

Minutes: March 21, 2012 meeting of the
TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Agenda Item 1: - Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement

Farrell called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm. Farrell read the advisory role statement. Present: Sandra Farrell (Chair), Gil Jemmott (Co-Vice Chair), Karen Binns (Co-Vice chair), Ben Morris (secretary), Tom Kumura.

Agenda Item 2: Review of minutes of previous meetings: February 2012 Minutes were reviewed and no corrections were made, Farrell made a motion to approve, Kumura seconded and the motion was approved 4-0-1, Morris abstained as he did not attend the February meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Public Forum: Mike Hunsaker commented on who represents the community of Lake San Marcos, and what is the process of annexation for areas of the County. Patricia Worsham asked about the County plan to dissolve the sponsor groups. Farrell indicated that the Red Tape Reduction Task Force Report will be discussed tonight under Agenda item 8.

Agenda Item 4: Henry Palmer: The Sponsor Group will recognize and thank Henry Palmer for his years of service to the Twin Oaks Valley Community Sponsor Group as a member and an Officer. Mr. Palmer was unable to attend tonight's meeting so the recognition will be rescheduled for a future meeting.

Agenda Item 5: General Plan Update: Review of any updates from the County, regarding the General Plan update and property owner requests. NC-42 Merriam Mountains, Review of the alternatives to the Recommended map of RL20. Newland Real Estate Group is requesting a higher density. Mike Rust, Sr. Vice President of Newland Real Estate Group LLC, will be here to meet the residents and answer questions. Binns recused herself and joined the audience. Farrell pinned up maps of the old General Plan, the 2010 Recommended Map, and the applicant's Newland/ Merriam Mountains LLC Communities request. Mike Rust and Greg Bielli, Western Regional President from Newland answered questions made by the public. Chief concerns by the public were traffic, fire, and community character associated with the changes requested by Newland. A resident asked how the applicant's request in terms of percent increase of dwellings compared with the RL-20. Was it a 1000% increase, 400% increase? Newland said they didn't know that at this time. The VR designation in both Newland's request and the alternative were particularly troubling to the community and to members of the Sponsor Group. Everyone, with the exception of the applicant, felt the Village Residential didn't fit with the community. Farrell said she could support the Alternative if the VR2.9 was replaced with SR4.

Morris said he looked at the request and the alternative in relationship to the latest Community Plan and said both the Alternative and Newland's requested changes weren't supported by the Community Plan. He said the Community Plan directed Commercial to be in two locations and said they should be designed to reflect the rural Character and not be strip-mall like. Morris felt the problem with the Village Residential designation was that it created a village, something larger than the community, at the very edge of the community. He said he didn't understand the logic of this land use this designation unless this was to be part of a much larger project that would support the Village Residential. Morris said Twin

Oaks didn't have a village center but if it did it would be in the center of the community, near the existing market, and not over at the edge by I-15.

Morris pointed out that when the Sponsor Group looked at all the other property specific requests using topographical maps and documents to provide clarity on how a particular designation would work in the community given topographical constraints. He said he didn't understand why we were being asked to make a decision without this level of information. Through the whole General Plan process there had been no discussion of Village Residential for the Twin Oaks area and Morris could see no argument to support the Village Residential designation for this location. Without a planner's (staff) explanation and supporting documents showing the logic behind why the VR designation was now being proposed, he couldn't support the Alternative.

Rust responded that the County and not Newland had requested the VR 2.9 designation. Newland was requesting changing 25 acres of Office Professional to Village Residential and other uses so that the trip generation would be equivalent. Morris said that the I-15 intersection with Office Professional on the west side and Neighborhood Commercial on the east side felt appropriate for the community. Those Office Professional activities support the needs of the rural of the Twin Oaks Community [not traded for Village Residential] and should remain.

Kumura felt he too couldn't understand how you could go from RL 20 on the General Plan to VR2.9 with the type of community features in that area.

