

PLANNING COMMISSION

ADDITIONAL ITEM ADDED AFTER DISTRIBUTION OF PACKET

Agenda # 2
SHUSD

1. Staff Memo - Reso edit (11/4/13)
2. Email / Letter from James Bartholet
(11/4/13)

Date 11/4/13
Time 4:45 PM



Memorandum

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Division
DATE: November 4, 2013
SUBJECT: Resolution PC 13-4365 San Marcos Unified School District K-8 School Site Public
Resources Code 21151.2 Review & Government Code Section 65402 Report Request

Planning Commission Resolution PC13-4365 Findings and Determinations shall be modified as follows:

- C. The future school facility site does not currently conform to the General Plan, but will conform once if the General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Specific Plan Amendment application is processed to its successful completion.

Kiss, Lisa

From: Scollick, Phil
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 4:28 PM
To: Backoff, Jerry
Cc: Kiss, Lisa
Subject: FW: Planning commission Letter about k8 school
Attachments: SM Planning comm. 4 November.docx

RECEIVED
NOV 04 2013
CITY OF SAN MARCOS
PLANNING DIVISION

See below and attached.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Bartholet [<mailto:jim@clae.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Scollick, Phil
Subject: Planning commission Letter about k8 school

Hi -

I hope this isn't too late to get on record for tonights planning commission meeting.

Please confirm.

Thanks and Regards,

Jim Bartholet

RECEIVED
NOV 04 2013
CITY OF SAN MARCOS
PLANNING DIVISION

James Bartholet
830 Deadwood Drive
San Marcos, CA 92078

4 November 2013

San Marcos Planning Commission
City of San Marcos
1 Civic Center Drive
San Marcos, 92069

I was just made aware of the meeting scheduled for tonight, so want to be on record regarding the K8 School on the agenda.

My family owns APN # 22212114, which is comprised of 10 acres, with our house in the top corner of the parcel. The house and surrounds use approximately 1 acre. The remaining 9 acres are mostly disturbed.

We are just across Attebury from the proposed school site and are the closest residence.

I think some background is necessary to understand our point of view.

We've had the property for 15 years. We fell in love with the views and country feel of the area. Of course, encroachment was inevitable, but we did not expect what has happened, and I most certainly did not expect a school to be constructed into the uneven topography next to us.

About a dozen years ago, we were in the midst of a lot split whereby our house would be separated onto two acres, which is consistent with the top of Deadwood, where several parcels are just over 1 acre. With the lower 8 acres, we intended to build our dream house. Just before the final map, we learned the adjacent property, the Torres 22 acres, was planned to be an 18 home subdivision by a lower end Temecula builder.

With this disturbing news, we evaluated if it was prudent to build our dream home on 8 acres adjacent to, and with a direct Western view of, an 18 home tract. We decided to change course and hire the person behind the Torres and Venzano deals, Jim Simmons. He showed us that based on the Estate zoning of upper part of our property, slope, perc tests and other factors, it was completely reasonable to get at least 4 or 5 lots from the 10 acres.

However, before getting too far in the new process, we were put in the Ridgeline zone (unbeknownst to us as we were not mailed notification – 830 Deadwood did

not have a mail box), and have had other things come up, such as fighting a neighbors attempt to put a cell tower 90 feet from our kids bedrooms (the distance at which there would be peak radiation according to their plan).

Most recently, we put an application in to retain estate zoning (and expand it to the lower part of our parcel) and attended the open houses about the general plan amendment. Unfortunately, we were not notified when the task force would review our application and never had the chance to make what we think is a compelling case. We were, however, notified of the application for the Torres property and invited to their meeting, which resulted in a plan for up to 12 homes on 22 acres. Meanwhile, we were downzoned to Agriculture 1 across our property.

It is our belief that our current zoning deserves review in light of the fact that 5 former Ag-1 parcels will be used for the school.

With the school properties to our North, Torres 12 homes on 22 acres, to our West, and 3 lots on the 10 acres to our East, we are surrounded by much more density than we are allowed. We don't think that is fair.

Further, we are also the residence most impacted by the road noise from San Elijo Road (it is a straight line for the sound...we can watch the wheels turn...there was never any noise mitigation in the plan for us), and will be affected by the noise and dirt of the earthmoving and construction of the school, not to mention the school itself when it is up and running.

With all this in mind, I hope some consideration to our situation will be given.

Sincerely,

James Bartholet