



MINUTES

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 2014

City Council Chambers

1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069

CALL TO ORDER

At 6:33 p.m. Chairman Flodine 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: FLODINE, JONES, KILDOO, MAAS, NORRIS, PENNOCK, SCHAIBLE

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: JACOBY

ABSENT: MINNERY.

Also present were: Planning Division Director, Jerry Backoff; Principal Planner, Garth Koller; Principal Civil Engineer, Peter Kuey; Deputy City Attorney, Avneet Sidhu; Office Specialist III, Rosalia Lechlitter

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 4/7/14

Action:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS



2. **Case No:** P13-0045: GPA 13-004, SP 13-002, MFSDP 13-001, SDP 13-003, TPM 13-003, ND 13-009

Application of: El Dorado II, LP – Todd Cottle

(continued from 4/7/14)

Request: A General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan, Multi-Family Site Development Plan, Site Development Plan, Tentative Parcel Map and Mitigated Negative Declaration (the environmental review document) for a proposed mixed-use project consisting of 120 unit affordable family apartments, 1,850 square feet of community center/leasing office, 1,000 square feet laundry facility and 7,000 square feet of commercial space spread over nine buildings located on 3.8 acres. This project is located in the Richmar Specific Plan Area and is proposed to be developed under the design criteria established in the El Dorado II Specific Plan document.

Location of Property: 304 W. Mission Road (Mr. Taco), 312-318 (Hair Salon/Barber Shop/Tax Preparer), 320 (vacant), 330 (vacant), 340 (vacant) & 350 (vacant) and 303 Richmar Road (12 unit apartment), 331 (17 unit apartment), 343 (La Fiesta Grande Market), & 363 (vacant), San Marcos, more particularly described as: Portion of Lot 1, Block 50 of Rancheros Los Vallecitos de San Marcos, in the City of San Marcos, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map No. 806 filed in the County Records of San Diego County, December 21, 1895. Assessor's Parcel No.: 220-100-08, 09, 10, 12, 14, 29, 56, 59, 62, 63, 64, 66 & 67

Backoff: Commented there'd be two presentations, first by staff, then the applicant.

Staff Presentation (Garth Koller):

Described request and location. PowerPoint presentation shown. Discussed background: There are independent projects built or under construction that are under separate Specific Plans: West Village, Parkview and Autumn Terrace. They are all part of the Richmar Specific Plan (SP). During the 2012 General Plan update, a designated land use as a Specific Plan Area was given to the entire 62 acres of Richmar SP. Surrounding area consists of multi-family, a single family detached on north side, vacant property, mixed-use, existing retail, abandoned buildings, Sage Point & Paseo del Oro projects and Buelow Park. A site study was done for the entire area. It was a smaller density based on parking. A General Plan Amendment is required because the applicant proposes a change to increase density from 44 units to 120 affordable apartment units, and decrease retail 21,000 s.f. to 7,000 s.f. The Multi-Family Site Development Plan addresses the design criteria for the apartment complex, the Site Development Plan deals with site plan and retail design and a Tentative Parcel Map would consolidate the existing 13 lots into two new lots. Phase 1 consists of 74 of the 120 units, along with a 2,850 s.f. community center/office and laundry facility. Existing 12-plex would remain until Phase 1 is completed. Pleasant Way would be modified from a one-way to a two-way with parking on west side. Phase 2 would demolish the 12-plex and build remaining 46 units & 7,000 s.f. retail building. Discussed traffic: A Focused Traffic Study was completed and shows that the project will generate 430 ADT's per day and continue to operate at Level "C" or better. Peak hour intersection analysis shows no significant impacts. Noise study was conducted and attenuation will be necessary along Mission Road. During environmental review period, City initiated a historical evaluation of two buildings that are 50+ years old. It concluded they do not need to be preserved and can be demolished. Staff recommends approval to City Council of all resolutions and Negative Declaration.



OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Todd Cottle, C&C Development and Orange Housing Development Corporation, Applicant: Indicated they've been working on project for several years. Both companies are affordable housing developers; they own and manage properties for the long term. They have never sold an affordable project that they've developed, are known for being strict but fair and manage the properties themselves. They previously developed The Knolls on Vineyard and Parkview Apartments is currently under construction. Acquired existing apartment building in 1996 & started working with former Redevelopment Agency in 2009. Site is a total of 13 parcels with seven properties owners. Discussed project, number of units/bedrooms, 200 residential parking spaces & 21 commercial. Project is designed to achieve LEED Silver and is 100% affordable. One bedrooms, \$444-\$888, two bedrooms, max at \$1,066, three bedrooms, max at \$1,231. Will have BBQ's, tot lots and is close to Sprinter line & walking trails. Conceptual views shown.

Kildoo: Inquired if the existing units were counted as part of 120?

Koller: No, at that time they weren't planned to be demolished.

Kildoo: Difference is more like 90. Asked how they were able to get financing?

Cottle: City staff had the foresight to acquire properties & assemble, so it was put in a good position. The two phases are being done as a result of the loss of redevelopment. Being able to break it up allows it to request a little more tax credit equity.

Kildoo: Asked about the timing of phases?

Cottle: Tax credits are applied for in March and July. One project is in the queue in the City. They'd like to apply in July for Phase 1, as a backup project. They're not looking for two projects competing. It would likely be next March for Phase 2.

Backoff: Westlake project was done in a similar way.

Schaible: Asked the income range for affordable?

Cottle: Based upon County median with percentages of income based upon household size. They have units that start at 60% and work their way down based on household size.

Norris: Noticed a lot of 1-bedrooms.

Cottle: They offer variations. It's a family project. A minimum of 30% three bedroom units are required when applying for tax credits.

Norris: Asked if one bedroom's are a problem with family designation?

Cottle: No.



Norris: Asked about LEED Silver?

Cottle: Indicated they do it on all new construction. They don't have to, but they believe in it because it's a benefit to project and residents.

Norris: Asked if electrical vehicle charging is required?

Cottle: Yes, it's conditioned by staff and would be an install.

Pennock: Asked when Pleasant Way would be converted and who incurs cost?

Cottle: Phase 1, paid for by Developer.

Pennock: Inquired about current businesses?

Cottle: They've been notified and would be shut down during construction. Would like to relocate them back in. La Fiesta Market has indicated a strong interest, not sure about others.

Flodine: Asked why Bldg. A contains one residential end unit on the ground floor?

Cottle: Designed as accessible unit for ADA. It takes away the requirement for an elevator. Staff had concerns for that unit. It may be reconfigured away from commercial space and more towards open space.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Kildoo: The Richmar neighborhood has improved and this project will compliment it. It's dense but affordable and a well thought out project.

Action:

COMMISSIONER NORRIS MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF:

GPA 13-004 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4399;

SP 13-002 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4400;

MSFSP 13-001 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4401;

SDP 13-003 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4402;

TPM 13-003 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4403;

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

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE, JONES, KILDOO, MAAS, NORRIS, PENNOCK, SCHAIBLE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE



Flodine: Commented that the one vote was for all five resolutions.

Sidhu: Confirmed okay because all were named.

3. **Case No:** P14-0011: SPA 14-003

Application of: Urban Villages San Marcos, LLC – University District SP Amendment

Request: The request involves various changes to the adopted University District Specific Plan including a potential addition/reduction in land use (14,000 square feet increase for general office and 300,000 square feet reduction in mixed-use retail/commercial) and a new land use category defined as adaptive re-use. There will also be a reduction in the grading volumes in the central portion of the property along with a modified Conditional Use Permit to allow an onsite rock crusher and revision to grading plan to eliminate all export and reduce volumes by nearly half. The applicant is proposing revisions to interior circulation network, with the addition of roundabouts, improvements to traffic calming design, introduce changed water quality solutions in the area to address storm water regulations on site. The “Re-adaptive Use” concept provides a unique and creative way to preserve, enhance and utilize existing industrial buildings within the Specific Plan area. Additionally, the developer is asking for changes to park amenity locations and configuration, and changes in the distribution of private and public space, plaza and paseos. There is also an Addendum to the certified Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR 08-43, Clearing House #2008101083) for the Specific Plan.

