Response to Comment I12-1

Please see the Global Response to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4 which includes analysis of land use compatibility and community character pursuant to the requirement of the General Plan. Specific to the quotes, they pertain to an amendment to the Specific Plan for Rancho Cielo in the community of Rancho Santa Fe, and were excerpted from a September 26, 2012, Board of Supervisors meeting transcript. The comments are noted, but the bases for those conclusions do not apply to the Harmony Grove Village South (HGV South) Project. The context of the comments makes it clear that opponents to that amendment were focused on reliance on earlier EIR documents (1981 and 1984) completed prior to the 2011 General Plan update, proposed ridgeline development, the lack of Resource Protection Ordinance review, removal of commercial and associated uses (including possible park uses) from an approved locale and placing them on a more distant part of the overall development, and other issues such as the inclusion of steep retaining walls along curving roads without a specified sidewalk or path nearby to provide pedestrian separation from the road. Relative to community character, Supervisor comments were heavily focused on the fact that the prior project had been approved under older standards and that ridgeline development was not preferred within the County in accordance with current standards.

Board of Supervisors meeting transcript. The comments are noted, but the bases for those conclusions do not apply to the Harmony Grove Village South (HGV South) Project. The context of the comments makes it clear that opponents to that amendment were focused on reliance on earlier EIR documents (1981 and 1984) completed prior to the 2011 General Plan update, proposed ridgeline development, the lack of Resource Protection Ordinance review, removal of commercial and associated uses (including possible park uses) from an approved locale and placing them on a more distant part of the overall development, and other issues such as the inclusion of steep retaining walls along curving roads without a specified sidewalk or path nearby to provide pedestrian separation from the road. Relative to community character, Supervisor comments were heavily focused on the fact that the prior project had been approved under older standards and that ridgeline development was not preferred within the County in accordance with current standards.

Each of those issues differentiates that project from the Proposed Project. HGV South has its own current EIR and is not relying on an EIR prepared decades ago, analysis has been completed in accordance with the current General Plan, no amendments to an existing approved Specific Plan are proposed, no ridgeline development is proposed, and no high retaining walls are proposed along curving roads. Some of the specific items identified as problematic in the public comments (lack of a Resource Protection Study review, lack of design criteria in the Specific Plan, and lack of private and public view impacts analysis) are not relevant to the Proposed Project, which includes each of those elements.
As such, the comments are noted but do not pertain to the Proposed Project. It is also noted for informational purposes that the Rancho Cielo amendment was not denied, but was returned to staff for additional review. That review, which was completed in 2013, resulted in a re-hearing of the amendment in August 2013, at which the amendment was approved.

Response to Comment I12-2
As noted in Response to Comment I12-1, the Supervisor was discussing roads in Rancho Santa Fe pertinent to a different project. Her comments do not relate to the current analysis. Please also see the Global Responses to Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access.

Response to Comment I12-3
Comment noted. Subchapter 2.2, Transportation and Traffic, of the EIR, analyzes impacts on road infrastructure using thresholds established by the County. A majority of the comment’s text is copied from the Rancho Cielo Specific Area Plan. It predates consideration of the Project and is either not relevant to the Project due to the distance of the Rancho Cielo area from HGV South–affected road segments or does not deviate from the information presented in the EIR. No response is required.
Response to Comment I12-4

Please see the Global Responses to General Plan/Community Plan Amendments CEQA Impact Analysis and Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4. Please also see the Global Response to Fire Adequacy of Evacuation and Access.

Response to Comment I12-5

These are conclusion comments. They do not raise specific issues regarding the content of the DEIR, but will be included as part of the administrative record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

Regards

David Radel

18354 Via Ambiente

Rancho Santa Fe CA 92067