

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California

Meeting minutes of the regular meeting of the Foothill/Trabuco Specific Plan Review Board held September 14, 2022 at 7:00 P.M.

In attendance were Chairman Dale Weber, Vice-Chairman Jake Reed, Secretary Robert Borland, and members Richard Gomez and Mike McClanahan. Joining the meeting were members of the public.

Item 1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 PM by Dale Weber

Item 2) Approval of Minutes

Motion by Gomez: Approve minutes as presented

Second by Reed

No further discussion

Vote: 4-Ayes 1-Abstain

Item 3) Old Business

None

Item 4)

PA22-0015

A Site Development Permit to rough grade lots 3, 6 and 8 of TR 14749; and the development of two new single-family homes with ADUs on 20062 Summit Trail and 19942 Summit Trail. The proposal project is in the Trabuco Canyon Residential District.

Representing the applicant was a civil engineer and two architects currently working on the project. They provided a brief description of the grading that they wanted to do and the two houses they were proposing to build.

Board Discussion:

McClanahan asked about the dates when the original tract map was filed in regards to the extension, the representatives did not know.

Several board members asked about elevation drawings for lot 7 as they were not included in the files provided. One of the architects provided drawings which showed a very modern looking design. McClanahan and Gomez both commented on the lack of "rural" consideration, and Weber read the

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW

BOARD

Trabuco Canyon, California

section in the plan where it talks about designs needing to be rural in nature.

Gomez asked about the easement off the main road, about their consideration of hiking trails, including doing a trail overlay. The representatives were not aware of any hiking trail studies.

Borland read two statements in the purpose of the plan which state that development is to be supported, but it is to be done in a rural fashion. Asked the representatives about a wildlife corridor report as required by the plan, they said they were not aware of that requirement. Asked about a tree relocation / impact report, they were not aware of one. Asked about whether or not there would be more than a 10' vertical cut during grading, the civil engineer responded saying no there would not be. (Later a member from the public provided drawings showing cuts above 10', and the civil engineer said she would research it). Asked how one lot had an ADU when it wasn't 8 acres which would be the threshold for a second dwelling. Representatives responded that it was a mistake, there would be no ADU. Asked about Geo and Soils report, representatives said they were not aware of one. (Later a member of the public advised it was included in the Water Quality Management report). Asked about the max development of 30% of the lot and why they were over, the representatives were not aware of this. Asked about the significant environmental impact in their report of building on the west side of Lot 6, and why they had chosen to grade the pad on the west side. The representatives were unaware of this report or its findings.

Weber brought up the checklist in the back of the plan and how important that was for the applicant to use to ensure they have everything prior to coming to the meeting.

Public Comments:

Bruce – Spoke to the downside of grading lots for the purpose of selling and later building out. Asked about grading amounts for the project. Asked for clarification on the square footage being moved, and why there were not drawings and supporting documents provided for the public to view.

Ray – Asked about grading permit numbers, and why they would have numbers if the permits had not been approved. It was discussed that these are actually application numbers, not permit numbers as labeled. Ray passed out several documents to the board and the representatives. He reviewed the history of this project and showed a Resolution from the Board of Supervisors dated October 19, 1993 with specific requirements on how this project is to be conducted. This Board was not provided those documents by the county. Ray spoke about a project in the past called Zadeh, currently Falcon View, which allowed lots to be graded without building plans. They sat for many years and became an eye sore to the community.

Gloria agreed with and seconded all of Ray's comments. She referred to the Board of Supervisors Resolution that Ray provided and pointed out that Lot 3 needed structural plans per 5(a). She voiced frustration that she requested the conditions of approval from the county on this project and was initially ignored. After pressing the issue she was finally sent 1347 pages of material two days prior to this meeting. She stated there was no way anyone could review that much material in that short of a period of time. She also said she asked the county if the conditions of approval were sent to this Board, and she was told that this Board did not ask for them. She then asked the county representative how this board would even know the document existed when it was created long before any of the current members joined the FTSP Board? Gloria also pointed out several other

FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California

items on the provided document. Lot #7 says there needs to be a report from US Fish and Wildlife, Item #26 requires a tree preservation plan, and #34 requires that the applicant adhere to the FTSP, Gloria stated that the applicant should have been provided a copy of the FTSP to ensure compliance.

Kim asked about whether a fire turnaround was in the plans, and representatives pointed out that those were put in with the first few houses.

Motion:

Weber provided the representatives with a choice of withdrawing their request at this time and returning at a later date with the requested information, or if they wanted the Board to vote. Representatives said that on behalf of the applicant they would like to withdraw their request.

Vote: No vote at this time.

Item 6) Public Comments

None

Item 7) Administrative Matters

Reed proposed a modification to the Foothill / Trabuco Specific Plan as indicated on the description which was passed out to the Board and members of the public, and is also attached to these minutes.

Public Comments:

Gloria asked how many one acre lots are currently impacted by this section of the plan. She advised that she felt it was a can of worms trying to make any changes to the plan as in the past it has taken great resources to make this happen.

Kim asked about making the change the other way, imposing the 66% set aside to all lots regardless of size.

Ray said that when you only have one acre you should be able to develop the whole thing, but if you have more than that then you have space to set aside.

Board Discussion:

Gomez stated he had concerns about the lack of an environmental impact report.

Reed stated that the purpose of this was to fix an inequity between land owners because someone who owns just over an acre can only develop a third of their property, while someone who owns one

**FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW
BOARD
Trabuco Canyon, California**

acre can develop the whole thing.

Borland made a motion to approve.

Reed seconded

3-Ayes, 2- Nay's.

McClanahan made a motion to adjourn, Gomez seconds. Meeting adjourned at 8:38 PM