Location of Property: The University District Specific Plan Area is located south of Highway 78, north of Barham Drive and future Discovery Street, east of Echo Lane and west of Sprinter rail line (west of Trade Street), more particularly described as: (East of Twin Oaks Valley Road) All of Lots 12 and 13 and portions of Lots “A,” “C,” 11, 14, 16 and 17 in block 58 of the map of Rancho Los Vallecitos de San Marcos, according to map thereof No. 806, recorded December 21, 1895, together with portions of Parcels 3 and 4 of Parcel Map No. 2738, recorded June 7, 1974, all in the City of San Marcos, County of San Diego, State of California. Assessor’s Parcel No.: 220-200-02, 220-200-40, 220-200-43, 220-200-47, 220-200-48, 220-200-52, 220-200-79, 220-200-81, 220-200-82, 220-200-84, 220-200-85, 221-110-20, 221-110-30, 221-110-31, 221-110-44, 221-110-46, 221-110-50, 221-110-54, 221-110-55, 221-110-56, 221-110-57, 221-110-58, 221-110-59. (West of Twin Oaks Valley Road) Portions of Lots 2 through 10 in Block 62, Lots 1 through 7 and portions of Lots 12 and 13 and Lots 14 through 21 in block 63, together with those portions of the unnamed street adjoining Lots 2 through 10 in block 62, and that portion of the unnamed street (Myrtle Ave.) adjoining Lot 7 in block 63, all lying within Rancho Los Vallecitos de San Marcos, in the City of San Marcos of San Diego, State of California, according to the map thereof No. 806, filed in the Office of the City of San Marcos recorder of said San Diego City of San Marcos, December 21, 1898. Assessor’s Parcel No.: 221-100-02, -03, -04, 221-100-09 and -10, 221-100-14, 221-100-16, 221-100-21 and -22, 221-100-24 and -25, 221-100-29, 221-100-32 and -33, 221-100-35, 221-100-37 and -38, 221-100-40, 221-100-43 thru -48, 221-100-54 thru -66, 221-100-68 thru -73, 221-080-05 thru -08, 221-080-11, 221-080-15 thru -18, 221-080-20, 221-080-22, 221-080-25 and -26, 220-170-36, 220-170-40, 220-170-46, 220-181-35 and -36, 220-181-38 thru -40, 220-181-44, 220-181-45, 220-190-52

Backoff: Clarified that the hearing is for the Specific Plan only. Subsequent action on the CUP modification and TSM would take place later. The Amendment lays the framework for other applications the Commission will be seeing.



Staff Presentation (Garth Koller):

Described request and location. PowerPoint presentation shown. Discussed background. The University District Specific Plan was adopted in 2009 under a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). The applicant wishes to make changes due to market conditions. The applicant is requesting an amendment: Revisions to grading plan, changes to street configurations, changes to park locations & open space, Form Based Code, and addition of new land use "Adaptive Re-Use." The SP Amendment doesn't warrant a General Plan Amendment because the changes are consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, policies and programs of the General Plan. The Initial Study review concluded that there are no new impacts that were not already addressed in FEIR, therefore an Addendum to FEIR was prepared. A workshop was held March 2014 with approximately 5,000 public notices mailed out. It was well attended. A presentation was given by the applicant and they responded to questions. Typical questions included the timing of the future rock crusher, noise & dust control and how residents & businesses might be affected. Discussed revisions: Chapter 4, Open Space & Conservation. Revisions to parks, plazas, open space, with locations and size to be determined at time of Site Development Plan review. New standards relating to private open space, patios & balconies. Chapter 5, Transportation & Circulation. Proposed modifications to facilitate movement of pedestrians, bicycles & motorists. Several roundabouts are incorporated and an inverted median to manage storm water. Amendment results in a reduction of 21,817 ADT's, or a 19% reduction from current plan. The mitigation measures in the FEIR are still applicable and will be required. The amendment changes the timeline to thresholds as projects come forward. It maintains the transit-oriented nature. The revised grading plan achieves a balanced site rather than the earlier significant export of material. They're pulling back from the big box use anticipated in current plan to a small/medium retail use. The "Adaptive Re-Use" would convert existing buildings to new architecture. There would be several cross sections modified, additional student housing and adjustments to residential development, modifications to landscape & parking structure standards. Discussed Exhibits A & B shown on PowerPoint. Staff would like to retain ground floor retail on north side of the building facing the street as well as east side, as shown on Exhibit/Option B. It's the only item staff & applicant disagrees on. Staff recommends approval to City Council, along with several attachments: A- Matrix with changes, B- Revised Specific Plan/Red-line changes, C- Summary of changes as the Errata Sheet, D- Memo which addresses two minor changes.

