

Letter I23

From: Marc Cyr [<mailto:marcacyr@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 3:03 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: re: Lilac Hills Ranch Development

Marc A. Cyr, JD, MBA
10002 Covey Lane
Escondido, CA 92026

Mark Slovick, Project Manager
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310, San Diego, Ca 92123
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

July 23, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

I have a property interest in my parents' land and avocado grove adjacent to the proposed location of Lilac Hills Ranch, immediately to the east of W. Lilac Road on Covey Lane.

I23-1

I23-1

The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to this project. The comment is introductory in nature.

We are opposed to the building of Lilac Hills Ranch for the following reasons:

- To build over 1,700 homes on tiny lots in an area that is zoned for home sites of 1 to 2 acres (minimum) is irresponsible. There is a very valid reason for the current zoning and to rezone an area designated for agricultural purposes (in a county that is quickly losing its fertile and established agricultural sites) is completely unacceptable. We are living in this area because of the open spaces and large properties. Many of our neighbors are living here for the same reasons.

I23-2

I23-2

The comment is duplicative of comment I22-2. See response to comment I22-2.

- The unique composition of the soil in our area doesn't exist in many areas of the world and needs to be preserved for growing food and providing for the community at large. Once pesticides and herbicides leech into the soil, and will ultimately affect the aquifer, it will cause irreparable damage to the soils and the aquifer itself. Also, converting over 600 acres of arable land for residential use is inappropriate and irresponsible. Once converted, it can never be used to grow crops or produce food again. It is forever ruined.

I23-3

I23-3

The comment is duplicative of comment I22-3. See response to comment I22-3.

- We have a sever water shortage in California, especially in San Diego County. How can it be feasible to build a large subdivision, with its vast infrastructure, during a time when water is not available or plentiful? We are constantly threatened with potential water rationing and limitations on use of residential and agricultural water use. To further limit the use of water in a highly dense area, as this development will be if constructed, is again irresponsible and a disservice to taxpayers and residents.

I23-4

I23-4

The comment is duplicative of comment I22-4. See response to comment I22-4.

LETTER

RESPONSE

- Despite the promises by this developer, San Diego has been plagued by promises made by builders of building pristine, self-contained and sustainable communities, which are often anything less than promised. These communities strain resources, as evidenced by recent fires in the County, especially in San Marcos, Escondido and Carlsbad.

I23-5

I23-5 The comment is duplicative of comment I22-5. See response to comment I22-5.

- The increased noise, congestion and traffic from the construction phase and then occupancy will completely change our area from open country to urban sprawl. If potential resident of Lilac Hills Ranch want urban sprawl, they can move to those communities of San Diego County. There is no need to develop an area that is not urban and change it to suit this builder's wants and desires. Let them look elsewhere, but not in our community!

I23-6

I23-6 The comment is duplicative of comment I22-6. See response to comment I22-6.

- We are not convinced that there will be suitable availability of support services (i.e. fire, medical, etc.) to support the number of potential residents and traffic in the area. Also, we live in a high fire danger zone. We cannot afford to have a loss or reduction of emergency services and fire department support due to over congestion and lack of sufficient resources during danger.

I23-7

I23-7 The comment is duplicative of comment I22-7. See response to comment I22-7.

I23-8

I23-8 The comment is duplicative of comment I22-8. See response to comment I22-8.

- The West Lilac Road access for this development (including the Lilac Road Bridge) is not sufficient to handle the increased traffic load and congestion that will result from the number of vehicles driving in the area. It is estimated that over 9,000 vehicles will cross the bridge daily at the height of occupancy. This two-lane bridge is not designed for this amount of traffic. Also, the projected number of vehicles using the current two-lane road will cause significant traffic congestion and difficulties for all residents of the area.

I23-9

I23-9 The comment is duplicative of comment I22-9. See response to comment I22-9.

Sincerely,

Marc A. Cyr, JD, MBA