wall for a big TV.

Jacoby: Why not limit fireplaces to end units?

Kildoo: Part of discussion was cost. Faux chimneys are not that expensive.

Lough: PC 10-4196. Q.4. Take out pool reference. Suggested when making the motion to authorize Secretary to make clerical changes consistent with motion in case not all changes have been found. And, reference changes on staff memo that were read into the record earlier.

Action:

COMMISSIONER WEDGE MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF CUP 10-835 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4194; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JACOBY AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE;

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: JACOBY, KILDOO, MAAS, MINNERY, NORRIS, SCHAIBLE, WEDGE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER WEDGE MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF MFSDP 10-51 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4195; WITH MODIFICATIONS: INCORPORATE ALL CHANGES AS PER STAFF MEMO/HANDOUT DATED 1/3/11; F.7. STRIKE SWIMMING POOL.

Lough: Pointed out that basketball half-court is still there.

Wedge: Indicated she'd like to see both.

Kildoo: Surfaces are different. Turf allows for storm water drainage.

Lough: Should read, Recreational amenities, adjacent to Units 46 to 50, shall include a badminton/volleyball court. The rest as is.

Wedge: Correct.

COMMISSIONER WEDGE AMENDED MOTION: F.7. ALSO STRIKE BASKETBALL HALF-COURT IN LIEU OF BADMINTON/VOLLEYBALL COURT. (F.7. Recreational amenities, adjacent to Units 46 to 50, shall include a ~~swimming pool and basketball half-court, instead of the proposed~~ badminton/volleyball court. Final design shall be approved by the Planning Division Director.); G.3 & 4. ELIMINATE THE REQUIREMENT FOR STONE MATERIAL. (G.3. ~~Stone material shall be added to all front elevations and those side elevations facing Bougher Road and Woodland Parkway.~~ G.4. 3. {and renumber} Details shall be provided for the entry courtyards (patio) into each unit. ~~Fence/walls shall incorporate stone material that matches the building.~~ Courtyards shall have enhanced paving.); H.2. ALL END UNITS SHALL INCLUDE A FIREPLACE AND FALSE CHIMNEY FACADES SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE ROOFLINE. (H.2. All end units shall include a fireplace. **Additional false facade chimneys shall be included in the roofline with review and approval by the Planning Division Director.**) ; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHAIBLE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE;

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: JACOBY, KILDOO, MAAS, MINNERY, NORRIS, SCHAIBLE, WEDGE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER WEDGE MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF TSM 479 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4196; WITH MODIFICATIONS: INCORPORATE ALL CHANGES AS PER STAFF MEMO/HANDOUT DATED 1/3/11, AND STRIKE ANY REFERENCES TO THE POOL, Q. 4., AND ANY OTHERS. (K.1. On Sheet 1, entry monument sign shall include stone material that matches the multi-family buildings.; K.4. On Sheet 1, the detail for tubular steel fencing shall include masonry pilasters with a typical spacing of fifty (50) feet. ~~Pilasters shall be covered with a stone material that matches the multi-family buildings (as conditioned)~~ ; O.18. Building plans for the multi and single-family developments shall include a fencing plan. The fencing plan shall consist of decorative fencing with a detail of each proposed fence/wall type(s). Perimeter fencing shall have pilasters ~~covered with stone material that matches the building.~~ Chain link and dog-eared fencing is not allowed. All safety fencing shall be decorative and shown on plans.; Q.4. The applicant shall have installed all recreational amenities (i.e.: ~~pool, tot-lots,~~ outdoor furniture, outdoor fireplace, bbq, ~~half-court,~~ etc.) prior to occupancy.) SECONDED BY

COMMISSIONER NORRIS AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING
ELECTRONIC VOTE;

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: JACOBY, KILDOO, MAAS, MINNERY,
NORRIS, SCHAIBLE, WEDGE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER WEDGE MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY
COUNCIL OF R 10-146 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4197;
AUTHORIZED SECRETARY TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IF NEEDED;
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHAIBLE AND CARRIED BY THE
FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE;

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: JACOBY, KILDOO, MAAS, MINNERY,
NORRIS, SCHAIBLE, WEDGE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER WEDGE MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY
COUNCIL OF GV 10-85 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4198;
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MINNERY AND CARRIED BY THE
FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE;

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: JACOBY, KILDOO, MAAS, MINNERY,
NORRIS, SCHAIBLE, WEDGE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Wedge: Suggested it would be nice to have a water spray area in the tot lots.

