



# City of San Marcos

1 Civic Center Drive  
San Marcos, CA 92069

## Staff Report

---

**File #:** TMP-1750

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE:**

JULY 05, 2022

**SUBJECT:**

Draft 06.06.2022 Planning Commission Minutes

**Recommendation**

Recommend Approval

Prepared by: Gina Jackson, Senior Office Specialist

Reviewed by: Joseph Farace, Planning Division Director

Submitted by: Gina Jackson, Senior Office Specialist



# MINUTES

## Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission

**MONDAY JUNE 06, 2022**

City Council Chambers  
1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069

---

### **CALL TO ORDER**

At 6:30 p.m. Planning Commission Chair Flodine called the meeting to order.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Rios led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

### **ROLL CALL**

The Secretary called the roll:

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, FLODINE, CARROLL, RIOS

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: NONE

ABSENT COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN

Also present were: Planning Division Director Joe Farace; Principal Planner Saima Qureshy, Principal Civil Engineer Stephanie Kellar, Deputy City Attorney Punam Prahalad; Senior Office Specialist Gina Jackson

### **ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

None

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

#### **1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 05/16/2022**



**Action:**

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM #1 AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NUTTALL. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, FLODINE, RIOS  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: CARROLL

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**2. Project No:** SP21-0002, SP22-0002, GPA21-0005, TSM21-0002, & SDP21-0003

**Applicant:** Urban Villages San Marcos, LLC

**Request:** The project applicant is requesting an Amendment to the University District Specific Plan (UDSP) to allow the following:

- Increase building height in specific areas. The current Specific Plan generally limits buildings to seven stories and up to 90 feet in height. The proposed amendment would allow up to 16 stories and 185 feet in certain areas. Other areas will be increased to 12 to 15 stories and 150 feet to 175 feet.
- Removal of a future SR 78 bridge connecting the UDSP Area to Johnston Lane, north of SR 78.
- Removal of a planned pedestrian bridge connecting the UDSP area west of Twin Oaks Valley Road to the area south of Discovery Street.
- Revisions to various development standards to allow design flexibility.
- Expansion of the Specific Plan area east of the Sprinter Rail Line to cover Assessor's Parcels 220-201-90-00 and 220-202-18-00, a currently vacant site located on Carmel Street.
- Revisions to the mix of land uses. The revisions would not change the maximum number of residential units, however, it would reduce the number of hotel rooms and decrease non-residential uses by approximately 187,000 square feet which will result in an overall decrease in average daily trips compared to the existing UDSP.

In addition to the above University District Specific Plan changes, the applicant is also requesting approval of the following entitlements:

- Site Development Plan for the construction of a 484 apartment unit, 12 story, mixed-use project with 18,741 square feet of ground floor commercial space at the northwest corner of Campus Way and North City Drive; a 25,000 square foot grocery store with 55,000 square feet of office space and parking structure at the southeast corner of Carmel Street and Campus Way; and a 73 apartment unit, 5 story mixed-use project with 4,812 square feet of commercial space on the east side of Campus Way.
- Tentative Subdivision Map to create five (5) lots at the northwest corner of Campus Way and North City Drive, south of Carmel Street, and east of Twin Oaks Valley Road. The Tentative Subdivision map will also establish 23 commercial condominium units on the (5) parcels and 3 residential unit on three (3) of the parcels.
- General Plan Amendment to remove the previously planned bridge connecting the UDSP area



- from Johnson Way north of SR78; and, removal of future pedestrian bridge over Discovery Street.
- Specific Plan Amendment to the Heart of the City Specific Plan to remove Assessor's Parcels 220-201-90-00 and 220-202-18-00 from its boundaries.

**Environmental Determination:** Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Addendum to the programmatic Final Environment Impact Report (FEIR) for the University District Specific Plan has been prepared. It is determined that no new environmental information or documentation was presented revealing any new unidentified environmental impacts, which had not been previously mitigated, in the programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the University District Specific Plan. The Addendum complies with all applicable requirements of CEQA, including CEQA Guidelines sections 15164 and 15168. The proposed project is within the scope of the program approved earlier and the programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the University District Specific Plan adequately describes the proposed project addressed in the Addendum for the purposes of CEQA.

**Location of Property:** Approximately 195 acres are located south of State Route 78, north of Barham Drive, and overlaps Twin Oaks Valley Road to the east and west.

Assessor's Parcel No.: 220-201-90-00 and 220-202-18-00

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval to City Council

**Saima Qureshy, Principal Planner, Stephanie Kellar, Principal Civil Engineer, and Joe Farace, Planning Division Director:** gave staff presentation.

**Gary Levitt with Seabreeze Properties, Applicant:** gave a presentation

**Darren Levitt, Co-Applicant:** gave a presentation

**Planning Commissioners discussions included:** expansion to the rail system; hotel space; battery system support when the grid goes down; concerns with student housing; opportunity to buy housing or rent only; concerns with electric vehicle charging stations; charging ports for electric bikes; reduction of hotel size; managing student housing to prevent mini dorms; input from the school district; concerns with traffic analysis; concerns with attendance maps of nearby schools; clarify decision on building amount of units on this site; signage for the project;

