

Final Minutes: May 18, 2016 meeting of the
TWIN OAKS VALLEY COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Roll Call and Advisory Role Statement

Co-Vice Chair Karen Binns called the meeting to order. Present: Karen Binns (Co-Vice Chair), Sandra Farrell, Rob Peterson and Colleen Branin. Tom Kumura (Chair) and Erik Chapman were absent.

Karen Binns read Advisory Role Statement and Public Forum statement.

Review/Approval of Minutes: Approval of April 20th 2016 Meeting Minutes (4-0-0)

Public Communications: No comments.

Action Items:

1. **Jaoudi Tentative Map-PDS2016-TM-4700TE2 Project (55 lot single family residential subdivision). East of the easterly terminus of Deeb Drive and north of the westerly terminus of Hardell Lane; APNs: 178-160-04-00 & 178-160-05-00:** Map expired March 23, 2016; applicant, Joseph H. Jaoudi/John Barakat has automatic 60-days extension per the Subdivision Map Act. Marisa Smith, San Diego County Project Manager. Marisa.Smith@sdcounty.ca.gov; (858) 694-2621;

You Tube Links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SDDALBo8Hm0>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZoaEWFZYVrU>

There was a large turnout (over 100 people) in opposition to the Jaoudi Tentative Map, and no representatives from Jaoudi were present. It was stated the Jaoudi project was not approved by the Twin Oaks sponsor group in 2005, but the San Diego Co Board of Supervisors did approve the project. Community members asked many questions regarding the legality of extending the Subdivision map and granting approval. The community members made the following statements and asked the following questions:

1. What is the proper zoning density and lot size for this area? Is this new project of 55 homes on half-acre lots in compliance with the density and character of the area?
2. In 2005, after the proposed "Country Estates" Map was unanimously denied by the County's Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors approved it? Why?
3. Why were we not notified all these years that this project was being planned, and that It had received three extensions in the last 11 years?
4. Is there a limit to how many extensions can be given to a project, before it needs to go back to the drawing board and be re-examined?
5. If their request for an extension is granted on 5/23/16, will the project have to comply with all the latest regulations? If this project goes forward, will it have to comply with all of the most up-to-date regulations (of 2016)? The General Plan was approved in 2011 and this project is not consistent with the General Plan.

6. Storm water regulations have recently changed. In February 2016, the County of San Diego adopted its Best Management Practice Design Manual, dictating on all MS4 permits that final construction drawings issued after February of this year must comply with these new regulations. If this project goes forward, will it have to comply with today's regulations for containing storm water on site? Will there be bio-retention basins for controlling storm water run-off?
7. Since 2005, due to extended drought conditions, rural areas such as ours have experienced devastating wildfires. The area being considered for this project is in a box canyon with only two-lane rural roads leading in and out. Could the Fire Board please explain the process by which we could all be safely evacuated in the case of a wildfire?
8. TRAFFIC STUDIES: 55 homes will permanently add a significant number of trips per day to Ora Avo and Buena Creek Rd. What is the current number of trips per day and the number of cars on Ora Avo? What would the impact of all construction vehicles be on the condition of the road? Have any complete traffic studies been done?
8. #12, Section G of the list of specific conditions to be met before a Final Map is approved, states that the developer must provide deeds showing access rights granted to the owner of this property, from the owners of all parcels through which Deeb Drive passes unless it is shown that such access was acquired prior to the transfer of the lots and remains in effect. According to a letter written by at least one of the owners of said properties, the developer of the proposed Country Estates has failed to grant himself access to the project in front of their property on Deeb Dr. Do you have the deeds showing that these access rights were granted? What happens if the developer cannot obtain easements from all owners of Deeb Dr. properties? Also, what happens if easements from all owners on Hardell Rd cannot be obtained? Were the people who granted access told the development would be 55 homes, or 14? Knowing the scope of the development maybe important in their decision to grant access.
9. Where are they going to run the sewer? What about easements that now need to be granted for sewer access? Were the people who granted access for sewer told the development would be 55 homes, or 14?
10. Have the noise, including construction noise - grading, blasting, equipment - issues been properly addressed?
11. What provisions have been made that align with current standards for wildlife habitat? Will there be off-site mitigation?
12. There is a Resolution of San Diego County for this Tentative Map approved by the Board of Supervisors dated February 2, 2005 detailing improvements to Ora Avo Drive and Buena Creek Road, offsite mitigations, etc. Do all these conditions still apply for the final map to be approved and recorded?

13. The Board of Supervisors used information from the project's traffic analysis that was based on the wrong street classification\width for Ora Avo Dr. Can the map extension, which relies on the amended information to the EIR, be found inadequate and require a new analysis?
14. The county is still reviewing the projects new Storm Water Plan for conformance to the new required standards. If the new storm water requirements cause a design change to the project, can the map extension still go to public hearing without showing the necessary design changes?
15. The original EIA traffic analysis indicated that the project had no significant impact because the threshold of significance would not be reached. That threshold is sited as 4500ADT. That ADT comes from the County's Design Manual for a public street having 40' street width, curb to curb, within a 60' right of way. However, that is not the street classification of Ora Avo Drive. The conditions of approval state that the existing width of Ora Avo is 21' curb to curb (C-C) and the project is required to improve it to 28' C-c. The cut off for acceptable ADTs on a residential street, per County Standards, 1500 ADT with a C-C width of 36'. It appears that the EIR threshold of significance used for impacts may have used the wrong street standard. Will the project have an added condition of approval to improve Ora Avo Drive to the 36' analyzed in the EIR that the project analysis was based or will there be a new finding of significance for the traffic volume?
16. What is the zoning for Buena Creek and the surrounding area? Is the Country Estates appropriate for the area? In 2011 the zoning was changed to 1 home per 20 acres, rural lands. Can this development be grandfathered in?
17. What are the grading plans? As the community see it, the existing plan is impossible. The width of the roads leading to the project are inadequate to support the increased traffic. The developer would have to widen the existing Deeb Dr and it would go directly into an existing home. The current road is at a 16% grade and line of sight is limited.
18. Since the development as it is proposed, with 55 homes will result in almost 40% increase in traffic in the form of Average Daily Trips along Ora Avo. Previous litigation brought against the project, one of the conditions of the 2005 permit is that intersectional sight distance along Deeb Dr from Palm Hill Dr shall be 200 feet to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. The existing slopes at the corner of this intersection must be excavated to provide the necessary sight distance. A significant amount of personal property would have to be removed to facilitate the increased traffic. Does the developer have deeds showing that he has been granted those properties? How does the developer propose to acquire this personal property if the owner is not willing to relinquish their rights to the property?
19. Much of the existing plan is on private roads. Page 9 of the Survey Report of Off-Site Access Roads states Deeb Drive was created as a private street serving one acre and larger lots. This is the only access road to the project site. The cluster of 55 homes on half an acre parcels does not meet that criteria. Will the developer be responsible to maintain the existing roads? Many areas are single lane and would not allow construction traffic to pass.

Action Item. Motion Farrell/ Peterson. Recommend that we ask the county to let this map expire and **not** to support any extensions because the applicant has had over ten years to act on the project, all the documents are now insufficient and the project is not in compliance with the general plan, new water quality standards, it lacks a meaningful mitigation to address traffic, as well as safety and egress in wildland fire situation. **Motion was passed 4-0-0**

2. **Action Item.** Resignation – Gil Jemmott, seat #5; Discussion. Mr. Jemmott has been very involved in the community for many years. The Sponsor Group would like to acknowledge his service with a plaque or similar gift.

Motion: Call his wife for appropriate gift to acknowledge his years of service. **Motion was passed 4-0-0**

GROUP BUSINESS

1. Meeting Updates: Next Meeting will be June 15th, 2016
2. Vacancy notice and a new applicant will be interviewed

Acting Chairwoman Binns adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Colleen Branin, Secretary