I-200 Rebecca Howell

I-200-1 The comment thanks the County for the opportunity to respond to the Draft EIR and asks why the County isn’t following the General Plan. Please refer to Topical Response LU-1. The Draft EIR details that project development would require amendments to the General Plan, including a General Plan Amendment to amend the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Map from existing General Commercial, Office Professional, Semi-Rural 10, and Rural Land 20 designations to Village Core Mixed Use, Semi-Rural 1, and Open Space Conservation. (Draft EIR Section 1.6, Project Inconsistencies with Applicable Regional and General Plans, p. 1-29 – 1-32.)

With these General Plan Amendments, the Draft EIR finds the project would be consistent with the General Plan. The Draft EIR evaluates the project’s consistency with the General Plan in detail in Chapter 3.3, Land Use and Planning; and Draft EIR Appendix DD. (See, Section 3.3.3.2, Conflict with Plans, Policies, and Regulations, p. 3.3-21.) In undertaking this consistency evaluation, the Draft EIR analyzes whether the project was consistent with each of the “Guiding Principles” and policies of the County of San Diego General Plan (2011) and Subregional Plan. Based on this detailed review, the Draft EIR concluded impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.3-21 - 3.3-36, 3.3-38.)

In addition to evaluating the project’s consistency with the Guiding Principles and policies of the General Plan, the Draft EIR directly compares the proposed project land uses to the Existing General Plan Land Uses in Section 4.5, Existing General Plan Alternative. (Draft EIR, p. 4-16.) Compared with the project, Section 4.5.5 has determined that the Existing General Plan Alternative would actually result in greater significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics and Mineral Resources compared to the project. (Draft EIR, p. 4-24.) This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

I-200-2 The County acknowledges the comment letter, and notes it expresses general opposition for the project, but does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.