

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I73

From: sandman55@cox.net [mailto:sandman55@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 4:03 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Fwd: Lilac Hills Ranch Project (hope the third time is the charm)

> Date: Mon, 28 Jul 2014 12:24:02 -0700
> From: <sandman55@cox.net>
> To: Mark.Slovik@sdcounty.ca.gov
> Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch Project

> Mark,
>
> I am sure have heard it before but I spoke to you 3 weeks ago and you directed me to the county web site so I could review the Lilac Hills Ranch Project. I have done so and am blown away by how out of place this development is for this area and how little the "improvements" will benefit current residents. The size and number of proposed residents would be catastrophic alone but the fact that whichever way they state it they cannot make the roads work at all!
>
> I have attached a letter or opposition to this email, if I need to direct it elsewhere please let me know.
>
> I would be interested what the view of you and staff is on this project.
>
> Thanks for your help
> Best Regards
> Dennis Simmons

} I73-1

I73-1 This comment is an introduction to comments that follow and addresses general subject areas of improvements and scale of the project which were analyzed in the FEIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis. 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

July 28,2014
County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
Re: Lilac Hills Ranch Project

Dennis & Jeanne Simmons
10034 Covey Lane
Escondido Ca 92026

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter to express my opposition the Lilac Hills Ranch Project due to several factors that should reasonablyA project that is well designed with the area and topography preclude this project to be approved.

I moved into this area from Encinitas in March of this year to be able to enjoy space and views from my new home and the gardening space afforded by the size of my property. I was unaware of this project until I saw a sign posted at the Old 395 and West Lilac Road interchange. After contacting Mark Slovik I was directed to the web page where I would be able to access the plans of the project.

I was disappointed after I had read and reread the project outlines, the general plan, traffic plan, grading plan and the various mitigations and numerous exceptions requested by the developer to make the project would mesh with the rural character of the area as it is.

The impact to the current residents from the traffic plan alone is enough to disapprove this project. West Lilac Road east bound from Old 395 to Covey Lane is a substandard light collector with NO intermittent turn lanes, little or no shoulders and a dangerous at best bike lane. With marginal "improvements" limited to the proposed round a bouts, which were called unfeasible by the independent engineer hired for peer review, to eliminating the north shoulder altogether and having a "conceptual parkway and bike lane" on the south side do nothing to improve traffic circulation in this area.

The size and concept of this project is completely contrary to the County of San Diego's own General Plan and screams leap frog development where building "town center" style projects near the area considered the center of each area. This is neither near the town center of Valley Center or Bonsall. The idea that this would improve the value of life in this area is a hollow chant, it would instead degrade the quality and peace now enjoyed with five times or more of the current traffic load on the current substandard roads that this project would feed onto.

A project that is well planned and designed to fit in with the nature and topography of the area taken into consideration would not need to request exceptions from

173-2

173-3

173-4

173-5

173-6

173-2 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.

173-3 The comment provides background information about the existing condition of West Lilac Road. 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.

173-4 The comment references the results from the Reid Middleton Roundabout Study. As detailed in subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR, the project includes various improvements to West Lilac Road to accommodate anticipated traffic. Two roundabouts are proposed along West Lilac Road, one at the main project entrance at Main Street and Street C and a second at the easterly project entrance at the intersection of Main Street and Street Z. As stated in subchapter 2.3 of the FEIR:

Several roundabouts are proposed along the new West Lilac Road. Roundabouts would calm traffic, thereby enhancing the comfort and safety of both cyclists and pedestrians. Proposed roundabouts would be designed to meet applicable safety and design standards. Thus, proposed roadway improvements would be safe for vehicles, bicyclists, and/or pedestrians.

The comment also refers to the elimination of the north shoulder and a "conceptual parkway and bike lane" on the south side. The north shoulder would not be eliminated because the full shoulder width to current Mobility Element standards does not currently exist. Section II of the Specific Plan details the proposed pathway that would be accommodated within the road right-of-way along the south side of West Lilac Road. Due to constraints along the north side of West Lilac Road (residences, slopes), improvements will be focused on the project side (south side) of West Lilac Road. The project will be required to improve West Lilac Road to accommodate anticipated traffic prior to recordation of the Final Map associated with the 929th EDU of the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan. West Lilac Road improvements between Old Highway 395 and Main Street would be required to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification of 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County (M-TR-4). Refer to subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR for details

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I73-4 (cont.) on the analysis of impacts and proposed improvements along West Lilac Road. The analysis demonstrates that project impacts to West Lilac Road would be fully mitigated to below a level of significance.</p> <p>I73-5 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 Chapter 3, subchapter 3.1.4, Land Use Planning of the FEIR and Appendix W provide information demonstrating how the project would comply with the General Plan. In addition, refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 included as an introduction to these Responses to Comments.</p> <p>The comment also addresses concerns with traffic which was analyzed in the FEIR. See subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E for details related to traffic impacts and required improvements. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis. 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.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

dozens of State, County and Local Development plans and guidelines. It would not have to fight "hostile" residents to make minimal improvements to a roadway that will still be substandard, not serve the purpose nor help the residential, commercial, bike or equestrian traffic that exists now. It would not eliminate or endanger what is considered to be Crucial California Agricultural Land, would not eliminate endangered species habitat and it would certainly not be built in a Critical Fire Danger Area where drought is a way of life.

173-6
cont.

The road and traffic plan are unacceptable.
The degradation to agricultural and endangered species land is not acceptable.
The impact on already strained infrastructure is unacceptable even with the proposed improvements (in twenty years) is unacceptable.

173-7

I respectfully request that the Planning and Land use Committee reject this proposal for what it is, sprawl.

173-8

I respectfully request the members of the Board of Supervisors reject this proposal for completely ignoring the General Plan and the work done by them and by their staff to put it in place.

Dennis & Jeanne Simmons

173-6 The comment expresses the opinions of the commentator and addresses general subject areas of roadway exceptions, traffic, agricultural resources, biological resources, and fire. See subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E, subchapter 2.4 and Appendix F, subchapter 2.5 and Appendix G, and subchapter 2.7.2.4 and Appendices J and K for details related to impacts and mitigation for traffic, agricultural resources, biological resources, and fire, respectively. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis. 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.

173-7 The comment addresses general subject areas of traffic, agricultural and biological resources, and infrastructure. See response to comment 173-6 for a discussion of traffic, and agricultural and biological resources. See subchapter 3.17 for details of infrastructure impacts and mitigation. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis. 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.

173-8 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.