**Applicant response:** We've had communication with North County Transit District about our plans and building a pedestrian undercrossing at Enterprise Street to allow walkability to the east and west side of project; we will have a 250 room hotel; the battery system will not fully support entire project, elevators may continue to run for a short period of time; of the 3400 residential units, 800 are student units, there is coordination with the University that student housing will exist; there will be housing for sale; there are HOA requirements that prohibit homes from being student housing and required CC&Rs approved by the City; 50% of all parking spaces in Phase A will be plumbed for EV charging stations; we are providing chargers for the residents; there will be charging ports available for electric bikes. Based on talks with Hilton and Marriot and their analysis of what is going to be built, what exist today, and what is in the pipeline



outside of our project, at 400 plus rooms of hotel within this specific project was too much and 250 rooms suffices; student housing is managed by COCM on campus community, and apartment buildings are managed by MG properties; adding more units will make the application process more difficult. The specific plan requires approval of the master signage program, it meets the demands for a project of this scale;

**Staff response:** The rail system is handled separately through North County Transit District, and they were notified of the project; with regards to concerns of mini-dorms, as part of the applicants Conditions of Approval they will need to submit CC&Rs to us for review. We reached out to the school district, but have not received any correspondence from them regarding this project. Traffic analysis models were generated by SANDAG for conditions proposed by this specific plan and the existing specific plan and 2016 base year, it's looking at the total trips that are generated and the length of each segment for each scenario.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Support the Project:

Jesus Delgadillo	Matthew Ceppi	Leon Wydeh
Angela Aymin	Heather and Mike Magee	Jessica Berger
Jonathan Aymin	Chris Williams	Matt Simmons
Mike Winter	Kamron Palizban	David Sasuga, email comment
Sarah Wynn	Allison Fortuna	Madison Cavanna, email comment
Daniel Bennett	Matt Prior	
Eric Bruvold	Chris Pascale	

Support the Project; filled out Speaker Slip of their support, but did not speak:

Jason Greminger	Christine Armstrong	Terry Matthew
-----------------	---------------------	---------------

Oppose the Project:

Patrick Walter	Jake Henry
Michael Zumbahlen	Chris Scollenmary – did not fill out speaker slip
Steve Overy	Dami Rayda – did not fill out speaker slip
William Nichols	Josephine Carroll – did not fill out speaker slip
	Did not give name or fill out speaker slip

### **CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING**



**Planning Commissioner discussions included:** Surprised the school district didn't respond; appreciate the public turnout tonight; this project meets a lot of the requirements; concerned that people coming to San Marcos can't afford to live here; density is the wave of the future and I like the plan; regret the loss of the flyover bridge; we have a growing opportunity for students, but unfortunately may not be affordable for those students; more should be done for residents currently living here who are looking for affordable housing; encourage the public to keep coming to the meetings and speak about their community; this project is not responsible for providing a school site; you see the ridgeline in the current specific plan, in the proposed specific plan the ridgeline is broken up.

How is the specific plan written in terms of the implementation of the bridge? We want the flexibility to build the bridge.

**Staff response:** The specific plan does include a construction trigger. It currently requires the improvements be in place prior to issuance of the building permit that would trigger 25% of the project's PM peak hours trips being reached. There's not funding identified; there's not a fair share identified; the requirement is not imposed directly on anyone or any particular project. What would likely happen, a project could build up close to the threshold trigger without going over it, to avoid triggering the requirement. That would leave the next project coming in to be the one triggering the requirement, which could theoretically be a relatively small project. One of the main functions of the bridge is to get people to San Marcos Blvd. We are looking at this in the context of schools in the area, San Marcos Middle and San Marcos Elementary. If you look at the alternative routes available compared to the Johnston Lane and how that would shorten people's trips, the route for San Marcos Middle School on Mission, once you cross over on San Marcos Blvd and Knoll Rd would be about 1500 linear feet from the future Grand Avenue bridge, and about 1250 feet from Johnston Lane. So it saves about 250 feet of travel on San Marcos Blvd. People may actually prefer the future Grand Avenue route because going eastbound would be a little bit better in the AM peak time for the 250 feet. For San Marcos Elementary, the route on San Marcos Blvd would be about 1400 linear feet from Twin Oaks Valley Road, and about 750 linear feet from Johnston/Westlake. It would save about 650 linear feet of travel on San Marcos Blvd.

**Action:**

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO ADOPT AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ADDENDUM FOR THE UNIVERSITY DISTRICT SPECIFIC PLAN; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NUTTALL. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, FLODINE, CARROLL, RIOS  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL PC22-4989 FOR SP21-0002; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NUTTALL. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.



AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, CARROLL, RIOS  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL PC22-4990 FOR SP22-0002; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RIOS. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, FLODINE, CARROLL, RIOS  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL PC22-4991 FOR GPA21-0005; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RIOS. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, FLODINE, CARROLL, RIOS  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL PC22-4992 FOR TSM21-0002; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NUTTALL. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, FLODINE, CARROLL, RIOS  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL PC22-4993 FOR SDP21-0003; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NUTTALL. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NUTTALL, CAVANAUGH, NORRIS, CARROLL, RIOS  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CRAIN  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

**PLANNING DIVISION DIRECTOR COMMENTS:** Tomorrow night is our General Plan Land Use Alternatives meeting and workshop here in the Chambers; we'll see you all then. This concludes my comments.



**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:** None

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:47 p.m. Chair Flodine adjourned the meeting.

---

ERIC FLODINE, CHAIRPERSON  
CITY OF SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION

**ATTEST:**

---

GINA JACKSON, SENIOR OFFICE SPECIALIST  
CITY OF SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION