

I-5 FRANK OHRMUND

- I-5-1** The comment introduces other comments that follow. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-2** The comment expresses an opinion that there are flaws in the Draft EIR that impact the commenter's property, as well as other properties in the area, that were supposed to be addressed when Village 14 moved forward. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-3** The comment restates a policy from the Otay Ranch General Development Plan/Otay Subregional Plan, Volume II (Otay Ranch GDP/SRP) that is contained in the Draft EIR, specifically Appendix 3.1.3-1, General Plan Amendment Report (page 139). The County clarifies that the policy to which the comment refers was included in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP upon its approval in 1993. Since that time, the policy has been satisfied by the County's consideration and approval of the County-initiated General Plan Update (GPU) in 2011, which included Otay Ranch Village 14 and the adjacent properties. No further response is required or provided.
- I-5-4** The comment expresses an opinion that neither of these efforts to address access, utility needs, draining issues and long-term land uses for the scattered surrounding parcels has been completed. The comment further notes that the parcels surrounding the Proposed Project will become isolated remnants if the Proposed Project is approved as submitted. Please refer to **Response to Comment I-5-3**. The long-term land uses for the adjacent properties were addressed in the 2011 GPU. Property-specific issues such as drainage, utilities, and access for each adjacent property will be addressed at the time each property owner applies for development permits. The Proposed Project and Proctor Valley Road in particular has been designed so as not to impair any existing, recorded, legal access of adjacent properties and complies with the County's applicable ordinances. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-5** The commenter expresses an opinion that the GPU was never meant to address the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP policy and that no statement as such was ever made at that time. In addition, the comment then states that road designs to the various limited parcels were [n]ever completed as part of the GPU even though they were planned for rural residential uses. The County does not agree with these comments. For clarification, access to individual lots is not addressed at the General Plan level. The

- proposed Tentative Map provides abutting properties with access to Proctor Valley Road (directly or indirectly through the proposed development circulation system). The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR, therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-6** The comment expresses an opinion that even portions of Village 14 not owned by the Project Applicant, are being provided access roads and utility designs. The County notes that the access roads in question either (1) are required to provide primary and secondary access to the Proposed Project or (2) are required to provide access to adjacent Otay Ranch properties with common property lines. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-7** The comment expresses an opinion that there will be the need for another planning effort for Village 14, when the intent of the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP policy is to address all the owners within the planning area and the few surrounding parcel owners in one planning effort. The properties in question are not owned by Project Applicant, not proposed for development, do not include any pending application, and there is no requirement to include these properties under the California Subdivision Map Act or other County Ordinance. See **Response to Comments I-5-3** and **I-5-6**. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-8** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that he and other surrounding property owners “need to have our land uses, access and other development requirements addressed as part of the Village 14 analysis” per the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP policy. The comment further states it would be negligent to allow the Proposed Project to move forward when so many neighbors have been relying on the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP policy (quoted in comment I-5-3) to finally solve their land uses, access and utility connections. Please refer to **Response to Comments I-5-3** through **I-5-7**. The comment does not raise any issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-9** The comment expresses the commenter’s opinion that surrounding landowners should be able to develop at similar densities because housing is greatly needed in San Diego County. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-10** The comment expresses an opinion that the remaining private owners of Village 14 within the City of Chula Vista need access worked out through the County of San

Diego and that the Proposed Project would re-align Proctor Valley Road without providing access to these properties. The comment also refers to specific parcels and states that where and how the parcels get access from Proctor Valley Road and utilities must be addressed by this Proposed Project to be consistent with the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP policies.

The County notes that the proposed design of Proctor Valley Road does nothing to impair any existing, recorded, legal access to adjacent properties.

The County further notes that Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 595-050-04, -07, -08, and -09 are located within the jurisdiction of the City of Chula Vista and are immediately adjacent to a subdivision tract approved by the City of Chula Vista; therefore, it is not under the County's jurisdiction to address access issues for those parcels.

Regarding APN 595-050-15, as shown on the Proposed Project's Tentative Map (Sheet 5 of 24; available at <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/ceqa/OtayRanchVillage14.html>), the Proposed Project is designed to provide access to APN 595-050-15 with a median island break. The Proposed Project's design of Proctor Valley Road abuts APN 595-050-15 on its eastern boundary and, as such, does nothing to impair any existing legal access the property owner may have in that location. In addition, the County understands that the commenter is negotiating to obtain an access easement from the City of San Diego for APN 595-050-15. To the extent that easement is finalized, the County will work cooperatively with the commenter to ensure access to the property.

The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

I-5-11 The comment states that Proctor Valley Road is based on an old Road Survey from the 1890s and that its location has been moved from the original alignment years ago. The comment provides background information regarding the Proctor Valley Road. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided

I-5-12 The comment expresses an opinion that the Proposed Project does not have rights to use the current or any proposed alignment of Proctor Valley Road. The County does not agree with this comment. Refer to **Thematic Response – Proctor Valley Road and Other Off-Site Roads**. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.

- I-5-13** The comment expresses an opinion that the County maintains a road that does not match the adopted road survey and that County Public Works has admitted they cannot survey the road and just maintain it because it is on the County Maintained System. The comment provides background information regarding the County Maintained System of roadways and does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I-5-14** The comment states the road has no point of beginning and is based on multiple angle points and distances that cannot be followed. The comment further states that the road survey does include Township, Range and Sections, which show the road has moved from one side of Proctor Valley to the other, and that it was probably done when Upper Otay Reservoir was constructed in the early 1900s. The comment refers to the road survey and does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-15** The comment expresses an opinion that the County and Proposed Project need to include all the neighbors in fixing and defining exactly where the road should be and how everyone can gain access to it. Please refer to **Response to Comment I-5-10**. No further response is required or provided.
- I-5-16** The comment expresses an opinion that the Proposed Project shows a road location that crosses a portion of the commenter's property without any easement or public right-of-way. The County intends to work cooperatively with the commenter to the extent any right of way is needed from the commenter for Proctor Valley Road, but the comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.
- I-5-17** The comment expresses an opinion that the Proposed Project is not consistent with the lot sizes planned for the site. The comment further states the Village Core has higher density and is consistent, but the area around the Village Core should be developed at 2-3 dwelling units/acre (L and LMV categories). The comment also states this would allow for the more rural character that was planned for the transitional village between Chula Vista and Jamul. Lastly, the comment expresses the commenter's opinion that the areas around the Village Core should be 10,000-square-foot lots and larger. The County does not agree with the comment regarding lot sizes of the Proposed Project. As analyzed in the Draft EIR Section 3.1.3, Land Use and Planning, as well as Appendix 3.1.3-1, General Plan Amendment Report, the Proposed Project is consistent with the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP, including the density. Density is calculated based on gross acres in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP, and the unit

count in the Proposed Project is consistent with the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP unit allocation for the Proposed Project.

With respect to the comment that the 10,000-square-foot lots should be located around the Village Core, the County notes that planning principles in the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP prescribe smaller lots around village core. The Otay Ranch GDP/SRP low-medium village “LMV” residential land use category allows up to six dwelling units per acre, and the low “L” residential land use category allows from one to three dwelling units per acre. Additionally, lot sizes on the Tentative Map are expressed as minimums, and the average lot sizes in areas R-5, R-6, R-7, R-8, and R-9 around the Village Core range, are 11,363; 8,649; 9,518; 7,504; and 10,068 square feet respectively. The Proposed Project is consistent with the Otay Ranch GDP/SRP. Please also refer to **Thematic Response – Plan Consistency and Community Character**.

- I-5-18** The comment expresses an opinion that placing so much density and small lots will ruin the character of Proctor Valley and cause damaging landform alterations with large cut/fill slopes, which is inconsistent with Otay Ranch GDP/SRP policies. Please refer to **Thematic Response – Plan Consistency and Community Character**.
- I-5-19** The comment express an opinion that schools in Chula Vista are impacted, and sending kids from Village 14 would over-burden Salt Creek Elementary, Eastlake Middle, and Eastlake High schools. The commenter further suggests an elementary school should be built within the Proposed Project and that middle and high school students should go to Steele Canyon. Draft EIR Section 1, Project Description, states the Proposed Project includes a 9.7-acre elementary school site in the Village Core. Section 3.1.6, Public Services of the Draft EIR discusses existing schools and school districts, including boundaries, attendance, locations, and capacities of each school district. Section 3.1.6 also includes an analysis of the Proposed Project’s impacts on school services. The Proposed Project secured Service Availability Letters (Appendix 3.1.6-3) from the Chula Vista Elementary School District, Sweetwater Union High School District, Jamul Dulzura Union School District, and Grossmont Union High School District. Please also refer to the letter from the Jamul Dulzura Union School District, **Response to Comment A-5-7**.
- I-5-20** The County acknowledges the comment and notes that it provides concluding remarks. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required or provided.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK