

BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



Segments Impacts

- The project would have a significant cumulative impact to each of the segments of the I-15 listed below.
- Between Riverside County Boundary and Old Highway 395;
- Between Old Highway 395 and SR-76;
- Between SR-76 and Old Highway;
- Between Old Highway 395 and Gopher Canyon Road;
- Between Gopher Canyon Road and Deer Springs Road;
- Between Deer Springs Road and Centre City Parkway;
- Between Centre City Parkway and El Norte Parkway; and
- Between El Norte Parkway and SR-78.
- The LHR project proposes doing nothing whatsoever to mitigate its I-15 traffic impacts.

Planning for Compatibility:

- "Plan and site infrastructure for public utilities and public facilities in a manner compatible with community character, minimize visual and environmental impacts, and whenever feasible, locate any facilities and supporting infrastructure outside preserve areas. Require context sensitive Mobility Element road design that is compatible with community character and minimizes visual and environmental impacts; for Mobility Element roads identified in Table M-4, and LOS D or better may not be achieved." Please refer to comments on LU-12.2 Maintenance of Adequate Services – Converting Rural Circulation Element 2.2 E to traffic signal controlled Urban Gridlock Environments is not compatible with General Plan Land Use design for the Adjacent Areas.

General Plan Goals and Policies NOT discussed or analyzed in the DEIR include:

LAND USE ELEMENT

LU-1.4 Village Expansion: *"Permit new Village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with an existing or planned Village and where all the following criteria are met: Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents, and the expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area"*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: If there was an existing or planned Village in western valley Center, Accretive could try to use this provision, instead of being prohibited by the Leapfrog Development provisions of LU-1.2. However, the only "existing or planned Village" in Valley Center is the Village in the central valley where north and south nodes are separated by a dramatic escarpment and Moosa and Keyes Creeks. This area has existed as a "Village", has been planned for expansion for more than 50 years and was designated a SANDAG Smart Growth Opportunity area with the recent update of the County General Plan. The area is sewerred and has received a large grant from the state of California to expand wastewater facilities. Valley Center Road which traverses this area and connects to Escondido and Pauma Valley was improved to Major Road standards only a few years ago in anticipation of expanded development here. The Valley Center Community Planning Group has increased residential densities in this area so that about 25% of the community's growth can be accommodated in the "vibrant, compact Villages" the community has envisioned.

C2b-255 cont.

C2b-256



Page 47 - 56
<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/Groups/Bonsall.html>



C2b-255 (cont.)

Significant Cumulative Impacts: The comment lists the segments and intersections identified in the Draft EIR (July 2013) at which the project would result in a significant cumulative impact. The recommended mitigation was payment of the County of San Diego's Transportation Impact Fee (TIF), which the comment contends was inadequate to mitigate the identified impacts. However, since the proposed project is seeking an amendment to the County of San Diego's General Plan, the County will be required to update the TIF Program. Through this process, the program fee calculations contained in the TIF program's nexus study will be updated to account for the General Plan land use and roadway network changes proposed by the project. With this required update, the TIF program will then accurately account for the proposed project land uses and identified cumulative transportation-related impacts; hence, the project's cumulative transportation-related impacts would be adequately accounted for and funded by the County of San Diego TIF program.

The comment refers to identified significant cumulative impacts at segments of Interstate 15. As these facilities are under the jurisdiction and control of Caltrans, the County General Plan policies do not apply in this instance. As to the comment that the project proposes to do nothing to mitigate the impacts, please see Global Response: Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to I-15.

Planning For Compatibility: The project is consistent with Policy LU-12.4. The project includes design guidelines to ensure compatibility with the character of a rural Village. Stand-alone facilities are located outside of dedicated open space and are separated from residential areas. Old West Lilac Road will be retained in its current location and is not used for access by individual homes within the project. Designed as a Village Entry Street, new Main Street within the project includes a travel way, bike lane, and parking. Pedestrian walkways are included in the private area adjacent to buildings.

C2b-256 See response to comment C1e-76.

BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



This provision is a clear companion to and exemplifies the GP support for intensifying development in existing Village areas and its thrust against leapfrog development -- by emphasizing only expansion of an existing Village. The Project also fails to meet the criteria: Its construction would clearly reduce services to all Valley Center residents outside the development by taking away from the economic viability of the existing two Villages, as well as blocking emergency evacuation ability for current residents. As previously pointed out, its urban pattern is totally out of "character and scale" with Valley Center's vision. Nor does a third Village provide "contiguous growth of a Village area." A new Regional Category Village is prohibited in the area of the Proposed Project. This provision would have to be amended to allow this Project, and the DEIR would have to analyze the environmental effects countywide of such an amendment.

C2b-256 cont.

