

Draft Responses to Comment Letter R

Individual
 David A. Howe
 March 13, 2013

	Comment	Response to Comment
<p>R -1</p>	<p>This is in response to the County staff’s request for comment on the recently released environmental review of the Alpine area, formerly FCI lands.</p> <p>I have skimmed the huge document that includes environmental findings concerning land formerly under that designation, but I see no direct reference to the request made by my neighbors and me for a reclassification from RL-40 to RL-20. My 475 acres fronts on Japatul Valley Road from both sides of the roadway. My north line touches land already developed in 8 acre minimums – Larry Road and the Japatul Valley Estates. The western most side of my property, on the west side of Japatul Valley Road, is also immediately adjacent to small lot development.</p>	<p>This comment establishes support for a Rural Lands 20 designation on property along Japatul Valley Road. The Alpine Community Planning Group (CPG) also voted for RL-20 in this area. As such, the Rural Lands 20 (RL-20) designation is consistent with the Draft Plan / SEIR Proposed Project.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that County staff will be recommending to the Planning Commission a lower density designation of Rural Lands 40 (RL-40) for the Japatul Valley area. For reference, this Area of Consideration is referred to as “AL-8” in the staff report and has been highlighted as an area for discussion during the upcoming public hearing process.</p> <p>The County staff working group that formulated the staff recommendation for AL-8 found that the RL-40 designation was more appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The subject area is virtually surrounded by National Forest lands. b. Many of the parcels in this area are only accessible by dead-end roads that exceed County Fire Code standards. c. Additional development would require construction of new roads through steep terrain (slopes greater than 25%) to existing roads approximately 1.6 miles apart.

Draft Responses to Comments

	Comment	Response to Comment
		<p>d. Further improvement of infrastructure in the subject area, including utilities and road access, would have an adverse impact on wilderness values and would increase the need for fuel management for fire safety.</p> <p>e. The RL-40 density is consistent with how the General Plan land use map applies the RL-40 designation in remote areas with large parcelization outside the County Water Authority boundary.</p> <p>While County staff will be recommending the lower density of one dwelling unit per 40 acres, the final determination will ultimately be made by the County Board of Supervisors.</p>
R -2	<p>The Japatul Valley is a fertile area with plenty of water. The designation change from 40- to 20-acre minimums in our area is not injurious to the environment, and will provide more roads to aid circulation. I own and operate a horse ranch, and wish to preserve large areas of my land for that pursuit. The change to 20-acre minimums will enable me at some time to cluster homes near the neighboring small lot development, and protect my open spaces.</p>	<p>This comment appears to confuse minimum lot size and density. The commenter’s property currently has an eight-acre minimum lot size that would already allow for homes to be clustered near the neighboring small lot development to protect open spaces. The commenter supports RL-20 over the RL-40 density. The RL-20 density would allow for one of the commenter’s parcels, consisting of 355 acres, to be subdivided into 17 lots. By comparison, the RL-40 designation would limit future subdivision to eight lots. However, as discussed above, either density will allow for the clustering of lots sizes as small as eight acres. The primary difference between the two designations is that RL-20 will allow for more subdivision potential.</p>
R-3	<p>Giving property owners control over their destiny and fighting against rural “blight” caused by the inability to create usable parcels, is something I believe that your Board and the County of San Diego consider important. Please show that by granting my neighbors and me the right to a RL-20 land use classification.</p>	<p>The County does not agree that a RL-40 density would lead to rural “blight”. As discussed in response to comment R-2 above, either a RL-20 or RL-40 designation would allow for clustering with eight-acre lots. See response to comment R-1 above regarding the reasons for the staff recommendation of RL-40.</p>