

LETTER

RESPONSE

From: Ray Groyer [mailto:rgroyer@kzagroup.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2014 4:37 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Proposed Lilac Ranch Development

Letter I42

7/27/14
Raymond Groyer
9796 Megan Terrace
Escondido, 92026
619-244-8309

Dear Mr. Slovick

I am a property owner residing in Circle R Ranch estates

In regard to the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR I have the following specific concerns.

Note that my 1st and most important concern is one of basic safety for my family and close friends and neighbors.

1) **Major impediment of fire evacuation routes.** The current homes on or off of West Lilac between the easterly most and westerly most egress and ingress to the development have only two emergency exit routes, both of which will be drastically impeded by up to 3000 additional cars exiting from this development. Our only current routes to exit to safety during a fast moving wild fire are either:

2)

1. Turning left from Running Creek Rd on to West Lilac to either exit the area via Lilac or Circle R depending on the direction of the fire.

2. Turning right from Running Creek Rd on to West Lilac to exit over the West Lilac bridge to Old Highway 395.

Additional direct exits from Lilac Hills Ranch to Old Highway 395 close to the Interstate 15 entrance would alleviate the impact of this development onto West Lilac if a wild fire evacuation required a westerly exit route. This would not help significantly if a fire jumps the Highway 15 in a easterly direction as it did in the Fallbrook Fire in May of this year or if fire comes in a northerly direction through the very high fire risk canyons from Moussa Creek. A fire scenario like this that would cut off westerly exits could be easily foreseen in this area designated as an extreme fire danger area in the county. In this very potential scenario all of

I42-1

I42-1 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project and concerns about the fire risk in the area. See response to comment I41-3.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>us living in this locked in area with its only two exits would have to compete with up to an additional 3000 cars . During the 2003 and 2007 wild fires, the evacuation routes to the west on West Lilac over the bridge to the Old 395 crossroads were the scene of a major traffic jam. There was a slow moving line of cars backed up for more than 2 miles to the east of the West Lilac / old Highway 395 stop sign. During these increasingly severe wild fires we have very limited time to respond. This impedance of an additional 3000 cars exiting over the 2 lane west lilac bridge or through the back country on Circle R or Lilac Rd is simply illogical when considering basic fire evacuation safety. Consider that one of the original selling points to the Lilac Ranch Development on the old Solomon property was that it would allow for ultimate fire evacuation routes to the west from Cole Grade in Valley Center. We all know that Valley Center has few evacuation routes available to it as a community. There is a scenario where this Lilac Hills Ranch development would have to exit to the east into this already evacuation stressed community. Please consider this plea for safety for my family, friends and neighbors.</p> <p>3)2) Strong Objection to such significant violations of the core premises of GP2020. The necessary changes to the GP2020 to allow for this development would not be in-line with the original goals of the GP2020 to place density near town centers where there are services conveniently located to serve the needs of the population. If approval of this development results in a net increase to the GP2020 density for Valley Center, this also would be a second violation to the goals of the GP2020. It will also add a significant density increase far from basic services like groceries, gas, etc. This will increase the demand on our freeways and local streets while increasing our carbon emissions. Allowing changes to the GP2020 for this development will result in additional creep of changes to the GP2020 for these needed services.</p> <p>4)3) It is also stated that sewage may have to be trucked out of the area. If a new planned development requires truck hauling of the waste stream through our community, it obviously is a poorly planned development.</p> <p>The bottom line is that a development of this size should have direct access to a major thoroughfare. As organic growth on the west side of Valley Center continues over the next decade or so, its combined population growth with this development will require either a widening of West Lilac and Circle R or a doubling of the West Lilac Bridge over the Highway 15.</p> <p>This is paramount in the backcountry to all for adequate wild fire evacuations. The constraints of the natural geography on West Lilac and Circle R prohibit it from ever being widened enough to handle this increased traffic. Widening of the 2 lane West Lilac bridge over Highway 15 is obviously cost prohibitive for this development. It also will be cost prohibitive for the county once the development is completed and there is no one to fund such a significant change.</p> <p>In my years of participating in this process I have not run into a single person who lives within the immediate impacted area that supports this size development in this location. This is because the development, contrary to the sales pitches by the developers, will only degrade our current quality of living. Allowing this developer to modify the GP2020 for such an ill planned development will benefit only one entity, the developer. Those who currently live in the area over the next decade can expect to see their taxes increase, water costs increase, fire evacuations impeded, and property values decline. What is the charter of the San Diego Planning group, Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission? It is stated on your website</p>	<p>I42-1 cont.</p> <p>I42-2</p> <p>I42-3</p> <p>I42-4</p> <p>I42-5</p> <p>I42-2 See response to comment I41-4.</p> <p>I42-3 See response to comment I41-5.</p> <p>I42-4 See response to comment I41-6.</p> <p>I42-5 See response to comment I41-7.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

that "The department analyzes privately initiated land use projects to ensure compliance with land use regulations, and advises the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission on the projects." The bottom line is that this development clearly does not fit into the land use regulations described in GP2020. So if the GP2020 is changed for this ill planned development, maybe the website should state "The department analyzes privately initiated land use projects to ensure land use regulations can be modified to allow developers to do as they wish wherever they wish, even if the basic fire evacuation safety of those already living in the area is impacted." Please consider my concerns seriously. The well being and life and safety of my family is paramount. I feel the county has the ethical responsibility to protect the safety of the current residence of San Diego County, and not bow to the whims of the deep pocket developer community.

I42-6

I42-6 See response to comment I41-7.

Ray Groyer
 KaiZen Automation Group, Inc.
 619-244-8309



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of this original message.

This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.