LU-2.3 Development Densities and Lot Sizes: *"Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community."*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: This is another demonstration of the interwoven fabric of the GP. Densities and lot sizes reflect community character. Valley Center's community character (once you drop Acreitive's fiction that there is no existing community) is primarily rural, exemplifying the Community Development Model at the heart of the GP. Urban densities and lot sizes proposed by this Project are inconsistent with the Semi-Rural land use designations established by the GP and CP for this area.

C2b-257

C2b-257 See response to comment C1e-77.

LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character: *"Ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles."*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: This is yet another demonstration of the interwoven fabric of the GP. Requiring projects to comply with the applicable Community Plan is the most effective way to meet the GP Goal LU-2, to maintain the county's rural character. Valley Center's community character (once you drop Acreitive's fiction that there is no existing community) is primarily rural, exemplifying the Community Development Model at the heart of the GP. This Project is inconsistent with the Semi-Rural land use designations established by the GP and CP for this area, as well as all the Guiding Principles, as previously pointed out.

C2b-258

C2b-258 See response to comment C1e-78.

LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation: *"Ensure the preservation of existing open space and rural areas (e.g., forested areas, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, and groundwater recharge areas) when permitting development under the Rural and Semi-Rural Land Use Designations."*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: If this Project proposed development consistent with its existing Land Use Designations, it would still be required by this provision to "preserve," not destroy. The proposed project destroys even more open space, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and corridors, and watersheds than it would be allowed with consistent development, by its urbanized design, density, and size, as previously pointed out. Urban densities and lot sizes proposed by this Project are inconsistent with the Semi-Rural land use designations established by the GP and CP for this area.

C2b-259

C2b-259 See response to comment C1e-79.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



LU-6.1 - Environmental Sustainability: *“Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.”*

Comment- INCONSISTENT

There have been thirteen (13) Group 1 animal ‘species of concern’ observed on the Accretive project site. They include lizards, snakes, raptors, small mammals, large mammals and passerine birds. Most of the wildlife surveys conducted focused on the proposed open space areas, brushing over the considerable land area devoted to agriculture as being disturbed. Of the 608-acres on the Project site, 504-acres will be graded, cut and filled, for the construction of the Project.

The DEIR acknowledges the significant impact to these 13 species [and presumably to other species numerous enough not to be of concern], and particularly the raptors [white-tailed kite, Cooper’s hawk, turkey vulture] and the loss of 504-acres of foraging area [including agricultural areas]. The DEIR dismisses this loss with 81.7-acres of on- and off-site mitigation area [presumably already populated by members of these species with whom the Project’s individuals will compete], a substantial differential from the complete 608-acres. Many of the individuals of the 13 species will be killed during construction operations, particularly the smaller, less mobile animals. Others will be forced into new territory. Of the larger animals, they will be forced to compete with others of their species in substantially less area.

So, the Project is not protecting sensitive natural resources except those that it is prohibited from completely destroying [largely, riparian wetlands]. Such practices of building urban density projects in rural and even agricultural areas will ultimately decimate the natural environment.

LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design: *“Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and when appropriate, provide public amenities. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]”*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: The Accretive Project instead proposes the minimum required open space, eliminates existing and imperils adjacent agricultural operations, and substantially worsens fire safety and defensibility, as shown by the Deer Springs Fire District comments. Instead of reducing impervious footprints, it proposes 1746 residential units etc., covering 504 of its 608 acres. Trumpeing “sustainable” development practices, it completely ignores the fundamental requirements of LEED ND to have a Smart Location and preserve Agriculture. The public amenities necessary to support their proposed city in the county, parks, schools, sewers, are all couched in “conceptual” terms, with built-in defaults to convert acres to still more additional residences. If, for example, the school or park sites (proposed without school and park amenities) are not accepted, the SP provides for their easy conversion to residential uses. This provision would have to be amended to allow this Project, and the DEIR would have to analyze the environmental effects countywide of such an amendment.

LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features Into Project Design: *“Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.”*

Comment: This requirement is again honored only in its violation by this Project. Over four million cubic yards of grading to destroy natural features and create “manufactured” hills suitable only for urbanized residential construction. This provision would require amendment to approve this project. The DEIR would have to analyze the environmental effects countywide of such an amendment.

C2b-260

C2b-260 See response to comment C1e-80

C2b-261

C2b-261 See response to comment C1e-81

C2b-262

C2b-262 See response to comment C1e-82.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into Project Design: *“Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.”*

Comment-INCONSISTENT

With the exception of the riparian woodlands/wetlands that must be set aside, the 4 million cubic yards of blasting and grading will obliterate any other natural features of the Project site. Once completed, the Project will resemble any urban center in the county, with little of the natural landscape remaining. Native vegetation habitats will be destroyed and mitigated off-site. Animal populations will be destroyed or shoved to the remaining riparian set-asides or off-site. Avoidance of sensitive environmental resources is minimal; destruction of this area’s natural features and mitigation elsewhere are the preferred approaches for this project, obviously inconsistent with Valley Center’s objectives.

