Response to Comment PCI2-1
The comment does not raise specific issues regarding substantive environmental analysis within the EIR. Opposition to the Project is noted, is part of the administrative record, and will be before decision makers during consideration of the Project.

Response to Comment PCI2-2
These comments address impacts to the historic Harmony Grove Spiritualist Association (HGSA) property and structures resulting from the 2014 Cocos fire. They do not specifically address the HGV South Project EIR, nor are they inconsistent with information presented in the EIR. As such, they do not comprise comments requesting response, and do not require additional response.

Response to Comment PCI2-3
The County disagrees that the Project would destroy the valley, or that prior promises were made that would restrict property owners from proposing use of their property. Regardless, the 2011 General Plan provides a land use designation on site for 0.5-acre lots, which would allow for approximately 220 residential units without consideration of environmental factors, or approximately 174 units with steep slopes considered. The Project would propose approximately the same number of residential structures. Please also see discussion in Subchapter 2.1, Aesthetics, as well as the Global Responses to Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.4, and General Plan/Community Plan Amendments CEQA Impact Analysis.
The County disagrees that the Project would “substantially threaten lives” or that Harmony Grove Village (HGV) has substantially added to the difficulty of evacuation. HGV improved segments of Country Club Drive, provided a new road to the east (Harmony Grove Village Parkway) and built a bridge over Escondido Creek, providing an improved route east and out of the valley. The structures of HGV also have been built to far more modern standards than the HGSA, and could provide a temporary refuge of last resort in event of fire blocking evacuation. Specific to HGV South, and Project design elements and improvements that would address fire safety in the Project area, please see the Global Responses to Fire Hazards Impact Analysis and Adequacy of Emergency Evacuation and Access.

The last paragraph of this comment focuses on the GHSA mission and 122nd anniversary. These comments are not on the Project environmental analyses and do not require response. No detail is provided as to the statement that the HGSA stands “to lose so much more if HGVS is approved.” As such, please refer to Responses to Comments PCI2-3 and PCI2-4 of this letter.

Response to Comment PCI2-5
Comments noted. Opposition to the Project is noted, is part of the administrative record, and will be before decision makers during consideration of the Project. Please refer to Response to Comment PCI2-4 of this letter.