# MINUTES

## Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission

**MONDAY, JUNE 16, 2025**
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 Marcinko led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ROLL CALL**
The Secretary called the roll:

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS: BARNETT, CAVANAUGH, MARCINKO, RIOS, CARROLL, NORRIS,

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS IN AUDIENCE: NONE

ABSENT COMMISSIONERS: KILDOO, SAULSBERRY, RICO

Also present were: Principal Planner Scott Nightingale for Planning Division Director Joe Farace; Associate Planner Corina Flores; Associate Civil Engineer Brad Holder; Deputy City Attorney Punam Prahalad; Office Specialist Susie Neveu.

**ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**
**None**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, 05/19/2025**

**Action:**
COMMISSIONER CAVANAUGH MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM #1 AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MARCINKO. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AYES: | COMMISSIONERS: | BARNETT, CAVANAUGH, MARCINKO, RIOS, CARROLL, NORRIS |
| NOES: | COMMISSIONERS: | NONE |
| ABSENT: | COMMISSIONERS: | KILDOO, NORRIS |
| ABSTAIN: | COMMISSIONERS: | NONE |

**PUBLIC HEARING**

2. **Project No:** V24-0001 – Ihm Residence Variance
   **Applicant:** Jenny Ihm
   **Request**: A Variance to allow an increase of allowable gross floor area for all accessory structures for the addition of a detached three car garage, with a second-story accessory dwelling unit (ADU), located within the front fifty percent of a four-acre parcel located at 245 W. La Cienega Rd. in the Estate (R-1-20) Zone.
   **Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval

**Assistant Planner Corina Flores:** gave staff presentation.

**Planning Commissioners Discussions:** Number of ADUs allowable on a property; slope issue, height, size and location issue; ADU versus building another regular size home; good project for size of the property.

**Staff Response:** Per State law and the zoning code, one detached ADU and one Junior ADU is allowed. Applicant wants to provide affordable options for potential residents.

**Action:**
COMMISSIONER CAVANAUGH MOTIONED TO APPROVE PC25-5163 FOR V24-0001 & EX25-032 AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARROLL. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE.

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

3. **Project No:** SP22-0005, SP22-0006, GPA22-0004, MFSDP22-0005, TSM22-0004, CUP22-0005 & EIR23-005.
   **Applicant:** Cornerstone Communities
   **Request**: A Specific Plan, Multi-Family Site Development Plan, and Tentative Subdivision Map for a 46-unit condominium development on 8.6 acres. Project includes Amendments of the Heart of the City Specific Plan and General Plan to remove the Richmar sub-plan designation of the property. Additionally, a Conditional Use Permit for a temporary crushing of rock material during grading operations is requested.
   **Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval to City Council

**Principal Planner Scott Nightingale and Associate Civil Engineer Brad Holder:** gave staff presentation.

**Jason Greminger with CCI:** gave the applicant presentation.

**OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Jose Carlos, resident of Mission Villas:** Expressed concerns with possible damage to the existing retaining wall during the rock crushing and what the developer plans to do about any damage done.

**Nina Carlos, resident of Mission Villas:** Expressed concerns with the rock crushing. What repairs will be done, how long it will take to repair the retaining wall back to its original integrity and who will incur the costs.

**Drew Kedra, resident of Mission Villas:** Expressed concerns with damage to the existing retaining wall during the rock crushing, flooding when the plants above are removed that currently reduce the flooding when it rains. Concerns with noise pollution from the blasting and the roof top deck overlooking their community due potential noise.

**Planning Commissioners Discussions:** Safety of the retaining wall during construction; checking wall for damage during construction and the outcome if damage occurs; data on public transportation; noise mitigations; long term solutions for the retaining wall if cracks occur after the property construction; concerns with blasting to the neighboring residents' homes; noise mitigation; rooftop deck mitigation; questions about not changing the specific plan; fire department access; engineering review of the retaining wall; blasting permit; ADA units; for sale or rental units; affordable housing; communication with the Mission Villa residents regarding their concerns with the retaining wall; enforcement of the community is a concern and residents and they are welcome to contact Code Enforcement to assist; happy that an elevator is provided for ADA but did not see a floor plan for ADA units; encouraged applicant to reach out to the residents; encourage residents to attend the City Council meeting; asked staff to provide more information on their presentation regarding the retaining wall.

**Applicant response:** The geotechnical reports showed no concerns with impact to the retaining wall during construction of this project. We are not allowed to push additional water on another property during or after construction. The water must be captured, cleaned and discharged appropriately per the City's stormwater standards and State regulations. The Geo Technicians will do a survey of the wall before and after construction. If damage does occur the wall must be restored to its pre-construction status at no cost to the homeowners. The State has mandates that if a housing project is built near public transportation, the developer is required to reduce the number of parking spaces and develop and Traffic Management Plan to provide transit passes and bike racks. A noise study was conducted, and it did not find any significant impacts. We are required to have CC&Rs in place to prevent mini dorms or other possible activities. The HOAs are also responsible for making sure these conditions in place are met. If damage occurs after constructions, and investigation will be conducted to determine what the cause was. If blasting is needed, a survey will be conducted on the surrounding area to mitigate risks. If damage occurs from the blasting, repairs will be made. The noise report will make recommendations on what materials to use for the windows to reduce the interior decibel levels below the required threshold. The rooftop deck is handled by the CC&Rs and the HOA with a management plan. ADA units will be on the ground floor. These units will be for sale and no affordable housing. We have not been in communication with residents regarding the retaining wall concerns. We still talk with the builder of the wall. Our office is open, and they are welcomed to call or stop by to discuss their concerns with us.

**Mike Levit with Excel Engineering response:** The large rocks from the Mission 316 project was broken up by a chemical and then used a rock breaker. A rock crusher was not used. We will survey the rocks and determine the best method to use. The anchors used on the retaining walls for the Mission 316 project is imbedded below and separated from soil.

**Staff response:** Part of the requirement is establishing a specific plan. The Fire Department did review and plan and they found the turnaround access sufficient. The applicant must provide detailed information on the type of wall, then staff will send out the plans to an independent construction consultant that will review the design and provide comments to the applicant. The conditional use permit permits the blasting.

**Action:**
COMMISSIONER BARNETT MOTIONED TO APPROVE PC25-5155 FOR EIR23-005, PC25-5149 FOR SP22-0005, PC25-5150 FOR SP22-0006, PC25-5151 FOR GPA22-0004, PC25-5152 FOR MFSDP22-0005, PC25-5153 FOR TSM22-0004 & PC25-5154 FOR CUP22-0005 AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MARCINKO. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE.

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

**CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**PLANNING DIVISION DIRECTOR COMMENTS:** The Armorlite project is going to City Council next Tuesday on the 24th and the Woodward project is estimated to go to City Council in the fall; no date has been set yet. We also had an SDP approved for a 17-acre park in North City West. Staff is also working on setting up a second public workshop for the Creek project and Joe should be back on Monday.

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:**
Commissioner Norris asked about the future Scripps project.

**STAFF RESPONSE:** We have not received a formal application, but there is interest in the North City West area within their property

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 7:58 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