



## Staff Report

---

**File #:**TMP-2144

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE:**

AUGUST 05, 2024

**SUBJECT:**

DRAFT 6/17/24 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

APPROVE Draft 6/17/2024 Planning Commission Minutes

**Attachment(s)**

Draft 6/17/2024 Planning Commission Minutes

Prepared by: Gina Jackson, Senior Office Specialist

Reviewed by: Joe Farace, Planning Division Director

Submitted by: Gina Jackson, Senior Office Specialist



# MINUTES

## Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission

**MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2024**

City Council Chambers

1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069

### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Carroll led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

### **ROLL CALL**

The Secretary called the roll:

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS: BARNETT, CAVANAUGH, RIOS, CARROLL, RICO, SAULSBERRY

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: NONE

ABSENT COMMISSIONERS: NORRIS, FLODINE, KILDOO

Also present were: Planning Division Director Joe Farace; Deputy City Engineer Stephanie Kellar, Senior Planner Chris Garcia; Principal Civil Engineer Kyrenne Chua; Deputy City Attorney Punam Prahalad; Senior Office Specialist Gina Jackson.

### **ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

**Chris Freeman from the San Marcos Budget Review Committee** – spoke about the City's budget passing and the sales tax measure being placed on the November ballot, and how important it is for residents to support this.



**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 04/15/2024**

**Action:**

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

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: BARNETT, CAVANAUGH, CARROLL, RICO, SAULSBERRY  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NORRIS, FLODINE, KILDOO  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: RIOS

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**2. Project No.: TA24-0002/EX24-007**

**Applicant:** City of San Marcos

**Request:** Text amendment to the Inclusionary Housing ordinance

**Location of Property:** Citywide

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

**Deputy City Attorney Punam Prahalad:** gave the presentation.

**Planning Commissioners discussions included:** Voting on fee levels?

**Staff response:** We are voting on the amendments to the ordinance. The fee study has been conducted, but not discussed.

**Action:**

COMMISSIONER BARNETT MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION PC24-5104; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SAULSBERRY. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: BARNETT, CAVANAUGH, RIOS, CARROLL, RICO, SAULSBERRY  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NORRIS, FLODINE, KILDOO  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE



**3. Project No:** GPA24-0001/EX24-009

**Applicant:** City of San Marcos  
**Request:** General Plan amendment to modify the General Plan Mobility Element  
**Location of Property:** Citywide  
**Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval to City Council

**Deputy City Engineer Stephanie Kellar:** gave staff presentation.

**Planning Commissioners discussions included:** Thanked staff for reaching out to the neighboring cities; different levels and Active Transportation Plan; timeline to implement the newer levels; reaction to some of the changes; locking the city in on spending money on bike lanes; Class 4 or Class 1 within the city.

**Staff response:** The Active Transportation Plan is new, and this is the first time we are bringing a document for approval to City Council. It will most likely be 10 to 20 years. The changes depend on what we can currently do on a street or make improvements to a street. This will occur when new development comes to the City, using CIP funds or grant funds. We get a lot of feedback pertaining to the new signals. It's been a process to get the streets up and running. We haven't received much feedback on the bike facilities. We are developing a plan for the City to construct the bike facilities. There is no mandate, and it will be considered case by case by CIP prioritization process or a grant application process. There are several Class 1s throughout the City and more coming from the upcoming development projects.

**Action:**  
COMMISSIONER SAULSBERRY MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION PC24-5112; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RICO. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: BARNETT, CAVANAUGH, RIOS, CARROLL, RICO, SAULSBERRY  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NORRIS, FLODINE, KILDOO  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

**4. Project No:** EIR24-002, SP22-0001, GPA21-0002, R21-0002, MFSDP24-0001, TSM24-0001

**Applicant:** The Las Posas Owner LPV, LLC  
**Request:** Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Multi-Family Site Development Plan, and a Tentative Subdivision map for a 228-unit residential development on an existing 33.2-acre vacant lot.  
**Location of Property:** A 33.2-acre vacant site located bounded by Pacific Street, La Mirada Drive, Las



Posas Road, and Linda Vista Drive.

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

**Deputy City Attorney Punam Prahalad excused herself due to a conflict. Special Counsel Stephanie Smith from Grid Legal sat in for this portion of the presentation and discussion.**

**Senior Planner Chris Garcia and Principal Civil Engineer Kyrenne Chua:** gave staff presentation.

**Greg Waite with Integral Communities, applicant representative:** gave applicant presentation.

### **OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Jimmy Arevalo with Western States Regional Council of Carpenters:** Expressed that he will be impacted by the project and that the city should hire local workforce employees to build this project and reduce CEQA impacts.

**Planning Commissioners discussions included:** Provisions exist to utilize local labor for projects such as this; ADA accessible units; consideration working with local contractors and carpenters for this project; opinions on the use of this area from noise; fencing; site development consistent with its neighbors; biological requirements; environmental permits; number of units; looking forward to seeing the project manage the biological protection.

**Staff response:** Our resolutions contain a condition. It's not a requirement to hire local labor, but developers are to consider local labor to help stimulate the City's economy.

**Applicant response:** About 57% of the units have ground floor accessible dwellings, and ADA path of travel. It's premature to have the construction labor discussions, but we will use local labor that is feasible to the project. We put in a disclosure document to people who purchase these units that these uses exist and will have associated noises. Window treatments and other treatments will be used in the units for noise reduction. Fencing on the Linda Vista side will be away from the street. There will also be fencing around the open space to protect the biological resources. The environmental permits occur after the CEQA documents are approved. We worked diligently to get where we are, and if we were not approved for permits, we would have to start over again. We started out with a 449-unit plan but realized it would be difficult to obtain a permit from the Federal wildlife. We then decided to reduce the development to 228-units and help preserve the biological resources.

**Gil Miltenberger with Integral Communities (part of applicant team):** From an industrial standpoint there was some interest, but after reviewing the property and the size of what can be developed due to the biological resources, it did not make any economic sense. Building residential makes sense due to the nearby plaza, park, and school.



**Thomas Liddicoat for Environmental Planning with Helix Environmental (part of applicant team):**  
The State and Federal Wildlife Agencies are producing the requirements. A Multiple Habitation Plan was also adopted by the County.

**Action:**

COMMISSIONER SAULSBERRY MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION PC24-5105 FOR EIR24-002, RESOLUTION PC24-5107 FOR GPA21-0002, RESOLUTION PC24-5108 FOR R21-0002, RESOLUTION PC24-5106 FOR SP22-0001, RESOLUTION PC24-5109 FOR MFSDP24-0001, RESOLUTION PC24-5110 FOR TSM24-0001 AND THE ERRATA FOR CHANGES MADE TO THE STAFF REPORT ON PAGES 3 & 5 AND RESOLUTION PC24-5109/C.31; AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNETT. MOTION CARRIED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES:	COMMISSIONERS: BARNETT, CAVANAUGH, RIOS, CARROLL, RICO, SAULSBERRY
NOES:	COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONERS: NORRIS, FLODINE, KILDOO
ABSTAIN:	COMMISSIONERS: NONE

**CLOSE PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**PLANNING DIVISION DIRECTOR COMMENTS:** The Hughes project was heard and approved by the Commission on April 15<sup>th</sup> has been appealed by SAFER and will be brought to City Council next Tuesday night. A report on the outcome of the meeting will be brought back to the Commission. This concludes my comments.

**PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 8:00 p.m. Chair Rios adjourned the meeting.

---

FATIMA RIOS, CHAIRPERSON  
CITY OF SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION



ATTEST:

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

DRAFT