

## Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group

Covering the area bordered by Escondido, 1-15, Valley Center, & Circle R  
Meeting location: The Hidden Meadows Community Center, 10141 Meadow Glen Way, East  
**24 August 2006**, at:7:00 p.m.

### FINAL MINUTES

- 1) **CALL TO ORDER:** Robert Frey, Chair 7:00 PM
- 2) **ROLL CALL:** Quorum established: Alter, Brey, Cook, Coultas, Cox, Frey, Matlock and Sealey
- 3) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**
- 4) **MINUTES**
  - a) Minutes of [27July 2006](#) approved unanimously
- 5) **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS/CORRESPONDENCE:**
- 6) **PUBLIC REVIEW / ACTION ITEMS:**
  - a) TM5313RPL1, Welk Resort, Canyon Villas – Cook and Matlock  
Cox moved that we deny the project based on density, traffic circulation and building height and ask for a 60 day extension to review. Approved 7 for 1 against, with Alter the dissenting vote  
Frey said he would draft a presentation letter for the county denoting our objections.  
See attached detailed exhibit *COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CANYON VILLAS PROJECT APPLICATION*.
- 7) **INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS:**
  - a) [GP2020 Road Network Planning](#) – Frey  
Frey reported that he had testified before the DPLU and had received their agreement that the Sponsor Group recommendations will be followed.  
See attached exhibit copy of DPLU presentation: *Response to the Board of Supervisors from the Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group of the GP2020 Planning Report on Proposed Changes to the Circulation Element Network and Framework*
  - b) Frey said we should develop a project for park formation. Frey asked Tom Francl and Jim Larsh to be the lead to develop a plan of park needs; and have a public meeting in September for public input
- 8) **OPEN FORUM:** No speakers.
- 9) **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:00 P.M.
- 10) Next regular meeting: **28 September 2006** - 7:00 p.m, The Hidden Meadows Community Center, 10141 Meadow Glen Way East

# HIDDEN MEADOWS SPONSOR GROUP

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CANYON VILLAS PROJECT APPLICATION TM 5313rpl1- received 6-30-06

8/24/06

### 1. Zoning Designators and Requested Changes

Use Regulations – S87 to C42

S87 = Special purpose, ltd. control

C42 = Visitor serving commercial

Neighborhood regulations/animal - W to R

Density - .4 units/acre to 4.3 units/acre

Building Type – C to T

C = residential – single attached one du/lot

T = Triplex three unit multiple

Attached 3-8 du/lot

Multi-dwelling same lot

Height – G to Q

Designator G (maximum height –35 feet permitting a maximum of 2 stories) to a Designator Q (maximum height – 60 feet permitting *any* number of stories, provided all building code requirements and floor-area ratio limitations are met).

Set Back – D to Q

D = front 60', side 15/35', rear 25'

Q = front 50', side 0/35', rear 25'

No Open Space Proposed

## 2. Discussion and Recommendations

Apply for a 30-day extension for public review of the project.

Deleted: 6

Based upon the completed and newly approved Welk condominium projects, as well as the existing community character, the Sponsor Group should not agree to the height zoning or set back change requests. The maximum height noted on the plans is estimated to be 75+ feet from the ground level (including terrain built-up to cover garages). To our knowledge, there are no high-rise structures in the sponsor group area.

Environmental Issues that need to be addressed:

- a. Traffic and Circulation – The proposed project will have a maximum of 240 units with 8 ADT's per unit (according to the Garden Villas EIR). This relates to 1,920 ADT's per day, without the cumulative effects of Garden Villas, Rimrock, and the new Welk sales office on Welk View Drive.  
Traffic control signals should be added at Champagne Blvd at Welk View Drive.
- b. Safety – Pedestrian safety along Welk View Drive is not addressed in the project. Potentially, 720 people could be walking along the streets that will be traveled by surrounding project traffic and pedestrians with a cumulative ADT impact.
- c. Biological resources – The project may be encroaching on wetlands to the West, which may contain endangered species. The Mission Resource Conservation Group should be advised. Seven (7) large Coastal Live Oaks are slated to be removed from the site and presumably destroyed –
  - 2 ea. – 48" diameter
  - 2 ea. – 36" diameter
  - 1 ea. – 30" diameter
  - 1 ea. – 18" diameter
  - 1 ea. – 8" diameter

This will significantly impact the visual screening of the project, as well as change the rural character of the site.

