

Attachment 3
Applicant's Letter of Explanation

MEMORANDUM

Date: 9/10/2020

Subject: PA20-0141 – OC20-16185

Background

In contrast to 30 years ago there are few places left where one can enjoy the pleasure of horse ownership and fewer yet that have access to trails. Just in the last 12 months, three large horse facilities have announced they are for sale. This includes Sycamore Trails that has nearly 500 stalls and Tar Farms, both in San Juan Capistrano. Another is Serrano Creek Stables in Lake Forest. It's our understanding there will be a loss of nearly 1000 stalls in the near future. Sadly, this is a loss for families, adults and children alike, not to mention the loss the animal feels when their owner must sell for lack of available boarding facilities.

The subject property (APN 842-081-02) is located at the intersection of Trabuco Canyon Road and Rose Canyon Road. The parcel contains 13.36 acres and is bounded by Trabuco Canyon Road, Rose Canyon Road and Mountain View Road. The property has historical uses and structures that include a private residence, caretaker house, citrus grove, horse stables and the raising of other farm animals such as chickens. The property includes an on-site well which was the source of irrigation water for the citrus grove. A number of years ago (date not certain) the orange trees were no longer productive and they were replaced with Peruvian Peppers. Historical photos and recent biological surveys reveal that the majority of the 13.36 acres has long been stripped of the native vegetation.

In approximately 2007, the prior land owner was pursuing entitlement for six residential lots with an application for Tentative Tract 17385. For reasons unknown to the current owner, the entitlement process was never completed.

Proposed Project

The property is located in the Trabuco Canyon Residential District of the Foothill Trabuco Specific Plan. Appendix B of the Specific Plan identifies (Lang) with 7 maximum dwelling units on 14.0 acres. Since adoption of the Specific Plan a portion of the property was sold to Trabuco Canyon Water District. Section III,6.4 of the Specific Plan permits commercial stables with Planning Commission approval of a use permit. The current owner of the property is seeking such approval.

This property may be the best opportunity for a commercial stable within the entire Specific Plan for the following reasons:

- Parcel is sufficiently large enough to support such a use
- The majority of the site is flat enough to support the use
- The area designated for the commercial stable has no native vegetation
- An on-site well is available to provide water for dust control
- The property is located adjacent to existing O'Neil Park trails
- Site plan and fuel modification is satisfactory for OCFA approval
- The onsite soils can support infiltration of onsite stormwater runoff
- Able to meet the Animal Care Regulations of the Specific Plan
- If acceptable to County, the project will provide an of road equestrian trail along a portion of Rose Canyon Road
- Other stables in the area have been shutdown creating a high demand for such a facility

Your favorable consideration of this application is greatly appreciated. Please consider the families this facility will serve. Riding is a wonderful activity for ages 5 to whatever! Our youth are in desperate need of healthy direction and we also have so many special needs children and adults that can benefit from relationships with horses. This facility would serve the community well!

Attachment 4

View Simulations



EXISTING CONDITIONS



WITH TREES REMOVED



WITH ADDITIONAL PLANTINGS

Attachment 5
Draft FTSPRB Minutes

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California

Meeting minutes of the regular meeting of the Foothill/Trabuco Specific Plan Review Board held Nov 19, 2020 by video conference due to COVID-19 restrictions.

In attendance were board Chairman Weber, Vice Chairman Reed, Secretary Anderson, and members Smith and Borland. Joining the meeting were members of the public and County representatives.

Item 1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 PM by Vice-Chairman Reed. (Chairman Weber was listening, but not audible)

Item 2) Approval of Minutes

Motion by Smith: Approve minutes as presented

Second by Reed

No further discussion

Vote: 4-Ayes 1-Abstain

Item 3) Old Business

None

Item 4) PA20-0141

A Use Permit to establish an 80-stall commercial stable on the lower portion of a 13.36-acre property bounded by Trabuco Canyon Road, Rose Canyon Road and Mountain View Road. Proposed commercial stable improvements will include four stable structures, one new exercise arena, one new training ring, a storage structure, a water tank and appurtenant parking and on-site access drives. Project site address is 37171 Mountain View Road.

Member Anderson recused himself as he is the Owner's consultant for this application.

Mr. Anderson, representative for the Owners, provided an introduction of the project summarizing the characteristics of the site and how this specific location provides a unique opportunity for the proposed use. Clarified that inclusion of the proposed public equestrian trail is contingent on the County's willingness to accept the trail easement.

