

RESOLUTION NO.**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OCEANSIDE OVERTURNING PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2025-P04 AND NO. 2025-P05 AND DENYING A DEVELOPMENT PLAN, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND VARIANCE AT 250 EDDIE JONES WAY (APN 145-021-29, 30, & 32)****(RPG Oceanside Eddy Jones Way Owner LLC – Applicant)****(Gretchen Gary on behalf of Oceanside Speaks Out -Appellant)**

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2025, the Planning Commission of the City of Oceanside, after holding a duly advertised public hearing, by a 7-0 vote, adopted Resolution No. 2025-P05 certifying the Final EIR (FEIR) and adopting the Findings of Fact and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”); and adopted Resolution No. 2025-P04 approving Development Plan (D22-00001), Conditional Use Permit (CUP22-00001), and Variance (V22-00001) to allow the construction of a warehouse, manufacturing, and office facility consisting of four separate buildings with a cumulative total of 497,822 square feet and 34 truck bays known as the Multi-Building and Truck Bay Reduction Alternative (MBTRA) on a 31.79-acre site; and

WHEREAS, on February 20, 2025, a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s denial of said project was filed with the City Clerk; and

WHEREAS, on May 21, 2025, the City Council of the City of Oceanside held a duly noticed public hearing and heard and considered evidence and testimony by all interested parties concerning the Planning Commission’s certification of the FEIR and approval of the Development Plan (D22-00001), Conditional Use Permit (CUP22-00001), and Variance (V22-00001), which public hearing was closed on May 21, 2025; and

WHEREAS, following the close of the May 21, 2025 public hearing, the City Council deliberated and by motion voted 3-2 (Weiss and Robinson “No”), stating the City Council’s intended decision to grant the appeal and overturn Planning Commission Resolution No. 2025-P04 and No. 2025-P05 and not certify the FEIR; and

1 WHEREAS, pursuant to Oceanside City Code section 2.1.43, there is no final action on a
2 project appeal until the City Council has reviewed and acted upon a written resolution; and

3 WHEREAS, the City Attorney was directed to bring back a formal written resolution at a
4 future meeting with findings consistent with the City Council's May 21, 2025 intended decision
5 for final consideration by the City Council; and

6 WHEREAS, on August 6, 2025, the duly noticed on the agenda an item for consideration of
7 final action on the appeal of the Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR and approval of
8 the Development Plan (D22-00001), Conditional Use Permit (CUP22-00001), and Variance (V22-
9 00001); and

10 WHEREAS, based on all the evidence and testimony, including the testimony of the
11 appellant, the public, and written submissions in support of the appeals, this Council has
12 determined that the findings of fact articulated by the Planning Commission in Resolution No.
13 2025-P04 and No. 2025-P05 did not establish the necessary findings to adequately justify
14 approval of the MBTRA project; and

15 WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); an
16 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared and circulated for the Project; and

17 WHEREAS, pursuant to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 15270(a),
18 the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") does not apply to projects which a public
19 agency rejects or disapproves; and

20 WHEREAS, the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings
21 upon which the decision is based will be maintained by the City of Oceanside Planning Division,
22 300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside, California 92054; and

23 WHEREAS, the studies and investigations made by this Council and on its behalf reveal the
24 following facts:

25 FINDINGS:

26 For Development Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Variance

- 27 1. The project requires a conditional use permit to allow four industrial buildings for
28 distribution and storage purposes with a floor area greater than 50,000 square-feet; and truck
terminals with more than six heavy trucks on the premises at one time. A development plan

1 is required to for the construction of the proposed 497,822 square-foot industrial warehouse,
2 manufacturing, and office facility. A variance is required to construct a perimeter flood wall
3 exceeding the maximum allowable height of eight (8) feet.

4 2. The required findings for approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in Section 4105.A
5 of the Oceanside Zoning Ordinance. Section 4105.A.2 requires the City Council to make,
6 among other findings, the following finding: "That the proposed location of the conditional
7 use permit and the proposed conditions under which it would be operated or maintained will
8 be consistent with the General Plan; will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or
9 welfare of persons residing or working in or adjacent to the neighborhood of such use; and
10 will not be detrimental to properties or improvements in the vicinity or to the general welfare
11 of the city."

12 3. The required findings for approval of a development plan are set forth in Section 4306 of the
13 Oceanside Zoning Ordinance. Section 4306.A.4 requires the City Council to find, among
14 other findings: "That the project as proposed is compatible with existing and potential
15 development on adjoining properties or in the surrounding neighborhood."

16 4. The required findings for approval of a variance are set forth in Section 4105.B of the
17 Oceanside Zoning Ordinance. Section 4105.B.2 requires the City Council to make, among
18 other findings, the following finding to approve a variance: "That granting the application
19 will not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity of the
20 development site, or to the public health, safety, or general welfare."

