

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I28

From: virgie sandie [<mailto:virninja@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 4:07 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Opposition

July, 28, 2014

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing with regards to the opposition of the PAA 09-007 request for 1,746 additional dwelling units and neighborhood commercial within Valley Center, and in support of the Valley Center General Plan. Let me begin with my story, then several reasons why I oppose this development, and finally maybe a few suggestions for a compromise.

I28-1

My family moved to 10123 W. Lilac Road in 1987 when I was nine years old. We were sad to leave our old one acre lime grove with horses, in search of more open space to ride. We had found out the approximately 50 acres we rode our horses on were about to be developed. You may be familiar with the parcel of land, it is West of the Escondido shopping center called the North County Fair (now a Westfield shopping center). There is nothing left, but wall to wall housing and a strip mall. I enjoyed my childhood growing up on W. Lilac. We explored the hills (many of the ones going to be developed) with our horses and motorcycles. We made plenty of people mad during our adventures, but we learned where not to go. We had campouts on my parent's ten acres, building forts with our friends, creating memories for a lifetime. My sister and I helped with the family ranch picking, packing, and even selling fruit, I learned many life skills with the ranch. We also joined 4-H, and eventually FFA raising horses and pigs. Agriculture became a part of my life, my way of life. I even attended Chico State and received my B. S. in Agriculture in 1999 and my teaching credential in 2000. I started teaching Agriculture down in Lakeside, when I purchased my 3.6 acres in the fall of 2000 on West Lilac Road, hoping to provide my future offspring with the same opportunity of growing up in a rural farming area as I had. Around the same time I purchased my property, I had heard the Rodriguez Ranch had been sold to some investors. The Rodriguez property, approximately a hundred acres, is located kitty-corner to my parents 10 acres on West Lilac Road. This is one of the areas I used to ride the most. The Rodriguez families are wonderful people and neighbors.

I28-2

Next, I would like to address several points for my opposition to the PAA 09-007:

I purchased my land to get away from people and development. I built my dream home seven years ago, and I am feeling very sad and helpless about 1,746 homes going in my back yard. I have a pristine three hundred and sixty degree view. I can see Palomar Mountain to the east and the Ocean to the west on clear days. I also love the view of surrounding farm land, it gives me peace, and is beautiful to observe. Our open space is shrinking, and should be preserved for wildlife. My gorgeous views would be overlooking a large unattractive development, and my parents will unfortunately be right next to it.

I28-3

More homes nearby would mean the possibility of more sexual predators nearby. With the latest news in the county, the thought of this development make me cringe. Do I have to worry

I28-4

I28-1 The comment is introductory in nature. The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

I28-2 This comment provides background information and does not raise an issue with regard to the content or adequacy of the FEIR. This information is acknowledged and will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

I28-3 The County acknowledges that impacts to views in the area would be significant and unavoidable. Refer to subchapter 2.1 of the FEIR for additional details on these impacts. Also see subchapter 2.5 and Appendix G for a discussion of biological impacts and mitigation. The project design includes 104 acres of open space for resource preservation. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