C2b-262 cont.

LU-6.7 Open Space Network: *“Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.”*

Comment-INCONSISTENT

This Project has reserved minimal open space along wetlands and riparian areas that are particularly protected by federal, state, and county laws. The continuity of the open space will be broken by multiple road crossings with culverts mostly inadequately sized for safe wildlife passage. Intensity urban development will dominate the presently rural agricultural and natural vistas with rows of dense urban rooftops. The open spaces being set aside are not coordinated with the draft MSCP/PAMA and will not connect with any similar open space uses off-site. While the Project is within the draft MSCP boundary, it is not part of a PAMA.

C2b-263

C2b-263 See response to comment C1e-83.

LU-6.9 Development of Conformance with Topography: *“Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent possible.”*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: Could the writers of the GP and the Board of Supervisors with their approval not make more clear that the destruction of the land proposed by this Project’s over four million cubic yards of grading to destroy natural features is prohibited? The Project glorifies, not limits grading. The Project proposes to obliterate, not “not significantly alter,” the dominant physical characteristics of the site. This provision would require amendment to approve this project. The DEIR would have to analyze the environmental effects countywide of such an amendment.

C2b-264

C2b-264 See response to comment C1e-84.

LU-9.6 Town Center Uses: *“Locate commercial, office, civic, and higher-density residential land uses in the Town Centers of Village or Rural Villages at transportation nodes....”*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: As previously pointed out in the comments on the Project’s total failure to meet the LEED ND Smart Location Requirement, it is not designed as a Transit Corridor or Route with Adequate Transit Service. It is not a “transportation node.” This provision would require amendment to approve this project. The DEIR would have to analyze the environmental effects countywide of such an amendment.

C2b-265

C2b-265 See response to comment C1e-85



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



LU-09.11 Integration of Natural Features into Villages: *“Require the protection and integration of natural features, such as unique topography or streambeds, into Village projects.”*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: This provision was included in the GP because Valley Center required the developers of the north Village to do exactly that, making the streambed there an open space centerpiece of their design in their cooperative plans for their adjacent projects. Accretive instead proposes to obliterate the natural topography for their entire site, grading over four million cubic yards of genuinely natural features into manufactured hills. This policy would require amendment to approve this project. The DEIR would have to analyze the environmental countywide effects of such an amendment.

C2b-266

C2b-266 See response to comment C1e-86.

LU-10.2 Development- Environmental Resource Relationship: *“ Require development in Semi-Rural and Rural areas to respect and conserve the unique natural features and rural character, and avoid sensitive or intact environmental resources and hazard areas.”*

Comment- INCONSISTENT: This Project does not respect nor significantly conserve the unique natural flora and fauna of the site, nor does it conserve the rural character of the site. This Project will destroy a mosaic of natural vegetation habitats that are interspersed among agricultural uses. The current mix of natural habitats, orchards and row crops provides distinctive opportunities for a variety of faunal species [several of them sensitive], benefits the local hydrology by restraining and filtering run-off, and presents a pastoral view-shed that is historically characteristic of north San Diego County. The Project will create severe hydrology issues with the addition of hundreds of acres of impermeable road and rooftop surfaces that will cause excessive run-off. Run-off that would otherwise enter the water table and help to stabilize levels vital to the riparian habitats down-slope, will be impounded and/or dispersed on the surface. The Project will be composed of dense urban village configurations that are completely at odds with rural and semi-rural areas and the natural habitats and populations they support.

C2b-267

C2b-267 See response to comment C1e-87.

MOBILITY ELEMENT

M-12.9 Environmental and Agricultural Resources: *“Site and design specific trail segments to minimize impacts to sensitive environmental resources, ecological system and wildlife linkages and corridors and agricultural lands. Within the MSCP preserves, conform siting and use of trails to County MSCP Plans and MSCP resource management plans.”*

COMMENT-INCONSISTENT
Presently, the trails proposed for the Project will intrude into the buffer and LBZ areas along side the designated biological open spaces as well as the open spaces themselves. The fences proposed to separate and protect segments of the open spaces from the edge effects created by the Project [human intrusions, domesticated cats and dogs, invasive plant species, etc.] will also create barriers to the movement of wildlife. Instead of treating these biological open spaces as retreats and corridors for the movement of wildlife, the trails proposed would turn them into parks for humans and their pets. This will have an adverse effect on the value of these open spaces for wildlife.