21 5. The City Council finds that there is substantial evidence in the administrative record to
22 support the findings that: a) granting a conditional use permit to allow distribution and
23 storage building facilities with a floor area greater than 50,000 square feet and trucking
24 terminals with more than six heavy trucks on the premises at one time is inconsistent with
25 the General Plan; will be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare of persons
26 residing or working in or adjacent to the neighborhood of such use; and will be detrimental
27 to properties or improvements in the vicinity; and b) that approving a development plan for
28 the construction of the proposed 497,822 square-foot industrial warehouse, manufacturing,
and office facility as proposed is not compatible with existing and potential development on

1 adjoining properties or in the surrounding neighborhood. The City Council therefore cannot
2 make the findings required by Oceanside Zoning Ordinance Section 4105 related to the
3 project application for a Conditional Use Permit or the findings required by Oceanside
4 Zoning Ordinance Section 4306 related to the project application for a Development Plan as
5 more fully articulated herein.

6 6. As described in Section 4105.A.2, the City Council has determined the project would be not
7 be operated or maintained consistent with the General Plan. Specifically, the City Council
8 finds the project inconsistent with Land Use Element policies located in Section 1.11
9 (Balanced Land Use), Section 1.14 (Noise Control), Section 2.1 (Industrial Development),
10 and 2.12 (Light Industrial) as follows:

11 a) The City Council finds the proposed project inconsistent with Policy 1.11(A) and
12 1.11(B) in that the project would not contribute to a proper balance of land uses that
13 would foster a sense of neighborhood, community, or regional identity or provide a
14 significant community benefit because the scope and intensity of the project would
15 not align with existing residential, open space, recreational, institutional, commercial,
16 and light industrial uses in the surrounding area. Adjacent land uses include single-
17 family residential subdivisions and the Prince of Peace Abbey north of the river,
18 Prince Memorial Skatepark and the future Ocean Kamp mixed-use project to the east,
19 and GoJump Skydiving at Oceanside Municipal Airport to the south, each of which
20 is materially inconsistent with large scale manufacturing and distribution at the scale
21 proposed. The project as proposed would develop four shell industrial buildings
22 totaling 497,822 square feet with 334,275 square-feet of warehouse space and
23 ancillary trucking terminals, which would represent a major intensification of the
24 previous 172,300 square-foot manufacturing facility. Approval of the CUP and
25 Development Plan would authorize future storage and distribution uses and trucking
26 terminals with a projected 140 average daily truck trips which would contribute
27 additional impacts to a constrained road network with only two points of ingress and
28 egress to the community north of the San Luis Rey River. The project would also not
align with the future residential and tourism-based uses included in the approved

1 Ocean Kamp mixed-use project that would introduce up to 700 residential units, a
2 300-key resort hotel, 134,000 square feet of commercial retail, and office space, and
3 a wave lagoon on a 92-acre site to the east of the project site.

- 4 b) The City Council finds the proposed project inconsistent with Policy 1.11(C) because
5 the intensity of the proposed land use would overburden the City's circulation system
6 beyond design capacity. The proposed project represents a major intensification of
7 the previous manufacturing facility by introducing a 497,822 square foot warehouse,
8 manufacturing, and office facility with an anticipated 1,286 average daily trips as
9 provided in the project's Local Transportation Study. The project would have a
10 transportation impact at the intersection of State Route 76 (SR-76) and Benet Road
11 resulting from cumulative traffic being added to the intersection and would introduce
12 heavy truck trips on a segment of Benet Road shared with a residential community
13 and not designed to accommodate a high volume of heavy truck trips. The project
14 would increase AM and PM peak hour traffic volume at the intersection of SR-76 and
15 Benet Road and further impact constrained intersections and segments on State Route
16 76, which Caltrans has confirmed will not be improved or widened in the near term.
17 In addition, the project would contribute additional vehicle trips at the intersection of
18 SR-76 and Foussat Road as well as the intersection of Foussat Road and Alex Road.
19 With the planned project entrance on Alex Road, there would be no meaningful way
20 to prevent heavy trucks from attempting to access the project site via Foussat Road
21 and Alex Road. Heavy trucks would have difficulty maneuvering around the future
22 roundabouts that would be installed in conjunction with the Ocean Kamp Project,
23 including the planned roundabout at the intersection of Alex Road and Foussat Road.
24 Additionally, heavy trucks that inadvertently turn on Foussat Road would pose a
25 danger to pedestrians, cyclists, and skateboarders accessing Prince Memorial
26 Skatepark and the additional future mixed use amenities of the Ocean Kamp
27 development. Furthermore, the proposed project could significantly impact
28 emergency evacuation of residents north of the San Luis Rey River who rely on Benet
Road and Foussat Road as the only points of ingress and egress into the community.

