

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I84

**From:** Administrator [<mailto:kyranlis@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 28, 2014 3:42 PM  
**To:** Slovick, Mark  
**Subject:** Comments

Dear Mr. Slovick,

I am strongly opposed to the Lilac Hills Ranch Development. The General Plan does not support that and it is not part of the plan for Valley Center. The Planning group in Valley Center has worked hard with some others developers to establish and desirable downtown core for Valley Center. They have drawn up a north and south village which will provide needed housing for the town. It is in keeping with the General Plan and the vision for the area. The infrastructure will grow out from the downtown there is established infrastructure. The schools, churches, post office, stores and other amenities will be located there in the downtown core of town. There is no need for housing out in the edges of town and spot development. This is categorized as urban sprawl.

I84-1  
 I84-2  
 I84-3

The roadways near and around this proposed development cannot handle that kind of traffic. I have studied the traffic reports and information concerning the roads. There is no capability of widening those roads enough to safely handle the additional traffic. Accretive has no right of way on the roads they are preparing in 4 and 5 phases for entering and exiting the development. I will not give up my easement for them or will I pay more taxes to enable them. The developer does not live in this area and never will. He will not look back at the damage caused while counting his bank account.

I84-4  
 I84-5

The W. Lilac bridge cannot be widened and will require a rebuild or another bridge to accommodate the traffic generated from this kind of dense housing.

I84-6

The roads will be clogged and lives will be in jeopardy if there is a necessity to evacuate as there was in 2007, 2008, and a recent fire earlier this year. School busses and large trucks cannot pass on parts of W. Lilac and Circle R Drive. The school busses are not even allowed on parts of W. Lilac. Valley Center had loss of life and serious injuries a few years back in a fire. How many lives will you put in jeopardy just to fatten the wallet of this developer?

I84-7

Trucking of effluent from 300 homes would require up to 9 trips a day of a heavy truck. Where will this sewage be stored while waiting for trucks to take it away? That is not a feasible suggestion for many reasons. Can you promise it will be odorless, safe, and sanitary? I had to get a septic system put in when I built my house. If these development cannot qualify for septic systems for each house, then it is reasonable to assume the homes cannot be built.

I84-8  
 I84-9  
 I84-10

Can you promise that the infrastructure that is part of the other phases will actually be built and maintained properly? If the first phase is built and the economy falls apart and there is no more building then what happens to the infrastructure included in the subsequent phases? Accretive will sell those phases off to other buyers, if in fact, there are other builders that can and will buy and develop the infrastructure as presented currently. This is a gamble at best. Can you gamble the lives of the current residents or that western side of Valley Center for the sake of this developer?

I84-11

- I84-1 The County acknowledges this comment and the opposition to the project. The project includes a General Plan Amendment to allow development of a new village in Valley Center. 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 Plan Amendment Authorization (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. See response to comment I4-1. 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.
- I84-2 This comment further characterizes the planned north and south Valley Center villages. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the environmental document.
- I84-3 The comment expresses the opinions of the commentator and does not raise an issue with 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.
- I84-4 Refer to subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR for details of the traffic impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. The comment does not raise an issue with a specific road or the adequacy of the environmental document.
- I84-5 For details on the easement rights to access to the project in phases 4 and 5, specifically Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane easement rights, refer to the Global Response: Easements (Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Roads) included in the introduction to these responses to comments. Also see response to comment I27-5 related to the requirement for the developer to acquire additional right-of-way for the improvement of roads.

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>184-6 The commenter is correct that it would be difficult to widen West Lilac bridge. The project does not include the widening of the West Lilac bridge; however, improvements will be made to accommodate projected traffic including paving, restriping, installation of a traffic signal at Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road including construction of a left-turn lane at the westbound West Lilac Road approach to Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road. This portion of West Lilac Road would be improved to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County (M-TR-4).</p> <p>184-7 The County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the project and concerns about the fire risk in the area. With respect to the adequacy of fire and emergency response service, see Global Response: Fire and Medical Services. The project’s Evacuation Plan outlines measures intended to create an orderly and safe evacuation of the project site in time of emergency. Specific project design features included in the Fire Protection Plan and Evacuation Plan are referenced in subchapter 2.7.2.4 of the FEIR. These measures would ensure potential hazards associated with wildfire and evacuations are less than significant.</p> <p>184-8 As stated in the Project Description (Chapter 1.0), if one of the on-site wastewater treatment scenarios is selected, the project would require temporary trucking of sewage during the initial phases of the project. This is necessary because a minimum wastewater flow is needed to operate an on-site WRF. For an on-site permanent WRF, trucking would be required for up to the first 100 homes (approximately three</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I84-8 (cont.)  truck trips per day) to allow for a sufficient minimum flow to operate the facility. For a smaller on-site interim WRF, trucking would be required until as few as 25 homes are occupied. In either case, as soon as sufficient flows are available, trucking operators would cease.</p> <p>The wastewater would be stored in the headworks (i.e., first tanks) of the water reclamation facility.</p> <p>I84-9 The FEIR, subchapter 2.2.2.5 addresses the potential odor impacts of the project, particularly related to the proposed wastewater treatment scenarios. For the on-site treatment plant scenario, the project will be conditioned to implement odor control measures as stated in the FEIR Table 1-3 and Section III. I (Water and Wastewater Development Standards) of the Specific Plan. Specifically, the proposed means of foul air treatment in the WRF shall be activated carbon towers. As discussed in subchapter 3.1.7, trucking of sewage would be required for up to the first 100 homes (approximately three truck trips per day) to allow for a sufficient minimum flow to operate the facility. The project would require temporary trucking of sewage, wastewater generated by the project would flow to the headworks of the on-site treatment plant. Although the treatment processes would not yet be operational (because the flows would be insufficient) the odor control systems which are part of the treatment plant headworks would be operational to address odors. Licensed sewage haulers would then transport the wastewater in tanker trucks to an off-site wastewater treatment plant for disposal. Odors would not be expected from the trucking operations because sewage would be completely contained during transport.</p> <p>I84-10 Septic systems are not feasible for the proposed density of development. For this reason, the project proposes sewer service.</p> <p>I84-11 Conditions of approval for each phase of development, associated with each Tentative Map or Tentative Parcel Map, will be required to be satisfied prior to grading for each phase. These conditions will ensure that services and utilities are provided concurrent with each phase of development.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

I have lived in this area for over 35 years and I have seen changes come. Change is expected, but it is expected to be 2+acre lots per dwelling and not condensed lego type houses. If I am not mistaken, that is the purpose of the General Plan. It insures that there will be proper growth and not urban sprawl. It is designed for all the people living there and not some out of town greedy developer who doesn't want to pay for the infrastructure needed to sustain that kind of housing.

184-12

Please consider my comments and do the right thing for all the people that the county is supposed to be working for. Please deny this project as it is the wrong idea in the wrong place.

184-13

Thank you for your time.

Nutritia Wilson  
 Countryside Pools  
 PO Box 529, Bonsall, Ca 92003

184-12 The County acknowledges this comment and the opposition to the project. 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 Plan Amendment Authorization (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. See subchapter 3.1.4 and Appendix W for details related to the project's consistency with the General Plan. Also see response to comment I4-1. 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.

184-13 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.