C2b-268

C2b-268 See response to comment C1e-88.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

GOAL COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment: *“Sustainable ecosystems with long-term viability to maintain natural processes, sensitive lands, and sensitive as well as common species, coupled with sustainable growth and development.”*

COMMENT-INCONSISTENT:

The Project will eliminate 504-acres of mixed native and agricultural lands that provide foraging area for numerous animal species identified in the biological resources report. This represents an incremental loss of habitat and ultimately a loss of local wildlife populations within the county and the Project site. The removal of the project site from the inventory of rural lands to create an urban village will constitute an irreversible loss and opposes the intent of sustainable development. It will likely result in growth inducing pressure on surrounding properties as the rural and natural characteristics of the land disappear.

C2b-269

C2b-269 See response to comment C1e-89.

COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement: *“Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important Natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Lands regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate.”*

COMMENT-INCONSISTENT:

This Project proposes to set a devastating precedent for the intrusion of urban development into rural lands. While the Project site is within the MSCP boundary, it is not a part of a PAMA. The site is presently designated for estate housing and agricultural uses but would be modified to allow urban village densities, which would diminish rural and natural lands within the MSCP area and likely induce similar densities on surrounding properties. Such creeping higher densities within the MSCP would ultimately impact the neighboring PAMA areas through edge effects and compromise value of those native habitats and the intent of the MSCP/PAMA program.

C2b-270

C2b-270 See response to comment C1e-90.

COS- 2.2 Habitat Protection Through Site Design: *“Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.”*

COMMENT- INCONSISTENT

Like GP Goal COS 2.2, the prerequisite of the LEED ND standard also is to place development in smart growth locations, such as urban infill and brown fields or adjacent to urban areas where there is easy access to infrastructure and job centers. This Project fails to meet those goals and, consequently, it will cause significant destruction of biological assets in an area that should be spared under the criteria for a smart growth location.

C2b-271

C2b-271 See response to comment C1e-91.

COS- 3.1 Wetland Protection: *“Require development to preserve existing natural wetland areas and associated transitional riparian and upland buffers and retain opportunities for enhancement.”*

COMMENT-INCONSISTENT

The project is preserving and restoring the on-site wetlands, habitats that are in shortest supply regionally, but the upland vegetation components will be subjected to severe grading, and fuel modification to accommodate the development. Rather than being enhanced, the upland areas will be shaved of value for both flora and fauna.

C2b-272

C2b-272 See response to comment C1e-92.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



COS- 3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development: *“Require development projects to: Mitigate any unavoidable losses of wetlands, including its habitat functions and values; Protect wetlands, including vernal pools, from a variety of discharges and activities, such as dredging or adding fill material, exposure to pollutants such as nutrients, hydro modification, land and vegetation clearing, and the introduction of invasive species.”*

Comment -INCONSISTENT

The Project proposes to mitigate the loss of wetlands caused by new road crossings by restoring or creating wetland on-site adjacent to existing wetlands. The value of mitigating wetland losses on-site is questionable given the edge effects caused by human intrusion, domestic cats and dogs, invasive plant species, trash, etc. that cause mitigation efforts to be diminished. Exacerbating the edge effects is the plan to establish trails within and adjacent to the biological open spaces.

Further, the Project’s storm water run-off from the massive acreage of impermeable surfaces to be built is likely to impact the water regime within the biological open spaces. Adding too much or, conversely, removing too much water from the water table can have adverse effects on the survivability of the riparian habitat.

HOUSING ELEMENT

H-1.9 Affordable Housing through General Plan Amendments: *“Require developers to provide an affordable housing component when requesting a General Plan amendment for a large-scale residential project when this is legally permissible.”*

Comment-INCONSISTENT: There appears to be NO discussion anywhere in the SP or DEIR regarding Affordable Housing or Goal H-1 and Policy H-1.9. Perhaps, since there are no firm plans for anything beyond the Phase I 354 homes, the County considers this not to be a “large-scale residential project?” Since the overall Project proposes more than 1746 homes and over 5000 new residents, it appears to be a “large-scale residential project.” This provision would require amendment to approve this project. The DEIR would have to analyze the environmental effects countywide of such an amendment. Alternatively, the DEIR should contain some discussion and analysis of why this provision is not applicable or is otherwise satisfied.

H-2.1 Development That Respects Community Character: *“Require that development in existing residential neighborhoods be well designed so as not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development consistent with the Land Use Element. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]”*

Comment: This is yet another demonstration of the interwoven fabric of the GP. Requiring projects “not to degrade or detract from the character of surrounding development consistent with the Land Use Element” explicitly ties housing back to the bedrock Land Use Element, the Community Development Model, and the LEED ND Smart Location Requirement. Unless you resort to Acrelive’s fiction that there is no existing community (and by extension, no existing “community character” to the western Valley Center neighborhood) plopping an urban project the size of Del Mar into a rural, predominantly agricultural area designated for Semi-Rural uses, would be in significant contradiction to the “character of surrounding development.” Once again the GP requires developers to comply with the applicable Community Plan. That is the most effective way to meet the GP Goal LU-2, to maintain the county’s rural character. This Project is inconsistent with the Semi-Rural land use designations established by the GP and CP for this area, as well as all the Guiding Principles, as previously pointed out.

