

I-374 Pamela Stahl

I-374-1 The comment states the County General Plan was updated after a lengthy evaluation. The comment states the General Plan should provide land use designations which provide for the quality of life for all residents of the County, enable prospective home buyers or renters to choose an area to live that suits their needs and provide developers with the knowledge they need to determine what to pay for raw land, as well as certainty of land use.

The County notes the comment provides background information and serves as an introduction to comments that follow, but does not raise an environmental issue related to the DEIR within the meaning of CEQA. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

I-374-2 The comment states that granting General Plan Amendments obliterates the integrity of the General Plan to the point that there is no reason for having a General Plan. The comment states that if the Draft EIR is approved, Newland Sierra will seek a General Plan Amendment.

The County first clarifies that the proposed Project, as analyzed by the Draft EIR, includes a General Plan Amendment, as more fully explained in Section 1.6.1 and outlined as follows in Section 1.6.2:

“The project application consists of the following components:

11. General Plan Land Use Element Amendment: revisions to Figure LU-1, General Plan Regional Categories Map (see Figures 1-38 and 1-39 of this EIR).
12. General Plan Land Use Map Appendix Changes: revisions to Figure LU-A-2, Bonsall Land Use Map, Figure LU-A-12, North County Metro Land Use Map, and Figure LU-A-12.1, Twin Oaks Land Use Map (see Figures 1-40 and 1-41 of this EIR).
13. General Plan Mobility Element Amendment (Deer Springs Road Option A Only): revisions to Table M-4 (“Road Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified”) to add the segment of Deer Springs Road between Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock Road.

Comment Letter Responses

14. General Plan Mobility Element Appendix Changes (Deer Springs Road Option A Only):

- a. Revisions to Figure M-A-12 to change the bicycle classification of Deer Springs Road from a Class III Bike Route to a Class II Bike Lane and to change the road classification of Deer Springs Road from a 6.1 Prime Arterial classification to the following classifications:
 - i. 2.1B Community Collector classification (Sarver Lane to Mesa Rock Road)
 - ii. 4.1A Major Road classification (City of San Marcos Boundary to Sarver Lane) and (Mesa Rock Road to I-15 SB Ramps).
- b. Revisions to the “Mobility Element Network—North County Metro Subregion Matrix” table to:
 - i. Add the segment of Deer Springs Road between Sarver Lane and Mesa Rock (LOS F)
 - ii. Delete the segment of Deer Springs Road between the I-15 NB Ramps and N. Centre City Parkway, as this segment is no longer failing in the County GP Buildout Scenario with Deer Springs Road reclassified.

15. General Plan Mobility Element Appendix Changes (Deer Springs Road Option B Only): Revision to Figure M-A-12 to change the bicycle classification of Deer Springs Road from a Class III Bike Route to a Class II Bike Lane.”

The comment addresses general subject areas, General Plan compliance, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 3.3, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix DD, Land Use Consistency Analysis. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I-374-3 The comment urges the proposed Project be dismissed “for the integrity of the General Plan” and “so that the quality of all for all residents can be preserved.”

The County acknowledges the comment letter, and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator. The comment 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.