10 minute break

3. **Case No:** PZ 10-20/PZ 10-21/PZ 10-22/GPA 10-108A/GPA 10-108B/GPA 10-108C/ND 10-807
Application of: City of San Marcos
Request: The proposed project consists of the following actions:

1. A General Plan Amendment to add .675 acres from the City of Carlsbad public road right-of-way to the City of San Marcos public road right-of-way.
2. A General Plan Amendment in the City of San Marcos for 1.072 acres of right-of-way land in the City of Carlsbad to a Light Industrial designation in the City of San Marcos.
3. A General Plan Amendment in the City of Carlsbad to add .696 acres of public right-of-way to the City of Carlsbad from the City of San Marcos.
4. A Prezone of 1.072 acres from roadway right-of-way in the City of Carlsbad to Light Industrial (LM) in the City of San Marcos.
5. A Prezone of .696 acres from the City of San Marcos right-of-way to the City of Carlsbad right-of-way.
6. A Prezone of 12.46 acres to Open Space designated as Rural Residential (.125-1 du/acre) and Light Industrial in the City of San Marcos.
7. A vacation of 1.072 acres of public road right-of-way upon annexation to the City of San Marcos, and a boundary adjustment of said area to existing adjacent parcel numbers: 223-030-62, 223-651-11, 223-030-95 and 223-030-46.
8. A 1.702 acre detachment from the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Carlsbad and annexation to the jurisdictional boundary of the City of San Marcos.
9. A .696 acre detachment from the City of San Marcos jurisdictional boundary and annexation to the City of Carlsbad jurisdictional boundary.
10. A 4.093 acre annexation to the City of San Marcos Fire Protection District.
11. A 12.66 acre annexation to the City of San Marcos from the County of San Diego.
12. A .675 acre City of San Marcos Sphere of Influence Amendment and annexation to the City of Carlsbad Sphere of Influence.
13. A 1.702 acre Sphere of Influence Amendment from the City of Carlsbad and annexation to the City of San Marcos Sphere of Influence.
14. A 1.346 detachment from County Service Area 83 - San Dieguito Local Parks
15. A 1.346 detachment from County Service Area 107 - Elfin Forest Fire Department

A majority of the project areas will not involve any physical change. Only Area 1 will result in the potential for some minor alteration of already disturbed and/or paved project area to use as landscape or hardscape (pavement, parking lot, etc.) as accessory to existing light industrial uses located adjacent to the project area resulting from the vacation and boundary change in the City of San Marcos upon annexation of 1.027 acres to four separate parcels.