C2b-273

C2b-273 See response to comment C1e-93.

C2b-274

C2b-274 See response to comment C1e-95.

C2b-275

C2b-275 See response to comment C1e-96.



<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/Groups/Bonsall.html>



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle
Page 48 - 56



Community Plan Inconsistencies

A. Community Character Goals

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle consisting of low-density estate type residential, agricultural and equestrian uses.

Policy 1 *Require development in the community to preserve the rural qualities of the area, minimize traffic congestion, and to not adversely affect the natural environment.

Policy 2 Maintain the existing rural lifestyle by continuing the existing pattern of residential, equestrian, and agricultural uses within the Bonsall CPA.

Policy 3 Require development to be sensitive to the topography, physical context and community character of Bonsall.

Comment: The SP and DEIR cannot avoid the clear violation of these provisions by the fiction of merely adopting a new Map. The rural character of the project site, indeed all of the Planning Area in Bonsall and Valley Center, will be destroyed by plopping an urbanized area the size of Del Mar in the middle of an active agricultural area. Destruction of a designated Semi-Rural agricultural area cannot be interpreted to be "preservation." *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of this discrepancy Why?*

C2b-276

C2b-276 See response to comment C1e-97.

B. Land Use Goals

Policy 1 Require subdivision design to minimize adverse impacts to community character, or to the environment, and to mitigate any impacts from other constraints on the land that could not be avoided. Require mitigation actions to remain within the CPA of Bonsall.

Policy 2 Buffer residential areas from incompatible activities, which create heavy traffic, noise, dust, unsightly views, or from incompatibility with the surrounding environment.

Policy 3 Preserve ridgelines by siting buildings below ridges or set back with sufficient distance to minimize visual impacts. Encourage screening to visually shield all structures, including the use of vegetation. And well as appropriate and varied building materials.

Policy 4 For proposed major subdivisions, require open space easements that first are considered for agricultural or equestrian needs of the Bonsall Community.

Comment: The SP and DEIR cannot avoid the clear violation of these provisions. Adding this project in our planning area is inconsistent with our land use goals and inconsistent with both the GP and CP, the Community Development Model, and the Smart Location requirements of LEED ND. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of this discrepancy WHY?*

C2b-277

C2b-277 See response to comment C1e-98.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



C. Village Boundaries Map

Comment: The SP and DEIR cannot avoid the clear violation of the existing Map, which shows the village boundaries of two designated rural villages. This project would show three Villages instead of two based on the community model the resulting conflicts with numerous other GP and CP provisions. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of this discrepancy.*

C2b-278

C2b-278 See response to comment C1e-99

Community Conservation and Protection

Each policy addresses a characteristic of slope or soil type which acts as a constraint to development. For each constraint that a particular project site contains, the project must offer a compensating benefit, designed to ameliorate the immediate impacts of the project and provide overall benefits to the community. These benefits are of two types; limitations on grading for residential building pads, and dedications of material open space easements, agriculture or equestrian easements over certain areas on the site. Limitations on pad grading provide benefits in terms of visual impacts, reduced storm runoff and reduced removal of soil in rocky areas which are difficult to re-vegetate.

Policy 1 Require grading to be contoured to blend with natural topography, rather than consist of straight edges.

Policy 2 Restrict, to the maximum extent feasible, extensive grading for development projects in areas with slopes that are 20 percent or greater, in order to preserve and protect the environment, and to lessen grading and erosion.

C2b-279

C2b-279 The project is consistent with the Community Conservation and Protection Goals of the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans.

Policy 3 Require development on slopes to be stepped to follow and preserve topography to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy 4 Minimize cut and fill grading for roads and access ways to the absolute minimum necessary.

Policy 5 Allow further reductions in minimum lot sizes indicated in Policy LU-5.2.1, through Planned Development, Lot Area Averaging, or Specific Plan projects only when setbacks, building scale, and design are appropriate to retain the equestrian and agricultural community character in the area. *This project does not meet the Lot area Averaging and Planned Residential with specific findings.*

A review of the grading plan shows how the project design is stepped down slopes to maintain the overall “shape” of the land. Additionally, grading is contoured to maintain the rolling nature of the existing topography.

