

I-296 Michael W. O'Connor

I-296-1 This comment expresses the commenter's opinion that the project is leapfrog development. The County does not concur. County General Plan Guiding Principle LU-1.2 addresses leapfrog development. Draft EIR Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning analyzes the project's consistency with the goals, policies and objectives of the General Plan. Appendix DD specifically addresses the proposed project's consistency with the County's Guiding Principles and concludes that Policy LU-1.2 is not applicable to the project Site because,

“The project as proposed is consistent with the Community Development Model, because the Community Development Model has already applied an established Village Regional Category designation to a portion of the project Site. The project does not propose to create a new Village, or expand or reconfigure the existing Village area. The project is also within the established boundaries of the Vallecitos Water District.

I-296-2 This comment states the County does not require projects to provide road improvements. The County does not concur with this comment. Draft EIR Section 2.13 address Transportation and Traffic. Section 2.13.12 provides the recommended mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potentially significant traffic impacts. Thirteen mitigation measures are identified. Further, each mitigation measure for a specific improvement includes a trigger by which the improvement must be complete or additional development may not occur. The improvements are the responsibility of the project to construct.

I-296-3 This comment questions why the County processes project which are inconsistent with the General Plan. The County allows for General Plan Amendments, which the project proposes. The project's consistency with the General Plan is addressed throughout the Draft EIR, including in Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning. The Draft EIR also compares the impacts of the proposed project against an Existing General Plan Alternative in Section 4.5. Section 4.5.5 concludes the Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater significant impacts compared to the proposed project in the following areas:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Transportation and Traffic

Comment Letter Responses

- I-296-4** This comment states the proposed project would result in gridlock during a fire evacuation. Please see **Topical Response HAZ-1**. No further response is required.
- I-296-5** This comment states that the project should include a fully staffed fire station. The County does not concur. The comment expresses the commenter's opinion and does not raise an issue within the meaning of CEQA. Nonetheless, the Draft EIR evaluates the proposed project's impacts to fire services in Section 3.5 and concludes the project would have a less than significant impact on fire service and would not require the construction of a new or additional fire facilities which could result in environmental impacts. Section 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, analyzes wildlife hazards in Section 2.8.3.1 and concludes "initial fire response for the improved portions of the project Site would be provided by DSFPD's Station 12 due to its ability to provide 5-minute travel times to all improved areas. In addition to Station 12, Stations 11 and 13 can also respond within 10 minutes to support the effective firefighting force." Thus, no additional fire station is required.
- I-296-6** The County acknowledges the comment expressing opposition to the project and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.