Jemmott said he was concerned that putting the higher density in one spot and the community thinking the rest would be low density. He is concerned that after the VR designation goes in that the areas nearby will request higher density. He is concerned about the traffic and thinks placing the Village Residential far removed from existing village development, so it is creating leapfrog development. Jemmott was concerned putting development clusters in constrained areas would make delivery of services difficult.

Farrell reminded everyone that the group had supported the use of the Old General Plan with all the constraints under the old General Plan and no clustering. She believed the SR4 designation with the steep slope overlay was similar to the old designation. Morris felt that the original vote only applied to the specific area that is now being considered for modification and not to the whole site.

Farrell said she could support the SR4 in those areas shown as being modified under the Alternative map, however she couldn't support the Village Residential because of the lack of services and the distance of the VR use from the existing Sprinter Rail and other mass transit systems. Farrell noted it was hard for even existing residents to even use the Park n' Ride as a transit option since it is always full. From a community character standpoint the Village Residential was out of character from the eclectic rural nature of the existing community. She would like to see the VR 2.7 remain Office Professional or Commercial, and Newland work to create a project that reflected a rural feeling of the Twin Oaks Community.

Farrell explained the steep slope destination areas over 50% slope would reduce the SR 4 density to one unit per 8 gross acres. Morris replied that the only area in North Twin Oaks given SR 4 designation was in North Twin Oaks valley and it is much flatter. He didn't see the area now being considered in NC 42 as similar in terrain—it was much steeper—so he has a hard time understanding, without additional topographical information, how SR4 is justified. Kumura agreed.

Farrell understood why the other group members couldn't support either Newland's request or even the Alternative based on lack of a topographical map. Kumura moved for the recommendation of using the 'Planning Commission/Staff Recommended Map- October 2010' for the General Plan. Morris seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0. Following the vote Binns rejoined the Sponsor Group.

Agenda Item 6: San Diego County Water Authority: A representative of the County Water Authority will give an update on the water treatment plant and other projects in the Twin Oaks area. Farrell announced that the representative could not attend tonight's meeting, so she will reschedule this for a future meeting.

Agenda Item 7: Countywide Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (POD-11:008): The County is requesting comments on the draft Residential Design Guidelines that will serve as a reference document for designing residential subdivisions and single-family residences. http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu/advance/POD_11008_Draft_Residential_Design_Guidelines_January_2012.pdf. Farrell indicated that she had not had time to really review this item, and she will review it for our discussion at our next meeting.

Agenda Item 8: Red tape Reduction Task Force Report and Recommendations: Update of January 29th hearing and information about recommendations that may eliminate or change many processes; Including, community groups and the County's Resource Protection Ordinance: See Agenda Item 3 at: <http://bosagenda.sdcountry.ca.gov/agendadocs/materials.jsp> Binns announced that the Agenda for this upcoming meeting is out for review. Farrell indicated that she attended the last meeting, and she plans on attending this meeting also. Binns indicated that she may also attend. Jemmott made a motion for Farrell to attend the meeting and to speak on the behalf of the Sponsor Group. Morris seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

Agenda Item 9: Update on ongoing projects: Morris indicated that at last month's meeting there was an item on the Tiered Equine Ordinance, and that the comment was made that the Sponsor Group would like to understand from him if a position is required by this group on the Notice of Preparation of the EIR. He indicated that he had read the NOP and felt that there was no comment that we needed to make, that we will have to wait for the Draft EIR for a thorough review.

Agenda Item 10: Old Business: None

Agenda Item 11: Administration and correspondence: Farrell indicated that she had not received any feedback on the vacancy notices for the Sponsor Group. Morris had two boxes of old County Planning maps he would like to pass on to another member; Jemmott accepted the boxes for safe keeping.

Farrell adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Ben Morris, Secretary

The next regular meeting of the TOVCSG will be on Wednesday, April 18, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. at the Twin Oaks Elementary School.