

ACCESS

My name is Claire Schlotterbeck and I will talk about access.

FIRST, LET'S BE CLEAR, the developer failed to secure adequate access to the project appropriate for the number of housing units he has proposed. He only secured one legal access and it is onto Stonehaven. By now cramming all of the project traffic out of this one access point *on a daily basis*, he is hoping you will be willing to throw his own residents in Esperanza Hills and existing residents on Stonehaven under the bus for his failure.

SECOND, LET'S BE CLEAR. Stonehaven, Option 1, was specifically eliminated by Supervisor Spitzer in June 2015 when he said, "Option 1 is off the table...". He was not just concerned about the two hairpin turns and steep grade. He also said "People live on Stonehaven and it was really unfair to dump all of that traffic, as a primary." He went on to say that he was purposefully eliminating it from the Specific Plan.

And now the developer has not only proposed it to be a primary access, but also to be the only daily access... No, it's off the table.

THIRD, LET'S BE CLEAR. The emergency access on an easement through Cielo Vista has *not* been fully adjudicated in Court. This was even referenced by Supervisor Spitzer on June 2, 2015 when he said "Some of those issues haven't been completely worked out."

The easement that Esperanza Hills has, may ultimately apply only to the Yorba Linda Trails parcel # 351-031-04, not the entire Esperanza Hills project. So to rely on that iffy easement as adequate emergency access for the entire 340 houses is deceptive. What if it doesn't come through?

FOURTH, LET'S BE CLEAR. The fundamental issue of danger has not been resolved. It has simply changed. The zigs zags may be gone with a bridge, but the single exit has just created a daily morning back up for the new residents not only contributing to more GHG emissions as they idle, waiting their turn to exit onto Stonehaven, but also a nightmare scenario in an emergency. These streets were gridlocked with existing residents pouring out of Stonehaven in the 2008 Freeway Complex Fire as was Yorba Linda Blvd., the thoroughfare they empty onto.

Fire officials I have worked with over the years have always said you need two ways in and two ways out. The bigger the development, the more exits are needed. Why would this not apply to a massive housing project deep in the hills, next to permanent fire prone parklands? Where did this common sense rule of thumb go?

Indeed, how far are *you* willing to go to compromise public safety to come to a “yes” for this project? You must deny the developer’s application for amendment.