The project is designed to be as compact as possible, in order to encourage walkability and use land efficiently. The grading needed to ensure efficient use of land is less than 2,500 cubic yards per house but it allows a compact development footprint rather than a scattered approach to project design which spreads development out just to avoid an otherwise developable area. Grading avoids the vast majority of steep slopes as defined in RPO complies with encroachment allowances.

The project will result in the designation of 75 acres within the Bonsall Community Plan area being changed from Semi-Rural to Village 2.9. As described for several policies above, this new Village would be consistent with the collection of highly varied uses that is Bonsall, contributing to the overall atmosphere that is defined as rural for the Bonsall and Valley Center areas. No lot area averaging or Planned Residential permits are proposed. The project does comply with the proposed zoning necessary to implement the Specific Plan.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



Agricultural soils and production

Policy 1 Encourage the protection of areas designated for agricultural activities from scattered and incompatible urban intrusions, along with the provision of greenbelt/buffers between agricultural zoning and urban zoning.

Policy 2 Require development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture and support local and state right-to-farm regulations.

Comment: Neither the SP nor the DEIR is clear as to which design standards apply. The SP purports to override all county documents and states it prevails over any inconsistent provisions in the GP, CP, ordinances or design guidelines. In other places it states some aspect of the project is consistent with the Bonsall and VC Design Guidelines, implying that they would, nevertheless, be applicable. The many pictures, instead of clear text, clearly show urbanized design, out of scale and character for a rural community. The massive grading replaces natural hills with manufactured slopes to accommodate urban design, ignoring natural topography for both roads and residences. The request for deviations from road standards is also in direct conflict with these provisions in the Community Plan. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of these discrepancies.*

C2b-280

C2b-280 See response to comment C1e-102.

Commercial Goals

Policy 1 Require the design of commercial development to enhance the character of a rural village and not take on an urban type design.

Policy 2 Require commercial development to be compatible with the rural environment and enhance the community's quality of life. Require all commercial uses to have aesthetically pleasing and functionally adequate operations with appropriate onsite parking, internal circulation setbacks, and landscaping, and not cause any adverse impacts on neighborhood properties.

Policy 3 Discourage incompatible land uses on areas of agricultural use and land suitable for agricultural Usage.

Policy 4 Require commercial development to provide buffers between adjacent residential areas, this can be accomplished through increased setbacks or other techniques such as grade differentials, walls and/or landscaping.

C2b-281

C2b-281 See response to comment C1e-101.

Comment: Neither the SP nor the DEIR deals with the fundamental fact that the CP establishes commercial uses only in the two existing Villages, and eliminates commercial uses elsewhere, consistent with smart growth principles and the Community Development Model. The Semi-Rural Land Use Designation for the Project Site is required by both the GP and SP to remain so. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of this discrepancy Why?*



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle

Agricultural Goals

Agricultural goals are supported through out every element of the Bonsall Community Plan.

Comment: Neither the SP nor the DEIR addresses this major thrust of both the GP and CP to “support” Agriculture, not destroy it. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of this discrepancy.*

G. Mobility Goals

Goal: Scenic routes where community character and natural resources are preserved by minimizing the impacts of public or private development along roadways in Bonsall.

Circulation and Mobility

Policy 1 Minimize the use of cul-de-sacs in the Bonsall CPA and require new subdivisions to provide local connectivity by providing linkages for long-term circulation improvement.

Comment: As noted above, neither the SP nor the DEIR is clear as to which design standards apply. There appears to have been no consideration of whether this Project can provide two separate LEGAL access points to public roads or if other public roads within the project would provide a clear circulation need that benefits the entire community are needed (to replace proposed private roads. The massive grading proposed seems a clear violation of the requirement for minimizing altering the landscape and following existing natural topography as stated before in the Bonsall policies and goals. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of these discrepancies WHY?*

Fire Protection Goals

Bonsall has fire supression coverage from three separate agencies Vista Fire Protection District, North County Fire Protection District and Deer Springs Fire Protection District. We support the district’s decision to object to unsafe building.

Comment: The continued objections of the Deer Springs Fire District to this Project negate compliance with this requirement, yet the SP and DEIR continue blithely on, as if no objections or deficiencies exist. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of this discrepancy WHY?*

School Facilities

The Bonsall Sponsor Group works closely with the school district coordinating school facility planning with residential development to ensure that school facilities will be available to accommodate the increase in enrollment without overcrowding.”

Comment: No school district has accepted the possible additional students generated by the Project. The residential construction will precede, not be coincident with, school construction. The potential school site is conditioned to be turned into additional residences if not accepted by a school district. *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of these discrepancies.*



C2b-282

C2b-282 See response to comment C1e-102.

C2b-283

C2b-283 See response to comment C1e-103.

C2b-284

C2b-284 See response to comment C1e-104.

