

From: Susanna Hoffert
To: AdvancePlanning, PDS
Subject: Property Specific Requests General Plan Amendment, PDS2012-3800-12-005, PDS2014-REZ-14-006; LOG NO. PDS2012-ER-12-00-003; SCH NO. 2015121012
Date: Monday, February 12, 2018 12:31:58 PM

I am writing regarding:
PROPERTY SPECIFIC REQUESTS GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, PDS2012-3800-12-005, PDS2014-REZ-14-006; LOG NO. PDS2012-ER-12-00-003; SCH NO. 2015121012

I17-1

I am opposed to PSR GPA for the Desert Subregion (specifically within the Borrego Springs CPA) identified as DS24.

I appreciate the detailed analysis presented in the SEIR, notably:

- DS24 PSR GPA is inconsistent with the Borrego Springs Community Plan (Policies LU-1.1.1, LU-2.1.1)
- DS24 PSR GPA would increase water demand at a time when the community must decrease water usage by 70%
- DS24 PSR GPA would negatively impact a beautiful natural forest of ancient ocotillos (The DS24 site is located within the Ocotillo Forest Resource Conservation Area of the Borrego Springs Community Plan.)
- DS24 PSR GPA would negatively impact air quality
- DS24 PSR GPA would negatively impact sensitive species
- DS24 PSR GPA lies in a flood plain (The site is within a particularly hazardous area for flooding, due to the confluence of west to east drainage flows associated with the alluvial fans of Dry Canyon, Tubb Canyon, Culp Canyon, and Loki Canyon.)
- Borrego Springs already has 3000+ entitled undeveloped residential lots

I17-2

I17-3

I bought a home in Borrego Springs about a half mile west of DS24. I bought in this neighborhood specifically because it is surrounded by properties with low zoning densities. Similarly, the DS24 property owner acquired the property knowing it was zoned SR-10. Allowing DS24's density to be increased to ten times higher than what is currently allowed would radically change the style and quality of life in the neighborhood I've invested in.

I17-4

Such a substantial increase in density on a site with undisturbed native desert habitat should not be allowed. Instead, this land should be conserved to the greatest extent possible. **A zoning change from SR-10 to SR-1 on DS24 would remove the Conservation Subdivision requirement from DS24; I object to this removal.**

I17-5

Please do not allow a density ten times (!) higher than what is allowed now on DS24!

Sincerely,
Susanna Hoffert
susanna@hofferts.com

Response to Comment Letter I17

Susanna Hoffert

February 12, 2018

I17-1 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the proposed PSR GPA for DS24.

This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, therefore, no further response is necessary.

I17-2 This comment summarizes potential impacts of the proposed GPA for PSR Analysis Area DS24 in very general terms.

The County agrees that the stated summary is generally accurate. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, therefore, no further response is necessary.

I17-3 This comment expresses thoughts and opinions of the commenter.

This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, therefore, no further response is necessary.

I17-4 The County acknowledges the commenters objection to increasing density on, and removing the Conservation Subdivision requirement for, DS24.

This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, therefore, no further response is necessary.

I17-5 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to increasing density on DS24.

This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR, therefore, no further response is necessary.