

July 20, 2014

Mark Slovick
Planning and Development Services-San Diego County
5510 Overland Ave. Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

Lilac Hills Ranch is poorly designed. Also it is not very safe. After reading the EIR concerns I have include...

1. It is not a feasible walking or biking community as claimed.
 - A. The school is not in the center of the community but at the back edge. Most of the homes are over half mile away making it too far to walk.
 - B. The church/possible private school is located at the south end of the project behind the gated senior area making it impossible to access except on Sunday.
 - C. Most streets lack bike lanes, including the one in front of the school, leaving only sidewalks and mud paths to ride on.
2. It is not a very safe community.
 - A. The church the gates into the senior community are open every Sunday for anyone to enter.
 - B. The school athletic field backs up to acres of gullies filled with rattle snakes. One snake bite on a child could be fatal. See map
 - C. Lilac Ranch Road the main road leading to the school from most of the neighborhoods does not have a bike lane. The only alternative is using the dirt/mud path.
 - D. According to figures 47 and 51 Covey Lane, the main road to the school for most of Valley Center, does not have sidewalks or a bike lane.
 - E. The dog park is surrounded by gullies with hungry coyotes.
 - F. The main town park has a motel sitting on the edge of it. How safe would the children playing in the park be with a transient population living next door in the motel?
 - G. The walking route to school for many kids is through the middle of down town either past the motel or a bar.
3. Poor design and limited parking.
 - A. The joint use parking lot at the county park has no turn around area. If a driver could not find a parking spot there is no way to turn the car around to exit.
 - B. The recreation center/fitness and next door restaurant share only 43 parking spaces. The staff alone would use half of the lot. In the new EIR the restaurant has been replaced by a fire station with many of the parking spaces eliminated.
 - C. The majority of the driveways are a minimum of 12 or 15 feet. Most large cars and trucks are too long and would block the sidewalks. The parking study counts only 124 parking spots on the streets. Most garages being built today are not deep enough for full size cars or pickup trucks. Where will all the cars park?

4. Poor trail design.

- A. Some of the trails are only 3 feet wide. Many are only two feet wide. Bicycle riders would kill the hikers or each other in head on collisions.
- B. No direct trail from the senior area to the village. Also the seniors have no legal way of driving golf carts to the village.

5. Poor street design.

- A. Residential street "O" in phase one is two blocks. The tentative map shows more than 150 lots on just these two blocks. Many of the lots are only 50 feet wide. The set back from the street is only 10 feet. Driveways are only 15 feet long. The worst designed entry level neighborhoods (aka "Instant Slum Estates") in Moreno Valley and Adelanto are better designed.
- B. Most all traffic in the community will need to drive through the congested 'town square/ Village green'.
- C. Attempting to back a car out of the diagonal parking will be very dangerous if not impossible and will also stop traffic. Cars doubling parking waiting for someone to back out will stop traffic flow. Cars attempting to parallel park will stop traffic flow. The stream of pedestrians crossing at cross walks within the town center will stop traffic. Trucks double parking to make deliveries will stop all traffic. Grid lock could happen! The only alternative for drivers is to cut through the parking lots.
- D. In the east edge of phase three a north/south residential street has over 50 homes on it. The street is connected on the north to West Lilac Road and on the south to Lilac Hills Ranch road. Many drivers will use this residential street to avoid the congestion in the down town area. Trying to back a car out from a driveway would be very dangerous.
- E. The limited street frontage in front of the school would be reserved for bus parking making very little room for individual student drop offs.
- F. Cars will not be able to leave the school because of the backed up grid lock at the two nearby roundabouts by cars waiting in line on Covey Lane and Lilac Ranch Road trying to enter the school zone.
- G. Vehicles parked on short driveways blocking sidewalks, ultra narrow building lots, large cars and trucks parked on the streets in front of every house, only a 10 feet setback from the street to the front of the house, postage stamp area for front yards –what a mess! Driving down any of the narrow residential streets all you will see is cars and trucks parking on the street or overhanging the sidewalks when parked on the driveway, garage doors, very small fronts of houses, and very little space for landscaping.

6. Citrus and avocado groves

- A. Citrus and avocado trees do not grow well in public maintained areas. These production trees require specialized grove care that the homeowner association 'mow and blow specialists' cannot or will not provide. No new planned communities have groves that have worked including new home developments in Irvine Ranch and Mission Viejo.

- B. Planting citrus and avocado trees in the new cut slopes also is a very poor idea. Page 46 of the EIR Agricultural report (paid for by Accretive) reports that this will not work due to the poor soils. Note-For some unexplained reason this report which was once on the county web site has disappeared from the EIR documents. Why?

7. Two Separate Projects or One

- A. The EIR maps show that this is not one project but two. These two areas touch each other at one very small point but are actually over 500 feet apart with a street connecting the two parts.
- B. Why is this 500 feet of connecting land not included in the project? Why is there just one project being processed instead of two.


8. Poor School and Park Design

- A. The goal lines on some of the playing fields are less than six feet from the street. These streets are very narrow with cars traveling next to the curb. See map
- B. The park plan shows a hiking trail going through a playing field. See map
- C. The main ball field for the school is over 90 feet below the school making supervision impossible. The cliff would be higher than a eight story building. See map.
- D. The parking lot in the park as no way to turn a car around if the lot is full. See map
- E. Most of the ball fields for the school use are across a public street from the school making access for the school kids very dangerous. What school district would approve such a plan? See Map.
- F. Most of the playing fields have very little or no area for spectator viewing. See map
- G. On three sides of the school are gullies field with rattle snakes.
- H. The park has no restrooms.
- I. The school has no gym.
- J. The park has no gym.
- K. The school has no hardtop area for basketball courts, handball courts, tetherball, four square, jungle gym or general fitness exercise area.
- L. The school has no running track.
- M. The school has no additional land for expansion.
- N. The school has no practical way for safety fencing.
- O. The school has no access for trash, food, and other service trucks to enter.
- P. The school has no bus parking except using the narrow short area in front of the school that is needed for student drop off.
- Q. The school has less than 500 feet of street frontage leaving little room for student drop off because busses will need the space in front of the school.
- R. The public parks ball fields are used during the school day by the school. How can a school provide safety when the park across the street and open to the public?
- S. Each day before and after school grid lock will happen at the two nearby 'roundabouts' by parents dropping off or picking up their kids. This will split the community and isolate it by making it impossible to travel. See diagram
- T. Grid will happen twice daily when cars start backing up on the three streets waiting for a limited space in front of the school. When the first few cars want to exit to school area they will be blocked at the 'roundabouts' by cars waiting in line to enter


the school drop off area. No one will be able to enter the area or leave. No one in the community will be able to move from the southern section to the northern section or vice versa. Classic gridlock! See diagram

- U. The school and the park will need to agree and sign joint use agreements. Which school district, Bonsall or Valley Center and which community Bonsall, Valley Center, or the county will need to sign? Do they all have to agree? Good luck.
9. Other design flaws in the community
- A. Why would a church want two athletic fields unless it is also a private school. What church would want to build on a site that cannot be easily accessed because it would be behind two locked senior citizen gates? How would the kids get to this private school? Accretive needs to explain this and show that an interested, willing and financially able church is ready to build.
 - B. Across the school in phase three a private recreational club is planned. But in phase one the Home Owners Association will have their own club. The illustrations show that the HOA club will be bigger and better than the private club. What private club would want to be there if no one would join? What would go on this site if no private club/gym was interested? Accretive needs to explain this and show that they have an interested, willing, and financially able private fitness center that is ready to build.
 - C. In the town center a large motel is planned but is there any demand for a motel in the area? Why would anyone rent a motel room here when much more desirable casino hotel rooms are available, also time share condos with golf are just down the road, and in city and beach motels are nearby. Accretive needs to show that they have an interested, willing, and financially able motel operator ready to build.
 - D. Accretive proposes a new school. Their project straddles two school districts. Neither district seems excited about a new school or cooperating with each other. Accretive response is maybe no school will be built. The problem is that Accretive is selling this complete village concept but without the school what kind of a village is left.....just a bunch of homes out in nowhere.
 - E. Accretive proposes a 200 bed Group Residential Care hospital. Most patients probably don't care or even remember that they are living in the middle of this 'greatest village in the world' housing development in the middle of nowhere. Most patients never leave the building unless they are going to the doctor or hospital. The nearest medical facilities are over eight miles away. How could this Group Care hospital compete with similar Care facilities located in town near doctor offices and hospitals?

Bill Aaron



Grid will happen twice daily when cars start backing up on the three streets waiting for a limited space in front of the school. When the first few cars want to exit the school zone they will be blocked at the 'traffic circles' by cars waiting in line to enter the school drop off/pick up area. No one will be able to enter the area or leave. No one in the community will be able to move from the southern section to the northern section or vice versa. Classic gridlock!



7/20/14

Mark Slovick
Planning and Development Services-San Diego County
5510 Overland Ave. Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

In the comment section of the original 2013 EIR many questions were asked about how Covey Lane will be affected. Accretive had a year to respond. In their second EIR Accretive still did not answer any of the questions. Questions not answered included

1. What is the design of the intersection of Covey Lane and Lilac Hills Ranch Road. Every other intersection in the development has been engineered, analyzed, discussed forwards and backwards, and diagramed but not this intersection. This intersection is very important. It connects the unconnected north and the south half of Accretives project. It contains a controlled gate and a guard shack for the senior housing. It connects a 500 foot road segment that the Accretives owners own but do not want to be part of their project. It moves the present public Covey Lane to a new location that now will become a private road owned by Accretive. It is a very critical intersection yet all of Accretives reports never discuss this intersection. Why?
2. Covey Lane is a private road. How can a segment of it be converted to a public road without all the owners' permissions?
3. According to the specific plan long segment of Covey Lane will stay a private road but become part of Lilac Hills Ranch and owned by its homeowners. Many others properties that are not part of Accretives project front or use this road. How will these properties be affected? How will their driveways from these present homes get access to Covey Lane if this new development has a fence around it? Will they have to pay HOA fees? Will they have any rights to how this new private road is managed? Neither the EIR or specific plan, or any other documents, drawing, or illustrations answers these questions.
4. Five hundred feet of Lilac Hills Ranch Road at the intersection of Covey Lane is owned privately by the developers. This segment is not part of their proposed project. This road segment connects what is actually two separate projects that the developers are claiming is just one project. Why is this short segment not part of the project? Why is it not discussed anywhere in Accretives documents why they are excluding it from their project? How will this private road segment work since it will not be owned by the 1746 Home Owners Association or be a public road. Nothing in the reports explains this odd proposal.
5. How will existing overhead electrical wires be addressed on Covey Lane? If these wires are moved how will the existing homeowners connect? How will future homeowners

connect if the wires are underground and under the new private Covey Lane owned by Accretive?

6. How will the existing water pipes be addressed on Covey Lane? Will it be realigned along with the road?
7. One plan discussed in the EIR is to run a sewer line down Covey Lane. Will properties outside the development be able to use this line?
8. How will a private water line under Covey Lane, built in 1961, before the VCMWD line be affected? It is still the property of some property owners. Nowhere in the reports is it discussed. Can it be removed without it owner's permission or compensation?
9. The new school/park is proposed to be on Covey Lane. According the Figures 47 and 51 of the specific plan Covey lane will not have sidewalks. How will these kids safely get to school?

These questions and other about how Covey Lane will affect nearby homeowners and need to be answered. Accretive has done a very poor job in their explanations. How could what is supposed to be a first class developer do such a poor job in planning?

Bill Aaron

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bill Aaron".

7/20/14

Mark Slovick
Planning and Development Services-San Diego County
5510 Overland Ave. Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

The EIR/specific plan for Lilac Ranch Hills explains that the developer has the option to build five phases of this project in any order they see fit and on any time frame. My concern would be what would happen if only part of it was built and the developer went out of business. It would be a bunch of homes on small lots stuck out in the middle of nowhere with few if any of the amenities that were promised. The first few new homeowners would suffer along with the existing neighbors.

The reports state it may take many years to build this project. Most of the streets, parks, pools, club house, school, trails, green belts, open spaces, churches, stores, and all the other amenities will not be there for the first home sales. When comparing what Accretive developers are proposing to two new master planned communities in Orange County many differences become apparent. Irvine Ranch now is selling a new village called Orchard Hills. The Mission Viejo Company is also selling a new village called The Ranch. These villages are similar to Lilac Hills Ranch. Each has a mix of several types of homes (single family, condo, town homes, separate senior citizen area with many different types of homes), schools, shopping, and parks). Each is about the same size. But the biggest differences are that these two developers built all the schools, parks, community centers, streets, sidewalks and trails, before they sold their first house. All the different types of housing were available the first day of sales. The first home buyers know what their village/community will look like because it is complete and not just pictures and promises from the developer. If these two developments can do it right then so can Accretive. If they can't maybe they should sell their development to someone who can.

Bill Aaron

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bill Aaron".


July 20, 2014

Mark Slovick
Planning and Development Services-San Diego County
5510 Overland Ave. Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123


The California Environmental Quality Act requires the EIR to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making. A number of alternatives to the project were considered during preparation of the EIR. The present plan has very little support from the community. Another alternative that might get support would be similar to what is happening all around the country. It would be a limited development with most of the land in a conservation farm easement. The Journal of Sustainable Real Estate by the University of San Diego published a researched article about how in Colorado housing in Conservation Developments worked. See attachment. By limiting the number of homes and increasing the open spaces buyers are willing to pay much higher price for the homes. The developer sold far less building lots to a builder but each lot sold for a much higher premium and the project had much lower infrastructure costs. The community and the environment win by a less dense communities with more open spaces. The developers get their projects approved and still makes a nice profit. Everyone wins.

Using the concepts used in Colorado a much more desirable village could be developed. The town village could be a little larger with more green belts and open spaces. The country inn and most of the town would surround a small lake. The down town village area has much larger plaza areas. The condos and townhomes would be buried with more landscaping, and parking lots are better hidden from the street views. Single family homes would be in 'six packs' surrounded by greenbelts eliminating the boring streets scenes. Outside of the village area are many equestrian half acre estate homes next to horse trails. The majority of the 608 acres would be open space or small farms/ranches. Lilac Ranch would bisect the project connecting to all the farms, ranches, church/private school, community center, and vineyards. Horse and hiking trails would surround the entire project and streets. An equestrian center/ stables would be in the south west corner. See attachment for pictures.

Bill Aaron



CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT



DRAFT

LILAC HILLS RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN

FIGURE 10



Park is in the middle of village center. Outdoor café and tavern overlook the lake. Picnic area overlooks lake. Fitness training circuit surrounds lake.



County Inn overlooks open space with views of the lake. Inn connects to park and town with pedestrian bridge.



Views from Lilac Ranch Road also include beautiful ranch homes, homes with vineyards, corrals, barns



Roads and driveways off Lilac Ranch Road lead to farms, ranches, and estates homes





Lilac Hills Ranch Road bisects entire project with a large median with native landscaping. Trail on one side. Fenced horse path on other.



Views from Lilac Ranch Road include horse ranches, farms, parks, vineyards, and flower fields.



The beautiful recreation and fitness center in the village



Vineyards with tasting rooms and outdoor banquet facilities are off Lilac Hills Ranch Road



Miles of horse, hiking and biking trails surround the ranch passing ranches, vineyards, groves and farms



Active and passive parks along Lilac Hills Ranch Road



Half acre estate homes with barns scattered throughout the ranch



Equestrain riding center and horse stables at the end of Covey Lane connect to miles of trails



'Historic Barn Park' remembers the past.....meeting hall for clubs and civic groups.....social hub of the community



Comparative Analysis of Housing in Conservation Developments: Colorado Case Studies

Authors Christopher Hannum, Steven Laposa, Sarah E. Reed, Liba Pejchar, and Lindsay Ex

Abstract Conservation development (CD) is an approach to the site design of a development property that combines residential development and land conservation. CD has been heralded as an environmentally-friendly development alternative and a means to finance land conservation. We employ a Box-Cox hedonic methodology using transaction data for all CD subdivisions in five Colorado counties, as well as a unique sample of homes in comparable nearby rural non-CD subdivisions to assess the value of the CD amenity to homeowners. Our research demonstrates significant sales price premiums for homes located in regulated and unregulated CDs relative to comparable non-CDs.

Conventional residential development poses several challenges to sustaining healthy ecosystems and human communities in the United States. Residential development is a leading driver of changes to biodiversity (McKinney, 2002) and ecosystem services that are critical for human well-being (Kroeger and Casey, 2007). Moreover, conventional residential designs have been linked to declines in the health of human communities (Frumkin, 2002). Land use and residential design also affect human well-being through public health, social equity, climate impacts, and community integrity (Dannenberg, 2003; Alberti 2005; Ewing, Bartholomew, Winkelman, Walters, and Anderson, 2008).

Although efforts to conserve natural resources on private lands have grown rapidly in recent years (Chang, 2010), land continues to be converted to residential and urban development at twice the rate that it is being protected (Aldrich and Wyerman 2005; USDA, 2009). Current funding for land conservation is inadequate to assemble an inclusive and ecologically viable network of conservation areas (Lerner, Mackey, and Casey, 2007). A recent National Association of REALTORS® (NAR) study demonstrated that environmental features are important to 90% of home buyers in the U.S. (NAR, 2008). The high rates of land development, conservation finance gap, and changing preferences among homeowners make this a critical time to examine new approaches for incorporating conservation objectives into development practices, financing land conservation, and providing a model for sustainable homeownership rates.

Exhibit 1 | CD Examples



Source: *Conservation Design for Subdivisions* by Randall G. Arendt. Copyright ©1996 by Island Press. Reproduced by permission of Island Press, Washington, D.C.

Standard economic theory suggests that as income rises, so too will demand for most goods, services, and amenities. Since economic growth inevitably leads to increases in income and living standards in the long run, this presents a conundrum for advocates of sustainable building practices and many environmentally-friendly housing attributes and amenities. Bloom, Nobe, and Nobe (2011) find a positive price premium associated with ENERGY STAR homes, while Aroul and Hansz (2011) find a similar premium for dual-pane windows. Goodwin (2011), examining survey data, finds that the importance placed on ENERGY STAR ratings and heating and cooling costs are negatively correlated with the subject's income. Many green amenities provide external benefits to society, but only cost savings to the individual directly affected. These costs matter less to high-income individuals, and if the green attribute provides an effective disamenity, as with compact fluorescent bulbs (Wall and Crosbie, 2009), that fact could inhibit adoption. Even where the green attribute does not create a disamenity, as with dual-pane windows, we would expect future income growth to slow the pace of adoption. However, some characteristics of a sustainable housing development might provide tangible aesthetic benefits to the individual homeowner and in such a case would expect greater possibilities for private supply of green housing amenities with limited need for government involvement.

Conservation development (CD) is an approach to the site design of a development property that combines residential development and land conservation with a goal of providing functional protection for natural resources (Milder, 2007; Pejchar, Morgan, Caldwell, Palmer, and Daily, 2007). CD includes a wide range of project types, ranging from just a few houses on large tracts of rural land, to suburban conservation subdivisions, to large master-planned communities in urban areas. CD has been heralded as an environmentally-friendly alternative to residential sprawl, as well as a means to finance land conservation. Exhibit 1 (Arendt, 1996) illustrates a CD (c) in contrast to a conventional dispersed development (a). In a CD, the natural resources of the property (b) are initially mapped and protected and home sites are then clustered on a smaller portion of the site.

Although CD has been in use for more than four decades in the U.S. and accounts for up to one-fourth of private land conservation (Milder and Clark, 2011) and a growing proportion of residential development activity, little is known about home sales, valuation trends, absorption patterns, and marketing strategies in CD

Exhibit 12 | Extended County Level Regression Results (Marginal Effects)

Variable	Larimer	Douglas	Mesa	Routt
LIVING AREA	\$62.17	\$61.51	\$56.22	\$230.23
LOT AREA (IN SQ. FT.)	\$0.07	\$0.12	\$0.11	\$0.05
AGE	\$149.27	-\$3,006.04	\$159.02	\$1,443.10
NUMBER OF BATHROOMS	\$9,100.33	-\$648.52	\$8,332.10	\$58,609.43
DISTANCE TO LARGEST TOWN	-\$0.03	-\$0.38	-\$2.18	-\$10.00
NUMBER OF BEDROOMS	-\$11,317.93	—	-\$14,866.89	-\$29,973.10
GARAGE	\$44,196.44 [18%]	\$24,939.11 [7%]	\$33,291.88 [20%]	—
BASEMENT	\$33,578.80 [14%]	\$6,521.70 [2%]	\$-23,505.66	—
FINISHED BASEMENT	\$-48,369.23 [-20%]	\$-10,069.39 [-3%]	—	—
CENTRAL AIR	\$11,106.23 [5%]	—	\$16,161.59 [10%]	—
NO QUALITY REPORTED	\$133,949.76 [56%]	—	\$-34,753.66 [-21%]	—
EXCELLENT QUALITY	\$197,330.27 [-21%]	\$39,061.44 [10%]	\$12,593.14 [7%]	—
GOOD QUALITY	\$69,712.52 [29%]	\$28,025.21 [7%]	\$5,848.08 [3%]	—
FAIR OR LOW QUALITY	\$-39,279.96 [-16%]	—	\$-35,789.55 [-21%]	—
POOL	\$28,271.25 [12%]	—	\$9,231.92 [5%]	—
WATERFRONT	\$-7,548.14 [-3%]	—	—	—
REGULATED C.D.	\$34,137.22 [14%]	\$97,594.29 [26%]	\$20,707.78 [12%]	\$253,416.84 [30%]
UNREGULATED C.D.	\$39,782.75 [16%]	\$147,473.92 [39%]	\$14,924.09 [9%]	\$433,270.85 [51%]

Note: Brackets indicate percentage change for Box-Cox marginal effects.

Conclusion

Housing markets at the national, regional, and city levels are recovering from the housing crash of 2007. Conservation development projects are not immune to the stigma and negative consequences of households deleveraging, increasing defaults,

decreasing second home markets, and lower homeownership rates (Burger and Carpenter, 2010). Numerous transactions were eliminated from our study due to deed types reflecting foreclosures and public sales. As the country eventually recovers from the Great Recession of 2007 and 2008 with improved economic conditions, interest in CDs and other housing transactions is likely to improve.

Our research focused on three questions. Based on our analysis, we conclude there are significant differences in prices for homes in CD projects versus 35-acre, large lot, and unregulated CD projects; there are significant differences in prices for homes in CD projects across the five Colorado counties; and there are significant differences in the total number of sales and transactions between CD projects and non-CD projects.

Despite low per hectare yields, CDs may not represent an unattractive alternative to developers of rural land or land on the urban/rural fringe. As other authors (Mohamed, 2006; Bowman, Thompson, and Colletti, 2009) have noted, there are reasons to expect cluster development plans like CDs to decrease developer costs rather than raise them—if we compare plans for the same site. While lot size does itself represent an amenity, the results suggest that the impact of additional privately-held land is only 9 cents per square foot or \$4,062 per acre. Given the average lot size of a home in a large lot development (4.6 acres), allocating two-thirds of the land of the development site to conservation would provide roughly twice the price premium of allocating the same land to larger individual lots.

Our research demonstrates a significant sales price premium for homes located in CDs relative to comparable non-CD projects, while controlling for housing, time, and location factors. We find that while the price premium associated with regulated and unregulated CDs is similar, the impact of property characteristics on prices in the two categories may differ. Understanding such differences between CDs and non-CDs will help developers and residential brokers create appropriate development and marketing strategies. If CD projects are also ecologically beneficial, our results suggest that this approach to development is a viable tool for conservation finance.

This research is limited to sales transactions for the five counties and four development categories. We do not address initial lot sales, net absorption trends, time to construct a home after the initial closing, or the value of the initial home; we capture only sales subsequent to all of these events. It is therefore possible that further research into the initial development, marketing, and home construction factors may complicate or confirm our results. If a relationship exists between turnover and CD status within specific school districts only, our data set may not capture bias induced by school district. Additionally there is very limited research on the overall financial returns to the developer with sufficient data such as time-dependent development costs, expenses, and lot sales to calculate internal rates of returns. Although our extensive dataset included transactions indicating foreclosures, we did not address how CD projects compared to non-CD projects during the recent housing downturn.

OPEN SPACES = HIGHER PRICES

Homes built in land-conservation developments sell for 29% more than homes built in traditional rural developments, a Colorado study finds



CALL IT the flora-and-fauna effect: Home buyers will pay a premium to live near open, undeveloped land. So much for good neighbors.

That's the conclusion of a Colorado State University study of home prices in conservation developments, where residential real estate is limited and a substantial amount of land, usually 50% to 70%, is set aside as open space. "That could mean wildlife habitats, agricultural lands, important cultural sites, open space for scenic vistas," says Sarah Reed, co-author of the study and associate conservation scientist with the Wildlife Conservation Society.

Researchers compared 2,222 home sales in five counties in Colorado between 1998 to 2011. The conservation developments set aside an average 64% of land as open space, while traditional rural subdivisions set aside 4.9%. Based on the analysis, homes in conservation developments sold for 29% more than homes located in conventional residential projects.

"For a homeowner, this means that the value of their home will be greater just by being in a development with open space," Prof. Reed says.



Conservation Development

These illustrations show two possible models for a development site in Sussex County, Del. In a conservation development, 50% to 70% of the land is typically left open. Home lots are depicted as yellow blocks.



Traditional Development

LESS OPEN In a traditional rural subdivision, much less land is set aside as open space.

Increasing lot size in an undesignated conservation development raised the market price by 38 cents per square foot or \$16,662 per acre, researchers found. In nonconservation developments, a bigger lot size translated to only 9 cents per square foot, or \$4,062 per acre. The study, funded by the National Association of Realtors and CSU's School of Global Environmental Sustainability, was published in December 2012 in the *Journal of Sustainable Real Estate*.

A 2011 study in the *Journal of Conservation Biology* estimates that roughly 310,000 acres have been developed in the U.S. as conservation subdivisions, where anywhere from

30% to 70% of land is protected as open space.

More subdivisions probably qualify, but developers haven't sought designation by the county as official conservation developments.

Regardless, the price perk is still there: Homes in undesignated conservation developments sell for 25% more than those in conventional subdivisions, the Colorado State researchers found.

Open-space living often appeals to active, outdoorsy buyers—"tree-huggers," says Rosanne Sledz, a real-estate agent with Weichert Realtors McKee Real Estate. One of the premier conservation developments, Prairie Crossing in Grayslake, Ill., about an hour north of Chicago, designates more than 60% of its 677-acre site as protected open space.

"You can walk out your back door and start jogging on a trail that takes you through miles and miles of forest preserves," Ms. Sledz says.

—Sanette Tanaka

July 20, 2014

Mark Slovick
Planning and Development Services-San Diego County
5510 Overland Ave. Suite 110
San Diego, California 92123

"A focal point of the community may contain elements such as an Amphitheater, which will host festivals, musical performances, celebrations and community events....."

"With a Town Center that encourages gathering, and promotes walkability in a village setting with conveniently located services and amenities....."

"A community that preserves our rural character....."

"Preserving and conserving open space and agriculture....."

These statements and others that appear on Lilac Hills Ranch web site or in the Specific Plan are very deceptive. I do not see an amphitheater anywhere in the documentation except for a small concrete step next to the sidewalk in the town square. If it 'promotes walkability' why is the senior housing over one mile away from the town center? How does it 'preserves our rural character' when 1746 homes are built of 250 acres which is denser than most major cities? 'Conserving open spaces' are just the gullies that are impossible to develop. No land is being conserved. The marketing word for gullies is 'Biological Open Space'. How does planting a row of avocado or orange trees on a cut slope conserve agriculture?

Along with these false statements the pictures of their web site and in the Specific plan are very deceptive. For example :

The Community Spoke



We Listened

Over the past three years, we've received input from hundreds of residents about our plans for Lilac Hills Ranch. This input has helped shape our community and, if approved, will include:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 20 Miles of Soft-Surface Hiking and Biking Trails • Over 25 Acres of Neighborhood Parks and Multi-use Sports Fields • Recreation Centers • Community Pools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Square with Tavern on the Green • Church • K-8 School • Senior Center • Group Residential and Group Care Facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Street • Restaurants • Sidewalk Cafes • Boutique Stores • General Store • Bakery • Country Inn • Farmers Market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Gardens • Office Space • Equestrian Trails • Trail Head/Staging Area for Equestrians • Community Recycling Facility • Increased Open Space
--	--	---	---



Lilac Hills Ranch

Please visit www.LilacHillsRanch.com for more information

Supporting Economic Growth and the Future of North County

This opening page on their web site shows beautiful estate homes, parkway, street with a bike path, and large estate lots on the ridge. Nowhere in their project does this street or ridge lines with estate homes. ²⁰¹⁵



This drawing appears to be a block long pedestrian plaza with an outdoor farmers market with wood arbors and stone pillars. Also in the background are rolling hills with the large orchard and a row of estate size homes? The Specific Plan does not show this.



Where is this winery visitor center and vineyard? It is not on the Specific Plan. Where in the development is the ridge in the background with estate size lots and a large orchard on the hill?



This drawing of the market looks like a very large outdoor seating area on a brick lined pedestrian plaza. Figure 72 in the Specific Plan shows only a very narrow side walk next to the main streets on two sides of the market, a loading dock on the third side, more stores and a parking lot of the fourth side.



This drawing looks like a park with beautiful homes in the background. But what is missing from the drawing is that it is a very small park with surrounded sides by the main streets of the project. Also these beautiful homes do not exist because stores are across the street not these homes.



The caption for this drawing is '20 miles of trails'. The drawing gives the impression of 20 miles of beautiful wide trails and green belts. In the Specific plan most of the trails are not in green belts but just unpaved dirt sidewalks next to the roadways. According to the Specific Plan many of the trails are just 24 inches wide.



This drawing looks like the pool in the senior center. In the back ground are estate size lots in surrounded by large groves. The Specific Plan does not show any large estate lots or large groves in the senior area.



This drawing looks like a restaurant with outdoor seating 12 inches from the busy street. How can pedestrians use the sidewalks? Are the streets going to be made from bricks?



This drawing looks like a café with an outdoor seating area in a very large pedestrian plaza. The town center concept plan, figures 72 and 134 in the Specific Plan, do not show this large plaza anywhere in the town center.



This drawing on their web depicts a beautiful '5 star' looking resort hotel. In the Specific Plan the footprint of the hotel looks much different. It is surrounded on three sides by public roads with no room for any landscaping. On the fourth side of the motel is a parking lot with some parking spaces right next to the building.



This drawing looks like a very large fountain in an area called "The Tavern". The seated people give to fountain a size of 14 feet or taller. The arbor appears to be over 18 feet tall and 40 feet square. Figure 134 (town center concept) does not show this arbor or fountain. Also the people on the grass field behind gives the impression that this area is very large playing field. Again, Figure 134 shows this area to be about 100 feet wide and 300 feet long or about the size of a small gym.

In the Specific Plan fifteen homes are showcased as representative home styles. Of these 15 beautiful homes few will fit on the most common lot size of 5000 square feet. Only the houses with garage in front will fit these very small lots. Of the houses that will fit these small lots the largest feature on the front facade will be the garage doors. The front of the house will be much smaller. The actual street scene will be driveways, garages, parked cars everywhere, and postage size front landscaping. The 15 homes are beautiful but most cannot be built except on very few lots. Again Accretive is misrepresenting their project.

Many people will judge this project by looking at just the drawings. These drawing are a misrepresentation of what is in the Specific Plan. If Accretive wants the support from the community then they should not lie to them. They have been and continue to be very dishonest.

Bill Aaron

Slovick, Mark

From: Carla <quiltlady7@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2014 8:58 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Re: Lilac Hills Ranch Project

These are some major concerns pertaining to this project.

The roads and traffic with these proposed changes would make a major difference, not in a good way. Increased traffic and a more dangerous area to exit safely when fire season hits.

This development violates too many provisions set forth in the general plan. Infrastructure: roads, bridges, water, sewer and schools are totally inadequate to support this project. We urge the county to reject this development. Remember we are in a critical water shortage, so more homes makes no sense what so ever.

Thank you, Carla Alvarez

Sent from my iPhone

Slovick, Mark

From: Robert G Alvarez <doitall8@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 1:22 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch Project

Attention Mark Slovic

I'm writing this letter in opposition to the Lilac Hills Ranch Project. The enormity of this development violates all provisions set forth in the San Diego County General Plan , which you are surly aware of. Existing infrastructure cannot support the size and density of this development. Existing roads, The West Lilac Bridge, Old Highway 395 and Interstate 15 Freeway access are totally inadequate to handle the amount of traffic this development would generate. To many homes in too small an area far exceeds current zoning ordinances, adding a School, Retail Shops and Commercial Buildings would DESTROY THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT !!! What about Sewer ??? Will the Public be on the Hook to Pay for these Improvements ??? If the County Department of Planning approves this Development we might as well tear up the Newly Adopted General Plan and the County can explain to the Tax Payers how their Money was Squandered Adopting the Counties New General Plan.

Mark Slovic

Please reject The Lilac Hills Ranch Project

Thank You , Robert Alvarez

Slovick, Mark

From: Nancy Anderson <ednancyanderson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 2:30 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Fwd: Lilac Ranch Development

Hope this finds its way to you. My original letter is below. Nancy Anderson

Jeweled

Designs by Nancy Anderson
www.nancyandersondesigns.etsy.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nancy Anderson <ednancyanderson@gmail.com>
Subject: Lilac Ranch Development
Date: July 26, 2014 at 3:15:21 PM PDT
To: MarkSlovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear Mr. Slovic,

As a resident of the area being considered for development I would like to add my opinion. My husband and I lived at 10081 West Lilac for almost 30 years. We presently live in Bonsall off of Via Ararat. For the many years of residency in the area we have seen much development take place. With the addition of new homes we now have major traffic, especially in the afternoon as people use I15 to commute to Temecula. All around us there are plans to build more homes. There is the area off 76 and I15, there is the area off of Twin Oaks Valley Rd. and then, of course, this project named the Lilac Ranch Development. Are we no longer adhering to the General Plan for the area off Lilac Road, which is the planning document that has had citizen input, or are you just ignoring this plan that took many years to develop?

I am very concerned that with all the planned development from those who do not live in the area we are fast losing the reason so many of us enjoy life in North San Diego County. If you have your way we will fast become Poway or Ranch Bernardo or Rancho Penasquitos. Lilac Ranch Development will change our lives dramatically, not in a positive way..... more concentrated housing, overcrowding in our schools, more traffic and the lose of our rural lifestyle.

Sincerely,

Nancy Anderson

Jeweled

Designs by Nancy Anderson

www.nancyandersondesigns.etsy.com

3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (TM),
3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-018
(STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

I live in Castle Creek Villas. Our access roads are Circle R Dr. & Circle R Way. It is very difficult to access Circle R Dr. from Circle R Way. There is limited view of the road from east & west due to curves in the road. When I have pulled onto Circle R Dr. I have ended up with people on my bumper because they come around the curve so fast.

(Attach additional pages as needed)

Janet A. Barnard 6/24/14
Signature Date

JANET A. BARNARD
Print Name

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
FAX #: (858) 694-3373
e-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

29579 CIRCLE R GREENS DR.
Address

ESCONDIDO CA 92026
City State Zip Code

760-297-1142
Phone Number

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

Slovick, Mark

From: Royalviewranch@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2014 8:46 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch Draft REIR comments

July 26, 2014

Allen F. & Karen Binns
2637 Deer Springs Place
San Marcos, CA 92069-9761
760-744-5916
royalviewranch@aol.com

Mark Slovic
County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Re: Lilac Hills Ranch Draft REIR Comments

Dear Mr. Slovic:

The comment I would like to make is that there should be no street parking allowed. Everything should be red curbed.

Due to the massive density increase, and the fact that the project is in an "extreme fire danger area" and due to the drought and a lack of water to adequately fight a massive wildfire there should be no on street parking at any time or any place in this development.

During a fire there is no room for crowded streets and fire trucks. Some homes have multiple families living in them in these trying times and with so many vehicles to one home people tend to park all over the streets, which is an especially bad scenario in a wildfire situation when fire trucks cannot make it through to fight the wildfires with people trying to evacuate at the same time. We cannot have evacuees hindering emergency vehicles.

Another comment I would like to make is regarding the Developer not wanting to do a list of road improvements. If he wants to do his project then he needs to do the road improvements needed for the increase in traffic caused by his project. This is a Health and Safety concern, especially in the case of a wildfire.