Backoff: Discussed two letters received: 1). Mr. Collins letter received at dais prior to start of meeting. The applicant has not seen the letter. It recaps the March workshop and discusses the blasting. (Read letter). Blasting is controlled by City's blasting ordinance. It does not limit it to just three days a week and/or at lunchtime. It does restrict hours and how it's conducted, which would have to be followed. Blasts are typically covered by earth. The letter discusses noise monitors and street sweeping. The City doesn't set up noise monitors, but there is monitoring of the site. City will condition the CUP accordingly. The SP will provide the required parking. 2). San Marcos Kennels letter is primarily concerned with the blasting/vibrations effect on the animals. Also raised concerns about water flow leaving the site. Grading plans would be done to direct water around their site.

Kildoo: Asked where the area of disagreement is located in all the paperwork?

Koller: It's not in the Commissioner's report; it was added to the presentation. Staff tried to work with applicant until the last hour. They don't want to be restricted.



Kildoo: Inquired if Commission approves resolution as it stands, would that do what staff is recommending? If Commission chooses not to, how do they phrase it?

Backoff: Believe it does cover it under Staff's revisions. The Form Based Code would model that block or building, and it already says commercial could be allowed but also doesn't preclude residential from also being on street frontage. Leave it as is.

Kildoo: If approved as is, they have the right to keep that as residential or do commercial?

Backoff: Correct. Staff wants to maintain some retail at the corner.

Flodine: Report mentions balanced grading. Asked how this is achieved with multiple owners and how does City monitor?

Backoff: It relates more to the CUP & rock crusher. Before the applicant can grade on other people's property, they'd have to purchase it or have an agreement with the property owners. If they don't agree to that, the applicant would grade their portion and balance that. It's a conceptual scheme that could balance the entire site.

Kildoo: The Task Force meetings lasted well over a year, and it appears the members names are now crossed out on the acknowledgement page of the Specific Plan. Asked why and if it's necessary? It's the same with Planning Commissioner's and staff that have changed. They all invested time and volunteered; he doesn't want to see it diminished. Inquired if there is a legal reason to do it? If not, he doesn't want to change it.

Backoff: No, the document was updated by City's consultant. They updated personnel. Agreed the comment is valid. Recommendation could be to retain original names.

Koller: There are a couple corrections as summarized on Memo.

Kildoo: He doesn't want anyone taken off and feels that everyone new should be added.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Gary Levitt, Applicant, on behalf of Michael McDonald & Urban Villages San Marcos, LLC: Didn't take the step of reopening the Specific Plan that they spent \$2.5 million in creating in 2009. A number of things changed while trying to make the plan a reality. 1). Grading. Discussed changes: North City Drive, the primary road, will loop around and join Rush Drive. They didn't want to take the road through the highest point and destroy one of the best features, the existing hill & 5 acres. It will be retained in its natural state as part of the park plan. The plan is now more sensitive to grading. 2). Retail. They initially wanted an urban-type Target store on the east side with parking underneath. Target looked at it but rejected it a few times because they have several nearby stores and the internet. You can buy everything on the internet now, so the world of retail has changed. The whole model built around a regional shopping center isn't the future of retail. Now it's creating place, a Main Street, with Mom & Pop stores, restaurants and a place you want to meet friends. The plan will bring residential above retail, similar to current student housing. People are shopping in the neighborhood. Retail is on the



east side. On the west side, there's 40,000-50,000 s.f. of retail. Don't feel additional retail is needed now. The land use type is townhouse and under SP, they're allowed to have retail. If they find later that retail is needed, they don't have to come back to the City for approval, they can add it. They don't want to be imposed to. That is the disagreement. 3). Re-use of existing buildings. There was nothing in the plan regarding re-use, so it was added. 4). Storm water treatment. Reverse sense of draining streets and traffic circles will address those issues. Hope to break ground in August.

