

## **FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD**

Trabuco Canyon, California

Meeting minutes of the regular meeting of the Foothill/Trabuco Specific Plan Review Board held June 8, 2022 at O'Neill Regional Park – Nature/Community Center.

In attendance were board Chairman Weber, members Gomez, and McClanahan.

Joining the meeting were members of the public and a County representative.

Item 1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:11 PM by Dale Weber

Item 2) Approval of Minutes

Motion: Gomez made a motion to approve the minutes without changes. Seconded by McClanahan Vote: 3-Ayes

Item 3) Old Business

None

Item 4) PA21-0244

An administrative Site Development Permit for a Model Home Sales Complex, a development phasing plan per Condition of Approval No. 22 of VTTM 17388, and an over-height retaining wall on Lot 62.

Narrative by Applicant:

Mike Miller, TriPointe Homes, outlined the scope of the application and intent of the merchant builder firm, TriPointe Homes. 2-model homes and a sales trailer are being built/installed on lots 64, 65 and 62 respectively, and a wall is required for lot 62. Applicant stated wall on lot 62 is required to comply with setbacks from fuel modification Zone A of the project.

County Comments:

Justin Kirk, OC Public Works, commented that requirements for the application are triggered by use; specifically that fuel modification zones and setbacks must be compliant, and that entitlement conditions of approval are defined within the project approvals. The wall height of 5-0' is within the guidelines of the Specific Plan.

Item 5) Public Comments:

Ray Chandos asked for clarification with regard to the 113 acre parcel with 62 approved homes yet TriPointe is proposing 38-homes. The discussion with applicant clarified that TriPointe's responsibilities are an overlay to the entire Rutter Development project. Chandos asked about the tree management and restoration condition of approval. Applicant replied that the underlying property owner (Rutter) is responsible for meeting conditions of approval, and that individual homeowners would not be responsible for compliance.

Gloria Sefton identified as a member of the Saddleback Canyons Conservancy and commented that lot 62 backs to a wildlife corridor and asked for assurances that no gates or access from adjacent lots would be allowed. Applicant responded that the wildlife corridor would remain inaccessible and protected from intrusion as required.

Sefton asked about oak tree mitigation. That the project was approved in 2012 with significant community opposition and that indeed a lawsuit had been filed by the Saddleback Canyons Conservancy and others. Further, that the staff report to the Planning Commission stated that over 150 mature oak trees would be removed and the oak tree mitigation plan called for the planting of 281 oak trees; 122 of which are to be larger than 15-gallon bases. In addition, saplings and 2,000 acorns are to be planted. Sefton asked how this was going to be addressed and acknowledged on-going discussions with Kevin in OC Public Works. Sefton's question centered on compliance, field verification and reporting.

Justin Kirk responded on behalf of the County and stated that a formal field verification plan and compliance reports are required and will be completed by the County.

Bruce Conn asked about the growth health of oak trees and specifically how the County is assured that reforestation is successful after the initial 7-year milestone condition of approval. Conn shared concern about the water requirements for successful tree establishment and growth.

Justin Kirk responded that a conservancy has been established based on the growth characteristics and cost to assure survival, and that an endowment has been established to manage tree health and growth. Kirk stated the intent was for tap roots to reach the aquifer within the 7-year timeframe, but that water conditions are an unknown.

No further discussion.

Mike McClanahan made a motion to approve the application as submitted, Rich Gomez seconded.

Vote: 3-Ayes

Open Discussion:

Conn asked about current Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) within the project. The discussion continued with clarification from Kirk on the ministerial nature of state ADU laws as an attempt to address the state housing crisis.

Sefton commented about the minimal public notice of AT&T's proposed utility pole on Live Oak Canyon Road, and if the project would be reviewed by the FTSP Board.

Board Discussion:

General discussion about ADU provisions and the comment that ADUs do not need to come before the Board.

General discussion on the proposed bridge on Trabuco Canyon Road over Trabuco Creek, and that a community meeting was held with limited community participation.

The Board requests County notify the Review Board on any hearings or public meetings relevant to projects within the Specific Plan area.

Item 6) Administrative Matters

None

Item 7) Adjournment

Gomez makes a motion to adjourn, McClanahan seconds. Meeting adjourned at 7:55pm