Questions from the Board:

There is an existing gate off Trabuco Canyon Rd. that provides limited stacking space, can that be improved? *The proposed project provides two points of access and both gates have been recessed to permit 40' of stacking.*

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW

BOARD

Trabuco Canyon, California

There are proposed restrooms, where are they located and what type of construction? *The restrooms are located adjacent to the parking area. They need to be non-combustible. They will likely be a converted shipping container with a holding tank.*

Will there be special events held at the facility? *No special events are to be conducted.*

Is there an evacuation plan for relocating all the animals? *No plan is available at this time. The fire modeling that was performed suggests a low probability of the flames reaching the proposed barns.*

Public Comments:

(Gomez) - Supports the project. Provided clarification that he is part of an organization that has worked closely with OCFA to prepare and implement an evacuation plan for the large animals in the area. He believes this site will enhance the plan.

(Chandos) – Will there be overflow parking on Rose Canyon Road? *This should be prohibited. There is ample area on-site if needed.* It is not clear which trees are to be removed. Will tree #92 be removed? *The intent is to protect all oak trees. Tree #92 should be safe. The proposed trail has the greatest potential conflict with oak trees suggesting the trail may need to be reduced in width in certain locations.* Where will the new fence be in relation to the existing fence along Rose Canyon? *Generally, the new fence will shift approximately 10' to the north.*

(Munk) – Has submitted written testimony in support of the project. Lives in Coto de Caza, believes this project is desperately needed, hopes that it will be approved.

(Sefton) – Supports the project. Is there a viewshed analysis? Believes one is required. Focus is Barn #1. *The analysis is not available. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant must provide OCFA with a landscape plan for the fuel modification. The analysis can be completed once there is an approved landscape plan that also accounts for which trees are to be removed.* The proposed fence material is chain link, is there an alternative? *The applicant has requested approval of vinyl coated chain link similar to what exists today.* Will the arena be lighted? *The only lighting is to be low voltage safety lighting at the parking area, pathways and inside the barns.* Will there be special events? *No.*

Motion (Smith): Recommend approval with the following recommendations:

No commercial events, visual analysis be prepared and shared with the FTSPRB, no lighting allowed at the arenas, no expansion of the facility beyond what is currently shown.

Second (Reed)

No further discussion

Vote: 4-Ayes

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California

Item 5) PA19-0078

A Site Development Permit and Variance to establish a new 462 sq. ft with single-family residence with a 462 sq. ft two-car garage and 236 sq. ft loft at 20601 Trabuco Oaks Drive locating in the Trabuco Oaks Residential District.

Mr. Salat, project architect, announced he was on-line and able to answer any questions.

Board Discussion:

(Anderson): No provisions for propane, will this be an all-electric home? *Yes.* The plan does not provide any detail for the onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS). What type of system is proposed, and does it meet the County criteria for systems located near existing drainages, and where is the 100% reserve area? *The civil engineer might be able to answer, but he is not available.* Was a CWQMP prepared? *None required.* The Tree Preservation Plan suggests six trees could be stressed. If all six die, over 50 trees are required for mitigation. What is the plan for dealing with this? *We believe the site grading will not damage the trees. The arborist may be able to answer this.* One suggestion to staff, there appears to be an opportunity to add one on-street parking space by adjusting the retaining wall.

(Smith): The Tree Preservation Plan seems to suggest that there is a high probability that these trees will die. What is your plan to deal with this? *We need the arborist to address this.* I too share the concern that we do not have sufficient information for the OWTS.

(Reed): Not sure why we are questioning the OWTS. It is not part of specific plan zoning.

Public Comments:

(Chandos): Point of clarification, compliance with the plumbing code is required by the Specific Plan.

(Sefton): Concerned that the trees are not adequately protected.

Motion:

(Smith): Recommend denial of the project.

Motion fails for lack of a second.

(Anderson): Will the applicant consider a continuance so that more detail can be provided concerning the trees and the OWTS?

(Applicant): We request a continuance to the Dec 9, 2020 meeting so that we may provide answers to the questions that have been raised.

Item 6) PA20-0049

A Site Development Permit minor home improvement to add to an existing single-family home; to include a second story addition, a new attached 638 sq. ft garage, an attached accessory dwelling unit

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW

BOARD

Trabuco Canyon, California

and junior accessory dwelling unit. The property is located at 20335 Adkinson Dr. The property is in the Trabuco Canyon Residential District of the Foothill/Trabuco Specific Plan.

(Applicant representative): I am available to answer any questions. I am on the phone (driving) and do not have video access.

