

TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement

Kumura called the meeting to order: Present: Sandra Farrell (Secretary), Eric Chapman (Co-Vice Chair), Gil Jemmott, Karen Binns (Co-Vice chair), Tom Kumura, Rob Peterson .

Review of Minutes Binns noted a few errors to minutes. **Farrell moved for approval of the minutes with corrections Jemmott seconded. Motion passed 6-0-0**

Public Communications, Presentations and Announcements:

Binns noted Newland Sierra has put forward their formal application

PDS2014-MUP-14-047, Verizon Wireless Cell Tower Project, 3857 Blue Bird Canyon Court, Vista, CA 92084, APN:181-181-43; Major Use Permit for 60-foot high faux mono-eucalyptus tree. Item tabled because applicant requested more time

Traffic Problems Along Buena Creek Road: Representatives from the County Public Works, including Kenton Jones (DPW Manager, Safety & Loss Mitigation Traffic Engineering and Chief of the Traffic Advisory Committee), Murali Pasumarthi (Manager, Traffic Engineering) and Giselle Finley (Senior Traffic Engineer), presented the problems of trying to deal with the safety and traffic issues along Buena Creek Road. The biggest problem the County mentioned was lack of funding. Pasumarthi enlighten the public about the three funding sources for roads and how the money was used:

1. Most of the money collected from the tax goes to fixing pot holes.
2. Grants
3. TIF fees Traffic Impact Fees collected from developments
4. Conditions of a developments

Pasumarthi noted a developer could just pay a fee and not have to do the improvements associated with his project.

Several residents who live along or must use Buena Creek Road expressed concerns about safety and functionality of Buena Creek Road. One resident who has been in road construction noted the road was not engineered to handle the weight of quarry and oversized trucks. He noted the overlay recently added is already starting to break up due to weight. He recommended a 7 ton weight limit until the road is rebuilt with sufficient base material which would allow it to carry the loads. He also noted the multiple speed limits posted are confusing for drivers and so divers tend to speed. He said people traveling east use the left turn lanes as passing lanes. Pasumarthi replied that the designation of Buena Creek Road (BCR) in the County's Circulation Element. Farrell said topographical and environmental constraints need to be considered for Buena Creek Road and expressed concern that the County was placing road designations that didn't take into account the actual on-the-ground engineering reality caused by constraints and implementation costs. Pasumarthi said the road had a 78-foot wide road cross-section and said that because BCR was a mobility element road the Board of Supervisors views it as a backbone in the Mobility Element, allowing for flow of all kinds of traffic, including large trucks. Therefore BCR could not have the weight restrictions that Twin Oaks and Deer Springs Road had. He suggested the community use the General Plan Amendment process to make the County aware of what the community wants for the long term goals. Several residents

asked for additional stop signs, traffic lights and roundabouts to calm traffic and make it safe for them to exit from their driveways onto BCR. Richard Borevitz said in 1981 he paid his share for a traffic signal at Buena Creek and Blue Bird Canyon and wanted to know where the traffic signal was. Pasumarthi responded that they have collected only 34K collected for BCR, the cost of one stop light, and it cost over \$1 Million for a single roundabout.

Pasumarthi said they would do the following to address the community's issues:

1. Reevaluate multiple speed limits along the whole road corridor and work with Law Enforcement to get speed profile so they know the speeds during different times of the day. They will ask for enforcement and see if they can adjust the speed limit.
2. Evaluate the multiple curves along BCR to determine what kind of traffic can use the road safely.
3. Work with the community to obtain grant funds to pay for trails improvement that would allow people who are using the Sprinter Station to get safely from the station to homes along BCR and nearby apartments on South Santa Fe.
4. Use portable speed signs to make vehicles traveling BCR aware of their speeds.

Pasumarthi noted that Newland Sierra has submitted their formal application and that it would impact Buena Creek Road with an estimated 30K cars.

San Marcos Highlands Project: P13-0009, Matt and Jason Simmons from the Simmons Group on behalf of the property owner Farouk Kubba presented the project. Sandra Farrell and Tom Kumura recused themselves and joined the audience. Karen Binns took over as Chair for this portion of the meeting. Matt Simmons said that although the project placed most of the development on county land that the project offered more protections and better public amenities than if the County land had been developed per the County General Plan. The project proposes roughly 130 -140 of total 189 home in an area of the County zoned SR10.

Simmons said the project offered:

1. 1.35 acres of parks and 4.2 miles of trails
2. 500-foot wildlife corridor in some places that exceeds the permit requirements
3. Restoration of the creek
4. Provides up to 150 fire buffer around the homes and has the support of the City Fire Protection District and County fire departments.
5. Contributes to San Marcos schools, fire stations, and an additional 1.67 Million for Las Posas road improvements, including improvements to the SR 78 interchange. Schedule C in the CFD for the project contributes money toward the eventual building of Las Posas Road to Buena Creek Road.
6. Impacts 50 acres of habitat which is less than if developed per the County General Plan.
7. Did not extend Las Posas Road to Buena Creek Road and isn't conditioned to provide an alternate alignment. To extend the road the County would have to take out all the mitigation this project was creating.
8. The County supports the project. Simmons said that the people who had raised the issues with the project at the County were not the same one who look at the project overall.

Members of the public who are opposed and/or expressed concerns about the project.

Kevin Mecum: the project was in violation of the City's Ridgeline Protection Ordinance. He said everyone in Santa Fe Hills loved the area in the County because it was rural and wanted to see it developed in a manner that kept the rural nature.

Sandra Farrell (as a member of the public): presented the sponsor group members with public documents from the County's evaluation of the site and impact on the General Plan submitted during the Property Specific Requests (NC22) and noted the project was in conflict with the County's General Plan, the Biological Goals and Guidelines of the MHCP, and the draft North County MSCP. She said the project hadn't changed much over the last fifteen years and wanted to see the project designed so that the City's density on the land currently within the City and the County's SR10 density on the County portion of the property.

Tom Byrne, a resident in the city, said Mr. Kubba needed to develop the project in a responsible manner and blend the density from high, next to the city, to low density as it progressed toward the County. He said in the documents the Wildlife Agencies in 2006 recommended a 1000-1500 foot corridor and not the 400foot corridor. Byrne is not opposed to the project as a whole but is opposed to the project as designed and felt this project extended Las Posas Road almost half way to Buena Creek. He didn't think this project or the City would be paying for any impact to Buena Creek when Las Posas Road was finally extended. He thought all Impacts will be paid by County residents.

Richard Borevitz: said the project should be moved to flatter land, better suited for it. He noted the project site was better suited for watershed.

Tom Kumura (as a member of the public): Thought it was unfair to County residents for an adjacent City, to make decisions on land that has such strong impact on County residents. County residents couldn't vote for City officials and the City wasn't considering impacts to County residents. He believed Kubba had the right to development is property but to put 130 homes in a place that is zoned for 17 was too intensive.

Sponsor Group member comments:

Rob Peterson said he is opposed because the project is not in keeping with the rural nature of the Twin Oaks Valley.

Karen Binns: Noted in the past the group has opposed the Property Specific Request to change the zoning and said since the majority of the project impact is in the County it should match the County zoning.

Erik Chapman said he had seen a project like this built in before and after it was built it created a traffic burden which became a real problem for the community. He thought that by making the project into larger lot custom homes it would generate high-quality, high-dollar homes that would help the tax base.

Comments made related to a County GP alternative:

Simmons: Kubba's 17 parcels would be developed individually which would have more impact. He could take the 4 parcels on the ridge proposed as conservation land and develop them. Another developer could buy the property and propose a project that would be worse. If the project were developed as large lots there would be a higher water use as residents of large lots tend to put in orchards. He noted orchards in Robinhood Ranches. In addition, although large lot parcels would be more compatible, the cost to get water and utilities to large lots would be prohibitive. Clustering was significantly less impactful and less costly.

Borevitz noted: the 17 parcels would be difficult to develop because they had to have access, water and had to perk for septic. He also disagreed with the statement about water use and said the average person couldn't afford to put in an orchard. He noted how he had cut back much of his eleven acre orchard because of cost. .

Simmons: If they don't do this project than the land will not be preserved in a manner that allowed for public access. If a conservancy bought the land the public won't have access and there won't be either trails or parks. In addition, with the drought, there is less sensitive habitat and the quality has degraded. A new developer or project will not have the same restrictions and won't have to preserve at much.

Binns closed the discussion and made the motion that: As the plan is presented today, with the majority of the development in County land, the sponsor group is opposed due to the high density. County zoning is 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres. The Sponsor Group wants the developer to comply with the County zoning". Chapman seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0-0

Farrell and Kumura rejoined the group. Kumura said they would have to postpone item 4 due to lack of time. He then adjourned the meeting at @ 9:20.

Respectfully Submitted, Sandra Farrell, Secretary