Location of Property: The project consists of three project areas located within the western and southwestern areas of the City. The first area (Area 1) is an approximately 2.39 acre area of road right-of-way located along Rancho Santa Fe Road (north of Melrose Drive to south of La Costa Meadows Drive) straddling the boundaries of the cities of San Marcos and Carlsbad. The second area (Area 2) is an approximate 11.32 acre property of upland habitat acquired by the City to provide mitigation for the Rancho Santa Fe Road improvements (La Costa Meadows Drive to Island Drive) and remnant right-of-way resulting from the realignment of Rancho Santa Fe Road located north of Area 1 on the east side of Rancho Santa Fe Road, north of Calle Venudo. The third area (Area 3) is an approximate 1.35 acre area of area located north of the San Elijo Road realignment, and including the segment of San Elijo Road located in the County, with City segments on each side located on north of San Elijo Road between Old Creek Ranch Development, just east of Rancho Santa Fe Road, and San Elijo Hills Development whereupon San Elijo Road terminates at the eastern boundary, more particularly described as: Map 7736, Lot 1, PM12104 (EX ST) PAR A, PAR A PER DOC06-660435 IN PAR B OF MAP 14508, 17.70 AC M/L IN LOT 8 of MAP 14508, PAR B OF DOC01-505017 IN NEQ SEC, PAR E OF DOC03-0670399 IN W H OF, Lot 1 of MAP 7736, LOT 5 PAR A PER DO06-66-435 IN PAR B OF MAP 14505, (EX ST) PAR A PM 12104&IN POR OF\,SEC 19-12-3W*SE1/4*/EXC RS 454/ & / EXC MAP 4443/ NE ¼ OF, (EX ST) PAR 55 PER ROS 4009 IN NWQ, SEC 20-12-3W*NWQ*(EX ST&D05-573044)PAR 56 PER ROS 4009 IN\, SEC 28-12-3W*SW1/4*W 100 FT LYING S OF RS 441 IN SW, PAR A OF DOC01-505017 IN NEQ SEC, SEC 33-12-3W*NWQ*(EX ST) W 100 FT OF N 100 FT OF NWQ, 17, SEC 20-12-3W*NWQ8(EX ST&DOC05-33507&573044&901855)PAR57R)S4009 IN\, DOC 2001-050507 AS R/W, DOC 2003-0670399 AS R/W, DOC 2004-0037355 AS R/W, DOC 2000-0444541 AS R/W, DOC 2003-0991381 AS R/W, County Highway R/W per DO C73-252590 OF O.R., That POR R/W on PM 12104m, southerly end of R/W continuous, together w/POR of roadway adjacent to the

west line of Lot 1 Map 7736. Assessor's Parcel No.: 222-143-29, 222-042-14, 222-042-17, 222-042-20, 223-040-05, 223-080-01, 223-080-47, 223-070-26, 223-070-27, 223-030-62, 223-651-11, 223-030-95, 223-030-46.

Staff Presentation (Susan Vandrew Rodriguez):

Described request and location. PowerPoint presentation shown. Requesting recommendation to City Council for approval of three Prezones, three General Plan Amendments and adoption of Negative Declaration and Planning Commission recommendation to the City of Carlsbad and LAFCO for approval of their respective entitlement actions. City-initiated jurisdictional boundary changes as a result of widening and realignment of Rancho Santa Fe and San Elijo Roads. Boundary change area's shown and discussed: Area 1 is 11.1 acres of City-owned open space, 4 parcels. Area 2 is 2.39 acres of previous roadway right-of-way along Rancho Santa Fe Road straddling the boundary of San Marcos and Carlsbad. Area 3 is 1.35 acres of County area plus 2,000 linear feet of roadway located in the north of San Elijo Road, including County segment of San Elijo Road. Discussed background information and proposed land use changes. Recommend approval to City Council of the resolutions, adoption of NegDec and annexation.

Jacoby: Asked if there are any improvements in any of the areas?

Vandrew: Area 2 could occur. Once modified by cities, area adjacent to La Costa Meadows Industrial Park could potentially be included in lot line adjustment. The extent would be minor landscape/hardscape. No improvements in Areas 1 and 3, remain as open space.

Norris: Just ironing out who is responsible?

Vandrew: Cleaning up jurisdictional boundaries caused by road widening and realignments. Majority is owned by City as open space areas.

Kildoo: Asked if okay to do as one motion/vote?

Lough: Yes.

Action:

COMMISSIONER KILDOO MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF:

LAFCO (NO CASE #) AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4207;

Area 1 -

PZ 10-20 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC10-4201;

GPA 10-108 (A) AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4202;

Area 2 -

PZ 10-21 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4203;

GPA 10-108 (B) AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4204;

Area 3 -

PZ 10-22 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4205;

GPA 10-108 (C) AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 10-4206;

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHAIBLE AND CARRIED BY THE
FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE;

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: JACOBY, KILDOO, MAAS, MINNERY,
NORRIS, SCHAIBLE, WEDGE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR COMMENTS

Koller: Informed Commission that Jerry Backoff was absent due to his mother passing away last Thursday.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

Lough: Clarified for the record that there were no public speakers during last hearing.

Kildoo: Confirmed.

Kildoo: Mentioned that the Creek District project has been in the news lately. Hopeful it will move forward this year.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:30 p.m. Commissioner Kildoo adjourned the meeting.



Steve Kildoo, Chairman
SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTEST:



Lisa Kiss, Secretary
SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION