

# FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California

Meeting minutes of the regular meeting of the Foothill/Trabuco Specific Plan Review Board held March 8, 2023 at 7:00 P.M.

In attendance were Chairman Dale Weber, Vice-Chairman Jake Reed, Secretary Robert Borland, and members Richard Gomez and Mike McClanahan. Joining the meeting were members of the public.

## Item 1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Dale Weber

## Item 2) Approval of Minutes

**Motion by Gomez:** Approve minutes as presented

**Second by McClanahan**

No further discussion

**Vote:** 5-Ayes

## Item 3) Old Business

None

## Item 4)

**Item #1** Consideration of meeting dates for the 2023 Calendar Year

McClanahan made a motion to approve, Gomez seconded.

5-Ayes

**Item #2 PA22-0015** - A Site Development Permit the development of two new single-family residences on 20062 Summit Trail and 19942 Summit Trail. The proposal project is in the Trabuco Canyon Residential District.

Justin Kirk from the county planning department gave a presentation on the project. Bruce, the applicant, joined in and discussed aspects of the project.

### **Board Discussion:**

Borland reviewed the list of items that were left outstanding from the last meeting and Justin Kirk said that the only valid item was the rural nature of the architecture. All the other items on the list would be addressed later in the process with county staff and the planning commission.

# **FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California**

Weber asked about the cut and fill limits and why they were allowed to go over. Kirk stated that the updated grading limits were approved prior to coming to this board.

All members of the board expressed great disappointment in the way this project has been handled up to this point. As a board we are responsible for ensuring that each project adheres to the Foothill Trabuco Specific Plan, and yet our hands have been tied to a point where all we are allowed to review is the architectural nature of the building. This board reviews small projects like decks and small homeowner improvements and has the ability to agree or reject any portion of the project based on adherence to the Plan. Here we have this huge project, two giant homes with a ton of grading that has a significant, permanent impact to the canyon. Major impacts to the environment, wildlife, trees and native plants, and this is the only say we have as the representatives of the community that is being impacted by this profit focused project.

## **Public Comments:**

Ray – Stated that the applicant did a good job with their grading plan, but had concerns that it wasn't consistent with the Area plan. Recommended that the county take another look at the Area plan.

Gloria – Asked the applicant if they considered building smaller homes so it wasn't such a big impact to the area. Applicant said they hadn't considered it because they are in this to make a profit and a smaller home would mean less or no profit. Gloria asked the applicant why they don't go make a profit somewhere else.

## **Motion:**

Gomez made a motion to approve with conditions. As stated earlier this board under protest has had its hands tied. These are the boards recommendations of approval:

An updated wildlife corridor report be completed as wildlife patterns change over the years

An updated tree preservation plan be completed to ensure all oak trees are protected per the plan. Trees grow and develop over time. Applicant stated that on the previous part of the project they moved approximately 12 trees and 10 died. This should not be allowed again.

Ensure that all items in the "Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Orange County dated October 19, 1993" be strictly adhered too.

Understand this boards concerns about allowing excess grading without any documentation showing that this extra grading is improving the way the homes blend into the hillside

An updated review of native vegetation as this changes over time

Ensure the Area Plan and Site Plan grading is consistent with the approval by the appropriate legal institution.

# FOOTHILL/TRABUCO SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW BOARD Trabuco Canyon, California

**Vote:** 5 Ayes

**Public Comments:**

Gary Zager asked if this development matter has been before this body for the past 30 years.

**Item #3** Presentation by OC Public Works Traffic Division on Traffic Safety in the Canyon Communities.

Wei Zhu from OCPW/Traffic gave a presentation on how safe Live Oak has become over the last 5 years. She presented statistics showing that traffic and accidents have both decreased and shared all the improvements the county has completed since a traffic study was completed in 2009. She also shared some additional traffic calming measures that were possible such as roundabouts, median islands, and radar signs with blinking lights. Zhu had no real solutions to dissuade street racers from speeding up and down the canyon.

Members of the community shared stories of holding the hands of teenagers as they died inside and outside of cars in the residents front yard. Others shared stories of countless near misses on the road for themselves, their friends, family and children. The community is terrified that one day soon someone they love will be taken from them on Live Oak Canyon Road.

Borland re-shared the original proposal of placing speed humps on the road to keep it from being a race track. No residents objected to this idea, the only one who objected was Zhu saying speed humps are not county approved.

*Item 6) Public Comments*

None

*Item 7) Administrative Matters*

Election of officers:

Jake Reed made a motion to keep everyone in their current positions, Rich Gomez seconded

5-Ayes

Reed made a motion to adjourn, McClanahan seconds. Meeting adjourned at 8:51 PM