I28-4 The comment raises a social issue that is not related to any physical effect on the environment or the adequacy of the environmental document. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>about who my new neighbors are?? I thought when we built here that we would be safe, and not have to worry about these things. } I28-4 cont.</p> <p>3. "Sustainable Community" to me should mean it is capable of being sustained or maintained (straight from the dictionary). This community would not provide enough jobs and support for 1,749 families. These people would be going to surrounding communities for work, Doctors, shopping, post office, Library, Little League, Soccer, etc. } I28-5</p> <p>4. The I-15 is already congested at the Gopher Canyon Exit. It gets tricky at times pulling out of there at rush hour. I have personally seen how the development of Temecula, Murrieta, and Menifee over the last twenty years has impacted the freeways. All of those developers did not do anything to improve or widen our freeway infrastructure. } I28-6</p> <p>5. The Valley Center Community General Plan was already made before this development. There are several people who bought property in Valley Center to eventually develop it. Moving density away from Valley Center to West Lilac may take away development possibilities to other investors. They will be told: Sorry, you bought your property, and now you may not develop it, that is not fair! } I28-7</p> <p>6. The Cactus Ranch is a successful family business, and the Road 3A will rip it in half. How can you rip apart one family's livelihood?? } I28-8</p> <p>7. The houses on Covey Lane. No one prepared them to have Temecula built around them. They did not ask for that. They built new homes with the intention of a rural setting. How can you let this happen?? } I28-9</p> <p>8. Habitat will be lost. Where will the animals go?? We frequently see coyotes and bobcats, where will they move to? I have already seen the local quail population diminish through the years, and I have not seen any Jack Rabbits for a long time. We need to preserve open space for the wildlife. } I28-10</p> <p>9. My parents were unable to divide their land, so my sister or I could have avoided buying our own property. Why do the developers get to divide their land as they please?? } I28-11</p> <p>Now that you have heard several arguments against this development, I would like to offer some suggestions for compromise. I am a reasonable person. I just feel like 1,746 homes are just too many. It is going to affect too many people, who came out here for privacy and beautiful landscapes. I think we need no more than 600 homes, no shopping centers, and build the homes close together in one area. Leave the rest of the land as open space for hiking, biking, horseback riding, and habitat. } I28-12</p>	<p>I28-5 The comment raises an economic issue with regard to the ability of the community to sustain itself economically. The FEIR does address sustainability in its discussion of compliance with General Plan policies (subchapter 3.1.4) and the discussion of potential greenhouse gas emission (GHG) impacts (subchapter 3.1.2). The project integrates principles of smart growth and green building design, and accounts for water and energy, includes water efficient and native palette landscaping, recycling and wastewater technology, and integrated pedestrian and bike paths connecting community amenities. All of these design elements encourages project sustainability.</p> <p>I28-6 The County acknowledges the commenter's concern about congestion at the I-15/Gopher Canyon exit. The FEIR concludes that the impacts of the project at the I-15 northbound and southbound ramps at Gopher Canyon would be less than significant with the required fair-share contribution to the County TIF program (M-TR-8). However, significant and unavoidable impacts along segments of I-15 are identified from Riverside County to SR-78. Refer to Global Response: Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to I-15, included in the introduction to these Responses to Comments.</p> <p>I28-7 The project would not result in a reduction in the planned development potential of other properties in Valley Center. The project would only affect the development potential on the project site, and would not affect existing General Plan land use designations that exist with the existing Valley Center village areas.</p> <p>I28-8 The comment references impacts that would occur with improvements of Road 3a (referred to as Road 3 in the FEIR and Mobility Element). The project does not include any improvements to this planned roadway. While the current General Plan Mobility Element identifies a 2.2E Light Collector road, called New Road 3, that would connect West Lilac Road to West Oak GlenRoad/Cole Grade Road, SANDAG recently acquired the 902-acre Rancho Lilac property and recorded a conservation easement over the entire property which may prevent future build-out of the planned Road 3 in its current alignment. Subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E analyzes two scenarios, one without the construction of Road 3 and one with the construction of Road 3. However, the project, as proposed, does not propose to construct Road 3.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope you think about how this development going to affect the people surrounding it before you make a decision. Will I be forced to move from my dream home one day, in search of land and open space again? We need to preserve our farmland and open spaces, so our future generations may enjoy it as well.

I28-13

Sincerely,

Virginia Erdelyi

10113 W. Lilac Rd.

Escondido, CA 92026

- I28-9 The County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the project. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.
- I28-10 Details of the biological resource impacts that would result from the project and the mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce impacts to less than significant are provided in subchapter 2.5 and Appendix G of the FEIR. For example, biological resource mitigation includes requirements for dedication of open space easements to mitigate for impacts to sensitive habitats and preparation of a Resource Management Plan to address any restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of open space. In addition, wetland creation is required as a mitigation measure of the project to ensure there is no net loss of wetlands. The project design incorporates 104 acres of open space for resource preservation.
- I28-11 Property owners may request a General Plan Amendment pursuant to Government Code Sections 65300 et seq. Prior to the sunset of Board of Supervisors Policy I-63, in order to initiate an amendment to the General Plan, an applicant was required to process a Planned Authorized Amendment (PAA). An application to amend to the General Plan was allowed to proceed by the approval of a PAA by the Planning Commission on December 17, 2010. The Board of Supervisors will have the discretion on whether the project may be developed.
- I28-12 The suggestion for approval of a reduced development alternative is acknowledged. Chapter 4.0 of the FEIR includes reduced density alternatives, similar to those suggested. These alternatives will be made available to the decision makers prior to project approval. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.
- I28-13 The County acknowledges this comment and the opposition to the project. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.