In previous neighborhood meetings, it was stated that these oaks would be saved and relocated on or near the project site.

- d. Visual Aesthetics and Grading – This project consists of three buildings totaling 397,000 square feet. The largest building has a height estimated at 70+ feet and a length estimated of 345 feet. The second and third buildings have height estimates of 75+ feet and length estimates of 270 feet. The structural features of the buildings are “open roof” rather than full gable and indicate that the mechanicals (Cooling and Heating units) will be positioned on the rooftops.  
Proposed grading on the North and Northeast corner of the project exceeds 40 feet in height.
- e. Noise – With the maximum number of units set at 240 with the heating and cooling units mounted on the rooftops, the constant noise level may reach a threshold of significance when compared to the current rural norm.
- f. Light pollution – The Palomar Mountain lighting ordinance should be strictly enforced to minimize the impact of these 240 units on surrounding communities at night.

**Response to the Board of Supervisors from the Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group of the GP2020 Planning Report on Proposed Changes to the Circulation Element Network and Framework**

(see page C-38 and the attached map for reference)

2 August 2006

My name is Robert Frey, 9885 North View Court, Escondido, and I chair the Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group.

On behalf of the my sponsor group, I speak in opposition to the DPLU staff recommendations for the construction of the two connectors from Valley Center to Mountain Meadow Road. Our opposition is based on three issues:

1. The two connectors result in a LOS of F for Mountain Meadow Road which would be severely compounded by the certain stacking of cars at the intersection at the I-15. This intersection may soon have as many as six stoplights with about one-quarter mile and this congestion will cause the stacking on a road with a posted 50 mph speed limit and limited visibility due to curves. These conditions would result in a very dangerous situation.
2. The increased noise and pollution will adversely affect the homes along Hidden Meadows and Mountain Meadow Roads.
3. Mountain Meadow Road is the only major emergency evacuation route from Hidden Meadows with its over 1700 homes and several thousand residents. In this very fire-prone community, the ability to evacuate quickly is critical to saving lives and with a dramatically increased volume of traffic from Valley Center our safety is at risk. The Paradise Mountain fire of three years ago and the fire off Old Castle Road just three weeks ago remind us of the need for rapid evacuation.

We understand the challenge facing DPLU to accommodate the traffic pressure in Valley Center. We do not feel that any changes in the amount of General Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial, and Office Professional in the “gateway” to Hidden Meadows at the intersection of Mountain Meadow Road and Centre City/Champagne Boulevard as proposed by DPLU would have any moderating effect on the traffic problem anticipated by this proposal since the volume of traffic will come from Valley Center and not be generated by these small parcels of land. We, however, do have three suggestions:

**1. Eliminate the Betsworth Road connection.**

- Preliminary traffic modeling demonstrated Mountain Meadow Road would operate at a level of service A-C with a single, two-lane road to Valley Center. Cost estimates suggest Betsworth would cost \$40 million dollars to build AND it would operate at a LOF of F! It also would funnel unnecessary traffic into Hidden Meadows creating an LOS of F on Mountain Meadow Road.
- The Betsworth connection produces only slight improvements to the Valley Center level of service results.

**2. Maintain the Mirar de Valle connection as two-lanes to accommodate Valley Center's needs.**

- A single two-lane road enhances connectivity and provides alternative access for Valley Center residents without unduly impacting the residents of Hidden Meadows.
- Valley Center Road will still have excess capacity of approximately 9,000 ADTs with a single, two-lane road connection.

**3. Recommend to CALTRANS a new I-15 interchange either north or south of Mountain Meadow Road/Deer Springs Road.**

- Direct staff to implement a “phasing concept” in the Community Plan portion of the General Plan. Request that improvements to the Mountain Meadow Road / I-15 interchange be identified and constructed prior to building the Mirar de Valle Road Connection.

We request DPLU staff be directed to work with the Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group in an assessment of these suggestions and report back to the Board of Supervisors within 60 days.

In conclusion, the proposed solution from DPLU staff doesn't solve the problem for Valley Center; it only moves it to Hidden Meadows.