Lack of water/ Severe drought: We are in a severe drought. It has been this way for several years now with no relief in sight. Now you are adding all these residents. Where is the water going to come from? Yes, I bet you are going to say it is Ag land and Ag land uses more water. If the Ag land is not in use, then there is zero water being used now. There will be lots of water used in this development. Also there is a tremendous amount of water that will be used during grading. Is that water use used for grading going to be coming from recycled water?

Density increase: This land is zoned for 110 homes based on slope. Now they want 1745 residences. That is a 1600% increase.

Now add in the 50 room Country Inn as well as the 200 bed group care assisted living facility. That brings the density to 1996 residences. Now we are looking at a 1900% increase in density from the new General Plan that was adopted in August 2011. The General Plan that took over 12 years and over 16 million dollars to complete.

Traffic increase: With all these residences as well as the 200 bed group care assisted living facility and 50 room Country Inn there will be many workers and many average daily trips. There is also the 90,000 square feet of commercial, office and retail space, plus a school.

Can the streets handle this overload? Are there the necessary road improvements that will be needed by this project?

Why do we even have a General Plan? Why did we spend so much time and so much money just to allow a General Plan amendment? Why are we allowing developers to destroy the General Plan?

Sincerely,

Allen F. Binns
Karen Binns

3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (IM),
3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-018
(STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

We do not want the traffic and
congestion from this proposed project.
Also the values of the houses in this
area will significantly drop. Especially,
because people purchased their homes
with a country atmosphere many home
owners and renter will be robbed of the
rolling hillside views and be upset.

(Attach additional pages as needed)

 7/28/14
Signature Date

Adrienne Bliss-Williams
Print Name

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
FAX #: (858) 694-3373
e-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

31832 Rocking Horse Road
Address

Escandido CA 92026
City State Zip Code

760 802 5985
Phone Number

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

LILAC HILLS RANCH
3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (TM),
3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-018
(STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

Please see attached sheets.

(Attach additional pages as needed)

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
FAX #: (858) 694-3373
e-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Marina Boubion *6/26/2014*
Signature Date

MARINA BOUBION
Print Name

9746 Megan Ter
Address

Escondido, CA 92026
City State Zip Code

760-749-7036
Phone Number

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

Marina Boubion
9746 Megan Ter
Escondido, CA 92026
760-749-7036
planktonbou@yahoo.com

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Subj: Lilac Hills Ranch Development

Dear Mr. Slovick:

Lilac Hills Ranch Project is a very large project that seems to be benefiting the developer and is not in the public's interest. A project like this would lower the quality of exiting communities, the impacts are many including large negative impacts on the environment, it exposes residents to greater danger of fire, it increases the traffic volume significantly on West Lilac Road, Circle R and all the neighboring roads.

I am opposed to this development being approved (Lilac Hills Ranch Development Project) for the following reasons:

1. The proposed changes to the zoning would have a major impact to residents who already live here and to local wildlife. Where would the wildlife go?
2. This project not only increases danger to all residents due to fire and traffic, it also increases the risk to our firefighters and first-responders. what happened at San Elijo Hills in San Marcos during the last fire is an excellent example of what can happen - it was difficult to get out and of course put residents and first responders at a higher risk. I am not sure we want to have similar situation here when the Santa Ana winds come. Do we?

Will the Developer be forced to upgrade access roads? This project would need access road improvements needed for the increase in traffic. Big time health and safety concern, especially in the case of a wildfire. West Lilac and the I-15 interchanges need to be upgraded - provide off and on ramps and make the West Lilac/I-15 bridge into a four-lane. West Lilac and Circle R also need to be upgraded to 4 lane roads. A recent example would be what was done for Hidden Meadows.

3. Wasn't the San Diego County General Plan approved just three years ago? August 2011? After all the resources spent by the Public (by the County), the county staff must have known what was best for rural areas. The current zoning is Rural SR-10, SR-4. It is zoned for about 110 homes and increases the density by 1700%. In my mind, this development definitely goes against the General Plan! Is the County going to ignore the General Plan or will they abide by it?

5. Another huge for me is water; seems crazy that developments of this magnitude are even brought up for discussion when our water needs in CA are such an issue. Where would the water come from for this development anyway? Agriculture? I don't think that is a good choice - where will our food come from anyway? China?

Again, I seriously oppose this development as it stands now. the SD County plan has it zoned for just 110 homes on 608 acres It should be drastically de-scoped to match the.

Let's keep it rural, please.

Marina Boubion

6-26-2014

LILAC HILLS RANCH
3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (TM),
3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-018
(STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

Please see attached sheets.

(Attach additional pages as needed)

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
FAX #: (858) 694-3373
e-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Jorge *6/26/2014*
Signature Date
JORGE BOUBION
Print Name
9746 Megan Ter
Address
Escondido, CA 92026
City State Zip Code
760-749-7036
Phone Number

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

Jorge Boubion
9746 Megan Ter
Escondido, CA 92026
760-749-7036
zdr2k@hotmail.com

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Subj: Lilac Hills Ranch Development

Dear Mr. Slovick:

Lilac Hills Ranch Project is a prime example of a project benefiting special interests and is clearly not in the public interest. It would degrade the communities, it would impact in many ways including significant negative impact on the environment, exposing its residents to significant danger of fire and significant traffic congestion on West Lilac Road, Circle R and the neighboring roads.

I oppose the Lilac Hills Ranch Development Project for the following specific reasons:

1. This is a Rural Agriculture area and proposed changes to the zoning would have a major impact to residents who already live here and to local wildlife.
2. Approval of this project would also increase danger to all residents due to fire. We saw recently what happened in San Elijo Hills in San Marcos during the last fire - it was a struggle to get out and put thousands of residents and first responders at a higher risk. Do we really want to have the same situation here when the Santa Ana winds come?

I didn't see anywhere in the plan for road improvements. Does that mean the Developer is not wanting to do access road improvements? If he wants to do his project then I would think he needs to do access road improvements needed for the increase in traffic caused by his project. This is a Health and Safety concern, especially in the case of a wildfire. At a minimum, West Lilac and the I-15 interchange needs to be opened up - provide off and on ramps. West Lilac and Circle R need to be developed to 4 lane roads similar to what was done for the Hidden Meadows Developments.

3. What happened to the newly written San Diego County General Plan? Wasn't it approved in just three years ago? August 2011? It took 12 years and in excess of \$16 million dollars but after all the time spent by the Public and money spent by the County, our county staff must have known what was best for that land. The current zoning is Rural SR-10, SR-4. It is zoned for about 110 homes. The proposal would increase the density by 1700%. The development would surely go against the General Plan! Is the County going to ignore the General Plan or will they abide by it?

5. Water is a HUGE concern as well; seems very hypocritical that developments of this magnitude are even considered when our water needs are such an issue. Where would the water come from for this development? Agriculture? That is what we saw earlier this year with CA farmers being denied water.

Again, I seriously oppose this development as it stands now. It should be drastically de-scoped to match the SD County plan of just 110 homes on 608 acres.

 6/26/2014

July 12, 2014

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Department
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123


RE: PDS2012-3800-12-001 (GPA), PDS2012-3810-12-001 (SP), PDS2012-3600-12-003 (REZ), PDS2012-3100-5571 (TM), PDS2012-3100-5572 (TM), PDS2012-3300-12-005 (MUP), PDS2012-3500-12-018 (STP), HLP XX-XXX LOG NO. 3910 12-02-003 (ER); SCH NO. 2012061100 LILAC HILLS RANCH PROJECT.

Dear Mr. Slovick,

We live at 9040 W. Lilac Rd., Escondido, CA 92026 which is located just north of the proposed project area. My wife and I moved to this area back in 2000 to escape the noise and pollution of the urban lifestyle. In January of 2012, I was diagnosed with Stage 3 aggressive form of prostate cancer. For treatment, I've undergone a radical prostatectomy, 8 weeks of radiation treatment and I'm currently receiving ongoing hormone therapy to slow progression of the disease. My recent PSA test results indicate cancers cells are still present but appear to be restrained by the hormone therapy. Medical literature for my type of cancer, emphasize the importance of living a healthy/ stress-free lifestyle. In an effort to stay healthy, we planted an organic vegetable garden on our property to ensure proper foods and I've made arrangements with my employer to avoid any stressful situations at work. But ever since plans for the Lilac Hills Ranch project became public, I've been terrified about the impending environmental impacts which could potentially jeopardize my fight against cancer and destroy our rural community.

My wife and I are very concerned about the significant/ unavoidable impacts the project would cause and request the Planning Department acknowledge this letter as a viable comment in response to the draft EIR. If you need further information in regards to this letter, please feel free to contact me by email or my home address.

Sincerely,


Greg and Christine Brady
9040 W. Lilac Rd
Escondido, Ca 92026
Cgbrady1959@yahoo.com

Slovick, Mark

From: Buddhika Abesingha <b_abesingha@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2014 11:29 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Comments: Lilac Hills Ranch

To: Mark Slovick, San Diego County Project Manager

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mr. Slovick,

I believe the applicant has not properly addressed all concerns in the DEIR. I have the following questions:

1. How is the applicant addressing the negative impact of widening Mountain Ridge road to the surrounding parcels?
2. How is the applicant addressing the negative impact of widening Mountain Ridge to the surrounding habitat?
3. How will the applicant gain rights to widen Mountain Ridge, given that Mountain Ridge is a private road?
4. Has the impact of outside visitors to the SFS-5/SFS-6/church developments been considered in the traffic study and the impact on Mountain Ridge road?
5. How could Mountain Ridge road, with its slopes and blind spots at various points, accommodate additional traffic without posing danger?

Respectfully,
Buddhika Abesingha
9790 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
619-808-3090

Slovick, Mark

From: PETER G BULKLEY <pgbwlf@wildblue.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2014 3:34 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: REIR Lilac Hills Ranch Project

Sir:

The county of San Diego recently spent thousands of tax payer dollars to update the general plan for the future good of the county. No sooner was the ink dry when Accretive Investments Inc. began efforts to have the general plan modified to suit their Lilac Hills Ranch project. Their goal is to increase cooperate profits by maximizing density on the 608 acres in question. When completed, they will move on to the next "look-a-like" master plan without regard to the consequences to the damage they have done to the environment and the people who already live in this area.

Objections to the project, traffic, noise, use of water, overcrowding of the area and the schools, damage to the environment etc. have been addressed very throughly by the Valley Center Community Planning Group. Revisions by Accretive are not for the benefit of this area, but sops to win approval for their project which in my opinion will destroy this unique rural area.

I believe the County of San Diego and the Board of Supervisors have the legal and moral responsibility to support the General Plan as written and approved with tax dollars, not the fiscal interest of a land development company. When Accretive Investments revises its master plan of 1746 homes to conform with the density specified in the San Diego's Master Plan for this area, I will consider withdrawing my objections to the Lilac Hills Project.

Peter Bulkley
9885 West Lilac Rd

Elizabeth A Bulkley

elizabethbulkley@mac.com

July 26, 2014

TO: Planning and Development Services (PDS)

Project Processing Counter, 5510 Overland Av., Ste. 110

San Diego, CA 92123

ATTN: Mark Slovick, Project Planner, Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

FROM: Elizabeth Bulkley, 9885 West Lilac Road, Escondido CA 92026

(APN 129-190-36 and 37)

RE: Public Response to the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR

My husband and I purchased 9+ acres in 1973 that we live on today. One end of the property is located where Rodriguez Rd, Covey Ln and West Lilac Rd converge, with long frontage on Rodriguez and West Lilac Rds.

I have participated in the meetings both in the field and in the Community Center regarding the Lilac Hills Ranch Development for several years now. I am diabolically against this development for many reasons.

I agree completely with the report of the Valley Center Community Planning Group—Lilac Hills Ranch Sub-Committee.

I am against this development for many reasons, some of them are:

1. General Plan: As we all know, the General Plan was voted and agreed upon after 12 years and over \$20,000,000.00 of tax payers money. All of a sudden, Accretive comes along and instead of 110 homes on 603 acres as the general plan states, their development states that they will have 1,746 homes plus Commercial plus an Assisted Living Facility. IT IS THE STATED JOB OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (ROSSMOOR VS. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS) TO

DEFEND THE GENERAL PLAN. The law gives the Board impunity but states that they work for the citizens.

2. TRANSPORTATION: West Lilac Rd is a lovely, curvy tree shaded road between Covey Lane and I-15. Bicyclists come here to ride and train; walkers walk and joggers jog. This development with over 1,700 homes, Commercial Development and Assisted Living Facility will add THOUSANDS of trips to the roads in the area, make them unsafe and destroy the existing rural atmosphere. There is a real problem at our corner and several other sites regarding acquisition of rights of way from property owners across private roads for public access from a private developer by eminent domain. The General Plan has taken into consideration transportation for the 110 houses planned for. It has not taken into consideration the traffic gridlock for 1,700 homes.

PLEASE DRIVE FROM ESCONDIDO TO TEMECULA ON I-15 DURING RUSH HOUR—AND THIS IS WITHOUT THE DEVELOPMENT AT THE NORTH-EAST QUADRANT OF HWY. 76 AND I-15.

3. WATER: The county has been told to cut their water usage by 20% by the State of California. I agree with this decision considering that state of the drought. Therefore can the County of San Diego morally and conscientiously consider permitting a grading permit using hundreds and hundreds of gallons of water that will move thousands of acre feet of land with adverse air conditions and inconvenience to the existing home owners? We are not even talking of the water usage of the development after it is completed with over 1,700 homes.
4. It has been shown by several knowledgeable reports that the Accretive proposal is not only incorrect in many places, but leaves out many important points including, but not limited to schools, water reclamation, emergency plans, ecological safety and open spaces, drainage and water concerns.
5. CONSIDERING THAT THIS AREA HAS BEEN DESIGNATED AS AN AGRICULTURE AND ESTATE HOMES AREA BY THE EXISTING GENERAL PLAN, IF THE ACCRETIVE DEVELOPMENT IS APPROVED AND

ALLOWED TO GO FORWARD, IT WILL ONLY BE THE FIRST
OF MANY THAT TRY THE SAME TACTIC IN ORDER TO
INCREASE THEIR PROFITS AND CONTINUE THE
SPRAWL. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND
CONSIDERATION.

LILAC HILLS RANCH
DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

WRITTEN COMMENT:

We (Jeff and Michelle Burdett) object to the Lilac Hills Ranch proposed development for the following reasons:

- 1.) This development is in extreme contrast from the existing visual character of our neighborhood. We currently have a beautiful view of agricultural and natural habitat land. The development proposes to replace our view/way of life with high density homes, traffic, senior center, parks, etc. We moved out of the city to country living. We specifically purchased a home next to agriculturally zoned land to avoid the stressors of city living. These towns (Valley Center & Bonsall) are RURAL/COUNTRY living towns.
- 2.) Noise pollution – If this development is approved, we will be negatively impacted by noise pollution (cars, people, senior center, parks, etc.).
- 3.) Traffic – If this development is approved, we will be negatively impacted by traffic (noise, congestion, pollution, wildlife destruction, car accidents, public safety, increased commute time, traffic lights, etc.). We live on very DANGEROUS roads (narrow, blind giveaways, no shoulders, cliffs, rock walls, recreational bicycle riders, extreme curves, numerous blind spots, one lane, double yellow lines, etc. These roads, in our opinion, are NOT SAFE or ADEQUATE for high levels of traffic. Increasing the number of cars on these dangerous roads will cause numerous deaths.
- 4.) Habitat destruction – This development will destroy natural plants, animals, rolling hills, creeks, etc.
- 5.) The impact on schools, public services, law enforcement, parks, recreation facilities. This is a community that participates in community activities at the center of town (parades, sporting events, library, community center, churches, public pool, rodeo, Casino, agricultural events, etc.). Community members drive to the center of town on a regular basis. This huge influx of residents at the far end of town (Lilac Hills Ranch) is not, in my opinion, GREEN OR SUSTAINABLE. It is not reasonable to think that all of these people are going to stay in their little "sustainable" sub-town and reduce their carbon footprint.
- 6.) Do they (Lilac Hills Ranch) even have a legal right to access necessary roads, utilities, and change the zoning from high acreage agriculture land to high density homes?

Signature: _____

Date: 7-25-14

Address: _____

Slovick, Mark

From: Jonathan Carey <careyelement@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 9:13 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hill Development

Mark,

As a Valley Center resident I adamantly oppose this development. We live here specifically because it's quiet and rural. This development goes against everything Valley Center stands for. Please cease this effort.

A Concerned Valley Center Resident.

3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (IM),
3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-018
(STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

Does this project conform to the General plan for an agricultural area?

Does this plan address adequate evacuation egress in case of wildfires considering farm animals will be included in an evacuation?

Does this plan address the current and future drought situation?

Does this plan address safe roads for the cycling community and the safety of the students commuting to schools on bikes using narrow roads with fast moving traffic?

(Attach additional pages as needed)

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
FAX #: (858) 694-3373
e-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Signature

Date

MIKE CHESTER

Print Name

1915 CHEYENNE CIR

Address

OCEAN SPRING CA 92057

City

State

Zip Code

619 990-3360

Phone Number

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

Lot → APN 129-390-40

3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (TM),
 3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-013
 (STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
 ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
 DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
 June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
 Planning & Development Services
 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
 San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

- ① What justification can the county & A commission
 offer for the change to the Regional Land Use
 Element map - Semi-Rural to Village community?
- ② San Diego County General Plan: its 10 guiding principles
 for development. Could you explain how this project
 meets these guide lines? ① The project greatly has
 been met! ② Is it located near existing infrastructure
 other than I 15?

(Attach additional pages as needed)


 Signature Date 7/28/14

Bruce Christensen
 Print Name

9168 W. Lilac Rd
 Address

EScondido CA 92026
 City State Zip Code

760-994-8334
 Phone Number

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
 County of San Diego
 Planning & Development Services
 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
 San Diego, CA 92123
 FAX # (619) 694-3373
 e-mail, Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

2/8

- (3) Does it reinforce the vitality, local economy & character of the area? (its agricultural & scenic rural) where are the recreational opportunities? (other than parks & trails)
- (4) Promotes environmental stewardship & uniquely character? How does managing our farmland cys of dist protect the natural resources & habitat?
- (5) How does LTR. Account for any physical constraints and hazards of the land?
- (6) Where is the support for a multi-modal transportation?
- (7) How does LTR reduce greenhouses gas emissions and reduce its effect on climate change?
- (8) How does LTR preserve ^{the} Agriculture community and preserve open space?
- (9) How does LTR minimize costs of infrastructure and services?
- (10) How does and have Accretive strive for a consensus of the interests of the area residents? I've tried to affect 2 different accretive gathering/events

3/8'

and have been denied entrance to both, because it was a invitation only event. I've asked and have RSVP to attend these events to no avail.

- (12) How is this project address the requirements for LEED-ND? And does it?
- (13) How is this project compliant with CEQA regulations as Traffic is concerned?
- (14) As per SDCGP there should be a Feathering of residential densisting is there any?
To live on W. 11th Rd on 1.5 AC. and with in ~~two~~ 1/8 miles the is going to be over 100 homes with lots as small as .10 AC. is this considered Feathering?
- (15) Some compliance with LEED-ND state are required. How has Accounting met these stds?
- (16) ~~it is~~ calls it. →

9/8

(16) The county & Accretive call this project "SMART Growth"

The main promise is to lower A & C dependency and reduce greenhouse effects on the environment. Saving starting the county's Ave. miles/trip is 5.8 miles

The closest grocery store is 8 miles

The closest Hospital (Fallbrook) is

12 miles and 20 mins away

How is this Smart Growth? ↑ Frac

(17)

LEED-ND 2009 states the max. size of a village is 320 ac. How does LHR call it's self a village?

(18)

Where are the closest employment centers for the 5,000+ residents of LHR?

(19)

Where is the wastewater in Fallbrook that's needed? Will its planned wastewater plan be completed before Thomas being built?

3/2

(2) Does Accretion own the ~~Environment~~
For Severn?

(2) LEED-ND negotiates Public Transit
Services where are they in waiting?

(2) Where will Park & Ride / Ride share
parking located?

(2) How will downgrading of W. Lake
rd from class 2.2C to class 2.2F
help Traffic Flow?

(2) Will Accretion mitigate The Compromise
w/ Safety & Quality of Life in reducing
the mobility Elements of the Roads?

(2) Will The County be Liable for these
Safety Issues?

(2) How can the County & Accretion not
call this Leap Frog Development
Please Explain?

98

(27) What are the Recycling Facility operations going to be?

(28) Accutrip is Asking For Road Sides modification to down some (see quad 25) Roads & Right A ways IF this is the case, why should my lot size need to make the road widening? why not widening Wilbur Rd on the other side?

(29) Does Accutrip own the Right of Way to widen Wilbur Rd (my Home) 9160 W. Wilbur Rd?

How will the road (right A way) be obtained?

IF Eminent Domain is used will my Landscaping & Driveway be replaced as it is?

(30) How will the loss of plants & wildlife habitat be mitigated?

2/10

(3) How & who will improve & provide Traffic Safety?

The Traffic report states 1,150 people walking an hour and most of this will be on I-15. How can old 395 NB off ramp handle that many cars?

(4) with Accutue widening Wilbur Rd to 4 Lanes on both sides of Wilbur Bridge how will that both solve A major bottle neck?

(5) Since Wilbur Rd doesn't have sidewalks going west toward And to Sullivan School will the increased student population get to school with out parents driving them?

Does it increase more traffic & given more gas?

8/8

Q IF The zoning is changed
for more dense housing, will
I be rezoned so I can build
multi units on my 1.40. acs ??

Thanks. I'm looking forward
to your answers

Bruce Christensen

Annetta Citino
Richard Coffman
8975-212 Lawrence Welk Dr.
Escondido, CA 92026
760-751-2772
July 11, 2014

RECEIVED
JUL 14 2014
PDS-DIRECTORS OFFICE

Mr. Mark Wardlaw
Director
Planning and Development Services
County of San Diego
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Re: Lilac Hills Ranch

Dear Mr. Wardlaw:

The draft REIR identifies significant and unavoidable environmental impacts to air quality and traffic. These admitted negative impacts alone should **doom the project**. **An avoidable solution is to not develop!**

The lives of the many **new** residents and school children would be endangered by pesticides that would be regularly sprayed on remaining citrus and avocado groves that adjoin the project. This is completely unacceptable.

Traffic on I-15 is already much too heavy with commuters and many heavy, noisy delivery vehicles traveling in both directions. More development would certainly bring much more traffic.

The answer lies in using land as it was designated in the recent County Plan for agriculture of all kinds. Sticking to the plan shows foresight for San Diego County.

The changes should be to the use of the City of San Diego more effectively, as do world class cities and **NOT** have urban sprawl only making living conditions in San Diego County nightmarish. The rural areas of north San Diego County are beautiful and do not need to be ruined by greed.

Approval for this proposed project should be denied.

Sincerely,


Annetta Citino


Richard Coffman

6/18/14

County of San Diego
Planning & Development
5510 Overland Ave, St. 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Gentlemen:

1700 new homes in Valley Center?

1700 dishwashers and washing machines -
at least 3400 Bathrooms -

What do you plan to use for water??

I understand we in California are in
a severe drought.

"Don't waste water!" "Don't water your
plants!" ~~for~~ "Watch it when you
brush your teeth!"


So we save every drop of water so you can
build 1700 "new" water using homes??

I don't think so.

Time for a building moratorium - NOW.

No more new fancy developments until we
get more WATER.

Mrs Darlene Clifford
276 N El Camino Real Sp51
Occenside, CA 92058
760-433-7286

 **James F. Clifford**
Spec 51
276 N El Camino Real
Oceanside, CA 92058-1731

SAN DIEGO CA 920

19 JUN 2014 PM 9 L



RECEIVED
JUN 23 2014
Planning and
Development Services

County of San Diego
Planning and Development Service
5510 Overland Ave, St 310
San Diego, CA 92123



July 21, 2014

Mark Slovick
Project Manager
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Mr. Slovick:


The Lilac Hills Ranch, "one of the biggest housing developments every proposed for the area" according to the U-T newspaper, is the wrong development, at the wrong time, in the wrong place. The scale of this proposed development with 1,700 homes (composed of 903 single-family homes, 164 single-family attached homes, 211 residential "units", 468 single-family senior homes), in 608 acres, 5,000 residents, 90,000 square feet of commercial, office and retail space, 50-room inn, senior community center, group residential care facility, memory care facility, fire station, k-8 school, a town center, and 2 neighborhood centers is that of a small city and has no business in Valley Center, a rural, back-county area.

Given the current drought conditions and the recent mandatory water rationing that is being instituted, I can't understand how any sane person could approve creating another city anywhere, much less in a rural area. The always-high – and now extremely high – fire danger in Valley Center only compounds the folly of even considering a large-scale, high density development such as this. Density of this intensity belongs in cities, not in rural areas, period. Given the mixed uses proposed, the density will be much greater than the number of homes alone would indicate, since all the workers at the inn, 2 care facilities, school, fire station, town center, and commercial, office and retail spaces will not be residents. They will be commuters, clogging the roads and creating a significant danger to all who need to use the roads in the area for daily use, as well as during a wildfire. This development would take the current Valley Center population density of less than 100 people/square mile and increase it dramatically. Assuming 5,000 residents, it would increase Valley Center's population by almost 55% and its density to 152 people/square mile. If one adds the 2,500 more people (conservatively) for all the non-resident workers, that increase Valley Center's population by over 80% and increase its density to almost 180 people/square mile, an increase of more than 80%. At only 5,000 residents, Lilac Hills would have a density of over 5,260 people/square mile. In comparison, San Diego city's density is only just over 4,000 people/square mile. Density of this magnitude clearly does not belong in a rural area like Valley Center.

Valley Center is a rural area and, as our rural areas are scarce to begin with, should NOT be developed into another San Diego or Escondido. These new facilities, if warranted at all, should be built within already-developed areas. The Lilac Hills Ranch should be low-density residential (absolute minimum 5 acre lots, with a 10-acre minimum approaching a reasonable density) with only single-family homes permitted. And NO new development should be allowed unless a parcel will perk and until after our water supplies are improved and adequate current and future supply has been guaranteed for all existing residents and any future ones. Any other plan is sheer folly and will have severely negative consequences for current and future residents in terms of traffic congestion, public safety (wildfires and traffic accidents), lack of water, and destruction of the rural character of Valley Center.

I sincerely hope Planning & Development Services will not approve a project that cannot be justified on any grounds. This proposed development will destroy the rural character of Valley Center; increase the wildfire danger for all; use water resources that are simply NOT available; and create an entire new city with a density that is 30% greater than that of San Diego city. It is the wrong development, at the wrong time, in the wrong place.

Sincerely,


MCraggs

Valley Center, CA 92082

Slovick, Mark

From: Marc Cyr <marcacyr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 3:03 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: re: Lilac Hills Ranch Development

Marc A. Cyr, JD, MBA
10002 Covey Lane
Escondido, CA 92026

Mark Slovic, Project Manager
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310, San Diego, Ca 92123
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

July 23, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

I have a property interest in my parents' land and avocado grove adjacent to the proposed location of Lilac Hills Ranch, immediately to the east of W. Lilac Road on Covey Lane.

We are opposed to the building of Lilac Hills Ranch for the following reasons:

- To build over 1,700 homes on tiny lots in an area that is zoned for home sites of 1 to 2 acres (minimum) is irresponsible. There is a very valid reason for the current zoning and to rezone an area designated for agricultural purposes (in a county that is quickly losing its fertile and established agricultural sites) is completely unacceptable. We are living in this area because of the open spaces and large properties. Many of our neighbors are living here for the same reasons.
- The unique composition of the soil in our area doesn't exist in many areas of the world and needs to be preserved for growing food and providing for the community at large. Once pesticides and herbicides leech into the soil, and will ultimately affect the aquifer, it will cause irreparable damage to the soils and the aquifer itself. Also, converting over 600 acres of arable land for residential use is inappropriate and irresponsible. Once converted, it can never be used to grow crops or produce food again. It is forever ruined.
- We have a severe water shortage in California, especially in San Diego County. How can it be feasible to build a large subdivision, with its vast infrastructure, during a time when water is not available or plentiful? We are constantly threatened with potential water rationing and limitations on use of residential and agricultural water use. To further limit the use of water in a highly dense area, as this development will be if constructed, is again irresponsible and a disservice to taxpayers and residents.
- Despite the promises by this developer, San Diego has been plagued by promises made by builders of building pristine, self-contained and sustainable communities, which are often anything less than promised. These communities strain resources, as evidenced by recent fires in the County, especially in San Marcos, Escondido and Carlsbad.
- The increased noise, congestion and traffic from the construction phase and then occupancy will completely change our area from open country to urban sprawl. If potential resident of Lilac Hills Ranch want urban sprawl, they can move to those communities of San Diego County. There is no need to develop an area that is not urban and change it to suit this builder's wants and desires. Let them look elsewhere, but not in our community!

- We are not convinced that there will be suitable availability of support services (i.e. fire, medical, etc.) to support the number of potential residents and traffic in the area. Also, we live in a high fire danger zone. We cannot afford to have a loss or reduction of emergency services and fire department support due to over congestion and lack of sufficient resources during danger.

- The West Lilac Road access for this development (including the Lilac Road Bridge) is not sufficient to handle the increased traffic load and congestion that will result from the number of vehicles driving in the area. It is estimated that over 9,000 vehicles will cross the bridge daily at the height of occupancy. This two-lane bridge is not designed for this amount of traffic. Also, the projected number of vehicles using the current two-lane road will cause significant traffic congestion and difficulties for all residents of the area.

Sincerely,

Marc A. Cyr, JD, MBA

Slovick, Mark

From: Frank Cyr <fcyr1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2014 9:47 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: re: Lilac Hills Ranch Development

Francois L. and Theresa A. Cyr
10002 Covey Lane
Escondido, CA 92026

Mark Slovic, Project Manager
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310, San Diego, Ca 92123
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

July 23, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

We are residents who live adjacent to the proposed location of Lilac Hills Ranch, immediately to the east of W. Lilac Road on Covey Lane. My wife and I own a medical practice in San Diego, and she is a family practice physician.

This letter is written in opposition of the project. We have been residents of this area of Escondido since September, 2011. We spent over 6 ½ years looking for a property that we wanted to purchase in San Diego. We chose to live in this area. When we found our home, we were happy in that it was a quiet, serene setting on 5 acres in the country with very little traffic. Our neighbors are friendly, and we are happy to be in an area that is primarily an agricultural area with farms and horse ranches. We are also owners of a small, productive avocado grove.

We are opposed to the building of Lilac Hills Ranch for the following reasons:

- To build over 1,700 homes on tiny lots in an area that is zoned for home sites of 1 to 2 acres (minimum) is irresponsible. There is a very valid reason for the current zoning and to rezone an area designated for agricultural purposes (in a county that is quickly losing its fertile and established agricultural sites) is completely unacceptable. We are living in this area because of the open spaces and large properties. Many of our neighbors are living here for the same reasons.
- The unique composition of the soil in our area doesn't exist in many areas of the world and needs to be preserved for growing food and providing for the community at large. Once pesticides and herbicides leech into the soil, and will ultimately affect the aquifer, it will cause irreparable damage to the soils and the aquifer itself. Also, converting over 600 acres of arable land for residential use is inappropriate and irresponsible. Once converted, it can never be used to grow crops or produce food again. It is forever ruined.
- We have a severe water shortage in California, especially in San Diego County. How can it be feasible to build a large subdivision, with its vast infrastructure, during a time when water is not available or plentiful? We are constantly threatened with potential water rationing and limitations on use of residential and agricultural water use. To further limit the use of water in a highly dense area, as this development will be if constructed, is again irresponsible and a disservice to taxpayers and residents.
- Despite the promises by this developer, San Diego has been plagued by promises made by builders of building pristine, self-contained and sustainable communities, which are often anything less than promised. These communities strain resources, as evidenced by recent fires in the County, especially in San Marcos, Escondido and Carlsbad.

- The increased noise, congestion and traffic from the construction phase and then occupancy will completely change our area from open country to urban sprawl. If potential resident of Lilac Hills Ranch want urban sprawl, they can move to those communities of San Diego County. There is no need to develop an area that is not urban and change it to suit this builder's wants and desires. Let them look elsewhere, but not in our community!

- We are not convinced that there will be suitable availability of support services (i.e. fire, medical, etc.) to support the number of potential residents and traffic in the area. Also, we live in a high fire danger zone. We cannot afford to have a loss or reduction of emergency services and fire department support due to over congestion and lack of sufficient resources during danger.

- The West Lilac Road access for this development (including the Lilac Road Bridge) is not sufficient to handle the increased traffic load and congestion that will result from the number of vehicles driving in the area. It is estimated that over 9,000 vehicles will cross the bridge daily at the height of occupancy. This two-lane bridge is not designed for this amount of traffic. Also, the projected number of vehicles using the current two-lane road will cause significant traffic congestion and difficulties for all residents of the area.

Sincerely,

Francois L. Cyr, MBA, BS

Theresa A. Cyr, DO, ACOFP, ABIHM

Slovick, Mark

From: Sandy <sandy_demunnik@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 10:23 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac hills development

As a Valley Center resident I adamantly oppose this development. We live her specifically because it's quiet and rural. This development goes against everything Valley Center stands for. Please cease this effort.

Valley Center Resident,

Sandy DeMunnik

Sent from my iPhone

Slovick, Mark

From: Greg Duchnak <duchnak@earthlink.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2014 1:25 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Response to Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR

Gregory M Duchnak & Laura S Duchnak
9723 Running Creek Lane
Escondido, California 92026

July 26th, 2014

Mark Slovic,

This letter is submitted as part of the public response to Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR.

Background – For 20 years my family and I have lived off of Running Creek Rd. We are less than 1 mile from various entrances to this proposed high density development. We have had several large developments proposed for our immediate area over the 20 years including a 2 acre minimum, golf course community on Lilac Ranch, a large high density development on Lilac Ranch, and now Lilac Hills Ranch. We have seen many presentations from the proposing developers selling the various benefits the new development would provide to the surrounding community. I have attended many community planning meeting as well as information meetings presented by the various developments to keep abreast of what was being proposed and the community response. I also have followed the long and difficult process of the county developing the GP2020. I also have watched the valley center community planning board develop a center city with high density developments that allow for doubling its growth over the next several decades. This Valley Center plan with growth targeted for the town center meets the objectives of the current GP2020. The Lilac Hills Ranch does not, and will require significant modification to GP2020. If this ill proposed plan with very poor circulation is approved it will set a very dangerous precedent and effectively negate the value of the GP2020.

In regard to the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR I have the following specific concerns. **Note that my 1st and most important concern is one of basic safety for my family and close friends and neighbors.**

- 1) 1) **Major impedance for fire evacuation routes.** The current homes on or off of West Lilac between the easterly most and westerly most egress and ingress to the development have only two emergency exit routes, both of which will be drastically impeded by up to 3000 additional cars exiting from this development. Our only current routes to exit to safety during a fast moving wild fire are either:
 1. Turning left from Running Creek Rd on to West Lilac to either exit the area via Lilac or Circle R depending on the direction of the fire.
 2. Turning right from Running Creek Rd on to West Lilac to exit over the West Lilac bridge to Old Highway 395.

Additional direct exits from Lilac Hills Ranch to Old Highway 395 close to the Interstate 15 entrance would alleviate the impact of this development onto West Lilac if a wild fire evacuation required a westerly exit route. This would not help significantly if a fire jumps the Highway 15 in a easterly direction as it did in the Fallbrook Fire in May of this year or if fire comes in a northerly direction through the very high fire risk canyons from Moussa Creek. A fire scenario like this that would cut off westerly exits could be easily foreseen in this area designated as an extreme fire danger area in the county. In this very potential scenario all of us living in this locked in area with its only two exits would have to compete with up to an additional 3000 cars. During the 2003 and 2007 wild fires, the evacuation routes to the west on West Lilac over the bridge to the Old 395 crossroads were the scene of a major traffic jam. There was a slow moving line of cars backed up for more than 2 miles to the east of the West Lilac / old Highway 395 stop sign. During these increasingly severe wild fires we have very limited time to respond. This impedance of an additional 3000 cars exiting over the 2 lane west lilac bridge or through the back country on Circle R or Lilac Rd is simply illogical when considering basic fire evacuation safety. Consider that one of the original selling points to the Lilac Ranch Development on the old Solomon property was that it would allow for ultimate fire evacuation routes to the west from Cole Grade in Valley Center. We all know that Valley Center has few evacuation routes available to it as a community. There is a scenario where this Lilac Hills Ranch development would have to exit to the east into this already evacuation stressed community. Please consider this plea for safety for my family, friends and neighbors.