- 1 c) The City Council finds that the proposed project is inconsistent with Policy 1.14(A),
2 1.14(E), and 1.14(F) because the proposed separation between residential
3 development and the project would not adequately address noise from nuisance-
4 producing land uses, including the proposed trucking terminals. The requested CUP
5 for trucking terminals would exceed the base allowance for heavy trucks on the
6 premises at a given time and would not be in harmony with residential and
7 institutional uses north of the San Luis Rey River. The CUP would not regulate hours
8 of operation for the trucking terminals which could potentially result in heavy trucks
9 accessing the site on a 24-hour basis with the potential to generate nuisance-level
10 noise produced by the loading and unloading of trailers and back up alarms from
11 trucks and forklifts. The Council finds that approval of a CUP for trucking terminals
12 would be detrimental to the general welfare of the surrounding community by
13 introducing a land use with the potential to produce nuisance-level noise inconsistent
14 with existing land uses in the vicinity and the scale and intensity of the previously
15 established manufacturing facility on the project site.
- 16 d) The City Council finds that the proposed project is inconsistent with Policy 2.1(B) in
17 that the proposed industrial facility with the requested CUPs to allow wholesaling,
18 distribution, and storage with a building area exceeding 50,000 square feet and
19 trucking terminals is incompatible with surrounding land uses. The project represents
20 a major intensification of the site's previously established 172,300 square-foot
21 manufacturing facility and would introduce a 497,822 square-foot industrial facility
22 with flexibility to allow a wide range of limited industrial uses, including storage and
23 distribution, with the potential to introduce excessive noise, increased traffic, and air
24 pollution. Without a known tenant(s) or clearly stated category of end user, the project
25 would be inconsistent with the purpose of the Limited Industrial District of providing
26 a suitable environment for various types of industrial uses and minimizing the impact
27 of industrial uses on adjacent residential districts because the proposed project could
28 potentially introduce large-scale distribution uses with trucking terminals that operate

24 hours a day and could negatively impact the residential community on the north side of the San Luis Rey River due to noise.

- e) The City Council finds that the proposed project is inconsistent with Policy 2.12(A) and 2.12(B) in that the planned 497,822 square-foot facility is neither located adjacent to land uses of similar intensity nor restricted to uses generally engaged in the manufacturing, assembly, packaging, fabrication and processing of components into finished products. The proposed project exceeds the size and scale of existing industrial development in the area and would introduce potential distribution uses and heavy truck trips on a constrained roadway network. Surrounding land uses include the Oceanside Municipal Airport and a variety of light industrial businesses to the south, including light manufacturing, in buildings ranging in size from 6,000 to 16,000 square feet. Neither the airport nor the adjacent industrial properties have trucking terminals. The requested CUPs for warehousing and trucking terminals would be inconsistent with Policy 2.12(B) because the policy specifically states that light industrial uses shall be restricted to uses generally engaged in manufacturing, assembly, packaging, fabrication and processing with no reference to large scale warehousing and distribution as a compatible use.

7. The City Council finds that there is substantial evidence in the administrative record to determine that the findings required by Oceanside Zoning Ordinance Sections 4105.A.2, 4105.B.2, and 4306.A.4 cannot be met. As described in paragraphs 6.a through 6.e above related to the project conditional use permit and development plan, the City Council has determined that the project would be not be operated or maintained consistent with the General Plan and would be inconsistent with the purposes of the Limited Industrial District in which the site is located in that the project would not contribute to a proper balance of land uses within the community and would be incompatible with surrounding land uses. Light industrial lands must be able to accommodate a wide range of moderate to low intensity industrial uses capable of being located adjacent to residential areas with minimal buffering and attenuation measures. The proposed 497,822 square-foot industrial facility, with trucking terminals, represents a major intensification of a previous industrial manufacturing facility and lacks adequate buffering from surrounding residential

1 neighborhoods with the potential to introduce 24-hour heavy truck operations, noise related
2 nuisances associated with trucking terminal operations, increased traffic, impediments to emergency
3 evacuation, and air pollution. The size and scale of the industrial facility would not be consistent
4 with adjacent land uses, including the residential community north of the San Luis Rey River with
5 only two points of egress and would be detrimental to the general welfare of the public. As a result,
6 the City Council is unable to make the mandatory findings to approve the conditional use permit,
7 development plan, and variance.

8
9
10 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Oceanside does
11 resolve as follows:

12 1. The City Council grants the appeal of the Planning Commission's action on February
13 10, 2025 and denies with prejudice the Development Plan (D22-00001) and Conditional Use Permit
14 (CUP22-00001). In granting the appeal and denying the Development Plan and Conditional Use
15 Permit, the City Council takes no action on Variance (V22-00001) because a variance to allow the
16 construction of a flood wall exceeding the maximum permitted wall height is not applicable without
17 the approval of a development plan.

18 2. In granting the appeal and denying the Development Plan and Conditional Use
19 Permit, the City Council rejects or disapproves the project for purposes of Public Resources Code
20 Section 21080(a)(5) and accordingly takes no action and does not certify the FEIR.

21 3. Notice is hereby given that the time within which judicial review must be sought on
22 this decision is governed by CCP Section 1094.6(b) as set forth in Oceanside City Code Section
23 1.10.

24
25 ///

26
27 ///

1 PASSED and ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Oceanside, California this 18th
2 day of June, 2025 by the following vote:

3 AYES:

4 NAYS:

5 ABSENT:

6 ABSTAIN:

7
8 _____
Mayor of the City of Oceanside

9
10 ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

11
12
13 _____
City Clerk

14 _____
City Attorney