### COMMENTS

**Comment Letter I5**

From: Wintherway, Karen
To: Smith, Ashley; Agassai, Sarah; Horn, Bill; Robberts, Jacob; Danes, Cox; Greg
Date: Friday, June 16, 2017, 11:09 AM

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Harmony Grove Village South proposal being put forth by the Kovash Group and RCS Partners. I am a resident of the unincorporated rural communities of Eden Valley, Harmony Grove, and Edin Forest in unincorporated San Diego County, one of the last contiguous stretch of rural land and open space in the County within 15 minutes of the coast. We are one of the oldest rural communities in the County, going back to the late 1800s with the establishment of the Harmony Grove Spiritualist Association in 1896. I've lived in Edin Forest for 3+ years and moved here because of the rural, equestrian environment, large lots, and close knit community with no street lights or sidewalks.

I'm very concerned about this proposal to change the General Plan which many of us spent countless hours negotiating in good faith for several important reasons:

**COMMUNITY CHARACTER:** This project is completely out of place with the character and nature of our community. It offers condos and multi-story dwellings in an area surround by preserved open space, rare habitat, horse ranches, estate residences and semi-rural residential environments. Surely our decision makers can't envision that a remote development of condos directly adjacent to thousands of acres of protected open space and farmland is consistent with the policies of the General Plan? This project will destroy the character and nature of the last of the few special places in San Diego County that all citizens can enjoy.

### RESPONSES

**Response to Comment I5-1**

The County acknowledges these introductory comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the environmental analysis or adequacy of the EIR. Please see the responses below to specific comments.

**Response to Comment I5-2**

The Proposed Project would expand Harmony Grove Village (HGV) in a manner that is consistent with the community character of HGV and the surrounding areas. Please see the Global Response to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4.
When the strict application of the requirements set forth in Section 503.1.3 is impracticable, the Fire Code Official may grant a modification from such requirements. A modification may be granted pursuant to Fire Code Section 96.1.104.8. (MODIFICATIONS) when the modification is in compliance with the intent and purpose of the code and such modification does not lessen health, life, and fire safety requirements. The Project is requesting a modification from Section 503.1.3 of the Consolidated County Fire Code (“Fire Code”) with respect to dead-end road lengths because the topographical, geological, and environmental condition of the site make compliance with this standard infeasible. The Fire Protection Plan (FPP) that describes the modification has been accepted by the Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District (RSFFPD), the Fire Authority Having Jurisdiction.

With respect to secondary access, the ability of the Project to provide a secondary access route was considered infeasible, as described in the FPP. (Secondary access is the typical mitigation for exceeding the dead end road length, but is not required as stated in the comment.) Since secondary access was determined as not being feasible, the potential for impairment of a single road by vehicle congestion, condition of terrain, climatic conditions, or other factors was evaluated. The Project developed an alternative approach for secondary access that meets the intent of the code through the implementation of a list of specifically developed measures and features as described in the FPP.

The commenter is correct in that secondary access route is a typical mitigation for exceeding the dead-end road length. However, it is not a requirement per se for development projects. The Project proposes meeting the intent of the Fire Code through a combination of measures that provide a system of fire safety above and beyond the code requirements. One of the most significant measures is construction of roads on-site that include an additional travel lane that is within 800 feet of all Project structures. The additional travel lane provides additional capacity for evacuation and would occur throughout the Project, and would include Country Club Road from the southernmost Project entrance.
The project has a supposedly Shelter-in-Place "philosophy," (but not official status as stated in the DEIR, as this would have stricter requirements) but what about the rest of us who will be trapped on dead end roads with no secondary egress behind 1,500 additional acres? Will the developer make our homes shelter-in-place too? Many of our homes were built before 1980. And more than 20 houses burned only 3 years ago in the same exact area they are proposing 45 3 homes. The EIR should evaluate proper mitigation measures such as providing the same structure hardening mitigation measures as inside the project to all the existing structures their project will encumber; this could include installing fire sprinklers, replacing roofs, installing double glazed windows, cement board siding and appropriate roof vents, for example, to all those homes trapped behind the project entrance. The applicant should bear the cost of these hardening mitigation measures since they will be causing entrapment of current residents.

The granting of an exception to the Fire Code to waive secondary access requirement worries me the most. There are good reasons for the Fire Code requiring a secondary egress, especially in this Very High Fire Risk area.

It is also extremely disturbing to read in the DEIR that the developer is claiming the project will help fund a financial shortfall for the HGV Fire Station, especially in conjunction with asking the County to grant exceptions to the Fire Code. This smacks of conflict of interest.

**BROKEN PROMISES:** Our community worked cooperatively and in good faith with County staff during the GP update process to maintain our community's rural character, as demonstrated by the compromise on Harmony Grove Village, based on the agreement that this more than doubling of our density would be our fair share of population growth; the rest of our community was downzoned to reflect that agreement. Now, only 5 years after the General Plan was approved, developers are seeking to set aside this negotiation and plop another 453 houses into our community after we had already agreed to 742 in HGV. There are numerous references to this negotiation and compromise throughout county planning documents, video from BOS meetings and there are many folks, including former County staff, current and former board of supervisors that would attest to it. Furthermore, this agreement is encoded and spelled out in the Community Plan (and thus the SD General Plan), through the developer seeks to erase those very references in their proposed amendment to our Community Plan (without our input, naturally). Approval of this project would constitute a breach of public trust, and discourage communities throughout the county from ever trusting our County officials.

**Response to Comment I5-4**

The County acknowledges these comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the substantive environmental analysis within the EIR. Please also see the Global Response to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4.
Response to Comment I5-5

The EIR did not identify significant impacts related to public health, safety, and welfare. Please see the Global Responses to Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access, regarding fire safety and evacuation issues. Comments related to “public interest” concerning the Proposed Project and the sales of the existing HGV development do not raise environmental issues and therefore no further response is warranted.

Response to Comment I5-6

The southernmost portion of the Project site is bordered by Del Dios Highlands Preserve, to the east and west are equestrian (and non-equestrian) residential uses, the Harmony Grove Spiritualist Society is also located to the west, and the HGV residential development site is located to the north. None of the Project site is currently within “protected open space.” Please see the Global Response to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4.

Country Club Drive and Harmony Grove Road currently operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) under County guidelines, LOS D. As concluded in Subchapter 2.2, Traffic/Transportation, of EIR, the Project would not result in significant, unmitigated impacts to Country Club Drive or Harmony Grove Road. As part of the Project design and mitigation, Country Club Drive fronting on the Project and up to Harmony Grove Road would be expanded to three lanes, more consistent with the portion of Country Club Drive north of Harmony Grove Road and with the portion of Harmony Grove Road trending west. Please refer to Subchapter 2.2, Transportation and Traffic, Section 2.2.7, Conclusion, of the EIR, which presents the rationales for the conclusions of impact levels resulting after implementation of the Project and the proposed mitigation measures.

Response to Comment I5-7

Please see the Global Responses to Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access. As concluded in that response, the issues of health and safety in case of wildfire have been adequately addressed and recirculation is not required. The contribution to the HGV Fire Station is a routine part of development fees, similar to those paid to support police services and schools. The payment would support adequate
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<td>fire services for the Project. This may also provide associated benefits to Project neighbors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Comment I5-8**

The County acknowledges the comment, and it 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. This comment does not address the environmental analysis or the adequacy of the EIR, and no additional response is required.