- 3) 2) Strong Objection to such significant violations of the core premises of GP2020. The necessary changes to the GP2020 to allow for this development would not be in-line with the original goals of the GP2020 to place density near town centers where there are services conveniently located to serve the needs of the population. If approval of this development results in a net increase to the

GP2020 density for Valley Center, this also would be a second violation to the goals of the GP2020. It will also add a significant density increase far from basic services like groceries, gas, etc. This will increase the demand on our freeways and local streets while increasing our carbon emissions. Allowing changes to the GP2020 for this development will result in additional creep of changes to the GP2020 for these needed services.

- 4) 3) It is also stated that sewage may have to be trucked out of the area. If a new planned development requires truck hauling of the waste stream through our community, it obviously is a poorly planned development.

The bottom line is that a development of this size should have direct access to a major thoroughfare. As organic growth on the west side of Valley Center continues over the next decade or so, its combined population growth with this development will require either a widening of West Lilac and Circle R or a doubling of the West Lilac Bridge over the Highway 15.

This is paramount in the backcountry to all for adequate wild fire evacuations. The constraints of the natural geography on West Lilac and Circle R prohibit it from ever being widened enough to handle this increased traffic. Widening of the 2 lane West Lilac bridge over Highway 15 is obviously cost prohibitive for this development. It also will be cost prohibitive for the county once the development is completed and there is no one to fund such a significant change.

In my years of participating in this process I have not run into a single person who lives within the immediate impacted area that supports this size development in this location. This is because the development, contrary to the sales pitches by the developers, will only degrade our current quality of living. Allowing this developer to modify the GP2020 for such an ill planned development will benefit only one entity, the developer. Those who currently live in the area over the next decade can expect to see their taxes increase, water costs increase, fire evacuations impeded, and property values decline. What is the charter of the San Diego Planning group, Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission? It is stated on your website that "The department analyzes privately initiated land use projects to ensure compliance with land use regulations, and advises the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission on the projects." The bottom line is that this development clearly does not fit into the land use regulations described in GP2020. So if the GP2020 is changed for this ill planned development, maybe the website should state "The department analyzes privately initiated land use projects to ensure land use regulations can be modified to allow developers to do as they wish wherever they wish, even if the basic fire evacuation safety of those already living in the area is impacted." Please consider my concerns seriously. The well being and life and safety of my family is paramount. I feel the county has the ethical responsibility to protect the safety of the current residence of San Diego County, and not bow to the whims of the deep pocket developer community.

Sincerely,

Gregory M Duchnak and Laura S Duchnak

Slovick, Mark

From: Dunn <dunnclan@gmx.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2014 10:35 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch

Dear Mark,

I am corresponding to voice my objection to the Lilac Ranch development project. As a resident along the West Lilac corridor, I am greatly concerned of the negative impact such a development would render to the surrounding area. With this area already identified as a high risk fire area, the addition of the proposed homes and businesses has the potential to make the area even more dangerous should a serious wildfire strike the the vicinity. Traffic along West Lilac is already quite heavy at times, making walking or riding bicycles along it a risky venture. The additional thousands of residences would simply overwhelm the current infrastructure. The Valley Center Municipal Water District already has some of the highest water rates in North County, and is constantly broadcasting its limited water supply and capacity to serve its constituents. The proposed additional homes and businesses will tax this service provider even more, and thereby impacting everyone else within this water district. And lastly, the tranquil, beautiful countryside within this area that all of us residents cherish so greatly will be lost forever.

I ask you to do all within your power and authority to deny and stop the development of Lilac Hills Ranch and to add my name to the growing list of those opposed to the project.

Thank you.

Tom Dunn
32555 Mesa Lilac Rd.
Escondido, CA 92026
760-644-0699

LILAC HILLS RANCH
3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3100 5571 (TM),
3100 5572 (TM), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-018
(STP), HLP XX-XXX, SCH 2012061100
ENVIRONMENTAL LOG NO.: 3910 12-02-003 (ER)
DRAFT REVISED EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD
June 12, 2014 through July 28, 2014

DRAFT EIR COMMENT SHEET

Tuesday, June 17, 2014
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

See attached document.

(Attach additional pages as needed)

MAIL, FAX or E-MAIL FORMS TO:

Mark Slovick
County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
FAX #: (858) 694-3373
e-mail: Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Stephanie Eisenhower 6/27/14

Signature Date

Stephanie Eisenhower

Print Name

9154 W. Lilac Road

Address

Escondido, CA 92026

City State Zip Code

Phone Number

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4:00 PM, JULY 28, 2014

Lilac Hills Ranch
Draft EIR Comment Sheet
Written Comment and Question Form

Requested from the June 17, 2014 public meeting

Comments and Questions submitted by: Stephanie Eisenhower
9154 W. Lilac Road
Escondido, CA 92026

Over the years I have attended numerous community planning meetings, committee meetings and field trips organized by the San Diego Planning Commission, regarding the proposed Lilac Hills Ranch project, and the voice of the Valley Center residents remains the same. Despite our voiced concerns and the various revisions to the project, the outcome remains at 1,700 homes on 680 acres? How does this make any sense? I am not aware of any project of this magnitude, confined in such a limited area that exists in San Diego County. There is not a shortage of unused land available throughout our county and therefore I am questioning as to why is this project is so densely populated??? This is not San Francisco or New York City, this community is Country Living that has been designed with spacious acreage. The fire danger that exists in this area due to the surrounding rugged terrain is reality that our community must face and by adding approximately 3,000 more vehicles daily, to West Lilac Road will result in a death trap for our residents, pets and their livestock. I would like to know why this project is being considered when it does not follow the guidelines of the Valley Center General Plan and it clearly is not for the betterment of the community?

I have been a resident of this community for over 16 years and my neighbors and I moved to this community to escape the congestion and cramped lifestyle of our neighboring communities, example: Temecula, Escondido, San Marcos, Poway, Oceanside and Vista, to name a few. My property faces the proposed Lilac Hills site and the original sign that still remains on this site states: "Estate Home Site" not proposed condominiums, apartments and assisted living communities. This property was originally zoned for minimum 2-1/2 acre lots, which is exactly what the Valley Center General Plan calls for. Please explain why the Planning Commission is considering this land zoning change when the roads and the Lilac Bridge cannot support the increased traffic and congestion??? My neighbors and I moved to this community to provide opportunities to our families to raise crops, livestock and to start businesses. Has there been any thought about how this project will be affected by the current Avocado and other various orchards and nurseries that exist in this community??? Crop dusting is a normal practice in this community, and is a necessity for the farmers and their businesses. What impacts, if any, will affect the Farmers and current residents???

During the June 17th meeting at the Valley Center Library, the widening of West Lilac Road was discussed. It was stated that the road would not result in additional lanes, just a wider road??? It was also stated that if necessary, the Board of Supervisors could use their powers to obtain the necessary land to accomplish the widening of West Lilac Road by "grabbing" the land from the current property owners??? Please explain how it is fair to "grab" the property of the current residents, who made a

conscious decision to live in the Country, only to satisfy and benefit the needs of the developer??? I would like to know if the developers Mr. Goodson and Mr. Reiling are planning on residing in one of the cramped homes available in their project???

Medical services for urgent care or hospitalization are over 15 miles away in either Fallbrook or Escondido. This project plans to provide assisted living facilities, which in an emergency will take over ½ hour to reach medical treatment. Why would anyone want to put their elderly loved one in an area where medical services are not reliably available???

Restaurants and parks are also noted in the planned project. There was also a mention of “outdoor dining” being included in the plan. Given the size of this project and the densely populated area, this is not the type of environment that will attract customers to this area. Nussy Burgers that is located on Old Highway 395 and 76 has been an attraction for many years however even they are struggling in this tough economy.

Sewage concerns have been addressed in this project by planning for a sewage treatment plant. I currently work next to the Temecula sewage treatment plant and can confirm the stench and bugs that these facilities will attract. The residents of this community currently use septic tanks and I would like to know if this project allows for the current residents to utilize the sewer system that is being planned for???

In closing, I urge the San Diego Planning Commission to listen to the voices and concerns of the residents of this beautiful Country community. We are educated residents that made a choice to reside in this community, to provide for a better environment to raise our families, grow crops and raise livestock. Planning for Estate or Ranch home sites on this land is what the Valley Center General Plan was designed to provide for our community and the wildlife contained. Living in this community as it currently stands is such a pleasure for all of our residents and we pray that you will support our concerns and reject the proposed Lilac Hills Ranch project.

Respectfully Submitted

Stephanie Eisenhower

July 27, 2014

Slovick, Mark

From: virgie sandie <virninja@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 4:07 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Opposition

July, 28, 2014

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing with regards to the opposition of the PAA 09-007 request for 1,746 additional dwelling units and neighborhood commercial within Valley Center, and in support of the Valley Center General Plan. Let me begin with my story, then several reasons why I oppose this development, and finally maybe a few suggestions for a compromise.

My family moved to 10123 W. Lilac Road in 1987 when I was nine years old. We were sad to leave our old one acre lime grove with horses, in search of more open space to ride. We had found out the approximately 50 acres we rode our horses on were about to be developed. You may be familiar with the parcel of land, it is West of the Escondido shopping center called the North County Fair (now a Westfield shopping center). There is nothing left, but wall to wall housing and a strip mall. I enjoyed my childhood growing up on W. Lilac. We explored the hills (many of the ones going to be developed) with our horses and motorcycles. We made plenty of people mad during our adventures, but we learned where not to go. We had campouts on my parent's ten acres, building forts with our friends, creating memories for a lifetime. My sister and I helped with the family ranch picking, packing, and even selling fruit, I learned many life skills with the ranch. We also joined 4-H, and eventually FFA raising horses and pigs. Agriculture became a part of my life, my way of life. I even attended Chico State and received my B. S. in Agriculture in 1999 and my teaching credential in 2000. I started teaching Agriculture down in Lakeside, when I purchased my 3.6 acres in the fall of 2000 on West Lilac Road, hoping to provide my future offspring with the same opportunity of growing up in a rural farming area as I had. Around the same time I purchased my property, I had heard the Rodriguez Ranch had been sold to some investors. The Rodriguez property, approximately a hundred acres, is located kitty-corner to my parents 10 acres on West Lilac Road. This is one of the areas I used to ride the most. The Rodriguez families are wonderful people and neighbors.

Next, I would like to address several points for my opposition to the PAA 09-007:

1. I purchased my land to get away from people and development. I built my dream home seven years ago, and I am feeling very sad and helpless about 1,746 homes going in my back yard. I have a pristine three hundred and sixty degree view. I can see Palomar Mountain to the east and the Ocean to the west on clear days. I also love the view of surrounding farm land, it gives me peace, and is beautiful to observe. Our open space is shrinking, and should be preserved for wildlife. My gorgeous views would be overlooking a large unattractive development, and my parents will unfortunately be right next to it.
2. More homes nearby would mean the possibility of more sexual predators nearby. With the latest news in the county, the thought of this development make me cringe. Do I have to worry about who my new neighbors are?? I thought when we built here that we would be safe, and not have to worry about these things.
3. "Sustainable Community" to me should mean it is capable of being sustained or maintained (straight from the dictionary). This community would not provide enough jobs and support for 1,749 families. These people would be going to surrounding communities for work, Doctors, shopping, post office, Library, Little League, Soccer, etc.
4. The I-15 is already congested at the Gopher Canyon Exit. It gets tricky at times pulling out of there at rush hour. I have personally seen how the development of Temecula, Murrieta, and Menifee over

the last twenty years has impacted the freeways. All of those developers did not do anything to improve or widen our freeway infrastructure.

5. The Valley Center Community General Plan was already made before this development. There are several people who bought property in Valley Center to eventually develop it. Moving density away from Valley Center to West Lilac may take away development possibilities to other investors. They will be told: Sorry, you bought your property, and now you may not develop it, that is not fair!
6. The Cactus Ranch is a successful family business, and the Road 3A will rip it in half. How can you rip apart one family's livelihood??
7. The houses on Covey Lane. No one prepared them to have Temecula built around them. They did not ask for that. They built new homes with the intention of a rural setting. How can you let this happen??
8. Habitat will be lost. Where will the animals go?? We frequently see coyotes and bobcats, where will they move to? I have already seen the local quail population diminish through the years, and I have not seen any Jack Rabbits for a long time. We need to preserve open space for the wildlife.
9. My parents were unable to divide their land, so my sister or I could have avoided buying our own property. Why do the developers get to divide their land as they please??

Now that you have heard several arguments against this development, I would like to offer some suggestions for compromise. I am a reasonable person. I just feel like 1,746 homes are just too many. It is going to affect too many people, who came out here for privacy and beautiful landscapes. I think we need no more than 600 homes, no shopping centers, and build the homes close together in one area. Leave the rest of the land as open space for hiking, biking, horseback riding, and habitat.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope you think about how this development going to affect the people surrounding it before you make a decision. Will I be forced to move from my dream home one day, in search of land and open space again? We need to preserve our farmland and open spaces, so our future generations may enjoy it as well.

Sincerely,
Virginia Erdelyi
10113 W. Lilac Rd.
Escondido, CA 92026

July 28, 2014

To: Mark Slovick, San Diego County Project Manager

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mr. Slovick,

I have questions and concerns regarding the Lilac Hills Ranch development and the impact of the road improvements on Mountain Ridge in the event the road is improved to Public Road Standards. They are as follows:

- 1) Currently due to the contour of the terrain where Megan Terrace is located and due to the elevations decreasing heading west, during cold weather, cold air tends to “drain” to the west down the valley. Currently during times of frost, the amount of time that my fruit trees are exposed to temperatures at or below 32 degrees are short. The road bed of Mountain Ridge Rd at Megan Terrace is projected to be raised by 20 feet. This in effect will act as an air “dam” and hold the colder air temperatures much longer. The lower portion of my avocado trees and other vegetation may be severely impacted. Please determine and explain the following:
 - a) In one degree increments from 32 degrees down to 20 degrees, with no wind, how much longer will my trees that are below the Mountain Ridge Rd elevation be subjected to freezing temperatures?
 - b) What will be the long term damage to the trees and vegetation?
 - c) Will the colder temperatures hold the increased automobile pollution (due to the amount of increased traffic) longer in the air? Will this cause damage or impact the trees in any way or manner?
 - d) How will these impacts be mitigated?
- 2) With the road bed of Mountain Ridge Rd at Megan Terrace projected to be raised by 20 feet, and with the amount of traffic increase by several times:
 - a) How will the air patterns affect the pollinators for avocado and citrus trees along with other fruit and flowers?
 - b) How will the air patterns affect the birds of prey that hunt in the areas on both sides of Mountain Ridge?
 - c) How will the increased height and traffic of the Mountain Ridge Rd impact the birds of prey that hunt in the areas on both sides of Mountain Ridge?

- 3) With the elimination of the Mountain Ridge storm drain for rain water coming down from Megan Terrace:
 - a) How much more water will be diverted off of Megan Terrace and where?
 - b) What is the current capacity of the drain located on the property east of Mountain Ridge?
 - c) How will the drain be modified to accept the increase in water drainage?
 - d) What will be done to abate the accumulation of water?
 - e) What will be done to control the mosquitos that may inhabit the drain system?
- 4) With the road bed of Mountain Ridge Rd at Megan Terrace projected to be raised by 20 feet and built to public road standards, and with the current one street light:
 - a) Will any additional street lights be installed? If so, what will be the lighting impacts to those residents that view this section of Mountain Ridge?
 - b) How much additional light will be reflected back to those homes?
 - c) How much light will be reflected back to the outside areas of those properties?
 - d) How will this impact nighttime predators?
 - e) How will this impact nighttime pollinators?
- 5) With the road bed of Mountain Ridge Rd at Megan Terrace projected to be raised by 20 feet, sound from the road will not be the same. Please explain:
 - a) How the sound from cars and trucks will change?
 - b) Will the road banks/slopes reflect the sound further?
 - c) Will the road banks/slopes attenuate the sound?
 - d) For those properties that can view the sections of Mountain ridge that have been raised past their current height, what are the sound impacts to those residents that utilize the outside areas of their properties?
 - e) For those properties that can view the sections of Mountain ridge that have been raised past their current height, what are the sound impacts to those residents in their homes?
 - f) Will the road banks/slopes reflect the sound from I-15?
 - g) Will the road banks/slopes attenuate the sound from I-15?
 - h) Will the road banks/slopes affect the sound from I-15?
 - i) Will the road banks/slopes reflect aircraft noise?
 - j) Will the road banks/slopes attenuate aircraft noise?
 - k) Will the road banks/slopes affect the level of aircraft noise?
 - l) Will the road banks/slopes attenuate the sound from Camp Pendleton artillery?
 - m) Will the road banks/slopes affect the sound Camp Pendleton artillery?
 - n) Will the road banks/slopes reflect the sound from Camp Pendleton artillery?

Respectfully,

William R. Ewing
9741 Adam Ct
Escondido, CA 92026
760 749-3711

July 28, 2014

To: Mark Slovick, San Diego County Project Manager

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mr. Slovick,

I have questions and concerns regarding the Lilac Hills Ranch development. They are as follows:

Easements:

- 1) I have concerns that LHR (Lilac Hills Ranch) does not have adequate easement rights over Mountain Ridge for all of the properties in the development. They have previously claimed to have the right to be able to grant easements to other parcels across Mountain Ridge that is not supported by the documents they provided to the owners (of which we are one of the property owners) of the Circle R Ranch Estates development. The recorded documents (grant deeds) from the 1950s listing the Goodwins (owners of the property now known as Rodriguez Ranch) as reserving that right is not supported as the Goodwins did not own the properties in Section 31 where the easements are located nor is there supporting documentation that they so had that right granted to them. Jon Rilling of LHR now states in a letter dated August 6, 2013, to the Circle R Ranch Estates homeowners that "Kevin Johnson stated "Amendment 10 of the PTR indicates Accretive may have limited rights granted in 1957 to use the Mountain Ridge private road for two parcels". Hence, the nearby properties to the north of Rodriguez Ranch nor any of the parcels in the northern portion of the development have the rights to utilize Mountain Ridge nor could they inherit or be granted that right through this development (LHR) from the Goodwin deeds. In that case, then:
 - a. How can LHR plan for or utilize Mountain Ridge for any use for the development in its entirety.
 - b. How can the development plan for or utilize Mountain Ridge as an emergency exit for the entire development when only two parcels have access over Mountain Ridge?
 - c. How can this development proceed at all if only two of the many parcels are the only parcels to have access over Mountain Ridge?

- d. How can this development utilize any of the Rodriguez Ranch Rd outside of the development for those parcels that do not have any easement rights over that road such as the parcels in the northern development?
 - e. Again, how can this development be approved when all of the parcels in the development do not have access over all of the private roads, whether for normal use or for emergency purposes or evacuation?
- 2) The private roads will be over-burdened based on the density of the development. How will the developer and the County of San Diego prevent that from happening?
 - 3) Per Mark Slovak, the IODs along or on Mountain Ridge and Circle R from 1979 are no longer valid along with the Covey Lane et al IODs that are beyond 25 years old. How can those IODs be utilized by the County or the LHR developer that have expired or have been rejected by the County along with other IODs that have been rejected by the County?

Road and Traffic Concerns:

- 1) Mountain Ridge is steep and rolling and does pose line-of-sight problems. On several occasions, trash trucks and grove/packing house trucks have stalled and or broken down on the uphill section near the crest of the hill heading south within the Circle R Ranch Estates development. The road is also not aligned by about 5+ feet at the crest of the hill where the road transitions between Section 30 and Section 31. It is dangerous to pass when that situation exists as the misalignment causes the passing vehicle to move completely into the oncoming lane. There are no shoulder areas on the south bound side (westerly side) of Mountain Ridge, causing additional safety issues when a vehicle is blocking the south bound side. Within the Circle R Ranch development, Mountain Ridge has no shoulders at all for vehicles to move to so as not to block the travel lanes. The road is at its' maximum width within the graded section. How will this safety issue be resolved, especially with the traffic projections for this road?
- 2) Bicycle use – Circle R Rd, W Lilac from Camino Del Rey to the intersection with Circle to the intersection with Lilac is very heavily travelled on weekends by bicyclists. It is common to have individuals up to large groups (10 to 20 riders) on those roads on weekends. There are cyclists on weekdays but it is much lighter. The roads listed should be widened to accommodate the cyclists and not endanger them with significant traffic that will result from this development. There are several narrow and curving sections on all three road segments that are dangerous with the limited amount of

traffic currently on the road segments. In addition, W Lilac from the intersection of Circle R and W Lilac has no shoulders or areas where cyclists can safely pull off to the side except for a few private driveways. Sight distances are also very limited for cyclists in these segments.

- 3) There are several very narrow sections in curves on Circle R and W Lilac. Those sections (bottlenecks) become very dangerous when vehicles larger than cars and pickups (semi trucks, delivery trucks, flatbed trucks, vehicles with trailers, RVs, boats etc.) are coming in the opposite direction. Some sections are extremely limited in width due to the hillside and the guard rails. Most, if not all of W Lilac has no guard rail on slope side of the road. When vehicles have been stopped or broken down in the narrow sections, it has backed up traffic even with the limited amount of travel as it currently is used. There doesn't seem to be any mention to improve or eliminate the unsafe portions of the roads, especially with the increased amount of traffic that will be utilizing the roads. On 8/18/2013, a car went off the road in the narrow curving section of W. Lilac causing a traffic delay while the car was pulled up the hillside. Why is the developer not being required to improve the unsafe sections of these roads considering the amount of traffic the development will generate?
- 4) Morning commute traffic to the VC High School will over burden the W Lilac Rd and Lilac Rd to Old Castle/Lilac Rd, making the commute extremely long. According to the traffic study, there will be in excess of 250 trips to the VC High School in the morning. If you make the assumption that the length of an average car plus a safe distance front and rear would give you approximately 50 feet in length, times 250 cars, equates to about 12,500 feet long or 2.3+ miles in length. Traveling on the narrow and curving bottleneck sections of W Lilac / Lilac would slow and perhaps pack the cars closer making for an even longer commute to the VCHS. In addition, there is already traffic congestion on Lilac Rd in front of the Lilac School on Lilac Rd. How will the traffic issues be mitigated (i.e. removing the bottlenecks) along with the corresponding the safety (no guard rails in the narrow steep areas) and additional emissions from the congestion and noise? What happens to the flow of cars if a car breaks down or has a flat tire in the narrow sections of W Lilac Rd or Lilac Rd?
- 5) The single lane I-15 north bound Gopher Canyon off-ramp is congested now. The north bound I-15 exit to Gopher Canyon currently backs up about half the length of the off-ramp on the evening trip home due to the majority of the traffic heading west on Gopher Canyon. If it weren't for the east bound Gopher Canyon traffic running down the right hand shoulder (which is illegal), the traffic would be backed up to I-15 itself.

- a) How will the traffic signals relieve this safety issue?
 - b) How will the significantly increased east bound Gopher Canyon to Old 395 North traffic be managed safely and adequately?
 - c) Also, the current distance between the Gopher Canyon north bound off ramp right turn lane stop sign threshold and the Gopher Canyon left turn lane threshold to Old 395 North only allows about 8 to 10 cars.
 - i) How will this be rectified for the increased traffic load, especially with the off-ramps only being a single lane?
 - ii) What will be the increased level of emissions from the waiting cars?
 - iii) How will the increased level of vehicle emissions from the waiting cars be mitigated?
- 6) Circle R Rd (stop sign) at Old 395 currently backs up 10 to 15 cars in the morning with most of the cars heading south, and then turning right (west) on Gopher Canyon to either I-15 south or continuing west on Gopher Canyon. How will the stream of cars on Circle R Rd be adequately managed for wait times and emissions with the short distance between Circle R Rd and Gopher Canyon?
- 7) The traffic study does not indicate that the I-15 exits to Old 395 will be signalized. Due to the single lane design of the off-ramps, they will impact each other due to the cross traffic each will generate towards the other exit. It is very possible that there will be a backup on I-15.
- a) How will the potential traffic backup on to I-15 be mitigated?
 - b) What will be the level of emissions of waiting cars and how will the emissions be mitigated?
- 8) I-15 north bound traffic slows significantly (or stops completely – stop n go) under the Lilac Bride over I-15 during the evening commute. With the developments currently approved for the I-15 / Hwy 76 area:
- a) How will the traffic and emissions from LHR be mitigated?
 - b) What will the level of additional emissions be?
 - c) What will be done to mitigate any additional health issues and traffic congestion?
- 9) How will the County guarantee that any temporary sewer lines will be removed within the estimated development window the developer has proposed?

- 10) How will Rodriguez Ranch Rd be utilized that is not within the development?
- 11) How will Rodrigues Ranch Rd that is not within the development be improved?
- 12) How will Mountain Ridge Rd be improved?
- 13) How will the misalignment of Mountain Ridge Rd between Section 30 and Section 31 be corrected with the limited area available for grading based on the easement widths and considering the cuts and fills already in place?
- 14) The vehicle traffic from the northern portion of LHR will be significant on Circle R Rd heading west:
- a) How will this traffic impact the vehicles exiting Mountain Ridge and what will be done to eliminate any delays?
 - b) How much will be the additional wait times for vehicles exiting Mountain Ridge on to Circle R?
 - c) What will be the additional emissions from those vehicles?
 - d) How will the emissions be mitigated?
 - e) What are the effects to the neighboring properties and population with the increased emissions and noise?
 - f) The sight lines in both directions are inadequate and unsafe now, how will this be rectified?
- 15) For the southern part of the development (Phase 5) that will be gated, there are plans for a church and senior care facility. How will the developer control and mitigate public traffic for those facilities. What is the point of gated access if the facilities are available to the public? The developer states the following in a recent letter to us:
- Only the church and residents of this exclusive gated senior neighborhood would be allowed to access Mountain Ridge Road. The remainder of Lilac Hills Ranch will not access Mountain Ridge Road.
- 16) We currently have road easements for Mountain Ridge Rd in the LHR development up to the intersection of Rodriguez Ranch Rd. The developer shows grading and homes on approximately the northerly half of the road easement. How can they invalidate our easement rights?

17) If there is a major fire in the Valley Center area and evacuation is required as in the 2007 fire, evacuation could be severely hampered with the road designs. How can this be rectified?

18) How does lowering the speed limit on Mountain Ridge cause the road to handle more traffic? Does that not make it worse? Does not the road design need to match the traffic volume?

Respectfully,

William R. Ewing
9741 Adam Ct
Escondido, CA 92026
760 749-3711

July 28, 2014

To: Mark Slovick, San Diego County Project Manager

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mr. Slovick,

I have questions and concerns regarding evacuation of the Lilac Hills Ranch development and surrounding residents in the event of a wildfire or wildfires in the area. They are as follows:

- 1) In the event there is a wildfire that is west of the development, along old highway 395 and traveling east as happened this year, how long would it take to evacuate the all of the residents 1 mile east of I-15 including the LHR development, given that 80% of the development (at full capacity) have not previously evacuated:
 - a) Utilizing W. Lilac across the bridge over I-15 and Circle R:
 - i) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76?
 - ii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - iii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76 and W Lilac, west of old 395 is also closed?
 - iv) If I-15 southbound is closed at Highway 78?
 - v) If I-15 southbound is closed at Deer Springs Rd?
 - vi) If I-15 southbound is closed at Gopher Canyon Rd?
 - vii) If I-15 southbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - viii) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - ix) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 is closed in both directions?
 - x) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 and I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - xi) If Gopher Canyon is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions above and below Gopher Canyon?
 - xii) If Camino Del Rey is the only westerly route available off Old 395 as I-15 is closed in both directions from Old 395?
 - b) If W. Lilac heading east and closed at Circle R Rd is the only easterly route available?
 - c) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center?

- d) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center? If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center?
- e) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only route available is Circle R through Gopher Canyon?
- f) What is the evacuation plan for the senior 200 bed facility?
- g) Will additional evacuation notice be given due to the senior housing in Phase 5?

2) In the event there is a wildfire following and encompassing the San Luis Rey River and Moosa Creek, in that those residing in Bonsall between the Vessel's Ranch and Moosa Creek traveling east and southeast, how long would it take to evacuate the all of the residents and those 1 mile east of I-15 including the LHR development, given that 80% of the development (full residency/capacity) have not previously evacuated:

- a) Utilizing W. Lilac across the bridge and Circle R:
 - i) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76?
 - ii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - iii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76 and W Lilac, west of old 395 is also closed?
 - iv) If I-15 southbound is closed at Highway 78?
 - v) If I-15 southbound is closed at Deer Springs Rd?
 - vi) If I-15 southbound is closed at Gopher Canyon Rd?
 - vii) If I-15 southbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - viii) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - ix) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 is closed in both directions?
 - x) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 and I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - xi) If Gopher Canyon is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions above and below Gopher Canyon?
 - xii) If Camino Del Rey is the only westerly route available off Old 395 as I-15 is closed in both directions from Old 395?
- b) If W. Lilac heading east is the only easterly route available?
- c) If Circle R Rd to W. Lilac heading east is the only easterly route available?
- d) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center?
- e) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only route available is Circle R through Gopher Canyon?

- f) What is the evacuation plan for the senior 200 bed facility?
- g) Will additional evacuation notice be given due to the senior housing in Phase 5?

3) In the event there is a wildfire that is west of the development, along old highway 395 and traveling east as happened this year, how long would it take to evacuate the all of the residents 3 miles east of I-15 including the LHR development, given that 80% of the development (at full capacity) have not previously evacuated:

- a) Utilizing W. Lilac across the bridge over I-15 and Circle R:
 - i) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76?
 - ii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - iii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76 and W Lilac, west of old 395 is also closed?
 - iv) If I-15 southbound is closed at Highway 78?
 - v) If I-15 southbound is closed at Deer Springs Rd?
 - vi) If I-15 southbound is closed at Gopher Canyon Rd?
 - vii) If I-15 southbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - viii) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - ix) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 is closed in both directions?
 - x) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 and I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - xi) If Gopher Canyon is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions above and below Gopher Canyon?
 - xii) If Camino Del Rey is the only westerly route available off Old 395 as I-15 is closed in both directions from Old 395?
- b) If W. Lilac heading east and closed at Circle R Rd is the only easterly route available?
- c) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center?
- d) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center? If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center?
- e) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only route available is Circle R through Gopher Canyon?
- f) What is the evacuation plan for the senior 200 bed facility?
- g) Will additional evacuation notice be given due to the senior housing in Phase 5?

- 4) In the event there is a wildfire following and encompassing the San Luis Rey River and Moosa Creek, in that those residing in Bonsall between the Vessel's Ranch and Moosa Creek traveling east and southeast, how long would it take to evacuate the all of the residents and those 3 miles east of I-15 including the LHR development, given that 80% of the development (full residency/capacity) have not previously evacuated:
- a) Utilizing W. Lilac across the bridge and Circle R:
 - i) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76?
 - ii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - iii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76 and W Lilac, west of old 395 is also closed?
 - iv) If I-15 southbound is closed at Highway 78?
 - v) If I-15 southbound is closed at Deer Springs Rd?
 - vi) If I-15 southbound is closed at Gopher Canyon Rd?
 - vii) If I-15 southbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - viii) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - ix) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 is closed in both directions?
 - x) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 and I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - xi) If Gopher Canyon is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions above and below Gopher Canyon?
 - xii) If Camino Del Rey is the only westerly route available off Old 395 as I-15 is closed in both directions from Old 395?
 - b) If W. Lilac heading east is the only easterly route available?
 - c) If Circle R Rd to W. Lilac heading east is the only easterly route available?
 - d) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only easterly route available is W. Lilac to Valley Center?
 - e) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only route available is Circle R through Gopher Canyon?
 - f) What is the evacuation plan for the senior 200 bed facility?
 - g) Will additional evacuation notice be given due to the senior housing in Phase 5?
- 5) In the event there is a wildfire that is in the eastern portion of Valley Center, as has happened many times, how long would it take to evacuate the all of the residents 1 mile east of I-15 including the LHR development, given that 80% of the development (at full capacity) have not previously evacuated:

- a) Utilizing W. Lilac across the bridge over I-15 and Circle R:
 - i) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76?
 - ii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - iii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76 and W Lilac, west of old 395 is also closed?
 - iv) If I-15 southbound is closed at Highway 78?
 - v) If I-15 southbound is closed at Deer Springs Rd?
 - vi) If I-15 southbound is closed at Gopher Canyon Rd?
 - vii) If I-15 southbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - viii) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - ix) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 is closed in both directions?
 - x) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 and I-15 is closed in both directions?
 - xi) If Gopher Canyon is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions above and below Gopher Canyon?
 - xii) If Camino Del Rey is the only westerly route available off Old 395 as I-15 is closed in both directions from Old 395?
 - b) If W. Lilac heading west (and Circle R Rd is closed) is the only westerly route available?
 - c) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only westerly route available is west through Gopher Canyon?
 - d) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only westerly route available is Camino Del Rey?
 - e) What is the evacuation plan for the senior 200 bed facility?
 - f) Will additional evacuation notice be given due to the senior housing in Phase 5?
- 6) In the event there is a wildfire that is in the eastern portion of Valley Center, as has happened many times, how long would it take to evacuate the all of the residents 3 miles east of I-15 including the LHR development, given that 80% of the development (at full capacity) have not previously evacuated:

- a) Utilizing W. Lilac across the bridge over I-15 and Circle R:
 - i) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76?
 - ii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
 - iii) If I-15 northbound is closed at Highway 76 and W Lilac, west of old 395 is also closed?
 - iv) If I-15 southbound is closed at Highway 78?
 - v) If I-15 southbound is closed at Deer Springs Rd?

- vi) If I-15 southbound is closed at Gopher Canyon Rd?
- vii) If I-15 southbound is closed at Old 395 and I-15?
- viii) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions?
- ix) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 is closed in both directions?
- x) If W. Lilac is the only westerly route available as Old 395 and I-15 is closed in both directions?
- xi) If Gopher Canyon is the only westerly route available as I-15 is closed in both directions above and below Gopher Canyon?
- xii) If Camino Del Rey is the only westerly route available off Old 395 as I-15 is closed in both directions from Old 395?
- b) If W. Lilac heading west (and Circle R Rd is closed) is the only westerly route available?
- c) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only westerly route available is west through Gopher Canyon?
- d) If all LHR residents have to exit via Mountain Ridge Rd and the only westerly route available is Camino Del Rey?
- e) What is the evacuation plan for the senior 200 bed facility?
- f) Will additional evacuation notice be given due to the senior housing in Phase 5?

It was very evident from the fire a few months ago that W Lilac bridge was severely impacted, with a bottle neck formed which delayed residences from evacuating in a timely manner. Please take past congestion, road and highway closures during wildfire evacuations into consideration and please respond to my questions as the most recent fire and past fires have significantly impacted us.

Respectfully,

William R. Ewing
9741 Adam Ct
Escondido, CA 92026
760 749-3711

Slovick, Mark

From: Deborah Flynn <rubysmama@hughes.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 12, 2014 2:33 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch

Dear Mr. Slovic,

Here are my concerns regarding this project:

1. Nothing I see or read gives us any comfort or confidence that the fire danger and reporting fire stations have been adequately addressed. We cannot handle a fire in this area because of lack of roads, and the roads we have are only two lanes, and the fire stations are too far away. The traffic jam which would occur in the case of a fire would be catastrophic, not only to the new residents but to those of us who have lived here for many years.
2. The traffic on I-15 in the morning and afternoon is already out of control. We simply cannot handle 4000 more cars on the road up here. All of these new residents would have to commute to work, there are no jobs up here. Traffic, noise, air quality will all become health issues for all of us.
3. We have an agricultural business and this development will certainly impact our business in a negative way. The noise will drive away birds and bees that we rely on to keep our crops healthy. We moved here because of the zoning and open space. Lilac Hills Ranch will effectively destroy our way of life.
4. If the County evokes eminent domain to take a road from private owners in Valley Center, then everything we have been told about our elected officials will be a lie.

Please do not recommend that this development go forward.

Thank you,
Deborah Flynn
38145 Rocking Horse Road
Escondido, CA 92026

Slovick, Mark

From: Kate Fontenot <katefontenot@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 12:58 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch

Dear Mark,

I am writing to voice some of my concerns regarding the proposed development of Lilac Hills Ranch.

1. This is supposed to be a "Pedestrian Oriented Sustainable Community"

- a. No matter of the good intentions, we all know that most people do not walk to go shopping. Our society is, unfortunately, mostly lazy and dependent on automobiles to go anywhere.
- b. As far as I know, this type of community is supposed to reduce automobile dependence, traffic congestion, air and noise pollution. This project is going to cause significant traffic congestion with approximately 9,000 vehicles traveling over the Lilac Bridge on a daily basis and 24 cars per minute at the 395 exit ramp during peak times. I personally do not want to get stuck on the bridge with bumper-to-bumper traffic morning and night. All of this traffic will definitely add to air and noise pollution.
- c. West Lilac Road is extremely windy and narrow. I do not believe it is safe for heavy traffic. I live 2.5 miles east of Old Highway 395 and with the extreme traffic congestion that is predicted, I believe that it may cause my commute to work to increase as much as 45 minutes each way. Again, I do not want to get stuck on the bridge in bumper-to-bumper traffic. The EIR states that road improvements and traffic signals would reduce the impact to less than significant. This is absurd...we will still have extremely heavy traffic.
- d. The EIR also states that traffic on Old Highway 395/West Lilac Road impact would be mitigated through payment to the Transportation Impact Fee. This makes no sense to me. Payment of a fee does not reduce traffic.

2. Subchapter 2.3 States:

West Lilac Road between Camino Del Rey and Old Highway 395, is generally a two-lane undivided roadway and is classified as a Light Collector (2.2E) with Class II bike lanes in the County General Plan Mobility Element. The segment from Old Highway 395 to Lilac Road is also a two-lane undivided roadway. West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Covey Lane is classified as a Light Collector with intermittent turn lanes (2.2C) in the County General Plan Mobility Element, while the segment between Covey Lane and Lilac Road is classified as a Light Collector with reduced shoulder (2.2F). A posted speed limit was not observed along this road.

This is not true. West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Covey Lane has no intermittent turn lanes. The entire stretch of West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Lilac Road is very narrow with a reduced shoulder. If a car were to break down on this road, it would block traffic because the shoulder is so narrow.

3. I do not understand how or why an area of 608 acres that is zoned for 110 homes at approximately 5.5 acres per home could be changed to allow 1,746 homes plus commercial and retail space. I think it would be more reasonable to allow homes to be built on a 2 acre minimum lot and no commercial or retail space. I moved out here for a reason...I wanted peace and quiet, little traffic and space for my animals. I do not care that I have to drive 20 minutes to get to the nearest grocery store.

Well, I know this is going out late. There is so much data to review, but I wanted to address my main concerns of traffic congestion and changing the zoning requirements.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Kate Fontenot
31430 Rodriguez Road
Escondido, CA 92026
(858) 349-5287

Slovick, Mark

From: Jack Fox <fordtrk56@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 8:21 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Re: Nelson Way access

Comments to the Lilac Hills Ranch new DEIR.....6/25/2014

- 1...Are all the county departments,its employees and its legal team associated with this development including the Board of Supervisors ready,willing and able to accept total financial and moral responsibility for any lives lost during a fire and evacuation?
- 2...How will the Alzheimer patients be protected from smoke inhalation during a fire if the have to remain "in place"?
- 3...How does the county plan to address the lack of adequate fire escape routes as well as fire equipment access routes to this project in the event of a catastrophic fire such as we had recently north of Old Hwy 395 and in other areas of the north county?
- 4...Will the W Lilac bridge be expanded by this developer?
- 5...How can the county's traffic engineer make a statement,such as he did on 6/17/2014 at the public hearing in Valley Center's Library,that the county has no interest in this project pro or con when Chris, at this same meeting, stated the county has provided ALTERNATIVE options to the developer,one of which would be to seize private property through eminent domain for Mountain Ridge Rd to become a public road?
- 6...If a private sewer treatment plant is built in this project how and where would the solid waste to be disposed of or would this be considered a mitigated matter?
- 7..Will ANY Tax Payer dollars be used in any way to finance or purchase any property for mitigation of on site facilities,off site improvements of any nature such as roads,water,power,sewer,fire stations?
- 8...If the Valley Center Fire Protection District does not have the necessary finances to staff any new fire stations to facilitate this development,how does the county plan to address this situation?

Respectfully submitted,
John E. Fox
8612 Nelson Way
Escondido,ca. 92026

On Mon, Jun 23, 2014 at 1:07 PM, Jack Fox <fordtrk56@gmail.com> wrote:
Thanks..I will be emailing my concerns about this development in the coming weeks

On Mon, Jun 23, 2014 at 1:03 PM, Slovic, Mark <Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi Jack,

No, the project does not propose to use Nelson Way for access to the development. The EIR does not include an alternative with Nelson Way as access to the development.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks, Mark

From: Jack Fox [mailto:fordtrk56@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, June 23, 2014 12:37 PM

To: Slovic, Mark

Subject: Nelson Way access

Jack Fox here....I wish to inquire about a rumor I heard that Acrretive is attempting,planning,talking about or has made conversation with others regarding utilizing Nelson Way as another ALTERNATIVE to gain access to the proposed development..Please expand on this subject

Lilac Hills Ranch

COPY

July 2, 2014

Robert & Josette Franck
9767 Megan Ter
Escondido, CA 92026

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

RE: Lilac Hills Ranch Update

Dear Robert & Josette,

I am writing to provide you with an update of the Lilac Hills Ranch proposal and share some important information about your community.

On June 12, the County of San Diego released the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) for a 45-day public review period. All the documents, including a two-page reader's guide to help summarize the changes, can be found at:
http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/regulatory/docs/LILAC_HILLS_RANCH/LILAC-HILLS-RANCH.html.

In response to the public review period last summer and feedback from residents, community members and stakeholders, we made several changes to the project, including adding road alternatives for West Lilac Road and Mountain Ridge Road. However, we are continuing to plan the land just north of your neighborhood as a gated neighborhood for senior citizens. We believe that this will generate the lowest impact on you, your neighbors and on the road we share, Mountain Ridge Road.

One of the road alternatives, which was discussed at the county meeting on June 17, was the proposal for the future condition of Mountain Ridge Road. The following information provides a summary and background on this new alternative:

MOUNTAIN RIDGE ROAD

In its current condition, Mountain Ridge Road is a 40-foot wide, private road easement, as shown on the attached Exhibit "A". You will note that because the road is private, it is not a separate public right-of-way, as are public roads. Rather, the road area is part of the legal parcels owned by many of the property owners adjacent to the road and exists as an easement across those owners' properties. The paved portion is approximately 20-foot wide, with a five-to- ten- foot graded shoulder on each side.

Proposed Project

Our project would widen the paved portion of Mountain Ridge Road by four feet to provide a 24-foot wide, paved, private residential road within the existing 40-foot wide easement that benefits the southern 80 acres of Lilac Hills Ranch. Our plan provides internal gates so that all

LILAC HILLS RANCH | 32444 BIRDSONG DRIVE, ESCONDIDO, CA 92026 | 858-546-0700

July 2, 2014

Page 2 of 3

project traffic is restricted from using Mountain Ridge Road, except those residents living within the southern 80-acres. (see attached August 6, 2013 letter).

New Alternative Provided in the RDEIR

In consideration of comments on the prior Draft Environmental Impact Report circulated last July, a project alternative for the future condition of Mountain Ridge Road was added, the Mountain Ridge Fire Station Alternative. This alternative provides an option that could be considered by the County of San Diego as part of final approvals. The alternative plan includes the following new features:

19. A two-acre fire station site in the southern portion of Phase 5, on the east side of Mountain Ridge Road, just north of your neighborhood;
20. The removal of any proposed gates along Mountain Ridge Road and Lilac Hills Ranch Road;
21. The reclassification of Mountain Ridge Road to a Public Rural Residential Collector (Road).

Public Rural Residential Road

As part of this alternative, Mountain Ridge Road would become a public road (rather than its current classification as a private road). The road will remain in the same location (except as Mountain Ridge approaches Circle "R" Drive) and the areas within the adjoining property owners' lots currently subject to the road easement would be purchased and placed into a new public right-of-way for the road. In some cases, the land area required to accommodate the road improvements will extend beyond the current road easement area. As a public road, Mountain Ridge Road would be owned and maintained by the County of San Diego, saving your HOA money and reducing the ownership risk of the current owners. To help explain the proposal, we have attached an aerial map with the limits of both the public and private road designs. All road designs take into account three main factors that determine the ultimate configuration: width, grade, and design speed. The RDEIR studied the following public road design for Mountain Ridge:

The paved road surface, which is currently only 20-foot wide would increase to 28 feet wide by:
1) Widening each travel lane by two feet and 2) Adding, two foot paved shoulders on each side
Six foot parkways will be added to each side (which are non-paved areas on the side of a road that could accommodate walking or jogging paths). Improvements to the intersection alignment of Mountain Ridge Road at the intersection with Circle "R" Drive making it more perpendicular. These road improvements will be based upon a 30 mph design speed. For complete details, see page 11 of the RDEIR, Appendix V-2, Traffic Impact Study;
No homes or structures would be impacted under this scenario or any other scenario.

The Public Road Process

The existing 40-foot wide private road easement for Mountain Ridge extends from Lilac Hills Ranch to Circle R Drive, a distance of approximately 2600 feet. Currently, the Circle R Estates HOA is responsible for all maintenance and upkeep of the road and have exposure to liability (as do the individual property owners that own the land subject to the road easement). If the Public Road

LILAC HILLS RANCH | 32444 BIRDSONG DRIVE, ESCONDIDO, CA 92026 | 858-546-0700

July 2, 2014
Page 3 of 3

Alternative were selected, each property owner subject to the road easement would have that area purchased at fair market value and a public road would convert their "ownership" area into a public right-of-way, which would transfer the responsibility for maintenance and liability to the County of San Diego.

Please feel free to contact me at (858) 345-3644 to schedule a convenient time to meet and I would be happy to sit down with you and review this information in more detail.

Sincerely,



Jon Rilling
Project Manager
Vice President
Lilac Hills Ranch

Enclosure: Exhibit "A"
August 6, 2013 Letter

Slovick, Mark

From: Bob & Josette Franck <franckfort@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2014 10:13 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Eminent Domain: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), etc.

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

The applicant for Lilac Hills Ranch needs extraordinary assistance to access their project due to limited easement rights, which apply to a few parcels and are not extended to the rest of their lots. Enter eminent domain, which County Policy J-33 states: "Notwithstanding the above, non-blighted, owner-occupied, residential structures cannot be condemned for transfer to another private party for purposes of more profitable economic development."

Two, possibly three, "non-blighted, owner-occupied, residential structures" along Mountain Ridge Road, as well as similar numbers on Covey Lane, would be inaccessible &/or condemned with the County's authorizing use of eminent domain for the applicant's "more profitable economic development." Without this project's dire situation - lack of ownership of road easements for all parcels - the County would have no need to force eminent domain on the rightful easement owners of these two privately-owned roads.

Since this is contrary to the J-33 decree, why would the County even consider stealing (while financial compensation is required, how else should one term the forceful giving up of one's property to benefit a private entity that only has financial interest in gaining the property, not caring about how it's gotten) private roads for this private party to have road access to their development and not even build said stolen property up to County Standard roads? How is the County going to satisfy this decree with respect to the public road, West Lilac Road, which has 2-3 homes that may require condemnation to wide the road so LHR can be built? The County already stated that widening of WLR was in the plan, but not in the works because there isn't a current need to widen

it; without this project, there still isn't a need. Why would the County recommend eminent domain that opposes its own policy for its use?

Unfortunately for the developer, Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane are two very large project deterrents: both are **private roads with limited easement rights for the project**, they are both privately maintained, and all of the roads' owners will not give up their roads' intended uses to let Del Mar (1.8 square miles / 1,152 acres, 2,600 DU, population of less than 4,300) drop in on 608 acres (less than one square mile), with at least 1,746 DU, and a population of more than 5,200. Where is the public benefit? The only benefit to be had from the taking of these private roads, will be financial gain by the private developer.

As an aside, I know where it wants to be, but I have searched unsuccessfully on the approved County General Plan to find it, so where is Lilac Hills Ranch supposedly located within this approved General Plan?

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

Slovick, Mark

From: Bob & Josette Franck <franckfort@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 12:13 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR

Mark Slovic
San Diego County PDS Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

The submitted Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Lilac Hills Ranch (LHR), which falls outside of the County's recently adopted General Plan, includes glaring discrepancies, as well as legal issues with respect to roads safety and overburdening of easements.

The General Plan's (GPU) Village areas are where density concentrations are planned and approved, but LHR falls miles outside of the Valley Center North and South, and Fallbrook villages (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/landpdf/Docs/CountywideVillage.pdf>). The applicant was attempting to acquire, through outright purchases or lease options, the +/-608 acres while the GPU was in process, but never requested appropriate upzoning changes for this additional Village.

Since the GPU was designed to adequately fulfill San Diego County's future housing needs WITHOUT THIS PROJECT and the applicant failed to request upzoning changes for their parcels, why was LHR even allowed to go through the development process?

The County should also regard the public's safety on its public and private road network, in and around the proposed project. All ten road exemptions the applicant requested are so far out of line with the existing conditions, many jeopardize the public's safety, and, as a stand-alone concern, should result in denial of this project.

What would the County's reasoning be to approve LHR while accepting any of the ten road exemptions?

Trash collection days on Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Road - both with high, blind hills - summarily mean residents waiting behind waste vehicles to complete the collection route, or crossing into unseen oncoming traffic to pass the three separate trash trucks: regular trash, recyclables and green waste. Approving LHR benefit's the developer, not current residents or businesses, and legal aspects considered, not the County.

From the County's perspective, how insignificant are the current residents' safety and validated concerns compared to the financial improvement of the developer if LHR is approved?

Other legal problems to examine in this project include inconsistency within their DEIR, assumption of easements and overburdening of said easements.

One inconsistency exists between the DEIR Evacuation Plan and the Traffic Study. The applicant's evacuation plan states Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane will both be gated and locked at all times, with only the fire and police having keys. On the other hand, their traffic study says Mountain Ridge Road will be used only by the church and senior facility via the locked gates.

If first responders are the only ones with keys to the gates, then the church and senior facility won't have keys? If only the church and senior facility will have access through the gates, then first responders won't have access? If you speak out both sides of your mouth, a clarity deficiency occurs with your words.

Each plan the Applicant stated for Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane grossly overburden the restricted easements, which are available only to a few lots in the applicant's proposed project. That is, of course, unless the County asserts eminent domain against the valid property owners, subsequently choosing the lengthy, expensive lawsuit(s) to follow.

For this purportedly stand-alone development to continue without intercession from the public, County or State, what is the applicant's timeline for securing legal, written easement rights for EVERY lot within the project from the rightful owners without coercion?

Additionally, the LHR requested road exemptions include drawing roads and sewer lines on properties with no or limited easements / rights. Limited easement rights for one lot do not provide rights to any other lots. Period.

How is this not a **Red Flag concern for the County**?

In closing, thank you for reviewing the Applicant's DEIR and providing thorough responses to our comments, which are but a few problems with the project: its inconsistency with the GPU, discrepancies, and road and easement issues.

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

|

Slovick, Mark

From: Bob & Josette Franck <franckfort@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 12:59 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Construction: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), etc.

Mark Slovic
San Diego County PDS Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

The 2014 DEIR document *GPA12001-REIR-AppendixK-Evacuation_Plan-061214*) mentions Mountain Ridge Road, Covey Lane and Nelson Way as three exit roads in an evacuation.

Where and what are the applicant's road construction plan, schedule, timeframe, etc. for Mountain Ridge Road, Covey Lane, and, potentially, Nelson Way for current residents to access their properties while these private roads are being turned into public roads?

In the same DEIR, the document *GPA12001-REIR-AppendixS-WastewaterManagementAlternatives-061214* suggests Alternative 3 (Mountain Ridge Road) and Alternative 4 (Covey Lane) as wastewater / sewage flow start points leaving LHR.

Where and what are the applicant's road construction plan, schedule, timeframe, etc. for Mountain Ridge Road-Circle R Drive &/or Covey Lane-West Lilac Road-Circle R Drive) for current residents to access their properties while either of these roads torn up to install sewage and wastewater lines to accommodate the project?

And lastly:

Where are the legal, written temporary easements &/or encroachments that have been vacated for the applicant by the rightful property owners while any of the above scenarios occurs?

Thank you for properly addressing the aforementioned problems.

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace

Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

While Lilac Hills Ranch is being constructed, what is the applicant's plan, schedule, timeframe, etc. for Mountain Ridge Road, Covey Lane, and, potentially, Nelson Way (per

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 1:05 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Legalities & Safety: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA) et al

Mark Slovic
San Diego County PDS Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

The submitted Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Lilac Hills Ranch (LHR), which falls outside of the County's recently adopted General Plan, includes glaring discrepancies, as well as legal issues with respect to roads safety and overburdening of easements.

The General Plan's (GPU) Village areas are where density concentrations are planned and approved, but LHR falls miles outside of the Valley Center North and South, and Fallbrook villages (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/landpdf/Docs/CountywideVillage.pdf>). The applicant was attempting to acquire, through outright purchases or lease options, the +/-608 acres while the GPU was in process, but never requested appropriate upzoning changes for this additional Village.

Since the GPU was designed to adequately fulfill San Diego County's future housing needs WITHOUT THIS PROJECT and the applicant failed to request upzoning changes for their parcels, why was LHR even allowed to go through the development process?

The County should also regard the public's safety on its public and private road network, in and around the proposed project. All ten road exemptions the applicant requested are so far out of line with the existing conditions, many jeopardize the public's safety, and, as a stand-alone concern, should result in denial of this project.

What would the County's reasoning be to approve LHR while accepting any of the ten road exemptions?

Trash collection days on Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Road - both with high, blind hills - summarily mean residents waiting behind waste vehicles to complete the collection route, or crossing into unseen oncoming traffic to pass the three separate trash trucks: regular trash, recyclables and green waste. Approving LHR benefit's the developer, not current residents or businesses, and legal aspects considered, not the County.

From the County's perspective, how insignificant are the current residents' safety and validated concerns compared to the financial improvement of the developer if LHR is approved?

Other legal problems to examine in this project include inconsistency within their DEIR, assumption of easements and overburdening of said easements.

One inconsistency exists between the DEIR Evacuation Plan and the Traffic Study. The applicant's evacuation plan states Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane will both be gated and locked at all times, with only the fire and police having keys. On the other hand, their traffic study says Mountain Ridge Road will be used only by the church and senior facility via the locked gates.

If first responders are the only ones with keys to the gates, then the church and senior facility won't have keys? If only the church and senior facility will have access through the gates, then first responders won't have access? If you speak out both sides of your mouth, a clarity deficiency occurs with your words.

Each plan the Applicant stated for Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane grossly overburden the restricted easements, which are available only to a few lots in the applicant's proposed project. That is, of course, unless the County asserts eminent domain against the valid property owners, subsequently choosing the lengthy, expensive lawsuit(s) to follow.

For this purportedly stand-alone development to continue without intercession from the public, County or State, what is the applicant's timeline for securing legal, written easement rights for EVERY lot within the project from the rightful owners without coercion?

Additionally, the LHR requested road exemptions include drawing roads and sewer lines on properties with no or limited easements / rights. Limited easement rights for one lot do not provide rights to any other lots. Period.

How is this not a **Red Flag concern for the County**?

In closing, thank you for reviewing the Applicant's DEIR and providing thorough responses to our comments, which are but a few problems with the project: its inconsistency with the GPU, discrepancies, and road and easement issues.

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

|

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 1:12 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Fire & Evacuation: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), et al

Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR
Mark Slovic
San Diego County PDS Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

In reference to the fire protection plans in the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014, why are these four options still being considered? Deer Spring Fire Protection District will not buy off on three of the plans that were offered to them, and Cal Fire's letter to the County clearly states it wants NOTHING to do with this project.

As for the aforementioned Cal Fire letter, why was it not provided for public review with the rest of the input received?

With respect to the evacuation plans, the 2014 Highway 76 fire left the I-15, Highway 76 and Old Highway 395 closed to traffic in all directions, and for about three hours, the West Lilac Bridge was a parking lot of existing residents who were unable to evacuate as directed.

How does the County plan to evacuate proposed LHR residents - an additional 6,000-7,000 people - on winding, two-lane roads (West Lilac Road, Circle R Drive, Old Highway 395, Old Castle, and Lilac Road) in an emergency?

Why isn't the applicant being tasked to build-out all these roadways to four-lanes to sustain the daily traffic, as well as in case of required evacuations?

How does the County plan to assess the applicant for any injuries or loss of life that may occur from their project's insufficient evacuation plans?

Not only will the planned new residents' lives be risked, but also the lives of current residents that surround the project.

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 1:14 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Road Exceptions: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), et al

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcountry.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

Current road standards are in place for public safety. LHR wants full exemption from the 10 road standards that are hurdles to their project's plan, but damning to the public's safety.

Why would the County consider lower these standards to appease the applicant, when promoting public safety should be the priority?

Were the current road standards created with the thought that they were unnecessary, inefficient, and useless?

Were they created in the hopes that a developer would dare tell the County their employees are idiots for having planned the necessary, efficient and useful road standards?

The County should require the LHR applicant to bring all roads leading into and out of the project up to public road standards at their expense, not at the poor taxpayers' expense.

Where is this proclaimed in the 2014 LHR DEIR?

Thank you for responding to my concerns.

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 1:15 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Funding: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), et al

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

With regard to funding the Lilac Hills Ranch development, the applicant stated they believe school bonds, special assessment districts and other fees should be paid by taxpayers, in- and outside the project area.

How is the County ensuring the applicant pays the full cost of the project, without burdening existing taxpayers not located within the project?

What are the applicant's funding mechanisms, and where are they available for review?

Thank you for answering the above concerns.

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 1:09 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Eminent Domain: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), et al

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

The applicant for Lilac Hills Ranch needs extraordinary assistance to access their project due to limited easement rights, which apply to a few parcels and are not extended to the rest of their lots. Enter eminent domain, which County Policy J-33 states: "Notwithstanding the above, non-blighted, owner-occupied, residential structures cannot be condemned for transfer to another private party for purposes of more profitable economic development."

Two, possibly three, "non-blighted, owner-occupied, residential structures" along Mountain Ridge Road, as well as similar numbers on Covey Lane, would be inaccessible &/or condemned with the County's authorizing use of eminent domain for the applicant's "more profitable economic development." Without this project's dire situation - lack of ownership of road easements for all parcels - the County would have no need to force eminent domain on the rightful easement owners of these two privately-owned roads.

Since this is contrary to the J-33 decree, why would the County even consider stealing (while financial compensation is required, how else should one term the forceful giving up of one's property to benefit a private entity that only has financial interest in gaining the property, not caring about how it's gotten) private roads for this private party to have road access to their development and not even build said stolen property up to County Standard roads?

How is the County going to satisfy this decree with respect to the public road,

West Lilac Road, which has 2-3 homes that may require condemnation to wide the road so LHR can be built?

The County already stated that widening of WLR was in the plan, but not in the works because there isn't a current need to widen it; without this project, there still isn't a need.

Why would the County recommend eminent domain that opposes its own policy for its use?

Unfortunately for the developer, Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane are two very large project deterrents: both are **private roads with limited easement rights for the project**, they are both privately maintained, and all of the roads' owners will not give up their roads' intended uses to let Del Mar (1.8 square miles / 1,152 acres, 2,600 DU, population of less than 4,300) drop in on 608 acres (less than one square mile), with at least 1,746 DU, and a population of more than 5,200. The only benefit to be had from the taking of these private roads, will be financial gain by the private developer.

Where is the public benefit?

As an aside:

I know where the project WANTS to be, but I have searched unsuccessfully on the approved County General Plan to find it, so where is Lilac Hills Ranch supposedly located within this approved General Plan?

Thank you for responding to my public comments.

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 1:42 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Questions: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), et al

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

I have a slew of questions regarding the Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR.

1. How is the applicant funding the estimated annual \$500k Deer Springs Fire Protection District budget shortfall for the Mountain Ridge Road fire station alternative?
2. In which "Village" is LHR located in the recently approved, San Diego County General Plan (GP), and where in this current GP are the applicant's 1,746 EDUs planned?
3. How does LHR's 1,746 EDUs meet the current GP of allowing between 80-110 EDUs?
4. Who within the County is the person responsible for verifying the applicant's purported easement rights? Once the limiting nature of the easements were discovered, what cause would the County have to enact overburdening of easements for the applicant?
5. The Specific Plan Area (SPA) within the city of Escondido is near downtown Escondido, the Escondido Transit Center, and existing commercial & infrastructure, and can more easily accommodate Lilac Hills Ranch's planned structures and

population. If a project like LHR is to provide homes with commercial in a walkable environment, what would the County's valid reasoning be to NOT adopt this alternative?

6. Is it 1,746 new EDUs, plus the existing 16 EDUs (1,762 total), or does the 1,746 include the existing EDUs?

7. What commitment does the applicant have to build all 5 phases (bonded assurance, etc.)?

8. How does the County justify tearing up West Lilac Road &/or Circle R Drive for wastewater / sewage for LHR without requiring the applicant to widen these public roads?

9. With respect to construction, emergency services, and current residents, when the currently working roads are torn up to install sewer / wastewater lines. What phase will this be started and completed?

10. What other easements will the applicant require from abutting property owners to build LHR (slope, encroachment, etc.)?

11. All traffic leaving & entering LHR should be included in project's cost, including turning the lengths of West Lilac Road & Circle R Drive into four-lane roads from where the project begins all the way to I-15, as well as Old Highway 395 (from Highway 76 on the north side to Country Club Lane on the south), and the full lengths of Old Castle & Lilac roads. Unless the project's traffic will travel telekenetically, it will be over these roadways. Where are these road widenings proposed in the 2014 DEIR?

Thank you for answering all of the above concerns.

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 1:49 PM
To: Slovick, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Construction: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR 3800 12-001 (GPA), et al

Mark Slovick
San Diego County PDS Project Manager

(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

The 2014 DEIR document *GPA12001-REIR-AppendixK-Evacuation_Plan-061214*) mentions Mountain Ridge Road, Covey Lane and Nelson Way as three exit roads in an evacuation.

Where and what are the applicant's road construction plans, schedules, timeframes, etc. for Covey Lane, Mountain Ridge Road, and perhaps Nelson Way for current residents to access their properties while these private roads are being turned into public roads?

In the same DEIR, the document *GPA12001-REIR-AppendixS-WastewaterManagementAlternatives-061214* suggests Alternative 3 (Mountain Ridge Road) and Alternative 4 (Covey Lane) as wastewater / sewage flow start points while leaving LHR.

Where and what are the applicant's road construction plans, schedules, timeframes, etc. for current residents to access their properties while either of these roads (Covey Lane-West Lilac Road-Circle R Drive &/or Mountain Ridge Road-Circle R Drive) is torn up to install sewage and wastewater lines to accommodate the project?

And, finally:

Where are the legal, written temporary easements & encroachments that the rightful property owners have vacated for the applicant while any of the above scenarios occur?

Thank you for properly addressing the aforementioned problems.

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace

Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch 2014 DEIR

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

While Lilac Hills Ranch is being constructed, what is the applicant's plan, schedule, timeframe, etc. for Mountain Ridge Road, Covey Lane, and, potentially, Nelson Way (per

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

Lilac Hills Ranch

August 6, 2013

Mr & Mrs Robert Franck
9767 Megan Ter
Escondido, CA 92026

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Dear Mr & Mrs Franck,

I am sending this letter to continue to provide information regarding the future Lilac Hills Ranch Community. In attempts to get your feedback over the past year, we provided you with a copy of the Draft Specific Plan in October, 2012 and subsequently sent you a link to download the updated versions in February and July of this year. We also offered to meet with your HOA to present the details of Lilac Hills Ranch in October of last year and would like to extend the offer again to meet with you and answer any questions and/or direct you to the County for more information.

In addition, you have received the notice that the environmental impact report was released for public review on July 3. To help encourage you to meet with us in person, I am providing a summary of our plans for Lilac Hills Ranch with details on how Mountain Ridge Road will serve a small portion of the community.

Lilac Hills Ranch Summary:

As planned, the northern portion of the community is a traditional neighborhood, oriented around a town square (north of Covey Lane and South and West of West Lilac Road). The southern portion is comprised of an Age Restricted Senior Citizen Neighborhood (north of Mountain Ridge and south of Covey Lane).

Traditional Northern Community:

The traditional neighborhood consists of 1,278 homes around a small mixed-use Town Center (think Julian meets Healdsburg) with boutique retail. The Town Center would include traditional businesses such as a market, sidewalk cafes, restaurants, a Country Inn with a banquet facility and other businesses. In addition, we have planned for a K-8 school, a recreation center, and a large 12-acre public park with multi-use fields located between the Town Center and the Senior Neighborhood (in the middle of Lilac Hills Ranch). The community will also include numerous smaller neighborhood parks and over 20 miles of walking trails open to the public. These linkages will serve to connect all residents in the area to the amenities inside of Lilac Hills Ranch and into the surrounding neighborhoods.

Senior Neighborhood & Mountain Ridge Road:

As stated above, the southernmost portion of the Lilac Hills Ranch Community will consist of a private, gated senior neighborhood. The senior neighborhood will provide all the essential services and activities that many senior citizens desire or require including a senior (activity) center with a pool, tennis courts, parks, trails, church and an Assisted/Group Living building that will provide primary medical care and services.

LILAC HILLS RANCH | 32444 BIRDSONG DRIVE, ESCONDIDO, CA 92026 | 858-546-0700

August 6, 2013
Page 2 of 2

Per the enclosed plan, approximately one third of the Senior Neighborhood is planned as an exclusive gated enclave bordering Circle R Estates. This exclusive southerly portion would have two gated entrances - one from the north, through Lilac Hills Ranch, and one from the south following an existing 40-foot private road easement over Mountain Ridge Road, which Kevin Johnson stated "Amendment 10 of the PTR indicates that Accretive may have limited rights granted in 1957 to use the Mountain Ridge private road for two parcels." Only the church and residents of this exclusive gated senior neighborhood would be allowed to access Mountain Ridge Road. The remainder of Lilac Hills Ranch will not access Mountain Ridge Road.

The projected traffic levels on Mountain Ridge Road, as described in our Traffic Impact Study, are below the County private road standards and the road improvements that we will construct on Mountain Ridge Road occur within our existing 40-foot road easement.

We have enclosed the conceptual landscaping plan for you and hope that we can sit down to discuss any comments or concerns in the next few weeks before the close of the public review period on August 19. Please feel free to contact me at (858) 345-3644 to schedule a convenient time to meet.

Sincerely,



Jon Rilling
Project Manager
Vice President
Lilac Hills Ranch

LILAC HILLS RANCH | 32444 BIRDSONG DRIVE, ESCONDIDO, CA 92026 | 858-546-0700

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 3:37 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: MRR Baseline: LHR 2014 DEIR 3800 12-091 (GPA), et al
Attachments: Gordon COMMENTS TO THE RECON NOISE STUDY FOR MT RIDGE ALTERNATIVE - July 22nd ltr.pdf

Mark Slovic
San Diego County PDS Project Manager
Mark.Slovick@county.can.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project#: 3800 12-001 (GPA), et al

Dear Mark,

The basic definition of a baseline is the starting point from which measurements are based. However, inconsistencies exist in the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR baseline for Mountain Ridge Road.

Attached is a PDF from my neighbor, James Gordon, clearly summarizing what Mountain Ridge Road is in reality, which differs from what is purported at various locations within the DEIR. For everyone's clarity - the applicant's, the public's and the County's, on the road's reality is what the proposed project should be based, THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE DEIR.

Without a true, valid starting point, a true, valid decision cannot be adequately attained for any item referring to Mountain Ridge Road: noise, traffic, environmental, biological, wastewater, fire protection, road exceptions, or even eminent domain.

How does the County plan to base any decisions related to MRR when the road's baseline is improperly defined in the LHR DEIR?

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Bob & Josette Franck <franckfort@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 3:55 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Baseline needed: Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014 3800 12-001 (GPA), etc.
Attachments: Gordon COMMENTS TO THE RECON NOISE STUDY FOR MT RIDGE ALTERNATIVE - July 22nd ltr.pdf

Mark Slovic
San Diego County PDS Project Manager
Mark.Slovick@county.can.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project#s: 3800 12-001 (GPA), etc.

Dear Mark,

The basic definition of a baseline is the starting point from which measurements are based. However, inconsistencies exist in the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR baseline for Mountain Ridge Road.

Attached is a PDF from my neighbor, James Gordon, clearly summarizing what Mountain Ridge Road is in reality, which differs from what is purported at various locations within the DEIR. For everyone's clarity - the applicant's, the public's and the County's, on the road's reality is what the proposed project should be based, **THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE DEIR.**

Without a true, valid starting point, a true, valid decision cannot be adequately attained for any item referring to Mountain Ridge Road: noise, traffic, environmental, biological, wastewater, fire protection, road exceptions, or even eminent domain.

How does the County plan to base any decisions related to MRR when the road's baseline is improperly defined in the LHR DEIR?

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 12:50 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Subject: Proj Issue Checklist, Lilac Hills 3800 12-001 (GPA) et al
Attachments: Project_Issue_Checklist.pdf; J-33.pdf

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Hi, Mark:

Attached is the Project Issue Checklist I was asking about Tuesday evening. I downloaded it from the PDS site on Monday (16th).

With respect to the more detailed sections (pages 6-258):

Item 1, No. 1, General Plan Conformance - With the project being so far outside the General Plan that it may as well be Martian, how, specifically, did the applicant "resolve" this conundrum?

Item 1, No. 3, Off-site Improvements/Dedications - Paragraph 2 states: "It is the applicant's responsibility to provide suitable evidence that offsite improvements including grading, dedications, grants (if any), and easements can be accomplished **without resorting to County of San Diego assistance.**"

1. Where are these requested documents?
2. Who is allowed to review them?
3. Who from the County verified the documents are valid?
4. And if they were "resolved" 6/13/2013, then why would an alternative that **REQUIRES "resorting to County of San Diego assistance"** be included in the revised DEIR?
5. How will the County justify violating County Policy J-33 (attached) when the Deer Springs Fire Protection District will not put the bulk of their responses at risk for the sake of a development that is located farther from the fire district's existing residents? Being too large for me to attach, please also refer to GPA12001-REIR-Chap4-061214.pdf (*Section 4.8.1.7 Road Design Alternative 7*) and GPA12001-REIR-AppendixV-2-TrafficFireAlternative-061214.pdf
6. Without plans to build a fire station - that will not be used by DSFPD - within the project's boundaries, there is NO PUBLIC NEED for the stealing of Mountain Ridge Road. Since the only way this private road can be accepted as a viable alternative to access the project is through the developer forcing the County to enact eminent domain, why is this even being considered as a viable alternative?
7. How does Section 4.8.1.7 Road Design Alternative 7's text: "This would result in about **ten existing driveways no longer being accessible (red emphasis mine)** since they are at the sag or peak of the existing curves. These driveways would need to be redesigned and rebuilt, while maintaining access to the properties. In addition, this alternative **would encroach into the existing footprint of three single-family residences (red emphasis mine)** ..." follow the J-33 credo that "... non-blighted, owner-occupied, residential structures cannot be condemned for transfer to another private party for purposes of more profitable economic development."?

That's all I can do today 😊

Have a great afternoon!

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)509-5308

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME:

Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s):

3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP),
3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100
5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-
017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Summary of Document Requests and Reviews

Purpose: To track requests for technical studies, maps/plot plans, and other requested information

Last Updated: 6/13/2013

Plan/Study Request	Status of Review	Date Requested	Date of Study	Date Accepted
Agriculture Technical Report	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12 2/11/13	6/13/13
Air Quality Report	Accepted	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12	9/14/12	6/13/13
Biological Resources Report with Conceptual Resource Management Plans (On- and Off-Site)	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Climate Change Analysis	Accepted	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12	9/14/12	6/13/13
Conceptual Landscape Plan	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Cultural Resource Report	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Emergency Response Plan and Risk Management Plan	Project will be conditioned to update Valley Center Municipal Water District's existing plan.	2/7/11	6/14/12	12/10/12
Evacuation Plan		2/7/2011 12/10/12	6/14/12 9/14/12	3/20/13
Fire Protection Plan (FPP)	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
General Plan Amendment Report		2/7/2011 12/10/12	6/14/12	N/A
Geotechnical Report		2/7/11	6/14/12 9/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Summary of Document Requests and Reviews

Purpose: To track requests for technical studies, maps/plot plans, and other requested information

Last Updated: 6/13/2013

Plan/Study Request	Status of Review	Date Requested	Date of Study	Date Accepted
Groundwater Investigation		2/7/11	6/14/12 9/14/12	12/10/12
Hazardous Materials Information		2/7/2011 6/14/2012	9/14/12	12/10/12
Hydromodification Management Plan	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Implementing Tentative Map 5572	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12	6/13/13
Land Use/Community Character Study	To be provided in DEIR.	2/7/2011 12/10/12	6/14/12	N/A
Letters of Permission (Easement Holders)	To be provided	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12		N/A
Major Use Permit Plot Plan	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Master Tentative Map 5571	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Memorandums of Understanding		2/7/2011 6/14/2012		12/10/12
Noise Analysis	Accepted	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12	9/14/12	6/13/13
Off-Site Biological Mitigation Information		2/7/2011 6/14/2012	9/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME:

Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Summary of Document Requests and Reviews

Purpose: To track requests for technical studies, maps/plot plans, and other requested information

Last Updated: 6/13/2013

Plan/Study Request	Status of Review	Date Requested	Date of Study	Date Accepted
Open Space Fencing and Signage Plan (Biological Open Space)	Accepted	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12 3/20/13		6/13/13
Park Concept Plan (Site Plan S07-018)	Accepted	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12 3/20/13	9/14/12	6/13/13
Park Dedication/Development Phasing Plan		2/7/2011 12/10/12		3/20/13
Phasing Plan		2/7/2011 12/10/12	6/14/12 9/14/12	3/20/13
Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESA)		2/7/11	6/14/12 9/14/12	12/10/12
Photometric Study		2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12		3/20/13
Preliminary Drainage Study	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Preliminary Grading Plan TM 5571	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Preliminary Grading Plan TM 5572	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Project Description		2/7/11	6/14/12 9/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP),
3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100
5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-
017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Summary of Document Requests and Reviews

Purpose: To track requests for technical studies, maps/plot plans, and other requested information

Last Updated: 6/13/2013

Plan/Study Request	Status of Review	Date Requested	Date of Study	Date Accepted
Proof of Ability to Construct Off-Site Improvements	Accepted for public review	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12 3/20/13	9/14/12	6/13/13
Request for Modification (DPW)	In Process	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 3/20/13	9/14/12	
Roudabout Exhibits	In Process (third party review to be completed)	12/10/12		
RPO Open Space/Encroachment Map		2/7/12	6/14/12 9/14/12	12/10/12
RPO Slope Analysis		2/7/11	6/14/12	12/10/12
Specific Plan	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Stormwater Management Plan	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Traffic Impact Analysis with Parking and Sight Distance Analysis	Accepted	2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12 3/20/13	9/14/12	6/13/13
Trails Plan	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Vector Management Plan		2/7/2011 6/14/2012	9/14/12	12/10/12
Visual Resource Report	In Process	2/7/2011 12/10/12	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME:

Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s):

3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Summary of Document Requests and Reviews

Purpose: To track requests for technical studies, maps/plot plans, and other requested information

Last Updated: 6/13/2013

Plan/Study Request	Status of Review	Date Requested	Date of Study	Date Accepted
Wastewater Report	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Water Service Report	Accepted	2/7/2011 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/14/12 9/14/12	6/13/13
Water Supply Assessment		2/7/2011 6/14/2012 12/10/12	10/9/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	1	Major Project Issue	<p>General Plan Conformance In our February 7, 2011 Major Pre Application Letter, staff indicated that your project was inconsistent with the County's Draft General Plan in Major Project Issue 1. Since that time, the General Plan update was adopted on August 3, 2011. Based on the newly adopted General Plan, County staff has confirmed that the proposed project remains inconsistent with the land use map and numerous General Plan policies.</p> <p>Staff will be revising and updating the submitted comprehensive Draft General Plan Amendment Report submitted to detail these inconsistencies. Please immediately review the policies and indicate to staff how you would propose to revise these policies or if you disagree with staff's analysis. If policy revisions are required to the County's General Plan, then the project's EIR must also analyze the impacts to the County's General Plan (Major Project Issue 17).</p>	<p>The technical studies have been accepted and the EIR addresses consistency with the General Plan under Land Use.</p>	<p>6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13</p>	<p>6/13/13</p>

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	2	Major Project Issue	<p>Incomplete Specific Plan The draft Specific Plan submitted does not meet the requirements of Section 65451 (a) of the Government Code Section. The Government Code requires a text and a diagram or diagrams which specify all of the following in detail:</p> <p>(1) The distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land, including open space, within the area covered by the plan.</p> <p>(2) The proposed distribution, location, and extent and intensity of major components of public and private transportation, sewage, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, energy, and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the area covered by the plan and needed to support the land uses described in the plan.</p> <p>(3) Standards and criteria by which development will proceed, and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, where applicable.</p> <p>(4) A program of implementation measures including regulations, programs, public works projects, and financing measures necessary to carry out paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).</p> <p>(5) The specific plan shall include a statement of the relationship of the specific plan to the general plan.</p>		6/14/12	12/7/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	2	Major Project Issue	More specifically, the draft Specific Plan does not contain enough detail in regards to the distribution, location, and extent of all the uses of land within the area covered by the plan. For example, the plan does not identify the number of units within each phase, access to each phase or proposed uses, square footage of the proposed commercial or other uses, or the number of beds at the age restricted community. Please refer to the Planner's Guide to Specific Plan's prepared by the Office of Planning and Research's for additional information. The plan is available here: http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/specific/ .		6/14/12	12/7/12
1	3	Major Project Issue	<p>Off-Site Improvements/Dedications</p> <p>The project plans indicate off-site improvements and dedications. As indicated in the Major Pre Application letter, in order to allow for public and/or private improvements for areas outside the boundary of this subdivision, the following shall be completed:</p> <p>It is the applicant's responsibility to provide suitable evidence that offsite improvements including grading, dedications, grants (if any), and easements can be accomplished without resorting to County of San Diego assistance. This evidence can be provided in several forms (provide a letter of explanation with the below forms) used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Title Report showing applicant has the right to construct improvements along with a Title Company Guarantee (\$20,000) acknowledging those rights; • Recorded Grant Deed or Recorded Right To Purchase for the area where improvements are to be constructed; • Other evidence satisfactory to the County that clearly shows an existing and continuing right to construct the required improvements. 	Off-site improvements are identified and are analyzed in the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	3	Major Project Issue	The applicant's evidence must also show the ability to have any existing utility easements subordinated to the new Public Easement (if any) as per County Subdivision Ordinance. The foregoing must be accomplished to the satisfaction of PDS and DPW prior to writing final requirements for this project. Provide a Map, to Engineer's scale, which clearly indicates any off-site road Easements/Dedications/Letters of Permission to Grade/Improve to be acquired, existing I.O.D.s, existing Public Road Easements, etc. Letters of Permission to Grade/Improve must be notarized. Please note that existing off-site road easements may need to be expanded to accommodate road widening required by the project. The ultimate right-of-way width required would be determined through the results of a traffic study.	See above.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	4	Major Project Issue	<p>RPO Wetland Impacts and Buffers</p> <p>The project, as currently designed, proposes impacts to over 8 acres of RPO wetlands. In accordance with the Resource Protection Ordinance, impacts to wetlands must be avoided. The RPO allows for crossings of wetlands only when specific findings can be made. Impacts to RPO wetlands must be avoided on-site. For impacts that cannot be avoided, specific findings must be made in accordance with Section 86.604(a) (5) and should be included as a detailed discussion in the biological resources report. Also, it appears that buffers ranging from 20 to 50 feet are proposed and included within the open space areas shown on the Tentative Maps. In accordance with Section 86.602(r), a minimum wetland buffer of 50-feet is required from the edge of a RPO wetland and must also be included as biological open space. Buffers exceeding 50-feet may be required in certain instances as detailed in the RPO. All RPO wetlands must include an appropriate wetland buffer. The text of the report should also be revised to provide justification for the proposed buffer widths. In addition, a limited building zone of no less than 100-feet should be shown from the edge of the RPO wetland. Please see Major Project Issue 13 for additional information regarding the LBZ. Please see additional comments under Biology.</p>		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	5	Major Project Issue	Travel Time The project does not meet the maximum allowed emergency response time of 5-minutes required by the General Plan. The Fire Protection Plan incorrectly calculates the response time from the Miller Station; however, the appropriate station to calculate the response time is the Deer Springs Station 1, which has an 8 minute travel time to the midpoint of the project. The Miller Station is not considered a year-round structural fire station. An evaluation of the travel time to the area needs to be provided to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego. Furthermore, the Fire Protection Plan submitted indicates that travel time was calculated by accessing the project from the south; however, Phase 1 does not include the construction of an access road to the south.		6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	
1	6	Major Project Issue	Dead-End Road Length In our February 7, 2011 Major Pre Application Letter, staff indicated that your project may exceed dead-end road length and secondary access will be required. The project submitted exceeds the maximum allowed dead-end road length of 800-feet as required by Section 503.1.3 of the County Fire Code for parcels zoned for less than 1-acre. An evaluation of the road length and conformance with the Fire Code needs to be provided to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego. <u>Additional information is required to determine if the project complies with the fire code, including the proposed construction phasing. Staff requests an exhibit that shows the length of the proposed access roads in feet (800 maximum). The exhibit should also show all emergency/secondary access routes and if there are any restrictions. Please see the comments on the Fire Protection Plan. Staff has concerns with the ability of the project to use certain access roads.</u>	A Fire Protection Plan has been prepared that indicates that the project complies with the dead-end road length requirements.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	7	Major Project Issue	Subdivision Ordinance Compliance The project does not comply with Section 81.401 (q) of the Subdivision Ordinance, which requires a subdivision to be designed so that a street or road easement providing access to a parcel located on a subdivision boundary, shall not terminate in a cul-de-sac when it is feasible for the street or road easement to serve as a through street connecting the subdivision to a street or road easement in an existing or proposed, adjacent subdivision. The draft Specific Plan and Master Tentative Map show a new public road (Lilac Hills Ranch Road) ending in a cul-de-sac at the entrance to Lot 15. The draft Specific Plan also indicates an arrow at the bottom of southern boundary of the site, but does not indicate access to that point or where it would connect. This issue is closely related to General Plan policies regarding circulation and Fire Code requirements for dead-end road length and should be addressed in the project documents to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego.	See Major Project Issue 1.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
1	8	Major Project Issue	Water, Sewer and Fire Service The Project Facility Availability Forms provided from the Valley Center Municipal Water District and Deer Springs Fire Protection District indicate that facilities to serve the project are not reasonably expected to be available within the next 5 years based capital facility plans of the district. The applicant shall work with the Valley Center Municipal Water District and Deer Springs Fire Protection District to determine what improvements, if any, can be provided to enable the district to serve the project.	Updated forms have been provided; however, the facility availability form from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District indicates that services are not reasonably expected to be available within the next 5 years.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	9	Major Project Issue	Technical Studies The project was submitted without the requested technical studies for Traffic, Air Quality, Noise, and Climate Change. The Department has indicated and it was acknowledged by the owner/applicant that there is a risk that the studies could result in significant changes and/or revisions to the project after they are submitted, which would have an impact on the overall cost and estimated project schedule. Furthermore, the technical studies submitted for Agricultural Resources, Fire Protection and Visual Resources are incomplete and do not provide the information requested in the February 7, 2011 Major Pre Application Summary Letter.		6/14/12	12/10/12
1	10	Major Project Issue	Law Enforcement Services The project combined with other submitted projects could have a cumulative impact on law enforcement services. The San Diego County Sheriff's Office is in the process of evaluating the potential cumulative impact and PDS will forward their comments to the applicant once they are received.		6/14/12	12/10/12
1	11	Major Project Issue	Parks (Park Land Dedication Ordinance) As indicated in the Major Pre Application Summary letter, the project requires 15.24 acres of public parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The applicant proposes one public park; however, there are no details regarding the park and it is proposed in Phase 5. In the letter we also indicated that parks are typically constructed in the earlier phases of the project. The project should provide either three medium sized neighborhood parks (north, central and south) or two larger neighborhood parks (north and south). In addition, the draft Specific Plan needs to be revised to include additional details on the proposed park. <u>Please see the attached comments for the Department of Parks and Recreation.</u>		6/14/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	12	Major Project Issue	Trails Projects of this size provide comprehensive public trail systems that connect neighborhoods within the project to neighborhoods outside the project and to other existing and proposed public facilities and trails. A private trails system is not consistent with community character and the purpose of the Valley Center Community Trails and Master Plan to have an interconnecting public trails system. Please provide a public trail system consistent with the project size, amenities and surrounding community character of Bonsall and Valley Center. Attached is a revised public trails system exhibit for reference. <u>Please see the attached comments regarding the proposed trail network.</u>	The trails plan in the Specific Plan has been accepted.	6/14/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
1	13	Major Project Issue	Fuel Modification The project includes approximately 70.88 acres of biological open space, but there are no proposed Limited Building Zone (LBZ) easements shown on the maps. In order to protect the proposed biological open space easements from fuel modification, a minimum LBZ of 100-feet shall be provided from the edge of the proposed open space. The LBZ would preclude any habitable structures that would require fuel modification (clearing). <u>Additional revisions are required to address the fire district's comments. In addition, the Master Tentative Map does not clearly indicate the Limited Building Zone Easement. Please update the Master Tentative Map to indicate the Limited Building Zone Easement.</u>	A Fire Protection Plan has been prepared that identifies the required fuel management.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	14	Major Project Issue	Financing The Draft Specific Plan indicates a number of different financing options proposed as part of the Lilac Hills Ranch project, including a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or developer reimbursement agreement. The Board of Supervisors has adopted Board of Supervisors Policy I-136 regarding the formation of CFDs (attached). Please review the attached form for further information regarding the goals and policies regarding the formation of CFDs. Please note that the Board of Supervisors would determine whether to form a CFD. County staff can schedule a follow up meeting with County Special Districts to discuss these requirements in further detail if necessary.	<i>Informational</i>	6/14/12	N/A
1	15	Major Project Issue	Land Use Impacts/ Community Character As indicated in the Major Pre Application letter, the overall size and scale of the proposed development (1,746 dwelling units, commercial and civic use types) is a major project issue. The proposed development of the Lilac Hills Ranch project would substantially increase the size of northwestern Valley Center and Bonsall and change the character of this rural agricultural community. In addition, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will need to analyze the cumulative impact of the project on the rural character of the area when combined with other reasonably foreseeable projects within the region. The predominance of small lot development, as well as the uniformity of lot sizes within the development area would not be consistent with rural development patterns within the Valley Center Community Plan area. The EIR should also analyze the project's impact on neighboring residences, especially those surrounded by the site or directly adjacent to the project site.	To be addressed in the Draft EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	16	Major Project Issue	School Facilities As indicated in the Major Pre Application letter, the CEQA establishes special requirements for certain school projects to ensure that potential health impacts resulting from exposure to hazardous materials, wastes, and substances will be carefully examined and disclosed in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Surrounding land uses include the application of pesticides, fumigants and other potentially hazardous chemicals. The compatibility of a proposed school within an intensive agricultural setting is an issue that must be analyzed within the requested Agricultural Resource Report.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
1	17	Major Project Issue	Scope of Environmental Analysis As noted above, staff has identified a number of General Plan policies that may require substantial revision in order to accommodate the project as currently proposed. Such changes were not anticipated in the Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the County's General Plan Update. As such, the GPA may necessitate a broader environmental analysis that utilizes the certified General Plan Update EIR as a basis and evaluates the potential impacts of revising the policies. Therefore, it is essential that project proponents work with staff to determine (1) the scope of the GPA and (2) the level and scope of environmental analysis required.	The technical studies have been accepted and the EIR addresses consistency with the General Plan under Land Use.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	18	Major Project Issue	<p>Environmental Impact Report Requirements</p> <p>As indicated in our Major Pre Application letter, PDS has determined that there is substantial evidence that your project would have a significant adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, it will be necessary to prepare and submit a draft EIR to satisfy the requirements of the CEQA. Upon submittal of the required applications as detailed below with the discretionary applications, you will receive a detailed EIR scoping letter from PDS regarding the subjects to be analyzed in the EIR.</p> <p>Please be advised that staff will utilize the EIR process, particularly the development of EIR project alternatives, to address Major Issues, planning issues, and/or environmental issues that may arise during the EIR process.</p> <p>The County of San Diego's environmental review guidelines require that EIRs be prepared by a consultant from the County's List of Environmental Consultants (available at the Department of Planning and Land Use – Zoning Counter).</p> <p>A number of environmental issues have been identified, including, but not limited to the following resource areas: Aesthetics, Agriculture, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Historical Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards including Wildland Fires, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services and Utilities and Transportation.</p>		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
2	1	General Comment	Please remove all references to "Escondido" throughout the technical studies. The project is located within the unincorporated portion of San Diego County within the communities of Valley Center and Bonsall. All references to the Escondido Zip Code should also be removed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	1	Agriculture	Staff has reviewed the Agricultural Resources Report, dated September 10, 2012, prepared by Recon Environmental and submitted to the County, on September 14, 2012. <u>The report provides the necessary information to review and make substantive comments.</u> is extremely incomplete and requires major revisions as detailed in the following comments. All incomplete sections must be revised and finished for the next submittal.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	2	Agriculture	Please include an analysis of off-site impacts associated with roadway widening and construction.		6/14/12	12/7/12
3	3	Agriculture	With the next submittal, submit a Word Document for Department edits. That should have been submitted, with this Report. It is understood that Department staff attempted to obtain this digital file, but it was never submitted. The MOU for this consultant requires cooperation with the Department's requests for additional information and documentation. <u>The Word Document contains comments and edits, which must be revised by the applicant. Please revise the report to address the comments.</u>	Report has been revised to address staff's comments.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	4	Agriculture	Summary, Page 1: The description regarding the March 26, 2010, County's preliminary LARA Model run should not be referenced in this Report, nor included as an Exhibit. That preliminary LARA Model was created based on the PAA known as Accretive and its project description. The April 2012, project description is now different and includes more land area than that reviewed during 2010, by the Department. One of the purposes of this Report is to analyze the new project description and land, based on the County of San Diego Agricultural Guidelines, which includes preparation of a LARA Model. This Report must include a completed LARA Model and analysis, regarding the April 2012, project description and all involved land area, as well as land characteristics, as required by the LARA Model.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	5	Agriculture	The Report must present a full and accurate background and analysis relating to both Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, based on the County's Agricultural Guidelines. This Report is severely lacking any such analysis. County Guidelines 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 must be completely and fully analyzed, in relation to the proposed project. It is unclear why these sections of the Report were not finalized. Although, staff has substantive comments regarding these Sections, the analysis is now within the Report. See comments later in this checklist for the comments relating to the Indirect and Cumulative analysis.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	6	Agriculture	This Report was not signed as true and accurate, pursuant to the MOU.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	7	Agriculture	Section 4: The Report does not provide an analysis of the conformance of the project with existing agricultural policies. All listed Goals and Policies must be numbered, in the same numbering system as found in the document used (General Plan or Community Plan). It is unclear why this section is not completed. There are substantive comments relating to these Policies, but the analysis is now in the Report. See further comments below.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	8	Agriculture	The General Plan conformity section must be started and finished. there are no Policies listed and no analysis is provided. Referring the reader to the EIR is not appropriate. Based on the scale of this development, the General Plan Policies must be addressed in this Report. There are substantive comments relating to these Policies, but the analysis is now in the Report. See further comments below.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	9	Agriculture	The Report must address the need for mitigation to agricultural resources. This analysis is lacking, at this time. There are substantive comments relating to these Policies, but the analysis is now in the Report. See further comments below.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	10	Agriculture	Upon receipt of the Word file for this Report, more changes to the document will be made by the Department. These changes include typographical errors and wording changes for accuracy. These amendments are too numerous to be listed here. Changes to the Word Document were made and will be submitted to the applicant with these comments.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	11	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2 - Goals and Policies: Pursuant to the Report Format and Content requirements of the County's Agricultural CEQA Guidelines, this Section must address only those Goals and Policies relating to agriculture, not land use/site design, public services or conservation, etc. - unless there are policies in those categories that relate specifically to agriculture. There are substantive comments relating to these Policies, but the analysis is now in the Report. See further comments below.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	12	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2: Community Character Policy 1 is misquoted.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	13	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2: Agricultural Policy 2: The quoted policy is not found in the Valley Center CP.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	14	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2: Agricultural Policy 3: This quoted policy is misquoted and should be referenced as Policy 2.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	15	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2: Agricultural Policy 4 is misquoted and should be Policy 3, not 4. The first sentence of this Policy is correct, the remainder of the text should be deleted.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	16	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2: Conservation Policy 3: Is not found in the Valley Center CP. Policies 13 and 17 should be renumbered to 11 and 15, respectively.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	17	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2: Open Space Goal and Policy 7: At this time, it is not clear why this is found in the Agriculture Report. Further discussion with the Department will be needed, to assess its relevance. It is not clear how this proposal actually complies with this Policy. Staff suggests a working meeting to go through these comments and address changes to the Agricultural Report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	18	Agriculture	Section 4.1.2: Noise: Provide the Goal that is associated with Policy 6.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	19	Agriculture	Introduction: The Report should reference the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Agricultural Resources, as well as Appendix G. The Report is prepared using the County's Guidelines for determining significance of agricultural resources.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	20	Agriculture	Project Location and Description: The Project Description states that there are 608 acres in the project, not 611 (see p.14 and Table 2, as well). Further, delete all reference to Escondido from the Cover Sheet and this Report text. The project is located in the Valley Center CP Area, in the Unincorporated County of San Diego.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	21	Agriculture	Section 1.3 Analysis Methods: Delete reference to the LESA Model, as this Model is not applicable, to this analysis.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	22	Agriculture	All Figures must be labeled and included in the next submittal. Figure 3 (Project Design) is missing from the Report. Include in next submittal. Explain why not included, as the EIR includes such a Figure.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	23	Agriculture	Section 1.3 Analysis Methods: Cite the County's Guidelines for review of Cumulative Impacts (p.7). Although, staff has substantive comments regarding this Section, the analysis is now within the Report. See comments later in this checklist for the comments relating to the Cumulative analysis.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	24	Agriculture	Figures 5 and 9 include a legends which are missing categories of FMMP Farmland, such as Farmland of Local Importance and includes a classification that is not part of FMMP categories (e.g., "Farmland").		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	25	Agriculture	Table 1 Soils: Describe by map and locational data, where the portion of the unavailable acreage for farming is located, throughout the project site. Figure 8 does not provide the detail needed, for instance, of the unavailable lands. What is the reason they are unavailable - Slopes, biological lands, etc.? This should be clarified on the map, using descriptors that show the reason, or thematic forms that identify the specific reason for the unavailability of the soils. Report shows the required Figure. However, only comment, as found in the textual changes in the digital copy of the Report, is to amend the northeast section of Figure 8 to show that the Fallbrook sandy loam, eroded (5-9% slopes) is not contiguous. This is because an unpaved, graded roadway exists today, at this location.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	26	Agriculture	Table 1 should follow the format found in the County's Guidelines and it should identify the percentage of the soil acreages that are counted toward adequate farmland. There should be a column indicating if the soil is Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance, with a one or zero (if soil is not one of those soils). The Table should include the Soil Quality Matrix Score.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	27	Agriculture	A school site is proposed within the project, as well as senior housing. Pursuant to Section 1.4.3 of the County's Report Format and Content Guidelines, the Report must analyze and describe fully all agricultural operations within one mile of the Specific Plan. Section 1.4.3 of those Guidelines provides the specific analysis requirements. This was done in the Report. Staff has substantive comments relating to that Section, found below.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	28	Agriculture	Section 1.4.4 of the Report must identify the purpose of the A70 Zoning Designation.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	29	Agriculture	As stated above, all analysis in Section 2 must be based on the current project description and not on the past County preliminary LARA Model findings, which were prepared for a prior and older project description. Section 2 must make clear, via description, what project description is being analyzed. Further, Section 2.2 must address the County Guidelines' Determination of Significance Thresholds and provide full analysis of all Direct Impact Thresholds.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	30	Agriculture	Section 2.1.1.1 must delineate provide a detailed analysis on where the wells are located and where the Fractured Crystalline Rock aquifer underlays the project area. One, or more, figure(s) should be used to provide these details.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	31	Agriculture	The results described in Section 2.1.1.3 will be analyzed for accuracy, upon revision of Table 1, as described above, as well as the provision of more specific detail regarding the unavailable soils, as described above.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	32	Agriculture	Section 2.3 should provide maps that delineate the land uses listed, including the drainage areas and riparian habitats. Do not refer to another technical report for reference.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	33	Agriculture	Table 5 must be completed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	34	Agriculture	The conclusion found on Page 34 of the Report regarding soils must be verified, upon receipt of a complete Report and complete soils analysis, pursuant to the County's Agricultural Guidelines.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	35	Agriculture	Sections 2.4 and 2.5 need to be completed.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	36	Agriculture	<p>Section 3 Off-Site Agricultural Resources: It is expected that this project will present significant Indirect Impacts to off-site agricultural operations. The Report must address and analyze the indirect impacts caused by the proposed school and senior housing, to off-site agricultural operations. The presence of these sensitive land uses adjacent to existing and operating farmland creates conflicts with regard to noise, odors and pesticide use and threatens the continued viability of those existing agricultural uses. Mitigation should include on-site buffers (agricultural or landscaped), adjacent to those existing agricultural operations, in order to protect these operations. Other mitigation methods may be required, depending on this future analysis. Much of this information could have been provided in this Report, now and should have been. The analysis now in the Report identifies only two areas of the project site, where indirect impacts may occur. Staff finds that in most of the adjacent areas there are indirect impacts, which require additional on-site buffers and further analysis. The textual changes and comments to the Word Document of the Report identify where more analysis is needed. The number of mitigation measures should be increased with substantive measures. Further, the mitigation measure proposed by the applicant is not completely acceptable, due to proposing off-site buffers, as well as the distance of the width being only 50 feet, as opposed to proposing those buffers as on-site. These measures need to be discussed with staff, for further revision, prior to the next submittal. As a note, it is also unclear why there is a need for a mediator, between the HOA and the adjoining farms, if there are only two areas of possible impacts. This mediator allows the reader to infer a potential for further impacts along the project's boundaries.</p>		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	37	Agriculture	The indirect impact analysis is incomplete and needs to be finalized. A There is no fuller discussion of the overall impact of the project on the surrounding agricultural operations is needed. The Report needs further information and added mitigation measures, as discussed in the preceding comment.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	38	Agriculture	The Report provides no analysis of cumulative impacts and this needs to be further revisioned <u>are needed</u> , for the next submittal. It is difficult to arrive at the conclusion that Cumulative Impacts are not significant, without a full discussion of indirect impacts and further mitigation measures. The indirect impacts are significant and mitigation measures that are realistic must be proposed to mitigate. Otherwise, those impacts are not mitigatable and there is a Cumulative Impact.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	39	Agriculture	The Report must analyze the following potential indirect impacts: Conflicts with agriculture and urban/suburban development - Pesticide use and conflicts between development and existing farm operations use of pesticides. Issues to be analyzed include buffers, property owner notification of the use of pesticides, aerial applications of pesticides, use of pesticides adjacent to sensitive land uses (parks, schools, senior housing, waterways, etc.), weekend applications and pet exposure. Although discussed, further information is needed, as provided within the Word Document of the Report.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	40	Agriculture	The Report must analyze the following potential indirect impacts: Conflicts with agriculture and urban/suburban development - Invasive Pests - Increased population bringing domesticated pets to the area, quarantines and movement of pathogens by the domestic pets. The analysis provided in the Report is incomplete. Much of the indirect impacts analyzed in the Report are those caused by adjacent agriculture, onto the project site and possible future site development. This and the following comments require the analysis of the project's possible impacts on the adjacent agriculture, which is not fully discussed, if at all. The applicant needs to work with the staff, prior to the next submittal.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	41	Agriculture	The Report must analyze the following potential indirect impacts: Conflicts with agriculture and urban/suburban development - Farming Practices - Farm housing adjacent to the development, agricultural work hours and effect on the development residents, noise and odors from farm operations and its effect on development residents, lights and equipment (greenhouse fans and pumps), slow-moving farm vehicles on roadways, bee activities, nuisance pests such as flies, gnats, etc., dust and smoke. Although, County law includes a right to farm act, the development's effect on farmers in a rural agricultural area must be reviewed, as well as the impacts of the farms' operations on the residents/users of this development. The analysis provided in the Report is incomplete. Much of the indirect impacts analyzed in the Report are those caused by adjacent agriculture, onto the project site and possible future site development. This and the following comments require the analysis of the project's possible impacts on the adjacent agriculture, which is not fully discussed, if at all. The applicant needs to work with the staff, prior to the next submittal.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	42	Agriculture	<p>The Report must analyze the following potential indirect impacts:</p> <p>Conflicts with agriculture and urban/suburban development -</p> <p>Effects on Farmers - Vandalism of agricultural products; equipment, fences, etc.; potential for theft of product; potential of trespassing by development residents or visitors; displacement of wild animals and existing pests (rodents, coyotes, etc.); trails (which should not be included in the project land area adjacent to existing agricultural operations); spread of plant diseases; increased complaints from residents who lack agricultural awareness; increased liability and lawsuits; increased costs (pesticide application restrictions, public nuisance mitigation measures, technology, deterrent fencing, etc.); incompatible traffic flows - increased risk of accidents; increased fire risks; reduction in production areas (buffer zone requirements); impermanence syndrome - high degree of uncertainty in continuing farming operations; reduction in important/significant prime farmland; littering; and increased pressure on water and land use resources. The analysis provided in the Report is incomplete. Much of the indirect impacts analyzed in the Report are those caused by adjacent agriculture, onto the project site and possible future site development. This and the following comments require the analysis of the project's possible impacts on the adjacent agriculture, which is not fully discussed, if at all. The applicant needs to work with the staff, prior to the next submittal.</p>		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	43	Agriculture	The Report must analyze the following potential indirect impacts: Conflicts with agriculture and urban/suburban development -right to farm notification. The analysis provided in the Report is incomplete. Much of the indirect impacts analyzed in the Report are those caused by adjacent agriculture, onto the project site and possible future site development. This and the following comments require the analysis of the project's possible impacts on the adjacent agriculture, which is not fully discussed, if at all. The applicant needs to work with the staff, prior to the next submittal. The Report does appropriately analyze the Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	44	Agriculture	The Report must analyze the following potential indirect impacts: Conflicts with agriculture and urban/suburban development - Topography changes affecting stormwater runoff. The analysis provided in the Report is incomplete. Much of the indirect impacts analyzed in the Report are those caused by adjacent agriculture, onto the project site and possible future site development. This and the following comments require the analysis of the project's possible impacts on the adjacent agriculture, which is not fully discussed, if at all. The applicant needs to work with the staff, prior to the next submittal.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	45	Agriculture	The Report must analyze the following potential indirect impacts: Conflicts with agriculture and urban/suburban development - Hazardous materials storage - fertilizers, pesticides, fuel for farm equipment. The analysis provided in the Report is incomplete. Much of the indirect impacts analyzed in the Report are those caused by adjacent agriculture, onto the project site and possible future site development. This and the following comments require the analysis of the project's possible impacts on the adjacent agriculture, which is not fully discussed, if at all. The applicant needs to work with the staff, prior to the next submittal.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	46	Agriculture	The Report should address the possibility of preserving on-site agricultural operations as open space. Management of that agricultural open space should be discussed with the Department and included in the Report. The Report is contradictory, as to whether agriculture will be preserved and how much land area will be preserved. This must be corrected in the next submittal. Staff strongly recommends that on-site ag be maintained and used as buffers adjacent to existing agricultural lands.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
4	1	Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment	Based on the potential impacts the project may have on air quality, an air quality analysis is required. The air quality analysis must be completed using the County's Air Quality Analysis Format Guidelines which can be found on the World Wide Web at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/Resource/docs/3-pdf/AQ-Report-Format.pdf .		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	1	Air Quality	The Study states that the project would be developed in five phases which implies that certain phases would be operational while others are being constructed. There is no analysis in the Study of the emissions occurring due to overlapping construction and operational activities. Please update the Study with this analysis for all phases.	The Air Quality has been revised to address staff's comments and has been accepted.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	2	Air Quality	Section 1.2.2.1(b) - The DEIR states that grading for the project would be balanced with an estimated 4.0 million cy of balanced cut and fill (each), without the need for export or import of soil. The Study states that total earthmoving of 51,250 tons would be involved. Please indicate the density factor used for the cubic yards to ton conversion. The tonnage of soil in this section seems understated when compared to the 4 million cubic yards of cut and fill figure reported in the EIR. Please explain why such a large discrepancy exists between the two values. Since fugitive dust emissions are based on the values reported in the Study, these emissions estimates are understated as well. Please revise the emissions to be consistent with the grading quantities from the EIR. Additionally, grading quantities by phase need to be reported in this section.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	3	Air Quality	Please include the signature of the County-approved consultant on the cover page in the final version of the Study.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	4	Air Quality	Executive Summary - Please include all project design features/mitigation measures in this section, consistent with the <i>Report Format and Content Requirements for Air Quality</i> .		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	5	Air Quality	Section 1.2.2 - Please include the total acreage of the project site in this section.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	6	Air Quality	Section 1.2.2.1(a) - Please indicate when additional details on blasting operations will be available. If such information is available for the next iteration, associated emissions need be quantified and reported in the Study.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	7	Air Quality	Section 1.0 - Please include a map showing project phases and a description of planned development for each phase in this section.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	8	Air Quality	Section 2.1 - Please include a description of site topography and existing and surrounding land uses in this section, consistent with the <i>Report Format and Content Requirements for Air Quality</i> .		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	9	Air Quality	Section 2.3.3 - Please include a brief discussion of the current SIP and its approval status.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	10	Air Quality	Section 2.3 - Please include a discussion of SDAPCD rules and regulations applicable to the project.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	11	Air Quality	Section 2.4 - The section mentions multiple monitoring stations that report monitoring data. The data is reported in Tables 3 and 4; however, Table 3 does not specify the station for each pollutant data set reported. Please include this information in the table. Additionally, the difference between Tables 3 and 4 is not apparent upon review. Please clarify why the two tables are necessary and how they differ from each other.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	12	Air Quality	Section 2.4.1 - Please define first occurrence of TCM.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	13	Air Quality	Section 2.4.2 - The section states that localized concentrations of CO have the potential to occur at intersections with stagnation points such as those that occur on highways. Please edit this statement to reference on/off-ramps or interchanges when referencing intersections in relation to highways.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	14	Air Quality	Section 3.2 - The first paragraph in the section states that the basis for determination of significance for Guidelines 1 through 4 is the County's Guidelines for Determination of Significance. Please explain why criterion 5 is omitted from this discussion.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	15	Air Quality	Section 3.3 - Please include a statement in this section citing the County's <i>Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality</i> and their allowable use of the SDAPCD AQIA as CEQA significance thresholds.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	16	Air Quality	Section 3.4 - Please include a discussion of the County's Zoning Ordinance and relevant sections pertinent to odors (e.g., Section 6318).		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	17	Air Quality	Section 3.4 - The section states that unreasonable odors discernible at the property line will be considered a significant impact. Please explain why onsite receptors are not considered under this impact.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	18	Air Quality	Section 3.5.1 - Pursuant to Comment #2, please disclose the grading amounts in cubic yards for each project phase and the entire project and provide emissions analysis for quantities consistent with the DEIR.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	19	Air Quality	Section 3.5.1 - The section states that the majority of construction equipment utilized for the project would consist of Tier III equipment and may be replaced with Tier IV equipment in the later stages of the project. This provision needs to be identified as a project design feature/mitigation measure in order to be tracked and enforced.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	20	Air Quality	Section 3.5.1 - The section provides anticipated blasting quantities during construction. Please identify the type and amount of explosives anticipated to be used. Additionally, the GHG Study states that off-site construction emissions were estimated using the Road Construction Emissions model. Is this true of the AQ analysis as well? Please state this in the section and include the input and output from the model in the Appendix.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	21	Air Quality	Section 3.5.2 - Please disclose trip generation rates that were used to estimate operational emissions. Additionally, CalEEMod was run utilizing the "urban" setting for the project. This implies that the trip lengths used would be representative of more urban developments typical to the cities in San Diego county. The project's location cannot be reasonably defined as urban given its location and surrounding uses. Please explain why the urban setting was considered appropriate for this analysis. Staff recommends that the "rural" setting be used to provide an accurate estimate of trip lengths.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	22	Air Quality	Section 3.5.2 - Please identify the location of the closest sensitive receptor to the project site, both directionally and in terms of distance.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	23	Air Quality	Section 4.1.3 - Please include a mitigation measure stating that revised housing forecasts as a result of the project will be provided to SANDAG to ensure that the next revisions to the RAQS and SIP accurately reflect anticipated growth.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	24	Air Quality	Section 4.2.1.2 - Please see previous comment regarding inclusion of the Tier III and IV certified equipment as a PDF.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	25	Air Quality	Section 4.2.1.2 - Please describe how the 10,000 cubic yards of soil movement figure was derived. Does this represent the daily soil movement? Is this anticipated to be uniform across phases? Since grading quantities differ by phase, daily grading intensities would be expected to vary. Please provide substantiation to support this assumption. Additionally, see comment #2 regarding grading quantities.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	26	Air Quality	Section 4.2.1.2 - The section states that exhaust emissions calculated by CalEEMod were reduced by 33%. If this is due to the updates in load factors from ARB, the reduction should be directly applied to the equipment load factors contained in CalEEMod.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	27	Air Quality	Table 8 - It is not apparent from this table whether emissions from blasting were quantified and included here. More documentation needs to be provided regarding the assumptions used to arrive at the quantification, if any. If emissions were not quantified, they should be included in the next iteration based on AP-42 emission factors for various blasting agents, or other published sources along with supporting documentation and underlying assumptions. The analysis should include both fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from blasting agents.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	28	Air Quality	Section 4.2.1.2 - The section references a project design consideration regarding low VOC paints. This design consideration needs to be stated in Section 4.2.1.3.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	29	Air Quality	Section 4.2.1.4 - The conclusion is inconsistent with the Executive Summary that states that ROG impacts would be significant after mitigation. Please rectify the contradiction.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	30	Air Quality	Section 4.2.2.2 - Please describe the types of operational activities expected for the recycling center and how they were quantified within or outside of CalEEMod.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	31	Air Quality	Section 4.2.2.2 - Please describe the breakdown of fireplace types used in the analysis. This needs to be consistent with the assumptions in the Climate Change Analysis.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	32	Air Quality	Section 4.2.2.3 - A comparison of Tables 10 and 11 shows that mitigation measures/design features were applied to both mobile sources and area sources. The section specifies a measure for reduction in mobile source emissions; however, no measures are listed for area sources. Please explain the reason for expected reductions in area source emissions as shown in Table 11. The measures in this section should explore options of educational opportunities regarding low VOC paints and consumer products.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	33	Air Quality	Section 4.2.2.3 - Please see comment on the GHG Report regarding applicability of mobile source mitigation measures.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	34	Air Quality	Section 4.3.1.1 - Please see comment #1 regarding overlap between project construction and operations.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	35	Air Quality	Section 4.3.1.2 - The cumulative impact of project construction emissions needs to be evaluated in the context of other construction projects in the area. Additionally, the overlap between construction and operational emissions needs to be accounted for as well. No mention is made of either of these scenarios in this section. Please update.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	36	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - Construction equipment emissions in CalEEMod need to be adjusted due to revised load factors, not a calculation error. Please clarify this in the section.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	37	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - The location of the MEI should be determined based on dispersion modeling rather than assuming a location. Since cancer risk is based on annual average concentrations of DPM, it is likely that the location of the MEI could be different than the nearest sensitive receptor.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	38	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - Please provide the AERSCREEN input and output files for review. If the files are too large to attach to the document, it is acceptable to provide them electronically during the next iteration. Additionally, it is recommended that construction equipment be modeled as a series of volume sources as opposed to a discrete area source.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	39	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - The exposure frequency should be set at the number of days a resident is expected to be home. OEHHA recommends a value of 350 days per year for residential receptors. This value is recommended since cancer risk calculations are based on annual average exposure.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	40	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - Please clarify if an exposure duration of 9 years or 70 years was used in the risk estimation. Both values are referenced in the section; however, the "ED" value is set at 70 years on Page 47.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	41	Air Quality	Table 12 - Please specify the averaging time for DPM concentrations reported in this table.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	42	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - The calculations for cancer risk presented in this section are not clear. Multiplication of the DPM concentration by the cancer potency factor does not yield the risk value. DPM dose needs to be estimated and multiplied by the CPF. County staff do not get the same results based on the parameters presented in this section. Please show the detailed calculation in this section or in the Appendix for clarity. Additionally, Table 12 states that the maximum concentration occurs at 460 meters while the narrative below the table states a distance of 567 meters. Please correct the distance value.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	43	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - Please include the estimate of acute hazard index related to DPM emissions.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	44	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - Please provide more information on sources that influenced the crystalline silica monitoring study conducted by SCAQMD. To provide a valid comparison with the project, operational parameters such as intensity of mining need to be disclosed to determine if the project's grading intensity would be comparable.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	45	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.2 - The section references "SRA 2009" in the crystalline silica exposure discussion. Is this document associated with a public document? The references section does not provide enough information to allow the reader to locate the referenced document. If this document was prepared in support of a CEQA document, the associated needs to be specified.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	46	Air Quality	Section 4.4.1.3 - The mitigation measure states that a non-crystalline silica blasting material shall be used if feasible. When and by whom will the feasibility of this measure be determined?		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	47	Air Quality	Section 4.4.2.4 - The discussion of OSHA Guidelines regarding silicosis should be moved to Section 4.4.1 since it pertains to construction emissions.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	48	Air Quality	Section 4.5.2 - The section includes various features that would be used to reduce odors from the wastewater treatment plant. These features, in the narrative as well as under the bullet points, need to be identified as project design features and/or mitigation measures in Section 4.5.3 so that they can be tracked and enforced. County staff encourage Report authors to look at guidance from other air districts such as SMAQMD to include more specific technology- and design-based measures for odor control for the treatment process and for biosolids. It is also recommended that data from similar facilities be provided, as available, on the typical number of odor-related complaints, given the close proximity of the facility to residential uses. Additionally, the odor impact analysis should discuss impacts from surrounding agricultural uses on future residents of the project.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	49	Air Quality	Section 5.0 - This section needs to list all project design features and mitigation measures consistent with the title.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
5	1	Application	Please update the Assessor Parcel Number (APN) list provided (Schedule "1"). Please remove APN 129-010-15-00 and 128-280-03-00 and add APN 129-011-15-00 and 128-280-42-00.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	1	Biology	Based on a review of recent aerial photos, it appears that between 2009 and 2011 clearing occurred on APNs 128-290-07, 51, 58 and 59 which is currently mapped as "disturbed". Please provide evidence that this clearing was permitted (i.e.: grading permit, clearing permit, etc.). If this clearing was not done legally, the areas should be mapped as the habitats that existed prior to the clearing and appropriate mitigation must be provided.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	2	Biology	Throughout the Biological Resources Report, it is indicated that habitat based mitigation requirements will be fulfilled by the conservation of habitat designated as draft PAMA by the draft North County MSCP. The next iteration of the report must detail the location of this proposed offsite mitigation including details of the habitat types and acreages present on the proposed site. In addition, the applicant must provide a conceptual Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the offsite mitigation site. This conceptual RMP must comply with the guidance provided in Attachment E of the Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	3	Biology	Staff has reviewed the Biological Resources Report for Lilac Hills Ranch prepared by Gerry Scheid, RECON Environmental and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions as detailed in the following comments.	Informational	6/14/12	N/A
6	4	Biology	Since the proposed project will impact coastal sage scrub habitat, staff must evaluate the project for conformance with the County Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance and write Findings required under Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act. The County has scheduled your project to be discussed with the wildlife regulatory agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game) at 10:00am at the June 21, 2012 batching meeting. You may have up to two representatives at the meeting and one of the attendees should be the biological consultant for the project. Additional comments may result from this meeting.	A copy of the meeting minutes from the June 21, 2012 batching meeting was provided to the applicant.	6/14/12	12/7/12
6	5	Biology	Cover Page: Please include the date on the report. <u>Please also revise the cover to include 3810-12-001 (SP) rather than 38-12-001 and 3600-12-003 (REZ) rather than 360-12-003.</u>		6/14/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	6	Biology	Cover Page: The cover page must include the phrase "prepared for the County of San Diego".		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	7	Biology	Cover Page: Please remove the phrase "Lilac Hills Ranch Escondido, CA 92026" above the project applicant information.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	8	Biology	The report should include a Glossary of Acronyms as well as a Project Summary between the Table of Contents and Section 1.0 as detailed in the Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	9	Biology	Section 1.1: The reference to the MSCP and BMO should be removed from this section as the project is not in an approved MSCP area.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	10	Biology	Section 2.1: Delete the reference to the project site being within the Escondido Zip Code (92026) and simply refer to the community plan areas which the project occurs in (Valley Center and Bonsall).		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	11	Biology	Figure 1: Please delete the duplicated page including Figure 1.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	12	Biology	Figure 2: The report contains two copies of Figure 2, one showing the correct project configuration and one showing the incorrect project configuration. Please remove the incorrect figure. Offsite impact areas which are part of the overall project should also be included in the figure.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	13	Biology	Section 1.2: The last paragraph in this section should also include that an Open Space Vacation is proposed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	14	Biology	Figure 3: All offsite impact areas should also be included in this figure.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	15	Biology	Section 1.3.2: It is unclear whether the survey area included offsite impact areas. Please clarify whether areas to be impacted offsite were surveyed. If not, those areas should be surveyed and the results incorporated throughout the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	16	Biology	Section 1.3.2: This section of the report indicates that focused rare plant surveys were conducted in late spring and early summer, 2011 and therefore some species which bloom in the early spring may not have been identified. Please indicate whether spring rare plant surveys were conducted during early spring, 2012. If not, spring rare plant surveys should be conducted in early spring, 2013.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	17	Biology	Sections 1.3.3.1, 1.3.3.2, 1.3.3.3, 1.3.3.4, 1.3.3.5, 1.3.3.7, 1.3.3.8: The survey areas for these site assessments did not cover the entire project area as detailed in the maps in Attachments 1 through 6. The additional area now included as part of the proposed project should be analyzed for the potential for suitable habitat for these species. Attachments 1 through 6 should be updated to include the entire project site.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	18	Biology	Section 1.4: This section indicates that the project site contains two small areas of dedicated open space. It appears that these two areas are proposed to be vacated (VAC12-001) in accordance with Board Policy I-103. The report must include a discussion detailing how each finding in accordance with Board Policy I-103 can be made.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	19	Biology	Figure 6: It is difficult to discern between the different habitat types (especially those in green shades). Please revise figure 6 to include different colors, rather than different shades of green.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	20	Biology	Section 1.4.2: Each of the subsections in section 1.4.2 include a statement regarding the tiering of the habitat types if the NCMSCP were to be approved. Tier levels have not been adopted at this time and therefore, all references to tiers should be removed from the report. Instead, the report may include the required mitigation ratios required by the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	21	Biology	Section 1.4.2.1: This section indicated that the coastal sage scrub habitat onsite is considered an RPO sensitive habitat. The definition of sensitive habitat lands under the RPO is "land which supports unique vegetation communities, or the habitats of rare or endangered species or sub-species of animals or plants as defined by Section 15380 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 Cal. Admin. Code Section 15000 et seq.), including the area which is necessary to support a viable population of any of the above species in perpetuity, or which is critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem or which serves as a functioning wildlife corridor". County staff tends to disagree with the classification of the onsite coastal sage scrub as RPO sensitive habitat lands due to the fact that it does not support rare or endangered species. Please remove this reference from the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	22	Biology	Section 1.4.2.10: This section indicates that there is a pond onsite which qualifies as an RPO wetland. It is unclear on figure 9a where this pond occurs but in accordance with the RPO, this pond as well as an appropriate buffer of not less than 50-feet must be conserved in biological open space. Please ensure that this pond as well as an appropriate buffer is included in open space and is detailed on figure 9a.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	23	Biology	Section 1.4.6.1: In the paragraph discussing the white-tailed kite, please include that this species is a Group 1 species on the County of San Diego list.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	24	Biology	Section 1.5.3: The paragraph regarding the County of San Diego General Plan should be updated based on the current general plan. This portion of the general plan is called "Chapter 5 Conservation and Open Space Element".		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	25	Biology	Section 2.2: As detailed in comment 1, impacts to RPO wetlands and wetland buffers must be avoided. If wetland crossing are unavoidable, findings must be made to support impacts to RPO wetlands. Section 2.2 should contain a discussion regarding all required findings as detailed in Section 86.604(a)(5) of the RPO.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	26	Biology	Figure 10: It is difficult to discern between the different habitat types (especially those in green shades). Please revise figure 6 to include different colors, rather than different shades of green. It is also difficult to discern the impacted areas from the open space areas- please revise.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	27	Biology	Section 3.2: Each significance guideline (see pages 11-14 of the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources) must be listed in this section along with a detailed discussion evaluating this project's impacts in terms of each guideline.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	28	Biology	Section 3.2.5: This section discusses establishment of buffers, yet buffers should be included at this time. This section of the report should include information regarding the specific buffers required for this project. Minimum buffers must be provided in accordance with the RPO.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	29	Biology	Section 3.3: The cumulative impact analysis provided for this project is insufficient. The cumulative impact analysis must conform to the guidance provided in the Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources. A reasonable list of cumulative projects should be compiled based on past, present, and future projects that could also cumulatively contribute to the project's significant impacts. For each potential impact, a study area must be defined by considering the following factors and others, as appropriate: land use, MSCP or HCP boundaries, species ranges, habitats, site conditions, topography, natural history of the species, best available scientific literature, etc., using best professional judgment.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	30	Biology	Section 3.4.1: This section indicates that 3 Engelmann oaks will be impacted as a result of this project. Based on figure 6, it appears that the oaks may be located within the wetland and/or wetland buffer areas. Once appropriate wetland and wetland buffers have been placed into open space, please update this section to reflect whether or not these oaks will be impacted.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	31	Biology	Section 3.4.2: The discussion in this section should be expanded to detail how the proposed mitigation would mitigate impacts to all impacted species. This section should also discuss how impacts to group 1 wildlife species would be mitigated (i.e.: does the proposed mitigation site support the same species that would be impacted by this project?).		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	32	Biology	Section 4.2: Each significance guideline (see pages 15-16 of the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources) must be listed in this section along with a detailed discussion evaluating this project's impacts in terms of each guideline. Guideline C in particular should be carefully analyzed as the project includes the use of several wells within or in close proximity to the onsite wetlands.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	33	Biology	Section 4.2.2: This section only discusses the areas onsite that will be preserved within biological open space easements. As detailed in the previous comment, a detailed discussion for each significance guideline. In accordance with guideline A all onsite and offsite habitat impacts must be analyzed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	34	Biology	Section 4.2.3: As previously detailed in the major project issue regarding RPO wetland buffers, a minimum RPO wetland buffer of 50-feet is required in accordance with the RPO. Proper buffers must be included within the proposed onsite open space and this section should be updated to discuss those buffers and why the proposed widths (no less than 50-feet) are appropriate. Minimum buffers must be provided in accordance with the RPO.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	35	Biology	Section 4.3: Please see comment #34 above regarding the cumulative impact analysis for this project. This section must be updated in regards to that comment.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	36	Biology	Section 4.4: This section indicates that onsite revegetation and enhancement is proposed. While RPO impacts must be avoided, should findings be made for impacts to RPO wetland onsite, a conceptual Revegetation Plan must be provided for staff to evaluate whether the proposed revegetation and enhancement can be used toward the mitigation requirements for this project. Please provide a conceptual Revegetation Plan for staff's review and comments.	Please see comments below on the Conceptual Revegetation Plan	6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	37	Biology	Section 4.4: This section indicates that a conceptual RMP will be provided for the proposed onsite open space. Due to the size of the proposed onsite open space (over 50 acres), an RMP is required. With the next iteration submittal, the applicant shall provide a conceptual RMP for the onsite open space for staff review and comment.	Please see comments below on the Conceptual Revegetation Plan	6/14/12	12/10/12
6	38	Biology	Section 4.5: This section states that project design features would mitigate potential impacts of edge effects. This discussion should be expanded to discuss these design features in detail as they relate to this project specifically.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	39	Biology	Section 5.2: Each significance guideline (see the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources) must be listed in this section along with a detailed discussion evaluating this project's impacts in terms of each guideline.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	40	Biology	Section 5.2.3: As previously detailed in the major project issue regarding RPO wetland buffers, a minimum RPO wetland buffer of 50-feet is required in accordance with the RPO. Proper buffers must be included within the proposed onsite open space and this section should be updated to discuss those buffers and why the proposed widths (no less than 50-feet) are appropriate. Minimum buffers must be provided in accordance with the RPO.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	41	Biology	Section 5.3: Please see comment #34 above regarding the cumulative impact analysis for this project. This section must be updated in regards to that comment.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	42	Biology	Section 5.4: This section indicates that wetland mitigation ratios of up to 3:1 are required for wetland impacts. It should be clarified that the RPO requires a minimum 3:1 ratio for RPO wetland impacts (including a minimum 1:1 creation component, while restoration/enhancement of existing wetlands may be used to make up the remaining requirements).		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	43	Biology	Section 5.5: This section states that project design features would mitigate potential impacts of edge effects. This discussion should be expanded to discuss these design features in detail as they relate to this project specifically.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	44	Biology	Section 6.2: Each significance guideline (see pages 17-18 of the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources) must be listed in this section along with a detailed discussion evaluating this project's impacts in terms of each guideline. In the discussions for these guidelines, further discussion regarding wildlife movement through the onsite drainages as well as large animal movement through the project site. This section should also discuss any proposed culverts, their sizes and the ability of wildlife to move through these areas.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	45	Biology	Section 6.3: Please see comment #34 above regarding the cumulative impact analysis for this project. This section must be updated in regards to that comment.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	46	Biology	Section 6.4: This section indicates that onsite preservation will continue to provide secondary linkages to future offsite PAMAs. Based on the current open space design, there are several breaks in the proposed open space (road crossings) and several narrow areas that do not contain appropriate wetland buffers. With the current open space design, it does not appear that the onsite drainages would continue to retain their current wildlife movement patterns. After reconfiguration of the proposed open space in accordance with the comments regarding RPO wetlands and wetland buffers, it should be re-evaluated whether the onsite open space will allow for continued wildlife movement. This section should also discuss proposed open space fencing and signage and how it's implementation would reduce impacts to wetlands/wetland buffers. Section 6.5 of the report should provide a conclusion whether wildlife movement would be impacted by the proposed project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	47	Biology	Section 7.2: Each significance guideline (see pages 18-19 of the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Biological Resources) must be listed in this section along with a detailed discussion evaluating this project's impacts in terms of each guideline.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	48	Biology	Section 7.2.1: The references to the "proposed North County MSCP" and "proposed PAMA" should be changed to "draft NCMSCP" and "draft PAMA".		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	49	Biology	Section 7.2.1: This section should provide an expanded discussion regarding how this project complies with the required Habitat Loss Permit findings (i.e.: CSS impacts, minimization of impacts, habitat value, etc.).		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	50	Biology	Section 7.2.2: This section indicates that the proposed project would impact RPO sensitive habitat lands. As detailed in comment #26, staff disagrees that the onsite CSS habitat qualifies as sensitive habitat lands in accordance with the RPO. Please revise this section accordingly. This section must also address how impacts to RPO wetlands have been avoided or minimized.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	51	Biology	Section 7.2.4: The heading of this section should clarify that the NCMSCP is draft.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	52	Biology	Section 7.2.7: The discussion regarding bald and golden eagles should be expanded to include information on the closest eagle nest as well as the site's suitability and likelihood to be use for eagle foraging.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	53	Biology	Section 7.3: Please see comment #34 above regarding the cumulative impact analysis for this project. This section must be updated in regards to that comment.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	54	Biology	Section 8.0: This section should include a mitigation table as detailed in the Report Format and Content Requirements for Biological Resources. The table should include all proposed mitigation measures including but not limited to: onsite preservation, offsite mitigation, open space fencing and signage, RMP, revegetation plan, breeding season avoidance, limited building zones, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	55	Biology	Table 6: The columns for "preserved onsite" and "impact neutral" should be merged as all onsite open space contains RPO wetlands and wetland buffers and therefore must be considered impact neutral		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	56	Biology	Table 6: The mitigation ratio for CSS is shown as 1:1. Mitigation ratios for MSCP are 1:1, 2:1 or 3:1 depending on the habitat value. The required mitigation ratio for CSS for this project will be discussed with the wildlife agencies at the upcoming batching meeting. Should a higher ratio be required, this table must be updated.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	57	Biology	Section 8: This section should be updated to reflect all changes resulting from previous comments. The final paragraph should detail the project design features that will be utilized to reduce edge effects.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	58	Biology	The attachments to the report should include copies of all CNDDDB forms for sensitive species observed onsite.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	59	Biology	The existing open space easements (to be vacated should be noted on the Tentative Map and preliminary grading plan and a note should be included indicating that these easement are proposed to be vacated (VAC 12-001). The revised open space easements (avoiding RPO impacts) including appropriately sized wetland buffers must also be shown on the Tentative Map and preliminary grading plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	60	Biology	The open space fencing/signage plan for the proposed biological open space easement must be clearly shown on the preliminary grading plan. Second request, please provide an open space fencing/signage plan for the proposed biological open space easement. It should address the project phasing.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	61	Biology	All changes to the document must be in strikeout/underline format.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	62	Biology	Cover Page: Please remove the words "Escondido, California" from the title of the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	63	Biology	Please provide a detailed phasing analysis within the Biological Resource Report. It should discuss in detail when the proposed Biological Open Space easements would be dedicated. The analysis should also discuss any indirect impacts resulting from the phased approach.		6/14/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	64	Biology	All trails should be shown as impacts on the biological resources map. It is unclear in the biological resources report whether all impacts resulting from the proposed trails for this project have been included in the impact and mitigation analysis for this project. Although the trails in some instances appear to follow existing disturbance, all impacts resulting from trail improvements must be analyzed in the report. In addition, it appears that once of the proposed trails crosses a wetland. Please clarify whether the trail would bridge the wetland and analyze the potential impacts from that crossing.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	65	Biology- Phasing	The report includes proposed phasing of the onsite open space easements in accordance with the proposed project phases. It is unclear from the report whether the offsite mitigation is proposed in phases as well; please clarify. In addition, staff is concerned that without easements and open space fencing and signage in place for proposed open space adjacent to any given phase that there may be the potential for inadvertent impacts to occur within those areas. For example, OS3 may be more appropriately preserved in phase 1 and OS6 may be more appropriately preserved in phase 2. Please provide details as to how the proposed phasing plan would be implemented without causing impacts to adjacent open space areas or include opens space areas adjacent to any given phase within the previous phases mitigation requirements. Additionally, on figure 15, please detail which portions of OS5 would be dedicated in phase 1 and phase 3.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	66	Biology- Phasing	It appears that a sewer line from the northern portion of the property spanning all the way to the south of the project site and offsite will be required in phase 1 of the project. It appear that the sewer line is proposed near several wetlands which are not proposed to be dedicated until later phases of the project. Please provide details as to how the proposed sewer line would be implemented without causing impacts to adjacent open space areas.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	67	Biology- Conceptual Revegetation Plan	While the majority of the information necessary at the conceptual stage of the revegetation plan has been provided, it should be noted that the formatting of the final revegetation plan must comply with the Report Format and Content Requirements for Revegetation Planning (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/docs/Revegetation_Report_Formats.pdf).		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	68	Biology- Conceptual Revegetation Plan	Section 7.0 of the conceptual revegetation plan should include more information on the suitability of the mitigation site. All of the points outlined in section 2.5.1 of the Report Format and Content Requirements for Revegetation Planning should be discussed.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	69	Biology- Conceptual Revegetation Plan	The conceptual revegetation plan seems to indicate that the revegetation may occur in phases to correspond to the project phasing. If this is the case, please provide a phasing plan for the revegetation		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	70	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Onsite)	It is unclear whether the RMP for the onsite open space areas would be implemented for the entire open space area all at once or whether it would be proposed to be phased with amendments to the RMP as additional phases come online. Please provide additional details on the implementation of the RMP for staff to evaluate.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	71	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Onsite)	Please remove the last paragraph of section 1.1 as the proposed land owner and proposed easement holder are discussed in later sections.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	72	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Onsite)	Table 1 should include a task to "maintain permanent fences" as open space fencing is proposed and should also include a task to "control public access" as trails are proposed within and adjacent to the open space.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	73	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Offsite)	Please remove the last paragraph of section 1.1 as the proposed land owner and proposed easement holder are discussed in later sections.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	74	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Offsite)	Once the offsite mitigation location is specified, table 1 should be updated to include additional site specific management measures; for example: species management, construction of permanent signs and fencing, replacement of signs and fencing, etc.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	75	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Offsite)	Section 2.0 should be revised from "property prescription" to "property description".		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	76	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Offsite)	Section 3.0 should be updated once an offsite mitigation location is identified.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	77	Biology- Conceptual RMP (Offsite)	Please remove the last bullet point from section 4.1 as it will not apply to the offsite mitigation site.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	78	Outstanding RPO Buffer Comments	The biology report indicates that 50-foot buffers will be included and no longer states that 50-foot buffers will only be provided for 92% of the wetlands. There is an area on OS-5 that does not appear to show a buffer. There is also an area on OS-6 that would be impacted and does not show a buffer. The RPO analysis (Attachment 14) indicates that this is a road crossing but there is no road located here. Please clarify and apply buffers as necessary.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	79	Outstanding Fencing and Signage Comments	The signage plan provided in the report only includes signage (not the County's typical open space signage) where trails cross into the open space or are located along the edge of the open space. As requested twice before in comment 6-60, please provide a fencing and signage plan along the boundaries of the open space that are located in close proximity to development and/or have the potential for inadvertant trespass.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	80	Outstanding Phasing Comments	<p>The revised phasing plan on page 118 of the biology report indicates that "portions" of each open space area would be dedicated with each phase. The entire open space area should be dedicated with the appropriate phase. Staff sees the following dedications fit for each phase as follows:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Phase 1: Open Space 1,2,3,4,5,6 Phase 2: Open Space 7,9 Phase 3: Open Space 8,10 Phase 4: Open Space 11,12 Phase 5: Open Space 13,14</p> <p>The report should be updated to reflect this phasing plan. If the applicant wishes to deviate from this, please contact staff to discuss. This issue was previously addressed in comments 6-63, 6-65 and 6-66.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant should proposed additional measures to ensure that the sewer line which is proposed in Phase 1 would not impact open space areas 7,8,9,10,11,12,13 or 14 (ie: temporary fencing, etc.). Currently the biology only states that the sewer line would be placed in the road alignments.</p>	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	81	Outstanding Revegetation Comments	In the previous iteration of the report, it was indicated that phasing would be proposed for the revegetation as the wetland impact occurs. In this iteration, the conceptual revegetation plan indicates that "timing is not yet determined". This to be clarified. Staff recommends that all of the conceptual revegetation is implemented at once prior to any wetland impacts occurring. If the applicant does wish to pursue phasing of the wetland mitigation, we would need a phasing plan as previously requested in comment 6-69.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	1	Board Policies	The following Board of Supervisors Policies may apply to the project: I-48, I-17, I-73, I-78, I-103, I-132, I-136, I-18, J-34. Please explain how the project would comply with each of the policies.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	1	Climate Change Analysis	The proposed project exceeds the County's screening level criteria and requires the preparation of a Climate Change Analysis. The County has prepared Draft Guidelines for Determining Significance and Draft Report Format and Content Requirements for addressing climate change in CEQA documents. The County has also prepared a Draft Climate Action Plan (CAP) that includes GHG reduction measures that, if fully implemented, would achieve an emissions reduction target that is consistent with the state-mandated reduction target embodied in AB 32. A set of project-specific implementing thresholds are included in the Draft Guidelines that will be used to ensure consistency of new project's with the County's CAP and the GHG emission reduction target. Development projects that could have cumulatively considerable GHG emissions impacts would need to incorporate relevant measures from the County's CAP and use one of the implementing thresholds from the Significance Guidelines-Efficiency Threshold, Bright Line Threshold, Stationary Source Threshold, or Performance Threshold-to assess significance. Section 4.2 of the Guidelines document provides a detailed step-by-step guide to selecting the right implementing threshold (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/advance/Draft_Guidelines_for_Determining_Significance_Climate_Change.pdf).		6/14/12	12/10/12
7	2	Climate Change Analysis	Please see comments regarding the service population calculation, both for assumptions used for the proposed project and accounting for population associated with existing uses onsite. Also, see comments on project trip distances assumed.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	3	Climate Change Analysis	Executive Summary - Please list all measures from the County's Climate Action Plan that are applicable to the project in this section.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	4	Climate Change Analysis	Section 1.1.3.6 - Please change the title of this section from "Ecosystems and Habitats" to "Wildfires".	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	5	Climate Change Analysis	Section 1.2.2.3 - Please ensure that construction phasing assumptions are consistent with the AQ Study. The GHG Study states that construction for all phases except Phase III would last for 2 years while the AQ Study assumes the duration to be 1.5 years.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	6	Climate Change Analysis	Section 1.2.3.2 - Under Measure T2, please provide more detail on the bike and pedestrian network, especially connectivity on the road system external to the site including class of bike lanes.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	7	Climate Change Analysis	Section 1.2.3.2 - Please describe how the 20% reduction in baseline waste disposal will be tracked and enforced for subsequent projects.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	8	Climate Change Analysis	Section 2.1.2 - Please indicate the uses that would be removed from the project site, representing existing emissions that were used to estimate "net" emissions.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	9	Climate Change Analysis	Section 2.3.3 - The section states that existing emissions associated with 22 residences were quantified. The project description should clearly state that all existing residential uses will be removed from the site if that is the case.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	10	Climate Change Analysis	Section 3.2.3.1 - Please include a statement about the ongoing litigation regarding the LCFS.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	11	Climate Change Analysis	Section 3.3.2 - Please include the CAP compliance checklist for the project as an Appendix to the GHG Study.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	12	Climate Change Analysis	Section 3.3.3 - Please include a statement disclosing that the <i>Climate Change Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements</i> are still in draft form and have not been signed/adopted by the County yet.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	13	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.1 - CalEEMod output sheets in the AQ Study provide emissions data on a daily basis while annual emissions need to be reported for the GHG Study. Please provide the backup sheets for the annual calculations.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	14	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.1.1 - Please see comment on AQ Study regarding the 33% reduction in exhaust emissions.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	15	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.2, Table 7 - Population and employment numbers in this table seem overstated. For example, for a 200-bed assisted living facility, the table reports population/employment at 594. This would mean that in addition to 200 occupants (1 per bed), there would be 394 additional occupants or employees which seems to be too high for such a use. Please confirm/revise the assumptions to provide a more realistic reflection of the project uses, based on local data instead of data from SCAG. Additionally, the service population needs to account for existing uses onsite that would be removed. Existing population needs to be subtracted from projected population/employment, similar to the calculation for net emissions.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	16	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.2.1 - Please see comment on AQ Study regarding the use of the "urban" parameter in CalEEMod.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	17	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.2.1 - The Study needs to justify why the walkability design of the project would lead to meaningful reductions in VMT. The measure is typically analyzed in the context of improvements within the project, within the project and offsite, and in a rural setting. Please specify which assumption was used to estimate reductions for the project.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	18	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.2.2 - It is not clear why the 10% reduction was applied to non Title 24 electricity rates for the assisted living facility to reflect energy efficient appliances. Why wasn't the appliance mitigation option in CalEEMod used?	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.2.4 - Please include the type of wastewater treatment process that was used in the CalEEMod to estimate GHG emissions. Would the wastewater treatment facility only service the project? How were wastewater process emissions estimated? More detail needs to be provided since treatment processes, especially anaerobic ones, tend to represent a large source of GHG emissions. The assumptions should be disclosed in this section.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	20	Climate Change Analysis	Section 5.2.5 - Please explain what operation of the onsite recycling and green waste collection facility entails.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	21	Climate Change Analysis	Section 6.0 - The service population figure needs to be reduced by the existing population associated with existing uses to be removed. This will likely increase the GHG/SP for the project over the significance threshold.	The report has been revised to address staff's comments.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
8	1	Conceptual Evacuation Plan	The Conceptual Evacuation Plan should be revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.	The report has been revised to address the comments.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
9	1	Cultural Resources	Please note that the project may impact significant sites based on project design, and significance testing.	Resolved.	6/14/12	12/10/12
9	2	Cultural Resources	Please include an analysis of off-site impacts associated with roadway widening and construction.	Resolved.	6/14/12	12/10/12
9	3	Cultural Resources	Staff has reviewed the cultural resources report titled, "Cultural Resources Inventory and Assessment: Lilac Hills Ranch, Escondido, San Diego County, California", dated April 2012, prepared by Mary Robbins-Wade and Andrew Giletti with Affinis. The report provides the results of a cultural resource survey to determine the presence of cultural resources. A test program will be conducted to determine the significance of 6 site(s) located within the project area: CA-SDI-18,362, 18,363, 18,364, 18,365 & 20,436. The report requires revisions as detailed in the following comments:	Resolved.	6/14/12 12/10/12	2/20/13
9	4	Cultural Resources	Site CA-SDI-18,362 includes a rock room and bedrock milling features, measures 80m x 30m. CA-SDI-18,363 is a possible rock shelter or oven feature; CA-SDI-18,364 is a lithic scatter measuring ~70m x 60m; CA-SDI-18,365 consists of several milling slicks on a single boulder; measures ~3.5m x 5.5m; CA-SDI-20,436 is a single milling slick on a large granitic outcrop with an associated lithic scatter measuring ~50m x 20m. Testing will further define these sites.	Resolved.	6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9	5	Cultural Resources	The archaeological consultant has conducted a Sacred Lands Check with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). NAHC responded February 4, 2011 with a list of tribes in the vicinity of the project. In addition, letters to the tribes listed were sent March 29, 2012. Staff will communicate with any Native American individual or organization that may possess knowledge about Sacred Sites or be affected by your project. Staff will keep you informed as to future communications with local tribes. In addition, because the project includes a Specific Plan, County Staff will be contacting tribes for formal consultation. (Refer to item 5 directly below)	The project will be conditioned accordingly. This is ongoing.	6/14/2012 12/10/12 2/20/13	N/A
9	6	Cultural Resources	Sacred Sites Regulation: Effective March 1, 2005, the Sacred Sites Bill (Section 65352.3 of the Government Code, Senate Bill SB-18, 2004) was passed into law. The intent of this law is to allow California Native American Tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early planning stage for the purpose of protecting, or mitigating impacts to, cultural places. The law requires that local governments contact tribes and give them an opportunity to consult and comment on projects that are located within their historic areas. County staff will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) during project scoping for a listing of local Native American individuals or organizations that may be affected by your project. Staff will communicate with any individual or organization identified by the NAHC. Staff will keep you informed as to future communications with local tribes.	Initial SB-18 consultation was held with Pechanga, Saboba, Pala, Rincon and San Luis Rey Tribes. Copies of the draft cultural reports and project plans were sent to these tribes. Consultation will be on going throughout the project. This is ongoing.	6/14/12 12/10/12 2/20/13	N/A
9	7	Cultural Resources	Please provide all changes in strikeout-underline format and submit electronically as a Microsoft Word document.	This condition will be signed off when you resubmit the report with accepting the strikeout/underline revisions completed by staff.	6/14/12 12/10/12 2/20/13	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9	8	Cultural Resources	All existing and proposed, if any, cultural open space easements must be clearly shown on the plans/map and on the preliminary grading plan. Label the easements as 'Sensitive Environmental Resources'.	Resolved.	6/14/12	12/10/12
9	9	Cultural Resources	The open space fencing/signage plan if proposed for cultural open space easement must be clearly shown on the preliminary grading plan and on the Open Space Map.	Resolved.	6/14/12	12/10/12
9	10	Cultural Resources	Staff has reviewed the revised cultural resources report titled, "Cultural Resources Inventory and Assessment: Lilac Hills Ranch, Escondido, San Diego County, California", dated August 2012, prepared by Mary robbins-Wade and Andrew Giletti with Affinis . The report provides the results of a cultural resource survey to determine the presence of cultural resources. A test program was conducted to determine the significance of 6 site(s) located within the project area: CA-SDI-18,362, 18,363,18,364, 18,365 & 20,436. The report requires revisions as detailed in the following comments:	Informational		N/A
9	11	Cultural Resources	Comments/editorial changes made to the word document.	Informational		N/A
9	12	Cultural Resources	Signatures are required on the cover page for the next submission.	Resolved.	12/10/12	2/20/13
9	13	Cultural Resources	The PDF version of the Cultural Report is missing pages 48 through 52. The pages are included in the word document. For the next submission, be sure the PDF version is complete.	Resolved.	12/10/12	2/20/13
9	14	Cultural Resources	Section 4.2.3 (pg. 75) Native American Participation: Add comments to the effect that: letters to the County were received requesting SB-18 consultation from Pechanga, Rincon and San Luis Rey tribes (in addition to Pala and Soboba). The County conducted initial SB-18 consultation with all of these tribes between August and October. Consultation will be on-going throughout the review and evaluation of the project application. Consultation letters will be added to the Confidential Appendix D.	Resolved.	12/10/12	2/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9	15	Cultural Resources	Site CA-SDI-20-436: This site is almost entirely within a proposed park area which would result in direct impacts.. Because the site is CEQA significant, the preferred mitigation is avoidance. The alternative is for a data recovery program, which would be conducted prior to any grading. County staff recommends the more cost-effective mitigation of putting the site in an open space easement (the proposed OS-5 could be expanded to include this site). Refer to Section 6, Management Considerations.	Resolved.	12/10/12	2/20/13
9	16	Cultural Resources	Site CA-SDI-436: Data Recovery Plan: If this site is not going to be preserved in an open space easement, a Data Recovery Plan shall be developed and added to the Appendices.	Resolved.	12/10/12	2/20/13
9	17	Cultural Resources	Off-Site Improvements Appendix A: This report will be updated as location of off-site improvements are established. Be aware that the two sites identified within the current improvement area (CA-ASDI-5067 and 5072) are RPO significant; the off site improvement design should take this into consideration.	Resolved.	12/10/12	2/20/13
10	1	Emergency Response Plans and Risk Management Plans	Based on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District, the project will be required to provide evidence that the Risk Management Plan/Emergency Response Plans for Valley Center have been revised to include the proposed wastewater treatment plant.	The project will be conditioned accordingly.	6/14/12	12/10/12
11	1	Fire Protection Plan	The Deer Springs Fire Protection District has not accepted the Fire Protection Plan. Please see the attached comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District. <u>Please revise the Fire Protection Plan to address the comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The Fire Protection Plan has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	2	Fire Protection Plan	The project exceeds the 5 minute maximum fire travel time; therefore it does not comply with the County General Plan. Following consultation with CAL FIRE, Miller Forest Fire Station, at 9127 West Lilac Road is not considered a year-around structural fire station. The submitted road plan is incomplete, but the Fire Protection Plan states that Deer Springs Station 1 has an 8 minute travel time to the midpoint of the project. Please see Major Project Issue 5 for additional information.	The FPP has been revised to address the travel time issue.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	3	Fire Protection Plan	There appear to be pockets, peninsulas or islands of flammable vegetation within the project. These islands should be evaluated in the FPP. Staff recommends that the Conceptual Resource Management include methods of addressing the fire district's concerns regarding the on-going management of flammable vegetation within the Biological Open Space easements.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
11	4	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection plan does not address fire and emergency medical concerns for multi-story buildings. The plan should evaluate whether the fire district can provide fire and medical services to multi-story buildings and evaluate existing equipment and identify if any additional equipment is needed. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	5	Fire Protection Plan	The project proposes an age restricted senior citizen (care facility) community; however, the Fire Protection Plan does not address the impacts of this proposed use on the emergency medical delivery system. The Fire Protection Plan should evaluate the ability of the local medical delivery system to service the proposed project, including all uses proposed within the Specific Plan. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	6	Fire Protection Plan	There was no discussion regarding timing of installation or phasing. The FPP should include a breakdown of the phasing for the project. The Fire Protection Plan needs to include an analysis of each phase that demonstrates conformance with the fire code requirements, including dead-end road length, etc. Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
11	7	Fire Protection Plan	The project exceeds the maximum allowable dead-end road length of 800 feet required by the County Fire Code. Please see Major Project Issue #5 for additional information. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal. Please provide an exhibit that shows the length of all proposed roadways. The exhibit should also include length measurements to all proposed gates. The exhibit should also indicate how traffic would flow during an emergency. For example, would all gates open and allow traffic to flow in any direction? Please explain if certain residents only have emergency access to particular roadways. Staff has concerns over the ability of the project to use certain roadways for secondary access.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	8	Fire Protection Plan	Based on a review of the proposed roadways, including cross-sections provided, the Proposed roadways do not comply with fire code or County road standards. Sec. 503.2.1 (a) of the Fire Code states "Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed improved width of not less than 24-feet. The plans indicate number of roadway segments that are less than the 24-foot standard. Please revise the plans to indicate all fire apparatus access roads to be a minimum unobstructed improved width of 24-feet. Please see comments from the Department of Public Works regarding road sections for additional requirements. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	9	Fire Protection Plan	Fire apparatus access should be provided to all open space areas identified within the project. Please revise the project to include fire apparatus access to all open space areas. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	10	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan and map exhibits indicate off-site fuel modification. The Fire Code requires that all fuel modification should be maintained on-site. Furthermore, fuel modification zones are enforced through Limited Building Zone (LBZ) easements. Therefore, the proposed Fire Protection Plan and map exhibits should be revised to include a minimum of 100-feet of fuel modification on-site and adjacent to all proposed Open Space Easements. Please see Major Project Issue #13 for additional information. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	11	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan should include a full project description that indicates occupancy use, structure types, building sizes and densities. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	12	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan should include a detailed road circulation plan for all phases of the proposed development. All fire apparatus access roads are required to a minimum unobstructed improved width of 24-feet. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	13	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan should address dedicated public north/south and east/west circulation. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	14	Fire Protection Plan	The Fuel Modeling conducted should be revised to address phasing. For example, in Phase 1 and 2, the site would remain in its current state. Would this increase the flame length on-site? Please provide a detailed phasing analysis within the FPP. <u>Additional information is required based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	15	Fire Protection Plan	Please revise the Emergency Service Route exhibit to address phasing. The figure indicates that response time was calculated from the south (Mountain Ridge Road); however, there is no access from the south to Phases 1 through 6. Please address phasing in the FPP. <u>Please update the exhibit based on the previous comments.</u>	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	16	Fire Protection Plan	The FPP should evaluate all the proposed uses, including the wastewater treatment plant, school, age restricted community, and the recycling facility.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	17	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan provided on page 60 is unclear. Please provide a clear copy of the plan.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	12/10/12
11	18	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan identifies alternative measures, including off-site fire clearing easements. If off-site clearing is proposed, the easements must be provided before the project can move forward. Staff recommends that the project be redesigned to include all fuel modification (LBZ) on-site.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	19	Fire Protection Plan	Please discuss the proposed perimeter sprinkler system with the Deer Springs Fire Protection District. If this approach is accepted, the technical studies may need to evaluate potential impacts resulting from the sprinkler system.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	20	Fire Protection Plan	Please update the report to indicate the amount of grading proposed.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	21	Fire Protection Plan	Please update the report to remove the reference to a "G" Designator for the open space areas on page 9.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	22	Fire Protection Plan	Please ensure that the habitat/vegetation table matches the Biological Resource Report.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	23	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan needs to be updated to address the recommendations provided in the Deer Springs Fire Protection District Capabilities Assessment regarding new facilities.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	24	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan needs to be revised to address phasing based on the improvements installed for each particular phase. The report states that the FPP evaluated the emergency service routes for Phase 1 and 2 through a fully developed community; however, the improvements for the full community may not be completed. Please update as necessary.	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	25	Fire Protection Plan	Table 8 will need to be updated to address Phasing and the recommendations provided in the Deer Springs Fire Protection District Capabilities Assessment regarding new facilities.	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	26	Fire Protection Plan	Figure 5 needs to be updated to address Phasing and the recommendations provided in the Deer Springs Fire Protection District Capabilities Assessment regarding new facilities. Furthermore, the legend refers to midpoint of the project; however, it should be calculated to the furthest point.	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	27	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan should include a cumulative analysis. Please revise the second paragraph on page 27.	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	28	Fire Protection Plan	Please verify the estimated population numbers provided.	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	29	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan indicates that a Service Company may be required as a result of cumulative impacts. Please clarify and clearly state how the project would mitigate cumulative impacts.	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	30	Fire Protection Plan	The Fire Protection Plan should include an analysis of how the project meets the dead-end road length standards. The report should include figures with measurements and should correspond with the phasing plan.	The FPP has been revised to address the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	31	Fire Protection Plan	Please remove the discussion regarding Solar Photovoltaic Power System. The Specific Plan does not include any provisions for a solar facility.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
11	32	Fire Protection Plan	Please update the phasing exhibit to address the previous comments.	The FPP has been revised to address the the comments from the Deer Springs FPD and County Fire Authority.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
12	1	General Comment	Please clarify the acreage of the project site and the number of properties (parcels) throughout the technical studies.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	2	General Comment	Please clarify the number of parcels within the project area throughout the technical studies.		6/14/12	12/10/12
13	1	General Plan Conformance	The project remains inconsistent with the land use map and numerous General Plan and Community Plan policies. Please see the General Plan Conformance Review attached to this letter for additional information. The project also appears to be inconsistent with the Community Plan policies identified below. Please review the policies and indicate to staff how you would propose to revise these policies or if you disagree with staff's analysis. Some of the policies identified below may not be an issue based on a review of the technical documents requested. <u>The analysis of the projects consistency with these policies will be updated upon acceptance of the technical studies.</u>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	2	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal LU-1.1 A unique balance of Bonsall's rural agriculture, estate lots, ridgelines, equestrian uses, and open space land uses within the community, including open space and low density buffers that separate the community from adjacent cities and unincorporated community and new development that conserves natural resources and topography.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	3	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-1.1.1 Require development in the community to preserve the rural qualities of the area, minimize traffic congestion, and to not adversely affect the natural environment.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	4	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy P LU-1.1.2 Maintain the existing rural lifestyle by continuing the existing pattern of residential, equestrian, and agricultural uses within the Bonsall CPA.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	5	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU1.1.3 Require development to be sensitive to the topography, physical context, and community character of Bonsall.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	6	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Figure 3, Bonsall Village Boundaries.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	7	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal 1.2 Continued development that is appropriately designed to match the rural character of the Bonsall community.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	8	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy 1.2.1 Require development that is designed to be consistent with the rural character of the Bonsall community.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	9	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy 1.2.2 Encourage the application of design review to the majority of parcels in the Bonsall CPA.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	10	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal LU-2.1 Development that centers inside the core Village in Bonsall and discourages spot development outside that area.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	11	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-2.1.1 Encourage development inside the Village boundaries (see Figure 3) which are centered around the Mission Road/Olive Hill Road and State Route 76 intersections.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	12	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal LU-2.2 The San Luis Rey River Valley retains its rural character, while urbanized development remains within neighboring cities that are discouraged from annexing areas of Bonsall.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	13	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal LU-3.1 Estate lot residential development that provides adequate housing opportunities for all residents, while maintaining and enhancing the existing rural atmosphere of the community.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	14	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-3.1.2 Require subdivision design to minimize adverse impacts to community character, or to the environment, and to mitigate any impacts from other constraints on the land that could not be avoided. Require mitigation actions to remain within the CPA.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	15	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-31.3 Buffer residential areas from incompatible activities, which create heavy traffic, noise, dust, unsightly views, or from incompatibility with the surrounding environment.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	16	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-5.1.2 Require grading to be contoured to blend with natural topography, rather than consist of straight edges.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	17	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-5.1.3 Minimize grading to preserve natural landforms, major rock outcroppings and areas of existing mature trees. Integrate hillside development with existing topography and landforms.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	18	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-5.1.4 Restrict, to the maximum extent feasible, extensive grading for development projects in areas with slopes that are 20 percent or greater, in order to preserve and protect the environment, and to lessen grading and erosion.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	19	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-5.1.5 Require development on slopes to be stepped to follow and preserve topography to the maximum extent feasible.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	20	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-5.1.6 Minimize cut and fill grading for roads and access ways to the absolute minimum necessary.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	21	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal LU-5.2 The preservation of groundwater resources, community character and protection of sensitive resources in the Bonsall Community Planning Area.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	22	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	<p>Policy LU-5.2.1 Require lot sizes, except through planned development, lot area averaging or specific plan projects, to be no smaller than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 percent of the density indicated on the Land Use Map, without clustering or lot averaging, for Semi Rural 4 and higher densities, or • Four acres for Semi Rural 10 and lower densities. <p>Implementation LU-5.2.1 Zoning Ordinance</p> <p>Policy LU-5.2.2 Allow further reductions in minimum lot sizes indicated in Policy LU-5.2.1, through Planned Development, Lot Area Averaging, or Specific Plan projects only when setbacks, building scale, and design are appropriate to retain the equestrian and agricultural community character in the area.</p> <p>Example: Semi Rural 2 establishes a density of one dwelling unit per two acres. Fifty percent of that density would result in a minimum lot size of one acre.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	23	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-5.2.2 Allow further reductions in minimum lot sizes indicated in Policy LU-5.2.1, through Planned Development, Lot Area Averaging, or Specific Plan projects only when setbacks, building scale, and design are appropriate to retain the equestrian and agricultural community character in the area.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	24	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal LU-6.1 Infrastructure and public utilities that are provided concurrent to development in a manner compatible with community character while minimizing visual and environmental impacts.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	25	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy LU-6.1.2 Provide development on an orderly, phased basis so that it will not overload public facilities.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	26	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal LU-7.1 An adequate supply of water that meets current and projected needs of both residential and agricultural users in Bonsall CPA.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	27	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal CM-1.1 A circulation system which preserves the rural character of the community and provides a safe, balanced transportation system, which includes automobile, bicycle, equestrian and pedestrian users.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	28	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy CM-1.1.1 Reduce traffic volume on roads recognized as future "poor level of service" with methods such as, but not limited to, providing alternate routes and reducing density.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	29	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy CM-1.1.3 Coordinate with Caltrans to design and construct State Route 76, East Vista Way (S13), and Interstate 15 to efficiently carry traffic through the Bonsall CPA. Design and construct interior roads, such as Camino del Rey, West Lilac, Gopher Canyon, and Olive Hill to carry primarily local traffic and remain rural to the degree consistent with safety requirements.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	30	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy CM-1.1.4 Prioritize the preservation and protection of sensitive habitats, such as wetlands, over road location, relocation, or realignment. Encourage all mitigation to be on-site and site-specific. Require mitigation within the Bonsall CPA where on-site and site-specific mitigation is not appropriate, whenever feasible.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	31	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy CM-1.1.5 Minimize direct access points onto Mobility Element roads to produce unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas. Require new Commercial development to provide, where possible, indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop, or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	32	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy CM-1.1.6 Minimize the use of cul-de-sacs in the Bonsall CPA and require new subdivisions to provide local connectivity by providing linkages for long-term circulation improvement.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	33	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal CM-4.1 A circulation system which preserves the rural character of the community and provides a safe, balanced transportation system, which includes automobile, bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrian users.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	34	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy CM-4.1.2 Prohibit the use of all on street parking on Mobility Element Roads outside the Village Boundaries and require development to provide adequate onsite parking.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	35	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal CM-5.1 Scenic routes where community character and natural resources are preserved by minimizing the impacts of public or private development along roadways in Bonsall.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	36	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy CM-5.1.1 Design, maintain and/or improve scenic areas, road alignments, and realignments to minimize the alteration of the natural landform by following the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	37	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal COS-1.1 The preservation of the unique natural and cultural resources of Bonsall and the San Luis Rey River and associated watershed, with continued support for its traditional rural and agricultural life-style.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	38	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.1.4 Require development to be compatible with adjacent natural preserves, sensitive habitat areas, agricultural lands, and recreation areas, or provide transition or buffer areas.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	39	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal COS-1.2 The continuation of agriculture as a prominent use throughout the Bonsall community.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	40	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.2.1 Encourage the protection of areas designated for agricultural activities from scattered and incompatible urban intrusions, along with the provision of greenbelt/buffers between agricultural zoning and urban zoning.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	41	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.2.2 Encourage the use of agriculture easements in the CPA, especially as part of the Conservation Subdivision Program, while maintaining community character with rural and semi-rural homes.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	42	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.2.3 Require development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations, through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture and support local and state right-to-farm regulations.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	43	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.3.3 Preserve and encourage wildlife corridors including buffer areas, which are essential to the long-term viability of wildlife populations, through open space easements, public acquisition, or other appropriate means. The width of the easement will depend on the type of wildlife using the corridor and the natural topography, plus an appropriate buffer (as determined by a certified wildlife biologist) on either side of the corridor, where feasible.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	44	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal COS-1.4 An "astronomical dark sky" that retains the rural setting and facilitates the astronomical research in San Diego County and the continued operation of the Mt. Palomar observatory.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	45	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.4.1 Discourage street lighting, unless necessary for safety. Require street lighting to meet basic safety standards and the County Light Pollution Code, Ordinance #7155.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	46	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.5.1 – Require adequate setbacks from all watercourses and drainages to protect property, improve water quality, provide buffer for riparian habitat and wildlife, and enhance aesthetic quality of the riparian environment.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	47	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal COS-1.6 Important historic and prehistoric archaeological resources are identified and preserved through adequate protection for new sites, as they are discovered.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	48	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-1.6.1 Prevent development, trenching, grading, clearing and grubbing and other related activities that can be damaging to significant prehistoric or historic sites.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	49	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Goal COS-2.1 A balanced system of local parks, open space, riding and hiking trails, with outdoor recreation facilities and services, which incorporate the outstanding natural features of the CPA and meet the needs of the residents of the Bonsall community.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	50	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-2.1.1 Encourage the acquisition and development of parklands that will protect outstanding, scenic, and riparian areas, and cultural, historical, and biological resources.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	51	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-2.1.4 Require appropriate wetland preservation buffers in recreational facilities located adjacent to wetlands to use parkland to provide a transition to the wetland buffer area and buffers for additional passive recreational uses, as permitted.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	52	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-2.1.5 Coordinate with the Bonsall Community Sponsor Group on the future siting, naming, and planning of community parks in Bonsall.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	53	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy COS-3.1.1 Encourage agricultural and equestrian open spaces and only encourage linking of open space if it is biological and supports a wildlife corridor system.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	54	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	GOAL S-1 Adequate law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency services that contribute to a safe living and working environment for the residents of Bonsall.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	55	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy S-1.1 Support the provision of adequate law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency services for the residents of Bonsall.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	56	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	GOAL N-1 Protect and enhance Bonsall's acoustical environment by supporting the control of noise at its source, along its transmission path and at the site of sensitive receivers. Maintain an environment free of excessive noise by providing control of noise at its source.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	57	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy N-1.1 Require site design and building design controls to minimize noise emissions from noise sources.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	58	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy N-1.2 Encourage land use and circulation patterns, which will minimize noise in residential neighborhoods and sensitive wildlife habitat.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	59	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Policy N-1.3 Support limiting truck traffic to designated routes to reduce noise in residential areas.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	60	General Plan Conformance - Bonsall Community Plan	Section 6. Specific Plans and Special Study Areas.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	61	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	The Background section of the Valley Center Community Plan indicates that the "2010 SANDAG estimates for population and housing in the Valley Center CPA identify a population of 17,582 with a total of 6,573 housing units." The project would further increase the population and total number of housing units within the community.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	62	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>Community Character Goal Preserve and enhance the rural character of Valley Center by maintaining a pattern of land use consistent with the following regional categories.</p> <p>a. Village Enhance the rural village character of valley center's north and south villages defined by the current nodes of industrial, commercial and higher density village residential land use designations.</p> <p>b. Semi-rural lands preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the semi-rural areas.</p> <p>c. Rural lands preserve and maintain the overall rural and agricultural character of the rural lands area outside the semi-rural area.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	63	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Figure 2, Valley Center Context Map.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	64	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>Community Character</p> <p>Policy 1: Require that future projects are consistent with the goals, policies, and recommendations contained in the Valley Center Community Plan.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	65	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>Community Character</p> <p>Policy 2: Maintain the existing rural character of Valley Center in future developments by prohibiting monotonous tract developments. Require site design that is consistent with the rural community character.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	66	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>Land Use</p> <p>General Goals</p> <p>Two economically viable and socially vibrant villages where dense residential uses, as well as commercial and industrial uses, are contained.</p> <p>A pattern of development that conserves valley center's natural beauty and resources, and retains valley center's rural character.</p> <p>A pattern of development that accommodates people of diverse ages, lifestyles, occupations, and interests with opportunities for village, semi-rural and rural living.</p> <p>Development that maintains valley center's rural character through appropriate location and suitable site design.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	67	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Figure 3, Valley Center Village Boundaries	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	68	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>A. Environmental Concerns and Issues:</p> <p>1. Require that discretionary permits preserve environmentally significant and/or sensitive resources such as undisturbed steep slopes, canyons, floodplains, ridge tops and unique scenic views in order to reinforce the rural character of the area through sensitive site design and, where appropriate, with open space easements.</p> <p>2. Require preservation of unique features such as oak woodlands, riparian habitats, steep slopes, archaeological sites, and ecologically sensitive areas.</p> <p>3. Prohibit ridgeline residential development unless it can be shown through a viewshed analysis that there would be only minimal impact to adjacent properties.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	69	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>B. Rural Compatibility Issues:</p> <p>4. Require new residential development to adhere to site design standards which are consistent with the character and scale of a rural community. The following elements are particularly important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads that follow topography and minimize grading; • Built environment that is integrated into the natural setting and topography; • Grading that follows natural contours and does not disturb the natural terrain; • Structure design and siting that allows preservation of the site's natural assets; • Retention of natural vegetation, agricultural groves, rock outcroppings, riparian habitats and drainage areas. <p>5. Require new residential development to construct roads that blend into the natural terrain and avoid "urbanizing" improvements such as widening, straightening, flattening and the installation of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Follow Valley Center's Community Right of Way Development Standards.</p> <p>6. Buffer residential areas from incompatible activities which create heavy traffic, noise, odors, dust, and unsightly views through the use of landscaping and preservation of open space.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	70	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>Clustering</p> <p>7. Clustering, planned development, lot area averaging, and Specific Plan projects which utilize the clustering technique shall in no instance within the Valley Center CPA be used to create a greater number of lots than the property would have been entitled to without the use of the above mentioned techniques. Yield calculations shall be subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance.</p> <p>8. Once the appropriate number of lots has been established, the developer may elect to "cluster" or "lot area average" to lots of a minimum 0.5 acre in size in a Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, no minimum lot size in the Village Area and a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre in size in SR-1, 1 acre in SR-2, 2 acres in SR-4, and 2.5 acres in SR-10 provided the project is sewered, and providing that:</p> <p>a. The property contains significant environmental resources (such as important, rare, or endangered biological and/or animal habitat, floodplains, drainages, rock outcroppings, or archaeological and cultural resources) which would best be protected and preserved through the irrevocable dedication of these areas as Open Space easements to the County or another approved conservation agency.</p> <p>AND:</p> <p>b. Forty (40) percent of the gross acreage of the property is placed into permanent open space. Whenever possible, a link should be provided between all open space uses within the property.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	71	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	<p>Commercial Goals</p> <p>1. Prohibit strip commercial development by containing commercial uses in the Cole Grade Road and Valley Center Road area and the Mirar de Valle Road and Valley Center Road area.</p>	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	72	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	2. Require new commercial development to comply with the Design Guidelines for Valley Center including, but not limited to, the retention of significant natural features characteristic of the community's landscape. Existing topography, land forms, drainage courses, rock outcroppings, vegetation and viewshed shall be incorporated in the design of the future development of commercial land via the "B" Community Design Area.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	73	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	3. Ensure that all commercial areas are served by Mobility Element roads or local roads which meet the standards of the County of San Diego. Whenever possible, require new commercial development to provide secondary road access as opposed to access from major through roads.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	74	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	4. Commercial and civic uses shall be located in areas which have adequate roads for circulation and provide easy and safe multi-purpose pathways and trails.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	75	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	5. Future commercial development shall be planned so that strip commercial development will be avoided.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	76	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	6. Commercial/civic uses shall not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses or the rural atmosphere of the community.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	77	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	7. Commercial/civic uses shall be periodically reviewed to ensure that the standards for noise, light, traffic, odors and all other conditions of approval are continuing to be met.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	78	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	8. Discourage commercial and civic uses outside of the Villages and limit all such uses to those that are clearly demonstrated as needed and which are compatible with the rural lifestyle of the Valley Center Community Plan.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	79	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	9. The application of Land Use Designation Semi-Rural 2and Regional Category of Semi-Rural Lands are proposed for those properties that are currently zoned commercial and are located outside of the Villages.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	80	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Agricultural Goals 1. Support agricultural uses and activities throughout the CPA, by providing appropriately zoned areas in order to ensure the continuation of an important rural lifestyle in Valley Center.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	81	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	3. Prohibit residential development which would have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	82	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Specific Plan Areas (SPA) section.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	83	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Figure 4: Valley Center Generalized Specific Plans.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	84	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Mobility Goals 1. Where appropriate, minimize private driveway and private road access on to Mobility Element roads.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	85	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	2. Road design shall reflect the rural character and needs unique to the Planning Area. For example, turn radii shall be such that agricultural vehicles and equestrian rigs can be safely accommodated.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	86	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	3. Conflicting traffic movements such as uncontrolled access and uncontrolled intersections shall be minimized.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	87	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	4. Road alignment shall minimize the necessity of altering the landscape by following, as much as possible, the contours of the existing, natural topography without sacrificing safety or sight distance criteria.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	88	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	5. Required roadside and median landscaping shall reflect standards as outlined in the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	89	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	6. Existing trees and vegetation located within the "Right-of-Way" of all public roads, and determined to be of significant visual benefit shall be transplanted or replaced consistent with the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	90	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	7. To promote unimpeded traffic flow in commercial areas, minimize direct access points on to Mobility Element roads by recommending new commercial development to provide indirect access through the use of existing road access points, loop or frontage roads, common driveways or similar means.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	91	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	8. Woods Valley Road from Valley Center Road, east to Paradise Mountain Road and, Lilac Road from Old Castle Road to Highway 76 are significant aesthetic resources. Future improvements should maintain as much of their original character as possible without compromising safety.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	92	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	9. Require that the road system function at a service level no worse than "C" at peak hours as development occurs.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	93	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	10. Right-of-way development standards for private roads shall be compatible with the standards as outlined in Policy 6 of this section.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	94	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	11. Implement community right-of-way development standards for the Valley Center Planning Area to achieve a rural character and alternative features within the shoulder portion of dedicated right-of-way. Such improvements will identify the community's desire to modify County development standards permitted by Board of Supervisors Policy J-36. These standards shall include: a. Provide decomposed granite walking/jogging paths in lieu of sidewalks; b. Where edge of pavement barrier is necessary, use mountable asphalt dike (smike dike); and c. Provide a bike lane within the "travel way".	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	95	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	12. Access to new subdivisions shall be carefully examined. Where a clear circulation need which benefits the overall community can be demonstrated, public roads consistent with Department of Public works policy shall be dedicated and constructed. Where appropriate, future subdivisions shall be required to access public roads via at least two separate access points.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	96	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	13. Safely separate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic when these modes share rights-of-way.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	97	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Fire Protection Goals 1. All new development utilizing imported water shall provide infrastructure for fire suppression (such as pipes and hydrants) in accordance with the prevailing standards.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	98	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	3. New site locations for fire stations within the plan area should be centrally and strategically located.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	99	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	School Facilities 1. Coordinate school facility planning with residential development to ensure that school facilities will be available to accommodate the increase in enrollment without overcrowding.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	100	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	2. Develop schools in conjunction with neighborhood and community recreation facilities.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	101	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Water Service Goal 2. The delivery of imported water service to the CPA shall be coordinated and the infrastructure adequately sized so that service can be provided to all land within the Valley Center Municipal Water District Territory in a cost effective manner.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	102	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Open Space Goals 3. Incorporate publicly and semi-publicly owned land into a functional recreation/open space system wherever feasible.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	103	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	5. Design new residential development in a way that preserves an atmosphere of openness and access to surrounding open space.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	104	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Parks and Recreation Goals 3. Development of local and neighborhood park and recreation facilities will be coordinated with local school facilities whenever possible by establishing Joint Powers Agreements to promote joint development, operation and maintenance.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	105	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	7. All park lands dedicated in conjunction with the development of a Specific Plan Area (SPA) land use designation will consist of a reasonable amount of flat land suitable for play fields and other similar local park activities.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	106	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	8. Development of park facilities shall comply with the County's Ordinance No. 7155 relating to the regulation of Light Pollution.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	107	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	9. Provide riding and hiking trails, staging areas and other facilities within existing or proposed parks when appropriate to complement the Valley Center Trails System.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	108	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	Noise Goals 1. Develop and implement land use plans and circulation patterns that will minimize noise in residential neighborhoods.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	109	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	2. Permit residential development in areas with projected exterior Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNELs) exceeding 60 decibels near main roads only when traffic noise impacts can be mitigated.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	110	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	3. Design subdivisions to retain natural and landscaped sound barriers in preference to earth berms or walls, where they are needed.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	111	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	4. Encourage the use of buffering devices on off-road vehicles and provide strict enforcement of noise regulations for off-road vehicles.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	112	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	5. Minimize traffic noise impacts by means of roadway alignment and design and the management of traffic flows.	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
