


NC42 and Study Area

Existing GP Designation(s)	RL20/OP
Requestor(s) Position: Support workplan designations	
Area (acres): 3,529.6 [2,018.2PSR; 1,511.4 study area]	
# of parcels: 255	


Workplan Designations Evaluated	RL20/SR4/SR2/SR0.5/VR20
CPG Position	Oppose
Opposition Expected	Yes
# of Additional Dwelling Units	1,162
Complexity	Very High

Discussion: This is the site of the former Merriam Mountains project. The requestor is seeking general plan designations that maximize development yield on the property while remaining consistent with the General Plan Guiding Principles. Because a specific development is not being considered at this time, land use designations were applied considering the general constraints of the property and proximity to the planned employment core at the Deer Springs Road/Interstate 15 interchange. The workplan considers designations that would yield approximately 1,100 dwelling units on the project site. Multifamily (Village Residential 20) is applied instead of Office Professional in the southeastern corner of the site. The remainder of the property is given SR0.5, SR2 or RL20 designations. (continued on next page)

Existing General Plan Designations:



Workplan Designations Evaluated:



Discussion (continued):


RL20 is assigned to the more remote and sensitive northern portion of the site. Semi Rural designations are applied to the more developable southern portion of the site with SR0.5 on the flatter areas and SR2 surrounding those areas to reflect the steep slopes and provide a transition into the surrounding community. These increases in development potential on this property also required consideration of the designations on the properties in the surrounding community. It would not be appropriate to increase development substantially on the site while significantly restricting development on the surrounding properties. Therefore, the properties within the off-site study area are recommended for SR2 or SR4 depending on size of other parcels in that area. As a result, the total dwelling unit yield would increase by approximately 1,162 units as a result of this change, 1,100 within the PSR and 62 within the study area.

Rationale for Very High Complexity Classification:

- The workplan outlines an extensive community remapping that will have a major impact on the Twin Oaks Community and neighboring communities. The effects of adding over 1,000 dwelling units on land that is currently undisturbed rural land will require extensive study to determine the impact on the community, resources, and the environment and to address consistency with Policy LU-2.3 assigning densities in a manner that is compatible with the character of the community.
- The proposal would shift the focus of the Twin Oaks community from its center to its edge along I-15. At a minimum it would be necessary to review the proposed change to address consistency with the Community Development Model, Policy LU-1.1, and Guiding Principle 2. The Community Development Model supports decreased densities as the distance increases from the village core to promote compact development and preserve distinct boundaries between communities.
- The study area affects over 250 property owners. A change affecting such a large number of people increases the complexity involved in notifying owners of the proposed changes, seeking their input, and addressing their concerns. Given the large amount of community opposition to this project, additional issues will be brought up over the life of the approval process.
- The adjacent study area constitutes primarily agricultural lands. Further analysis would be required to determine the effect of a density increase on efforts to preserve important agricultural areas of the county such as this one.
- Portions of the requestor's property contain High and Very High Value Habitat and would require additional environmental analysis to ascertain the impact of development on such sensitive habitat.
- Review of the mapping principles regarding prohibiting "leapfrog" development as outlined in Policy LU-1.2 and consistency with Policy LU-1.4 involving establishing new Village Regional Category designations outside of an existing or planned Village will be required.

For Additional Information (January 9, 2012 Staff Reports): [NC37](#), [NC42](#)

Property Constraints



Dear Mr Gibson:

I find it hard to believe that I should have to write you this letter. You are responsible for fair and reasonable development in San Diego County and, I was led to believe it was your responsibility to follow the general plan. Since a new, long thought over plan is now in effect it should take something incredible to do more than make minor changes to it.

MERRIAM MOUNTAINS was considered in the new plan and the thoughtful decision was that this rural area could support the development of in the neighborhood of 75 houses. I know Bill Horn would develop anything without exception but I really find it sad that he has so much power over your department that you will go against all reason.

I won't go into all of the problems a big development would cause but I do beg you to get the strength to stand up to Bill Horn and the developers and tell them that we have a master land use plan and we are going to use it.

Sincerely,



Steven Muck

9528 Sage Hill Way
Escondido, CA 92026

RECEIVED
MAR 22 2012

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
AND LAND USE

PROJECT NAME: General Plan Update- property specific requests- NC42 **Case Number:** Agenda Item #8

Results of Planning / Sponsor Group Review:

Planning / Sponsor Group: Twin Oaks Community Sponsor Group

Meeting date: January 10, 2011

A. Comments made by the group on the proposed project.

Property Owner request to change land use designation from SR20 to VR30. Karen Binns recused herself and joined the public. Jemmott noted that the County did not provide the Sponsor Group with the level of information it had supplied with the other five requests. Group members were generally unhappy with the need to action so suddenly without adequate review or discussion, especially since the GP update had been going on for many years. Without the same level of information supplied on this request as supplied on the others it was hard to adequately debate the merits on Staff recommended land use verses the property owner request. (continued below)

B. **Advisory Vote:** The Group did or did not make a formal recommendation, approval or denial of property owner request for change.

If a formal recommendation was made, please check the appropriate box below:

MOTION:

- Approve without conditions
- Approve with recommended conditions
- Deny property owner request
- Continue

VOTE: 4 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain

Karen Binns recused herself and did not

C. Recommended conditions of approval:

Given the lack of information, Farrell moved to support, at a maximum or not to exceed, the density that the property would yield that would be possible under the existing General Plan [with RPO in place]. Jemmott said that since the Sponsor Group had always opposed clustering, he would support that motion but only if "no clustering" was added to the motion. Farrell accepted the change although personally she supported clustering if it meant preserving more open space. Kumura seconded the motion. Motion passed. 4-0-0

Reported by: Gil Jemmott Position Vice Chair Date 1-20-2011

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.sdcounty.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.sdcounty.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.