

Neufeld, Darin

From: Slovick, Mark
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 7:47 AM
To: Neufeld, Darin
Subject: FW: Newland Sierra NOP Comments

Mark Slovick, Planning Manager
County of San Diego | Planning & Development Services
T. 858.495.5172

From: Royalviewranch@aol.com [mailto:Royalviewranch@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2015 6:36 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Newland Sierra NOP Comments

March 14, 2015

Karen & Allen F. Binns
2637 Deer Springs Place
San Marcos, CA 92069-9761
royalviewranch@aol.com

RE: NEWLAND SIERRA, PDS2015-GPA-15-001, PDS2015-SP-15-001, PDS2015-REZ-15-001, PDS2015-TM-5597, LOG NO. PDS2015-ER-08-001 NOP Comments

Dear Mr. Slovick,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the NOP for Newland Sierra.

At the Scoping Meeting I brought to your attention the fact that there is a 5.40 Public Park (Park 14b) abutting our property. We have Ag property A-70 and have had horses on our property since we moved here 28 years ago. We also have chickens as well as a rooster.

We do not feel that this Public Park should abut our property. It is the largest of the parks and it is the only one of its size. I would say that 95% of the 28 parks are under 1 acre and about 5% are over 1 acre. This park is well over 2 acres larger than all other parks in the development.

Their entire school site is only 6 acres!

Parks should be in the neighborhood it serves so as to eliminate driving as the Applicant has stated that this is a walkable development. We strongly disagree.

In briefly looking over the Tentative Maps the sizes of the parks are 2.00, .54, .08, .20, 1.81, .37, .12, .12, 3.23, .52, .11, 2.01, .87, 2.84, .55, .98, .12, .30, 2.18, .69, .61. Park 14a is .55 acres, Park 14c is .98 acres, and Park 14d is .12 acres.

With the size of the park abutting our property we can only assume that seeing that it is a Public Park it could have softball fields or some other games and could have the potential for bright lighting until 10:30 pm or longer so as to accommodate the games as well as concession stands and loud speakers, etc.

If you watch the news you will see that parks can be a haven for drug deals as well as gang violence. We do not want this by our rural, agricultural property. We are not fenced and having a Public Park or any park for that matter abutting our property could very well open us up to litigation as our horse would become an “attractive nuisance”.

This Public Park is also going to have a large dog park, a Community Building, and 65 parking spaces. Why so massive? There has to be a reason for all of the parking etc.

Also what differentiates a Public vs a Private Park? Once you invite the Public into your development, how are you going to prevent them from entering, either by car or on foot, a Private Park especially when it abuts a Public Park?

Another reason why this Park needs to be inside the development and not on the outskirts is because there are numerous avocado groves in the area that require aerial spraying as well as topical spraying (my neighbor has a 40 acre avocado grove) and how can they do the aerial spraying when people are in the park?

Thank you for your time in consideration of these matters.

Sincerely,

Allen F. Binns
Karen Binns

I also want to include a letter I sent to Kevin Johnson regarding the NC 42 Study Area in this Newland Sierra NOP comment letter.

March 12, 2015

Allen F. & Karen Binns
2637 Deer Springs Place
San Marcos, CA 92069-9761
royalviewranch@aol.com

RE: NC 42 Study Area Proposed Property Changes

Hello Kevin,

I am writing in regards to our phone conversation on Friday March 6, 2015 regarding the NC 42 Study Area (formerly Merriam Mountains, now called Newland Sierra). Our property abuts NC 42.

We are opposed to having our property rezoned in order to make a project that is 4,000% over the General Plan allowed density, and does not conform to the General Plan, and needs a rezone, and a General Plan

Amendment, as well as a Specific Plan, more palatable by changing our zoning so as to not cause "spot zoning" for the Newland Sierra project.

Our property was rezoned when the new General Plan was approved in August 2011. It was all rezoned for a reason. The reason is that it is all "steep slope". Now the County wishes to change it back to its original zoning to help the Newland Sierra project.

We are actually opposed to the possible reclassification back to our previous designation of 1 home per 4 acres. This really is not going to benefit us in any way as we only have 5.20 acres, and we feel it may cause more "*unintended consequences*" to our zoning and Land Use designation.

We are zoned A 70 and we have had this zoning since before we moved here more than 28 years ago in March of 1987.

We have had horses on our property since 1987 and have one horse here now. We also have chickens and even a rooster on our property.

What if they try to change our Land Use Designation and then we cannot have livestock. Don't say it cannot happen. There are always "*unintended consequences*" to an action. I recall how we were going to be able to keep our health plan and keep our doctors. Let me tell you that did not work out for us. We lost our plan and lost 99% of our doctors. I only had 1 doctor left. "*Unintended consequences*" of an action. So no, we do not trust the system to protect our interests!

We are opposed to the NC 42 Study Area.

Sincerely,

Allen F. Binns
Karen Binns