C2b-285

C2b-285 See response to comment C1e-105.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



Open Space Goals

Policy 1 Support low intensity land use zoning in undeveloped mapped floodplains, such as agricultural and low density residential zoning, to protect downstream areas from flooding hazards to minimize impacts on wildlife habitat and to provide scenic open space.

Comment: The SP only tentatively designates a 12-acre public park site. The Project minimally meets the PLDO ordinance 3-acres per 1,000 population requirement, falling woefully short of the 10-acres per 1,000 GP goal for parks. At least 350 homes will be constructed and occupied before any parks, public or private. The SP makes no provision for construction of park amenities, just dedication of raw land. Overall Project site planning appears to destroy any existing connectivity for animal migration, instead of creating or maintaining a functional open space system. The design is to create an isolated urbanized compound totally unrelated to its surroundings. This will be a closed community of urban sprawl, not one with "openness and access to surrounding open space." *The DEIR must, but does not, explain and analyze the environmental effects of these discrepancies WHY?*

1. BOTH the Specific Plan and the DEIR for the project fail to substantiate consistency with CEQA or consistency with the San Diego GP policies that would justify exemption of this project from prohibition of Leap Frog Development, that the DEIR fails to disclose environmental impacts and/or provide adequate mitigation for this project.
2. Decision makers and the public are deprived of this essential information which is required by CEQA.
3. These failures require re-circulation of a revised DEIR that addresses them.

By way of brief summary, the County has failed to include assessment of Impact areas which are directly related to the proposed LHR Project Noise generation. The Noise analysis was not performed for these Noise Sensitive Land Uses (NSLUs), Environmental Impact is impossible to assess. There are contradictory values for projected Community Noise Evaluation Level (CNEL) values presented without reconciliation of the differing values.

August 16, 2013 Darnell Associates Independent Expert review of the Chen Ryan Traffic Impact Study presents factual evidence that the Chen Ryan Traffic Impact Study understated the Traffic volume and distribution. The reliance on the deficient Chen Ryan Traffic information directly affects the Noise modeling employed by Recon resulting in inaccurate Traffic Generated Noise levels.

Significant potential Impacts outside the Subdivision boundaries are not evaluated, or properly evaluated and need to be. *When will this happen?*

C2b-286

C2b-286 See response to comment C1e-106.

C2b-287

C2b-287 See response to comment I51j-4.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



Impacted existing NSLU's not evaluated for Noise Impacts

TABLE 12 – "FUTURE OFF-SITE NOISE LEVELS AT SPECIFIC LOCAL RECEIVER LOCATIONS" p. 47 of the Noise Report has errors and exclusions of key existing NSLU's. Every Assessor Parcel Number (APN) listed in the Table is incorrect. Please correct this deficiency. Also, Figures 6a and 6b geo-locate On-Site Local Receiver locations, and provide a reference back to Table 12. Figure 7 for Off-Site Local Receivers does not label Local Receivers with a reference back to Table 12. Remedy this by labeling Figure 7 Off-Site Receivers with a reference back to Table 12. Also, include a Table in similar format to Table 9 which cross references Off-Site Local Receivers to map locations.

Rodriguez Private Road is indicated on Sheet 9 of 9 of the Tentative Parcel Map. Rodriguez Road is being improved to a 24' paved surface. Consequently, the Traffic Study should indicate the traffic volume and the Noise Report should assess Traffic Generated Noise for all NSLU's along the route of Rodriguez Road. There is no indication in the discussion beginning at page 47 of the Noise Report that the Noise Impacts of Rodriguez Private Road increased traffic volume directly related to the proposed LHR Project was assessed. Please discuss specifically if and how Rodriguez Road is included in the Noise modeling results.

The following NSLU's on the eastern border of Rodriguez Road were not included as Specific Local Receivers in Table 12 "Future Off-Site Noise Levels at Specific Local Receiver Locations" p.47 of the Noise Report:
APN 129-190-37-00
APN 129-190-30-00
APN 129-380-01-00

Were these NSLU's assessed as Local Receivers? If not, why were these residential NSLU's omitted from analysis?

Contradictory CNEL Values for the same Local Receiver Location

Table 12 at p. 47 of the Noise Report specifies a predicted future Noise Level of 54 CNEL for 128-290-77-00 (APN corrected to proper value from the erroneous value in Table 12). This Assessor Parcel Number corresponds to the existing residence at 9550 Covey Lane.

Table 13 (page not numbered) "TABLE 13 - CUMULATIVE OFF-SITE TRAFFIC CNEL AT 100 FEET FROM CENTERLINE" lists an existing value of 44.2 CNEL and a LHR Project Build out value of 55.7 CNEL at the LHR project eastern boundary, which is approximately 190 feet from the property line of the 9550 Covey Lane NSLU.

