I-381 Stella Sutherlin

I-381-1 The comment states the commenter moved to Champagne Village and was aware of the County of San Diego General Plan and was “comfortable knowing the area was safe from over-development.” The comment then briefly notes the previous proposal on the project Site was denied by the Board, and now the proposed Project is being processed.

The County notes the comment provides factual background information and does not raise an environmental issue 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.

Nonetheless, the County notes that General Plan Amendments are permitted to be processed, and that regular updates to the General Plan, through General Plan Updates, occur. While the General Plan may contain a certain land use designation at any time, there is no requirement that such designations will remain indefinitely.

I-381-2 The comment states that many of the residents of Champagne Village are in the 80’s, 90’s and 100’s and asks if they are to spend their final years listening to construction activity and the pollution caused by construction.

The County acknowledges the comment and directs the commenter to Topical Response AQ-1 through AQ-3 and NOI-1 regarding construction schedule, air quality and noise impacts associated with construction activity.

I-381-3 The comment states that if residents are required to move, the value of their homes may be at risk due to the proximity to the construction from the proposed Project.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. 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-381-4 The comment asks if wildlife will be displaced, and where it will go.

The comment addresses general subject areas, impacts to wildlife, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.4, Biological Resources. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore,
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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-381-5 The comment states the existing traffic is “deplorable” and questions how it will be affected by new traffic from the proposed Project.

The comment addresses general subject areas, traffic, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic. 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-381-6 The comment states the commenter is not opposed to development but believes it should be in an area where infrastructure is in place. The County refers the commenter to Response to Comment O-1.7-4 and Appendix JJ-10 to the Final EIR regarding existing and planned infrastructure.

I-381-7 The comment states the Newland Sierra plans are “too vague” and there are too many unanswered questions. The County does not concur with this comment. The proposed Project includes a Tentative Map and Preliminary Grading Plan, a Specific Plan, and associated technical reports and a Draft EIR. The analysis therein was prepared in compliance with the County’s content and format requirements.

The County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise any specific issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. 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 or necessary.

I-381-8 The comment states the commenter’s opposition to the proposed Project.

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.