

Draft Responses to Comment Letter S

Individual
 Gerald W. Fisher
 March 11, 2013

	Comment	Response to Comment
S -1	<p>Downzoning Objection of: 23550 State Hwy, 76 Santa Ysabel, Ca 92070 APN Nos: 136-210-01-00 and 135-320-02-00 Palomar Mountain Owner: Fisher Family Trust</p> <p>Honorable Supervisors, Thank you for your work in representing the taxpayers of San Diego County.</p>	<p>This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required.</p>
S -2	<p>Our family’s property, not uncommon in a sea of data, apparently got caught in the “one shoe fits all” category. Our request is to leave our very unique property zoned the way it was and the way it was relied upon to be. It was purchased in the early 60’s, 1 DU/8 acres,</p>	<p>The comment letter identifies two parcels in the Fisher Family Trust: Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 135-320-02-00 is 8.53 acres and is not part of the FCI Lands GPA. APN 136-210-01-00 is 78.95 acres and straddles the boundary between the North Mountain and Pala/Pauma Subregional areas. Only the North Mountain side, approximately 13.5 acres, of this parcel is located within former FCI lands. Therefore, only 13.5 acres of the subject property is part of the FCI Lands GPA project.</p> <p>The County does not agree that the original density of one dwelling unit per eight acres (1du/8ac) should be applied to the property. Staff’s recommendation for the 13.5 acre portion of the subject property is Rural Lands 40 (RL-40), or one dwelling unit per 40 acres. Staff is recommending this designation because it is consistent with the remainder of the</p>

Draft Reponses to Comments

	Comment	Response to Comment
		property and with adjacent properties. A semi-rural designation (one dwelling unit per eight acres) would result in a spot zone that would not be consistent with the General Plan Guiding Principles, particularly the Community Development Model referenced in Guiding Principle #2.
S -3	and, to grandfather the two major use permits granted by the County of San Diego.	The RL-40 designation would not change the Limited Agriculture (A70) zoning for the property. Since the zoning is not proposed to change, the FCI Lands GPA will not have any impact on the two major use permits previously granted for the subject property. Major use permits are based on the zoning of the property rather than on the General Plan land use designation.
S -4	<p>Your attention is brought to the following to recognize these easily over-looked mis-descriptions:</p> <p>#1) [Policies –Water Goal, Palomar Mtn.]: “...rely solely on local wells for water supply.” “...to protect ... insure ... extraction does not exceed...recharges.”</p> <p>[Actual] (a) Spring water is the sole source of water on and to subject property –no extraction since ownership. (b) Available spring water exceeds 0.5 Acre Feet/year/family unit water usage by 60 times. (c) Use permit provides current septic for 100+ people.</p>	The County acknowledges that the groundwater resources available on the subject property exceed the requirements of existing and planned uses.
S -5	<p>#2) [MSCP –The Forest Area Safety Taskforce (FAST) – Criteria] “These projects have been scored and ranked relative to the other projects that remain in San Diego County.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Population 2. Escape Route 3. Safe Zones 4. Fuel/Vegetation 5. Infrastructure 6. Risk of ignition 	It is unclear what this comment means and, therefore, no response is provided.

Draft Responses to Comments

	Comment	Response to Comment
	<p>7. Ecological Sensitivity Project Area Scores: Palomar Mtn <u>19</u>. Specific segments: Birch Hill <u>20</u>, Birch Hill (N) <u>19</u>, Bailey <u>18</u>, Conifer Rd. <u>17</u>, Mendenhall <u>15</u>, Lower Bailey <u>15</u>, French Valley <u>15</u>, East Grade <u>14</u>, South Grade <u>12</u>.</p> <p>[Actual] The above segments are on top of Palomar Mtn. The high point is 6, 138 ft. elevation; Birch Hill is 5700 ft. Subject property is 2500 ft.</p> <p>Not only weather and terrain, but all 7 criteria above used for scoring, including two entrances on a State Highway, fire, school, services, employment, clearly put subject property in a different scoring situation.</p>	
<p>S -6</p>	<p>Considering the near ‘freeway’ use at Hwy. 76’s west end, with shopping centers and housing tracts mid-way, college and subdivision coming at U.S. 15, and some major features such as airport, golf and lodging at the east end, it is clearly not rural in the sense that a State Park, National Forest, the Observatory, and snow are as destination points on the top of Palomar.</p>	<p>This comment suggests that the subject property should not be considered rural. The County disagrees with this comment. The subject parcel is located approximately 26 miles from Interstate 15 and the described urban/village uses. The nearest semi-rural uses to the subject property are eight miles away in Valley Center, with undeveloped lands and steep terrain in between.</p>
<p>S -7</p>	<p>[Conclusion]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Palomar Mountain Planning Organization (PMPO) supports this request. 	<p>After review of the draft minutes for the Feb 4 2012 meeting of the Palomar Mountain Planning Organization (PMPO), the County disagrees with this comment. The minutes do not include any recommendations on this property.</p>
<p>S -8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The refinement of one of the major use permits will bring improvement, such as: no more 6,000 gal. water trucks on the mountain or State Highway 76; employment; enhanced fire protection (currently 3 fire hydrants). 	<p>The FCI Lands GPA project will not affect existing major use permits on the property (see also response to comment S-3 above).</p>
<p>S -9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This request is in keeping with the Scenic Highway designation, current policies and guidelines of 2020, 	<p>The County does not agree with this comment, which lacks sufficient support for the requested density of 1du/8ac. The</p>

Draft Responses to Comments

	Comment	Response to Comment
	MSCP, and keeping our Creator's flora and fauna happy.	requested semi-rural designation would result in a spot zone and conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan (see also responses to comments S-2 and S-6 above).