Cumulatively Significant Noise Impacts p. 56 "The nearest residence to the future centerline of Lilac Hills Ranch Road is approximately 200 feet to the west and 50 feet north of Covey Lane, which would result in a combined noise level of 61 CNEL at the building façade." This location is the residence at 9550 Covey Lane. There is a conflict with the cumulative CNEL value as presented in the text on Page 56 with Table 13's value. **Which value is correct?**

C2b-288

C2b-288 See response to comments I51j-5 through I51j-8.

C2b-289

C2b-289 See response to comment I51j-8.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



Evaluation of Existing Noise Conditions

Please discuss and justify the following regarding the baseline Existing Noise Conditions evaluation taken Wednesday, July 25, 2012 between 11am and 3:30 PM:

1. **Why were only 8 locations evaluated?** Please justify the adequacy of the 8 location sample size to construct a rational baseline for the project.
2. Please elaborate in detail the rationale for each of the 8 site locations selected.
3. Please elaborate in detail and justify the use of 15 minute mid-afternoon single samples as an adequate baseline for establishing Existing Noise Conditions.

C2b-290

C21b-290 See response to comments I51j-9 through I51j-11.

Traffic Generated Noise Analysis relies on the June 28, 2013 Chen Ryan Traffic Impact Study

Table 12 - "FUTURE OFF-SITE NOISE LEVELS AT SPECIFIC LOCAL RECEIVER LOCATIONS" p. 47 of Noise Report is presented as the basis for ADT traffic volume for modeling the LHR project Traffic Generated Noise.

The August 16, 2013 Darnell Associates Independent Expert review of the Chen Ryan Traffic Impact Study submitted as Public Comments for the LHR DEIR presents factual evidence that the Chen Ryan Traffic Impact Study (TIS) understated the Traffic volume and distribution.

In summary, the Chen Ryan TIS understated ADT trip generation 11.9%. Additionally, Chen Ryan overstated internal trip capture, which would change ADT distribution assignment to area roads. Further, the Darnell August 16, 2013 Independent Study assigns far greater traffic volume to Mountain Ridge and Covey Lane Private Roads, where a large population of Offsite NSLU receivers are located. The reliance on the deficient Chen Ryan Traffic information directly affects the Noise modeling employed by Recon resulting in inaccurate modeling of Traffic Generated Noise levels. Fact based assessment of Noise Impacts mandates revision of the Chen Ryan Traffic Impact Study, and corresponding revision of the Traffic Generated Noise modeling from RECON.

C2b-291

C2b-291 See response to comment I51j-12.

Impacts outside the Subdivision Boundaries

The 60 CNEL Noise Level Contour Graphic needs to be extended to include the Off-Site Impacts for ALL of the Projects Secondary Access Roads:

- Mountain Ridge from the Subdivision boundary to Circle R Drive
- Covey Lane from the Subdivision eastern boundary to West Lilac Road
- Rodriguez Road to Covey Lane

Noise and the Noise Report.

For example, DEIR Subchapter 2.8 – Noise 2.8.2.1 Issue 1: Traffic Generated Noise p.28 -8: "Existing receivers along Mountain Ridge Road south of the project site would experience a potentially substantial increase in ambient noise levels of 8 CNEL, however, noise levels within 100 feet of the roadway centerline would be 53 CNEL or less."

When Mountain Ridge Private Road traffic volume is increased to the levels indicated in

Extend 60 CNEL Contours Offsite

- Mountain Ridge to Circle R
- Covey Lane to West Lilac
- Rodriguez Road to Covey Lane

C2b-292

C2b-292 See response to comment I51j-13.



BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Dedicated to enhancing and preserving a rural lifestyle



the August 16, 2013 Darnell Associates Independent Expert Review, and the 60 CNEL Noise Level Contour line is plotted on Mountain Ridge, in excess of 60 CNEL will be indicated at the residential façade at 31013 Mountain Ridge (APN 129-430-13-00).

Summary

DEIR Subchapter 2.8 – Noise and the Noise Report have many significant errors and omissions, and the reports rely on the flawed LHR Traffic Impact Study. Informed Environmental Analysis is impossible to perform with this flawed information.

Please revise DEIR Subchapter 2.8 and the Noise Report and notice and recirculate for Public Comment.

C2b-292 cont.

C2b-293

Submitted by:

Margarette Morgan, Chair
Bonsall Sponsor Group



<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/Groups/Bonsall.html>



C2b-293 See response to comment I51j-14.

This is a conclusory comment. The issues raised have been addressed in the responses provided above. There are no errors or omissions in the Noise Technical Report and recirculation is not required. This comment will be maintained in the administrative record and available for review by the decision making body.