Ricardo Rabines, Safdie Rabines Architects: PowerPoint shown. The project is unique. The mountains are a strong value to City. Discussed changes to areas: Campus Way to Carmel, traffic circles. Adaptable re-use areas preserve existing structures. East side has the large hill and park. Plazas, student housing, restaurants, a blend of students and families. Main Street has public spaces, dining, entertainment, office, mixed-use, market rate housing. North City Plaza, retail and a lot of outside activities. Intersection of Twin Oaks and Barham is the heart of the project, mix of office, conference rooms, hotel, restaurants and housing. Most residential is on east side. Housing could accommodate all types of families and is very walkable. They've been building three phases of student housing during the last five years. Block C is next with about 200 residential units.

Flodine: Asked if they could address their perceived benefits of the plan?

Levitt: The Quad has retail on ground floor all around it. Block C has more retail. End of North City Drive will flow into adaptive re-use. At best, maybe another block going west. These are not national retailers. We expect the neighborhoods will come here, and hope greater San Marcos or North County will too. Anticipate a dry cleaner, nail salon, coffee shop & deli. On west side, more stores on the main streets. You can't put retail on every second corner or where it may not work. Don't know who would want to be on the corner near the park. There aren't enough people living there. There's nothing worse than empty retail space. It affects the market value of people living upstairs and the ambience. That's their concern with that location.

Norris: Asked if they have reports or facts showing the area won't be used? Or, is it what's been seen in the past?

Levitt: It's what they've seen. There's 8,000 s.f. below student housing. One tenant is open, another under construction. If you were to open a restaurant and you had the choice of an intersection or around the corner in the back, which would you choose? To line the whole block with retail doesn't make sense. San Elijo Hills finally has a coffee shop that seems to be making it now that it's almost built out with 3,000 units. There are fewer units here, but much more retail.

Kildoo: Asked if they want the flexibility?

Levitt: Specific Plan and Form Based Code allows it. They're not disagreeing it should remain as an option. To be deemed that it has to happen is the problem.

Paul Metcalf, Applicant's representative: Discussed four major changes: Huge reduction in grading, preservation of park area, roundabouts with bio-retention, adaptive re-use. The Task Force Committee went through a lot of things in detail. These are big issues in reduction and refinement. This amendment helps implement the intent of the Task Force. The grading was almost 3M yards, now it's



1.5, roughly half. It's a huge benefit to the community. They were going to have 60,000 truck trips to take export off site. That is gone now. The park is preserved. They worked with staff regarding water quality regulations. They took out traffic signals inside the development, have center draining streets, used roundabouts which don't require turn lanes, turned the turn lanes into medians with landscape and didn't lose any real estate. Now they meet very difficult regional standards. There's very little gross change in the plan. Would love to do 72,000 s.f. retail, but with current market and no big box, can't get near that. They added 6 acres to the park area, with 3.5 flat acres for use as playing fields. Mentioned two letters received. Those concerns are more appropriately addressed at the CUP stage. They are cognizant of them. The same concerns were brought up during workshop. He didn't hear anything that they're not willing or trying to do. The old grading plan required an 89 foot down cut/blast into solid rock, now it is half that. Moving the road over allowed more of the park to be preserved in its natural state.

Emilio Pastrana: He and his wife own property on Shubin Lane within University District SP. His wife asked him to read a letter to Commissioner's. (Read letter). They bought property in 1997. Her dream was to leave the property to children/family. She has no intention of selling it because she wants her family to have a source of income. In 2007, she received numerous offers from developers or real estate agents who wanted to buy property. They were never interested and did not entertain offers. She was told that a developer bought the majority of properties and they could close access to her road if she didn't sell. She knew they couldn't and she told them she'd consider leasing the land to them. In 2007, she met with someone at City's Development Services Department. They confirmed that developer could not close access to their property or force them to sell. They didn't have any more offers until four months ago. The developer sent a plan showing a road through their property. They didn't respond. The developer mentioned in their letter that the City has shown willingness to condemn their property and force them to sell. She hopes and prays that the City doesn't condemn and take away her wish of leaving it to her family.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Backoff: This is a Specific Plan. It has circulation roads and land uses on the master plan concept. There's nothing that forces property owners to sell. If roads and infrastructure are needed to implement the plan, there's a process called condemnation. Fair market value would have to be rendered if that was the case. It's been done previously on this planning area. If it results in condemnation, they'd be compensated.

Flodine: Asked where Shubin Lane is?