Board Discussion:

(Anderson): My initial question is directed to Staff, why are we reviewing this application when the staff report states that it is incomplete? (Staff): *The applicant requested that we bring it to the Board with the understanding that changes may require a resubmittal.* (Anderson): Sorry, I thought we agreed not to do this.

(Smith): **Notes lacking on Adam's ADU question**

(Anderson): Is an CWQMP required? *Yes, it is not yet approved.* Is a Fire Master Plan required? *OCFA stated that because it is an existing structure, none required.* Minor home improvement is limited to 150 cy of grading if on slopes less than 15%, how do we know that has been met? The Board may also request special studies as part of the Minor Home Improvement; a site-specific streambed analysis should be required per Section 4.2.a

Public Comments:

(Chandos): If the existing residence is expanded to 1335 SF in conformance with the Minor Home Improvement, then you add second story, the maximum square footage of living area is 2,670 SF vs. the 3,245 in the application. Does not seem to make sense. Is there a requirement for guest parking for the ADU's? (Staff): *No parking required.*

(Sefton): It appears the application has strayed from the intent of the Minor Home Improvement.

Board Discussion:

(Smith): This appears to be a misuse of the Minor Home Improvement. I participated in the development of this Ordinance and this proposal is contrary to the original intent. The Ordinance was developed to facilitate home improvements that had few or no impacts and did not justify expensive special studies nor the dedication of two-thirds open space for such items as a room addition, a new porch or a new garage.

(Anderson): I too believe this is a misuse of the Minor Home Improvement ordinance and a dangerous precedent. I disagree with staff interpretation that a second story over the State allowed ADU's is consistent with the Ordinance. In essence, such logic says it is OK to double the size of the State allowed ADU's. This is clearly an attempt to avoid the typical "special studies". This should be processed as a Site Development Permit.

(Reed): I agree with staff and support their interpretation.

(Borland): The proposal seems excessive for a minor home improvement.

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California

Motion:

(Reed): Recommend approval

(Weber): Second

Vote: Yes- Reed, Weber No- Smith, Anderson, Borland (Motion fails)

Motion:

(Smith): Recommend denial, application is not consistent with Ordinance No. 01-010

(Anderson): Second

Vote: Yes- Smith, Anderson, Borland No- Weber, Reed (Motion approved)

Item 7) Public Comments

(Sefton): The County's automated system to share notice of the meeting is not working properly. The County has been notified of the problem and it has not been fixed. Can Staff please follow-up on this?

Item 8) Administrative Matters

(Weber): Wish to welcome Bob Borland as a new member of the Board.

(Anderson): There has been an increase in dead or decayed oak trees in the canyon. Some of them experience "sudden death". Property owners are confused about the proper procedure to deal with a dead tree that presents either a fire or a safety hazard. A recent windstorm caused large limbs and whole trees to fall. A dying tree can unexpectedly block vehicular access or worse, fall on a parked or passing car. Do we have a clear understanding of how to deal with this?

(Smith): I too see this as a problem. Suggest it be a future agenda item.

(Weber): Sorry, I have a prior engagement. I need to leave the meeting at this time.

(Reed): We need to address this. Dead trees should not be allowed to remain if they are a fire hazard.

(Sefton): I have invested significant time preparing draft language that was previously shared with the County. I would be happy to provide that language to staff who can forward it to the Board members.

(Reed): I have a concern for how the current Specific Plan language deals with the open space dedication trigger for parcels greater or smaller than 1 acre. How can this be addressed? *(Staff): Any change will require a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA). Staff will only do a SPA if directed to do so by the Board of Supervisors.*

At 4:53 PM Member Smith made motion to adjourn; second by Reed, no discussion, vote unanimous.

Attachments 6

Site Photos

Cleveland National Forest





house

Mountain View Road

Canyon Rd

Rose Canyon
Cantina & Grill

Trabuco Canyon Rd

Rose Canyon

Rose Canyon Rd



Hickey
Canyon

Oaks Steakhouse
Delivery

Mountain View Road

Mountain View Road

Mountain View Road

Rose Canyon
Cantina & Grill
Takeout

Rose Canyon

Rose Canyon Rd

Rose Canyon Rd

Google



Rose Canyon Rd. Rose Canyon

Mountain View Rd.



S19

se Canyon

Rose Canyon Rd

Mountain View Road

Mountain View Road

Canyon
na & Grill

Road







1938



USDA FSA, Maxar | City of Riverside, County of Riverside, Esri

1938



USDA FSA, Maxar | City of Riverside, County of Riverside, Esri

1953



1970



1984



1990