Koller: Pointed out, west of Twin Oaks Valley Rd.

Backoff: Because of impacts on park slopes, the road was reconfigured to tie in to the driveway at Campus Marketplace.

Flodine: It didn't sound like the speaker had immediate plans for the property but wanted to gift it for future generations. Fair market value will go up. It's a conversation for another day. Nothing is immediate and they'd get advance notice. Commission is receptive of their concerns.



Backoff: It's a legal process; courts are involved, if it goes that far.

Norris: Commented that he works at UCSD where there are 20 vehicle electrical charging stations. He gets calls almost daily that it's not enough. Students are the generation that these vehicles are hitting. He'd like to see chargers installed. Asked how many in plan?

Levitt: They're planned in Block C. They're looking at demographics and having the debate of how many. There will be charging stations in the parking structure. Initially, it was planned on a North City Drive intersection, but generally there is a long cable and they don't want to leave that in a public space at this stage. It will be different when it's a 24-hour community with more people living there. They're also discussing internal electric go-cart vehicles & car sharing for access to neighborhood stores.

Flodine: Asked why the minimum private open space was reduced 50%?

Backoff: That was the standard from the old multi-family, two-story, garden apartments, where you had 150 s.f. of ground floor patio space. This is a different product type, more urban, mid-rise. Staff questioned the consultant. Their research showed 100 s.f. was more consistent with urban developments. Staff felt the extra space should be in the units and common areas.

Flodine: Concerned with the new west residential amenity which doesn't have a minimum size. Asked if the 10 pocket parks equal 2 acres? He wants it to be 2 acres minimum of useable.

Metcalf: Staff was clear that it be useable.

Kildoo: The topography on the west side was challenging. The revisions don't change the core of what the Task Force was trying to get to. Wish they didn't have to change anything, but the world has changed, and some of the revisions make it better than the original plan. He likes the adaptive re-use and flexibility to add retail later if warranted.

Flodine: Indicated he preferred the street layout of the revised version. Short grid pattern makes sense for urban core. Agreed with Kildoo in allowing them flexibility with residential vs. commercial. Need to be clear on how it's read into the motion.

Action:

COMMISSIONER KILDoo MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF SP 14-003 AS SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION PC 14-4417; WITH MODIFICATIONS: 1). **MAINTAIN THE FLEXIBILITY TO BUILD EITHER RESIDENTIAL OR RETAIL IN THE "TOWNHOMES/FLATS" BUILDING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF STREETS A-1 AND B ADJACENT TO THE PARK. (NO CHANGE NEEDED IN RESOLUTION, SP OR ERRATA);** AND 2). EDIT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PAGES OF SPECIFIC PLAN TO RECOGNIZE ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS: **RETAIN ALL ORIGINAL TASK FORCE MEMBERS, PLANNING COMMISSIONERS & STAFF NAMES, AS WELL AS ADDING THE NEW NAMES;** SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MAAS,

FLODINE: Reminded Kildoo of staff's memo/handout.

Action:



KILDOO: AMENDED MOTION TO INCLUDE: 3). ACCEPT REVISIONS AS PER STAFF'S 4/28/14 MEMO/HANDOUT; AND 4). THE GENERAL OFFICE NUMBER SHOULD ALSO BE CORRECTED: (Specific Plan) SECTION III.5 Land Use Descriptions (*GENERAL OFFICE*) . . . includes ~~638,000~~ **652,000** square feet of General Office use. . . ; AND (Resolution) 1. . . 450 hotel rooms, ~~638,000~~ **652,000** square feet of general office, 300,000 square feet of . . . ; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHAIBLE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ELECTRONIC VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: FLODINE, JONES, KILDOO, MAAS, NORRIS, PENNOCK, SCHAIBLE

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR COMMENTS

Backoff: Next meeting is May 19, 2014 as opposed to May 5th. D.R. Horton/Mulberry is on Agenda. The Telecommunications Ordinance was going to be on that agenda but has been extended to mid June to allow more public input.

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:30 p.m. Chairman Flodine adjourned the meeting.

ERIC FLODINE, CHAIRMAN
CITY OF SAN MARCOS

ATTEST:

LISA KISS, OFFICE SPECIALIST III
SAN MARCOS PLANNING COMMISSION