13	113	General Plan Conformance - Valley Center Community Plan	6. Encourage activities to increase public awareness of and enrollment in the Department of Agriculture program pursuant to the Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance. (This Ordinance was designed to protect established farm operations from being declared a nuisance when following accepted agricultural practices.)	The projects conformance with the General Plan is addressed in the Specific Plan and Land Use section of the EIR.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
13	1	Geologic Hazards	The Geotechnical Report provided is accepted; however, a supplemental report or additional attachment is required to evaluate any off-site improvements. These off-site improvement areas have not been identified and will need to be evaluated for any potential geologic hazards. The additional supplemental report or attachment shall be provided once the off-site improvements have been identified.		6/14/12	12/10/12
13	1	Groundwater Resources	A Groundwater Investigation is required; however, it should not be prepared until (1) after the Revised Preliminary Hydrogeologic Assessment has been reviewed and approved, (2) a meeting with the applicant's hydrogeologist and County Groundwater Geologist has been completed in which the well testing is fully scoped, and (3) a Well Test Plan has been provided and approved by the County staff for all aquifer testing to be conducted. A scope of work for the Groundwater Investigation is provided in Attachment G.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	1	Hazards	General comment for all sites: if stained or suspicious soil is encountered during future grading operations, the material should be evaluated and if deemed necessary, characterized for proper disposal per all applicable laws.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	2	Hazards	General comment for all sites: any buried trash/debris or other waste encountered during site preparations should be evaluated by an experienced environmental consultant prior to removal. Any hazardous materials should be removed and disposed properly per all applicable laws.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	3	Hazards	Please include an analysis of off-site impacts associated with roadway widening and construction.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	4	Hazards	General comment for all sites: septic systems and water wells that are no longer needed shall be properly abandoned under permit by DEH prior to site development. This includes, but not limited to the following properties: septic on Sun Flower Farms, Davitt, Bialkowski, Shirey Falls LP, Gopher Canyon LP, wells on Shirey Falls LP, Gopher Canyon LP, potential septic and/or wells on Bialkowski, Nelson, and Lilac Creek Estates LP.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	5	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Shirey Road property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions and the project will be conditioned as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	6	Hazards	Section 3.5.5 on page 10 refers to Mr. Manners instead of Mr. Behneman. Please double-check this section.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	7	Hazards	The resume provided in Appendix A is for Timothy Lester, but the cover page says the report was prepared by Polly Ivers and reviewed by Bernard Sentianin. Please provide resumes and Environmental Professional certification for the staff who actually prepared the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	8	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-290-74 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	9	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey and the Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment dated March 26, 2012 for the Sun Flower Farms Investors property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. This property will require additional action and conditions described in the following comments.	Requires special conditioning or proposal from applicant	6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	10	Hazards	Concentrations of lead in two sample locations on APNs 129-300-09 and 129-011-15 were above CHHSLs. This property shall be enrolled in the DEH Voluntary Assistance Program (VAP) to provide guidance for additional testing, waste removal and disposal. A closure letter from VAP will be required prior to site development.	Requires special conditioning or proposal from applicant	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	11	Hazards	Endosulfan exceeding the screening level was detected at sample point B-P-2, at the wooden storage shed located along the southern portion of the project site. This property shall be enrolled in the VAP for guidance. Pending alternate direction from VAP, the soil beneath B-P-2 shall be excavated and disposed at an offsite waste recycling facility, and confirmation samples shall be collected prior to site development. A closure letter from VAP will be required prior to site development.	Requires special conditioning or proposal from applicant	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	12	Hazards	All drums and containers of new and used motor oil, hydraulic fuel, diesel fuel, and pesticides should be properly characterized and disposed prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	13	Hazards	The structures on APN 129-300-09 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	14	Hazards	If not completed through the VAP process, the contents of all three pesticide storage sheds shall be removed and disposed in accordance with local and state regulations prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	15	Hazards	Based on direction from VAP, a soils management plan may be required prior to hearing to direct the handling of potential buried/concealed agricultural by-products, trash/debris, stained soil, or other environmental conditions not previously detected; should they be encountered during grading.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	16	Hazards	If directed by VAP, an environmental technician shall be onsite during grading to observe and document site soils for potential environmental concerns.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	17	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Akita Nursery property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required. See below for required conditions.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	18	Hazards	All hydraulic oil, motor oil, fuel containers, batteries, and pesticides should be properly disposed prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	19	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-440-01 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	20	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Zosa Ranch property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required. See below for required condition.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	21	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-440-05 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	22	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Denova property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required.	Requires special conditioning or proposal from applicant	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	23	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Tomasic property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required. See below for required condition.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	24	Hazards	The structures on APN 127-072-14/128-280-42 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	25	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Nutt property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required. See below for required condition.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	26	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-280-10 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	27	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Carlson property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	28	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Jones property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions and the project will be conditioned as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	29	Hazards	The aerial photos in appendix C are centered on the wrong property and the western edge of the subject property is cut off. Please provide the correct aerial photos.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	30	Hazards	The AST on APN 128-290-09 should be removed and disposed properly, with soil sampling for potential hydrocarbon contamination.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	31	Hazards	The 55-gallon diesel fuel drum, 55-gallon oil drum, and 25-gallon drum should be properly disposed prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	32	Hazards	All known or suspected hazardous substances stored onsite should be inventoried and properly disposed offsite prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	33	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-290-09 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	34	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Phase II Sampling dated March 26, 2012 for the Davitt property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions and the project will be conditioned as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	35	Hazards	The text mentions concrete cracking and staining in the large storage shed, but there is no photo showing it. Please provide a photo and/or additional description of why this area does not require testing, and/or test results for this area.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	36	Hazards	Please provide a figure and/or photo showing where the soil samples were taken relative to the fuel shed and UST location.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	37	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-290-69 and 128-440-14 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	38	Hazards	All storage containers, including fuel storage containers in the large shed northwest of the northeast residence, tanks and a drum near the fuel shed, and drums and a tank near the collapsed corrugated structure, should be properly disposed prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	39	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Phase II Sampling dated March 26, 2012 for the Bialkowski property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions and this property will require additional action as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	40	Hazards	In table 2, stained surfaces and ASTs/USTs should be marked as concerns.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	41	Hazards	One of the soil samples taken at the former AST location contained Diesel Range Organics at a concentration of 480 mg/kg, which exceeds the screening level of 110 mg/kg. The site shall be enrolled in the Voluntary Assistance Program to guide the further assessment, excavation and disposal of affected soil. A closure letter from VAP will be required prior to site development.	Requires special conditioning or proposal from applicant	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	42	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 23, 2012 for the Dawson property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. This appears to be a preliminary version of the report dated April 18, 2012 for the same property. The March 23 version is not needed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	43	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated April 18, 2012 for the Dawson property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	44	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 28, 2012 for the Nelson property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions and the project will be conditioned as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	45	Hazards	Please conduct a property owner interview/ questionnaire and include the responses in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	46	Hazards	In the Executive Summary, please delete the statements, "No other samples reported DDE..." and "No other samples reported DDT..." since no other samples were analyzed for these chemicals.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	47	Hazards	In section 5.2, please delete the statements, "No other samples analyzed detected DDE..." and "No other samples analyzed detected DDT..." since no other samples were analyzed for these chemicals.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	48	Hazards	DDE was detected in a composite sample at 320 ug/kg. Given that each composite is made up of five soil samples, this could indicate a concentration of 1,600 ug/kg in one of the five soil samples (ACR-21 through 25). The CHHSL for DDE is 1,600 ug/kg. Please individually test those five samples and submit the results.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	49	Hazards	Try to find out if any pesticide storage or mixing occurred on-site. If so, soil samples should be taken from on-site mixing and storage location(s) and tested for organochlorine pesticides.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	50	Hazards	The three 55-gallon storage tanks found on-site should be removed and properly disposed prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	51	Hazards	The structures on APN 127-272-38 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	52	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 27, 2012 for the Shirey Falls, LP property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions and this property will require additional action and conditions described in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	53	Hazards	Please conduct a property owner interview/ questionnaire and include the responses in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	54	Hazards	The subject property boundary as shown on Figure 2 includes APNs 128-280-27, 128-440-02, -03, -17 through -21, part of 128-290-74, and 128-290-07. This conflicts with the APN list on the cover, which includes 128-440-07 through -21. Please revise the cover to list the correct APNs and revise Figure 2 to exclude APN 128-290-74, which is covered by the Shirey Road report. APNs 128-440-14 and -15 are covered by the Davitt report. APN 128-440-07 does not appear to be covered in any of the other reports; however, it is shown as not a part of the current application.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	55	Hazards	Provide PDFs of the previous assessments referenced in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	56	Hazards	According to section 3.7, the soil testing conducted by AEI did not include testing for arsenic and lead. Please conduct arsenic and lead testing on the parcels tested by AEI.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	57	Hazards	Please revise section 5.0 to refer to APNs 128-440-17 through -21, instead of -19 through -21.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	58	Hazards	Toxaphene was detected at a level above the CHHSL on APN 128-440-02. This property shall be enrolled in the DEH Voluntary Assistance Program (VAP) to provide guidance for additional testing, contaminated soil removal and disposal. A closure letter from VAP will be required prior to site development.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	59	Hazards	The AST on APN 128-440-17 should be removed and disposed properly prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	60	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-440-03 and 128-280-27 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	61	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Sheffer property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report was found to be adequate and no further revisions are required. See below for required conditions.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	62	Hazards	Two 55-gallon and one 25-gallon drums shall be removed and properly disposed offsite prior to site development.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	63	Hazards	The structures on APN 128-440-11 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	64	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 26, 2012 for the Alligator Pears LP property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	65	Hazards	Provide PDFs of the previous assessments referenced in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	66	Hazards	Please conduct a property owner interview/ questionnaire and include the responses in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	67	Hazards	According to section 3.7, the soil testing conducted by AEI for APNs 128-290-54 through -61, -75, and -78 did not include testing for arsenic and lead. Please conduct arsenic and lead testing on those parcels.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	68	Hazards	In section 3.7, state how many samples tested positive for DDE and the maximum concentration detected.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	69	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Agricultural Chemical Survey dated March 27, 2012 for the Lilac Creek Estates LP property prepared by EEI and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The report requires revisions as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	70	Hazards	Please conduct a property owner interview/ questionnaire and include the responses in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	71	Hazards	Provide PDFs of the previous assessments referenced in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	72	Hazards	According to section 3.7, the soil testing conducted by AEI on parcels 128-290-51 and 129-010-62 did not include testing for arsenic and lead. Please conduct arsenic and lead testing on those parcels. Make sure sample(s) are taken by the concrete pad where a structure existed during the period of lead paint use.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	73	Hazards	Please find a way to access the southern parcels APN 129-010-73 through -76 and conduct organochlorine pesticide, arsenic and lead testing in the area of past agricultural use.	To be a condition, monitoring	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	74	Hazards	County Staff has reviewed the Environmental Transaction Screen dated October 27, 2011 for Five Parcels Near Lilac Road and Covey Lane (also known as Gopher Canyon LP) prepared by Ninyo and Moore and submitted to the County on April 30, 2012. The attached Phase I ESAs, Limited Pesticide Investigations, and Test Pit Sampling were also reviewed. The puff file was incomplete and this property will require additional action and conditions described in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	75	Hazards	Pages 33-42, 59-66, 77, 84, 85, and 97 of the puff file are blank. Please provide a complete hard copy and puff including the missing pages.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	76	Hazards	The level of toxaphene detected in one soil sample taken at 9603 Covey Lane was 610 ug/kg, which exceeds the residential PRG of 440 ug/kg and CHHSL of 460 ug/kg for toxaphene. Please enroll this property in the VAP for guidance on further assessment and removal/ remediation of contaminated soil. A closure letter from VAP will be required prior to site development.	Requires special conditioning or proposal from applicant	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	77	Hazards	The pipe discharging sewage to the ground on APN 129-010-68 should be fixed as soon as possible to prevent further sewage contamination.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
14	78	Hazards	The residential structures and warehouse on APN 129-010-68 will require asbestos and lead testing prior to demolition.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	79	Hazards	In response to attachment P of the Major Pre Application letter and attachment E of this letter, the applicant compiled a list of hazardous materials currently stored on-site. Please ensure that all of this information is reflected in the Phase I ESAs prepared for each property.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	80	Hazards	Please re-review attachment P of the Major Pre Application Summary letter and Attachment E of this letter, and provide the requested information. The hazardous substances that would trigger a hazardous materials business plan would be those proposed for use and storage for the proposed project, not those that are on-site currently.	To be a condition	6/14/12	12/10/12
15	1	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	Please have the engineer and owner sign the plans.		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	2	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	Please add the Tentative Map number to the plans (TM 5572).		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	3	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	Please revise to address all comments on the Implementing Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	4	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The plans indicate off-site improvements. Please see Major Project Issue #3.		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	5	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The cross-sections need to be revised to meet the minimum Fire Code requirement of 24-feet improved unobstructed access. <u>The road sections will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
15	6	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The hammerhead lot layout does not meet Fire Code. Fire Code requires a cul-de-sac when serving more than 2 lots. Please revise accordingly.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
15	7	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	Please provide details on all the off-site improvements, including widening of West Lilac Road. If additional right-of-way is required, it will be the applicants responsibility to obtain the right-of-way prior to the project moving forward. <u>The plans indicate off-site improvements, it is the applicants responsibility to obtain the right-of-way prior the project moving forward.</u>	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
15	8	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The Fuel Management Zone should be revised to indicate a proposed Limited Building Zone (LBZ) easement. The LBZ is a minimum of 100-feet from the edge of the proposed biological open space easement. Grading is allowed within the LBZ; however, habitable structures are not allowed. All required fuel modification must be provided on-site as required by the Fire Code. <u>The LBZ shown on the plan include sections less than 100-feet in width, which will require approval from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal. This will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
15	9	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	A number of the lots do not appear to be buildable due to the small pad sizes and restricted lot area. Please provide an analysis of the pad area for each lot indicated on the plans. The Specific Plan should also identify how all of these types of lots would be developed, taking into account setbacks, topography, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	10	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The plans indicate "???" along the centerline of the streets. Please revise as necessary.		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	11	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	Please indicate the grade of all proposed roadways.		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	12	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	Please clarify whether the proposed parks are private or public. Please also revise to address the comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
15	13	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The Subdivision Ordinance requires that the side and rear lot lines shall be located along the top of slope rather than at the toe or at an intermediate location on the slope. It appears that a number of lots lines are located in the intermediate slope or at the base of the slope (Lots 19, 197 through 211, 240 through 246, 117 through 137, 267 through 275, 284 through 291, 323 through 325, and 328 & 329.		6/14/12	12/10/12
15	14	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The Implementing Preliminary Grading Plan indicates that Phase 1 would require 170,000 cubic yards of material. Please address this throughout the technical documents, including the DEIR.		10/26/12	3/20/13
15	15	Implementing Prelim. Grading Plan	The proposed sewer improvements need to be reviewed and approved by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.		10/26/12	3/20/13
16	1	Implementing Tentative Map	The Implementing Tentative Map indicates off-site improvements. Evidence must be provided that these improvements can be accomplished before the project can move forward.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
16	2	Implementing Tentative Map	The Tentative Map indicates numerous easements to be vacated. All easement holders must agree to vacate these easements prior to Tentative Map approval. In addition, please provide a list of all proposed street and easement vacations.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
16	3	Implementing Tentative Map	Please add the map number to the Tentative Map (TM 5572).		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	4	Implementing Tentative Map	Please remove the topography (topo lines) from the Tentative Map exhibit. It should be included on the Preliminary Grading Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	5	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate all remaining structures on the Tentative Map and indicate all setbacks to property lines and centerline of the road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	6	Implementing Tentative Map	On Sheet 2, please clarify the dimension of L4 (333.16-feet). It does not match Sheet 4, which indicates a dimension of 854.82-feet.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
16	7	Implementing Tentative Map	On Sheet 2, please clarify the dimension of L12. The Tentative Map indicates 504.43-feet, while the Assessor Map indicates 460 feet.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	8	Implementing Tentative Map	Please add the net acreage of the site to the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	9	Implementing Tentative Map	Please add that all existing utilities will be undergrounded under note #6.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	10	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate how the Implementing Tentative Map would be phased (Units).		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	11	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate where access rights would be relinquished. It should be indicated as hatched lines along the right-of-way on the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	12	Implementing Tentative Map	Please remove the Condominium Map Statement.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	13	Implementing Tentative Map	Please ensure that the Assessor Parcel Numbers listed on the map are accurate. Please see previous comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	14	Implementing Tentative Map	Please add the Fallbrook Union High School District to the map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	15	Implementing Tentative Map	Please remove the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District unless the Tentative Map is within the district boundaries.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	16	Implementing Tentative Map	Please add the Tax Rate Area to the Tentative Map exhibit. Please note that no lot can be located within two Tax Rate Areas.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	17	Implementing Tentative Map	The cross-sections need to be revised to meet the minimum Fire Code requirement of 24-feet improved unobstructed access. <u>The proposed alleys do not meet the 24-foot minimum width required by the Fire Code.</u>	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
16	18	Implementing Tentative Map	The hammerhead lot layout does not meet Fire Code. Fire Code requires a cul-de-sac when serving more than 2 lots. Please revise accordingly.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
16	19	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clearly indicate where each of the proposed Zone Boxes apply. Also, the lots appear to be 4,000 square foot minimum. If the Zoning is proposed to be 4,000 square feet, please remove the other proposed Zoning Boxes. The map indicates that the C34 zoning is proposed; however, Phase 1 only includes property subject to the RU Use Regulations. Please revise as necessary.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
16	20	Implementing Tentative Map	Please revise the Zone Boxes to indicate a "D" Designator for the single-family residential portions of the development. The "D" Designator Site Plan would ensure that any future development is consistent with the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	21	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the purpose of the HOA Lots (AA through II).		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	22	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate Lot 27 on sheet 2.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	23	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate Lot 139 on sheet 2.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	24	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate Lot 149 on sheet 2.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	25	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate HOA Lot DD on sheet 2.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	26	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate whether the acreage of each lot is gross or net on page 2.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	27	Implementing Tentative Map	Sheet 2 indicates two lots (HH and KK) that are less than the 4,000 square foot minimum. These lots are required to be a minimum of 4,000 square feet. Please revise as necessary. <u>Sheet 2 indicates a number of lots below the minimum lot size. Please revise the lots to conform to the minimum lot size required by the proposed zone (3,200 square feet).</u>	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
16	28	Implementing Tentative Map	On sheet 3, please use the same double circle notation on the map that is indicated in the notes.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	29	Implementing Tentative Map	On sheet 3, please add easement notes for numbers 22, 44, 89, 96, and 117.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
16	30	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate easements 79, 80, 91 and 124 on sheet 3.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
16	31	Implementing Tentative Map	On sheets 4, 5 and 6 indicate a 100-foot minimum Limited Building Zone (LBZ) from the proposed biological open space. A larger LBZ may be required based on the Fire Protection Plan, but the minimum is 100-feet per Fire Code.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
16	32	Implementing Tentative Map	Please remove all references to off-site fire clearing.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
16	33	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate roadway access to Lots 1 through 4, including the right-of-way etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	34	Implementing Tentative Map	The minimum lot sizes indicated on the Implementing Tentative Map are smaller than 6,000 square feet, which is the minimum allowed under the Subdivision Ordinance. Therefore, the Specific Plan will need to indicate the project standards that are contrary to the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Furthermore, the Specific Plan should indicate how to determine the setbacks based on the lot size or lot dimensions.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	35	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clearly indicate the proposed dedications along Lots 42 through 60 and 130 through 178. The Tentative Map exhibit is unclear and it is difficult to determine what portion of the lot is not under a right-of-way or fuel modification dedication.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	36	Implementing Tentative Map	Sheet 4, please add the width of Lot 20 along the right-of-way.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	37	Implementing Tentative Map	Sheet 4, please clarify the rear lot dimension of Lot 29.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	38	Implementing Tentative Map	Sheet 4, please clarify what the box is that is listed as 114-feet long adjacent to the proposed Alley from West Lilac Road.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
16	39	Implementing Tentative Map	The Subdivision Ordinance requires that lot lines are radial from the edge of the right-of-way. Please revise the Tentative Map to ensure that all lot lines are radial to the roadway on which they front. It appears that the following may exceed the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance: Lots 197, 224, and 325.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	40	Implementing Tentative Map	The Subdivision Ordinance requires that lots do not exceed a width to depth ratio of 3:1. Please revise the Tentative Map to ensure that all lot lines conform to the 3:1 ratio. It appears that the following may exceed the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance: 19, 20, 21, 54, 269, 270, 271, 272, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, and 291.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	41	Implementing Tentative Map	The Tentative Map indicates a number of narrow lots (39-feet wide) and shallow lots (less than 90 feet in depth). Please indicate in the Specific Plan how these lots would be developed (setbacks) and if they would be consistent with other lots in the surrounding area.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	42	Implementing Tentative Map	Lots 336 through 350 appear to be unbuildable due to the constraints from the Limited Building Zone (LBZ) easement. Please clarify how these lots would be developed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	43	Implementing Tentative Map	Please indicate where access rights would be relinquished, specifically for lots that front on Old West Lilac and the new private roads. It should be indicated as hatched lines along the right-of-way on the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	44	Implementing Tentative Map	The Subdivision Ordinance requires that no residential lots shall be designed so that they front on a Mobility Element road. Please ensure that no lots front on a Mobility Element road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	45	Implementing Tentative Map	Sheet 5, please clarify the purpose of the area to the southeast of Lots 178 and 179.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	46	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the location of HOA Lot HH on Sheet 5.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
16	47	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the front lot line dimension for Lot 62.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	48	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the rear lot line dimensions for Lots 136 through 133.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	49	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the access to the lots along Old West Lilac Road. Based on the maps it appears that the hammerheads are lots. Please note that the hammerheads need to be cul-de-sacs are required by the Fire Code. The cul-de-sacs should tie into the proposed private road (Street "O").		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
16	50	Implementing Tentative Map	Sheet 5 indicates numerous improvements and dedications outside the boundaries of the project along Lots 65, 137, 138 and 139. Please see Major Project Issue #7 for additional information.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	51	Implementing Tentative Map	Please remove the proposed utility and access easement and any other references to the wastewater treatment plant from Sheet 6.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	52	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the front lot line dimension for Lot 259.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	53	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the front lot line dimension for Lot 322.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	54	Implementing Tentative Map	The minimum frontage for a cul-de-sac lot is 33-feet. Please revise HOA Lot KK as necessary. The side lot lines also need to be radial to the right-of-way.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	55	Implementing Tentative Map	Based upon the Phasing Plan, the biological open space easement associated with Lot E of the Master Tentative Map should be part of the Implementing Tentative Map along with the adjoining Limited Building Zone Easement.	Please see the biology comments regarding phasing.	12/10/12	3/20/13
16	56	Implementing Tentative Map	Please clarify the acreage of the site. The Specific Plan indicates that the site is 119 acres.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
16	57	Implementing Tentative Map	The TM indicates existing right-of-way to be vacated off-site along West Lilac Road; however, staff was unable to identify any existing right-of-way. Please remove the statement from the plans if there is no existing right-of-way. Additional revisions may be needed pending approval of the Traffic Study.		12/10/12	3/20/13
16	58	Implementing Tentative Map	The TM indicates that the minimum lot size under General Note 4 is 4,000 square feet, but the zone box provided indicates 3,200 square feet. Please clarify the proposed minimum lot size.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
16	59	Implementing Tentative Map	The Specific Plan identifies access via Shirey Road; however, the Implementing Tentative Map does not include any access roads to Shirey Road. Please revise the Implementing Tentative Map/Specific Plan as needed. Additional information may be required if the project includes access via Shirey Road.		12/10/12	3/20/13
16	60	Implementing Tentative Map	Please redesign Lot "HH", which does not meet the minimum lot size.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
16	61	Implementing Tentative Map	The Implementing Tentative Map indicates off-site fire clearing. An easement will need to be obtained from the property owner prior to the project moving forward. Also, the off-site fire clearing on the project site that is located outside of the Implementing Tentative Map area will need to be dedicated on-site prior to the recordation of the Final Map.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
16	62	Implementing Tentative Map	The Implementing Tentative Map indicates private road access to Street "U". The Traffic Study should include this roadway in the analysis. Sight distance certification is also required for this intersection.	The Implementing Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
17	1	Land Use/Community Character Analysis	The Land Use/Community Character Analysis needs to be rewritten. It does not include any analysis of the project's conformance with the surrounding area. For example, the report should include a lot analysis of the surrounding area to determine if the proposed lot sizes are consistent. In addition, the analysis should also include a set of draft Major Use Permit findings for the Major Use Permit proposed for the wastewater treatment facility.	Analysis included in Draft EIR. Please see comments under EIR.	6/14/12	12/10/12
17	2	Land Use/Community Character Analysis	Please indicate who prepared the Land Use Analysis.	Analysis included in Draft EIR. Please see comments under EIR.	6/14/12	12/10/12
17	3	Land Use/Community Character Analysis	Please submit a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	1	Landscape General	Note - Requirements for landscaping are based on the County of San Diego's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, the Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual, the County of San Diego Off-Street Parking Design Manual, the County's Grading Ordinance, and the Valley Center Design Guidelines.	Informational	6/14/12	N/A
18	2	Landscape General	Coordinate and verify all plant palettes within the proposed Specific Plan are consistent with Appendix A and B of the Fire Protection Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	3	Landscape General Plan Amendment	Coordinate all information within Chapter VII with the Specific Plan, including the planting schemes for entry monumentation, and fencing materials and lighting concepts (see page III-26 of Specific Plan). Consider adding a section to discuss private roads within this chapter to match the Specific Plan. Under Maintenance and Financing, the paragraph does not match the heading of Public Pathway Landscaping, but instead matches the Assessment Districts discussion on page IV-9 of the Specific Plan. Please revise. Coordinate maintenance information with pages III-47 and IV-5 of the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	4	Landscape General Plan Amendment	Chapter VII - add a section that discusses water conservation measures proposed within the Specific Plan as it relates to landscape irrigation and to be consistent with Project Compliance information provided in Attachment A of the General Plan. Specifically, Chapter 2, Guiding Principles 2, 8, 9, Policy LU-1.2, LU-12.2, LU-13.1, COS 4.1 and 4.2, COS 4.5, COS 19.2, and Policy 3 under Education Goal with the Valley Center Subregional Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	5	Landscape Irrigation	Coordinate all areas of the Specific Plan that discuss the use of potable water, recycled water, groundwater, and grey water systems for landscape irrigation and make sure all information is consistent. Page I-2 discusses the use of groundwater as a secondary source for irrigating orchards and common areas during drier and hotter weather. Page II-7 indicates that recycled water distribution pipelines will be installed within Community roadways. Page II-11 proposes the use of reclaimed water for agricultural lands. Page II-12 states that a dual irrigation distribution system will be utilized. Page II-20 indicates that a grey water system may be used for single family residential landscapes. Page II-21 states that groundwater will be used to supplement the recycled water supply for irrigation and page IV-7 says that a recycled booster pump 'could' deliver to the irrigation system or to the Valley Center Municipal Water District service area. See Project Compliance response within Attachment A under LU-8.3 of the General Plan Amendment dated March 30, 2012. Please review these sections and verify that the intent of the Specific Plan is to use potable water till the temporary/permanent wastewater treatment facility is up and running and how the transition from potable to recycled will be carried out. Discuss piping and how groundwater will be used as a backup to both sources of irrigation water. Clarify if groundwater and recycled water will be mixed at some point. Please also see the Groundwater Investigation requested in attachment G for additional information.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	6	Landscape Irrigation	Verify that all planting palettes proposed, including the introduction of new fruit trees into the parkway theme, will be able to survive and thrive the high salt content of tertiary treated wastewater and the potential use of groundwater, known to have high TDS (Total Dissolved Solids), as a back-up source of irrigation from installation, through establishment, and on-going during the life of the permit. Coordinate with COS 19.2 of Attachment A within the General Plan Amendment text, dated March 30, 2012. Anticipate these sources of water when addressing irrigation components to be used, including piping, valves, flow sensors, drip irrigation, and sprinkler heads. Not Resolved. No information provided relating to General Plan Amendment Report. 3rd Request. No indication from 2/13/13 submittal that this comment has been addressed. The applicant did not provide a response to comments to clarify if this has been resolved or not.	Resolved	6/14/2012 10/8/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
18	7	Landscape Sewer Treatment Facility Plan	Sht. 3, Temporary Facility - provide additional vegetation along the western edge of the facility to better screen the driveway, pavement/parking area, and buildings from residential view.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
18	8	Landscape Sewer Treatment Facility Plan	Sht. 3, Temporary Facility - coordinate Landscape Concept Note no. 2 with Tentative Map. Tentative Map does not contain any information to conform to at this point. Coordinate all information on both sets of plans with the Specific Plan text. Irrigation Concept Note no. 2, clarify that spray heads will be rotator or rotor type to be more efficient and meet the requirements of the Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	9	Landscape Sewer Treatment Facility Plan	Sht. 4, Permanent Facility - more information will be needed to illustrate how the detention basin interacts with the proposed park to the east and any potential future solar farm adjacent to this area as depicted on Figures 26 and 27 of the Specific Plan. Same comments about spray system and coordination with Tentative Map as with Temporary Facility. Still not resolved - no conceptual landscape plans provided with MUP12-005. 3rd Request. Sheet 2 of 2 submitted on 2/13/13 as part of the MUP does not provide any information about the interaction between the detention basin and the park to the east of the site as previously requested. No response to comments were provided by the applicant to address this comment either.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	10	Landscape Specific Plan	Page II-1, A.2, last sentence - in order for the Specific Plan to be more specific than the County's landscape requirements in areas of discrepancies and conflicts, much more information and clarity shall be required of the Plan. Design guidelines within this Plan shall establish irrigation standards, vegetated LID techniques, parkway planting, transitional zones based on vegetation communities and habitat types, compatible plant palettes with architectural themes, defining how Objective 3 (e) on page II-3 will be obtained, screening of recycling areas, sustainable landscape principles to ensure less energy and water are consumed within the Community, defining 'best management practices for water conservation as approved by the Valley Center Municipal Water District' (6.a, page II-4), clarification of how green waste/mulch will be available to common area and residential landscapes throughout the Community (6.b, page II-4), use of solar powered irrigation controllers/valves, Green Building standards for landscaping, revegetation and restoration plans for mitigation of disturbed areas (4 (d), page II-10), conformance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines, Bonsall Design Guidelines, and the I-15 Corridor Design Review Guidelines, the Scenic Corridors section within the Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan, informally planted private parkway and residential street trees, and design standards for the Senior Citizen Village.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	11	Landscape Specific Plan	Page II-7, 6.b - clarify with the Department of Environmental Health that wastewater can be used in front yard and rear yard residential landscapes. Make necessary revisions as needed. Coordinate with the fourth paragraph under 3.d on page II-20 about use of grey water systems for irrigating single family dwellings, multi-family dwellings, the senior community, parks, trail landscaping, fire buffers, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	12	Landscape Specific Plan	Page II-11, Landscape Concept Plan - provide location within the Specific Plan of the Conceptual Landscape Master Plan referenced in this section.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	13	Landscape Specific Plan	Page II-12, Water Conservation - first sentence, revise conformance to be with the County's 'Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance and Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual'. 2nd paragraph, Section 6712 (d) of the Zoning Ordinance has been eliminated with the County's updated Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, adopted on February 12, 2010. Please review this ordinance and make necessary revisions to this section. A Water Management Plan is no longer applicable and has been replaced with a Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet. 3rd paragraph, clarify who will be responsible for regular inspections and water audits. 5th sentence in third paragraph, change 'should' to 'shall'. Fourth paragraph, revise 'Water Management Plan' to 'Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet'. Partially resolved. Page II-27 still refers to deleted Section 6712 (d) in Zoning Ordinance and Page II-28 does not clarify who will be responsible for water audits and regular inspections.		6/14/12 12/10/12	2/25/13
18	14	Landscape Specific Plan	Page II-18, F.3.a - clarify if the 648,030 gallons per day figure includes irrigating the projects common and private landscapes. Coordinate information with the fifth paragraph under F.3.d on pages II-20/21.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	15	Landscape Specific Plan	Show the location, dimensions, and label all of the landscape easements mentioned on pages III-3 and 4 under Public-Private Road System within Figure's 17-20, 23, and 32-36.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	16	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-5, B.4, third paragraph - include that all parking lots shall include interior tree planting for screening and heat relief per the requirements of the County's Off Street Parking Design Manual.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	17	Landscape Specific Plan	Pages III-17/18, E.1 - verify that landscaping within portions of the project site inside the Community of Bonsall will need to be compliant with the Bonsall Design Guidelines. Also include the need for landscaping to be compliant with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance and the Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual. Explain how consistency will be achieved with these regulations and provide design criteria or refer to other sections within the Specific Plan text as appropriate. Explain how fruit trees will be maintained along parkways and how fruit drop and leaf litter will be addressed as it relates to storm water management practices. Consider the need for additional irrigation and fertilization to produce fruit and the eventual size of avocados and the grove management practice of leaving leaf litter under their canopies to retain soil moisture. Include mention of required Encroachment Permits to be issued through the Department of Public Works for all planting and irrigation within the public street rights-of-ways. Please also identify who will maintain the landscaping throughout the community.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	18	Landscape Specific Plan	Pages III-17/18, E.1 - Figure 38 is missing from the Specific Plan. Provide explanation of Special Conditions 1 and 2 on the Fire Protection Plan, Figure 57. Provide additional clarification of how landscaping within the Specific Plan will be compliant with Valley Center Design Guidelines, specifically pages 23 (Road Design Edge), pages 38-41 (Planting Design), pages 45-46 (Site Lighting), pages 47-49 and 54-55 (Commercial Development) pages 58-65 (Residential), and page 71 (Hillside Development).		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	19	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-19, E.2.a (i) - clarify how typically high water fruit trees may be included in drought tolerant, native slope plantings. Under Brush Management Zones, explain the use of 3 zones when the Fire Protection Plan calls out for 2 zones, A & B. Coordinate with Sections 4.4 and 4.5 of the Fire Protection Plan. Fruit drop from Olive trees are known to stain hardscape surfaces, how will this be addressed if proposed adjacent to roads. Consider clarifying locations of various plant palettes within Figures 17-20, 23, and 32-36.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	20	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-20, E.2.a (ii) - the Valley Center Design Guidelines talk about informal grouping of trees along roadways, and the Specific Plan talks about formal rows of grove trees, clarify intent. Provide discussion about how mixing fruit trees with native vegetation will be achieved considering the significant difference in watering, fertilizing, and maintenance requirements. Provide discussion about the use and locations of invasive plant species (typical to all proposed Zones), such as the olives, gazania, lantana, and vinca species.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	21	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-21/22 - provide discussion of the use and location of the proposed hydroseed mixes, A & B. Artemisia, Eriogonum, and Salvia melifera are all considered fire prone vegetation and identified on the County's Undesirable List within the Fire, Defensible Space and You brochure. Coordinate with the project's Fire Protection Plan (see Section 4.5.2.6). Please also see the comments under Fire Protection Plan under #11 in this checklist and comments from the San Diego County Fire Authority and Deer Springs Fire Protection District.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	22	Landscape Specific Plan	Coordinate Landscape Zones, street trees, parkway plantings, and fruit trees identified in section E.2 (a) and (b) within Chapter 3 with Figures 17-20, 23, and 32-36.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	23	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-24, E.2.c - show locations of primary and secondary signs on conceptual landscape plans (Fig. 38). Clarify if Figure 39 is mislabeled in showing two Primary signs and that one of them should be Secondary. Provide plant palette for this sign to match and expand upon what is described in the Description.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	24	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-24, E.2.c (ii) - clarify or combine the two different 'Descriptions' in this section. Provide plant palette.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	25	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-24, E.2.d - provide reference to specific cross sections and Figures within Specific Plan for information provided in this paragraph. Provide a plant palette.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	26	Landscape Specific Plan	Pages III-24/25, E.2.d (I, ii, iii) - provide details with dimensions and location within right-of-way, coordinate with Figures 21-23. Be specific on paving materials.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	27	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-25, E.2 (e) - call out locations of parks on conceptual landscape plans and provide plant palette. Coordinate, and/or refer to section E.2.b (iii).		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	28	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-25 - show calculations and provide discussion about how Park Land Dedication Ordinance percentages were established at 66.67% and 33.3%.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	29	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-26 - provide discussion of any alternative use for the Private Recreational Facility if 'successful negotiations' are unsuccessful.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	30	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-26 - clarify that Fence Concepts should be labeled as f) and Lighting Concepts should be g). Discuss planting to be provided in front of solid walls and fences to meet Valley Center Design Guideline requirements. Discuss alternatives to the Lighting Concept if studies show a conflict with the County's Light Pollution Code.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	31	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-38, F.4.c - include consistency with Valley Center Design Guidelines for landscaping associated with Multi-Family Residential developments, revise first sentence in this section to acknowledge this. Provide more direction on how this will be accomplished.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	32	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-39, Landscape General - list appropriate Federal, State, and County Codes the Specific Plan will be in conjunction with. Clarify if Landscape General applies to the Multi-Family section (F.4) or is meant to be applicable to all use types.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	33	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-40, first bullet - per the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, California registered Architects and Civil Engineers may also prepare required Landscape Documentation Packages. Plans shall be in compliance with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, the Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual, the Valley Center Design Guidelines, the County's Grading Ordinance, and the Off Street Parking Design Manual. Verify if the Bonsall Design Guidelines and the I-15 Corridor Guidelines apply to this project as well.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	34	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-41, 6.c - consider the end users of these areas and tailor the Landscape and/or Hardscape section to their needs, such as handicap ramps, ample seating, less stairs, more hardscape pathways, lighting, etc. This section, as written, is a repeat of that provided on page III-31 for the Village Center.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	35	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-42, Fire Protection Plan - this is a repeat of page II-17 and provides no new information except the last paragraph. Consider removing this section or referring to Page II-17. Also, consider listing 'other methods designed to reduce losses during a wild fire'.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	36	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-47, K.1, revise to acknowledge that any landscape re-designs will require a modification to an already approved landscape plan through the Department of Planning and Land Use. Plans shall also be in compliance with the Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance, the Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual, Grading Ordinance, Community Design Guidelines, etc. in place at the time of resubmittal.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	37	Landscape Specific Plan	<p>Page III-48 - first bullet, as part of the overall approval of required Landscape Documentation Packages, a Certificate of Completion (section 86.722 of the Landscape Ordinance) will be required prior to use or occupancy of a property and will include a maintenance component (section 86.724) - compare language of these sections with information contained within this bullet. Third bullet - parkway landscaping will not be allowed to be maintained by private homeowners. Please revise. Partially resolved, 2nd Request. Revise note number 7 on page III-48 to acknowledge that parkway landscaping will be maintained through the Lilac Hills Ranch Homeowner's Association. Private homeowner's will not be allowed to maintain any landscape improvement's within the parkway. <u>3rd Request. Still not resolved. Page III-50 of the 2/13/13 submittal still states that landscaping within parkways will be maintained by private homeowners or the HOA. Page 1-11 of the EIR submitted on 2/11/13 states under Private Roads that the street sytem to be maintained by the HOA. Make revisions to be consistent between two documents and remove any indication that a private homeowner would be responisble for maintaining adjoining parkway landscaping.</u></p>	Private landscaping within the parkway would be maintained by the HOA through a Landscape Maintenance District.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	38	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-52, K.3 (f) - this is the first indication of a Lilac Hills Ranch Revegetation Plan. Provide discussion of this and what impacts are anticipated to trigger requiring this document (RPO wetland impact mitigation). Not fully addressed. Applicants response states mitigation is for impacts to wetlands as analyzed in project EIR. No changes or clarification have been made to Page III-52, K as previously requested. No indication if addressed in the General Plan Amendment Report. Provide requested information with next submittal. <u>3rd Request. Page III-56, 7(a) still refers to a Lilac Hills Ranch Revegetation Plan for restoration of degraded and/or disturbed native plant habitats. The applicant did not provide a response to comments with the 2/13/13 submittal, so it is unclear of their intent on clarifying this comment.</u>	The conceptual revegetation plan is included in the Biological Resource Report.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
18	39	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-61 - missing Figure 38. Page III-62 - verify 'Secondary' project entry.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	40	Landscape Specific Plan	Pages III-63-66 - coordinate locations on conceptual landscape plans. Provide notes, labeling as necessary, maintenance responsibilities, and the source of irrigation water.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	41	Landscape Specific Plan	Page III-80 - explain Special Conditions 1 and 2, coordinate with Figure 58. Coordinate with Sections 4.4 and 4.5 of the Fire Protection Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	42	Landscape Specific Plan	Page IV-1, A.2 - second bullet - first mention of Planning Areas, please clarify and coordinate with overall Specific Plan language.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	43	Landscape Tentative Map	Coordinate Conceptual Landscape Plan, Specific Plan text, and Fire Protection Plan, make sure all components match, such as plant palettes, brush management zones, use of invasive and fire prone vegetation.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	44	Landscape Tentative Map	Sht. 2, Planting Notes - no. 4, clarify the intent of this note within the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan shall provide direction for future landscape submittals for various development types. No. 5, discuss the use of tree grates and unattached pavers within the Specific Plan. No. 6, encroachment permits shall be issued by the Department of Public Works for all trees proposed within the public right's-of-ways. Provide additional discussion of this note within the Specific Plan. No. 10, coordinate maintenance responsibilities with language of Specific Plan. No. 12, add that these plant types shall also not be allowed adjacent to Open Space Easements/Lots.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	45	Landscape Tentative Map	Sht. 2, Irrigation Notes - coordinate discussion of reclaimed water and potable water use with Water and Wastewater Plans section within Specific Plan, make sure all information matches. Notes 1 -7, coordinate with requirements of the Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance and Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	46	Landscape Tentative Map	Sht. 2, Brush Management Notes - revise hydroseed mixes within Specific Plan to eliminate fire prone vegetation identified in Zone B notes.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	47	Landscape Tentative Map	Sht. 3 - Coordinate Special Condition and Modified brush management zones with Specific Plan and place additional notes on sheet 2 of Tentative Map to clarify use of these zones.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	48	Landscape Tentative Map	Provide discussion and description of Open Space Lots, HOA Lots, and Remnants of Grove Trees within Specific Plan and on Conceptual Landscape Plan. Identify what is contained within these areas, how will they be maintained, and who will be responsible for maintenance. Consider utilizing a chart on the conceptual landscape plan to better explain.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	49	Landscape Tentative Map	Sheets 3 and 4 - provide more information within the Specific Plan to better explain intent of Community Entry Monumentation sites. Include planting palette. Show location of actual sign on Tentative Map and indicate any proposed lighting. Please note that all proposed lighting will need to be evaluated in the requested Photometric Study.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	50	Landscape Tentative Map	Clarify use of grove trees - graphics indicate new plantings based on plant palette on sheet 1 and information contained within the Specific Plan text, but notes identify these graphics as 'remnants of grove trees' - are they existing or proposed?		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	51	Landscape Tentative Map	Provide a detail of the proposed 6' fire resistant wall and provide discussion within Specific Plan and coordinate with Fire Protection Plan. Label proposed fencing within Tentative Map area and refer to Figure 44 within Specific Plan. Please note that a 6' foot fire resistant wall will need to be evaluated in the Visual Resource Report and Land Use/Community Character Analysis. The wall location will also need to be reviewed by the Department of Public Works to ensure that it does not create a safety hazard (sight distance).		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	52	Landscape Tentative Map	Sht. 4 - provide notes and label pads below lots 340, 351. Label area between lots 61 and 331. Sht. 5 - provide notes and label pad at the end of West Lilac Road. If information is provided on other plans, refer to these plans. Sht. 5 - clarify area within OS Lot 'E' and north side of street 'ZZ', it appears that it 'stretched'.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	53	Landscape Tentative Map	Sht. 6 - identify 'specimen trees' to be used, provide discussion within Specific Plan. Will these be trees harvested from the site prior to grading? Provide concepts for other Parks identified on previous sheets and/or reference figures within Specific Plan for clarity. Tree graphics differ from those shown on Sht. 1, clarify. Provide additional notes to explain graphics, such as benches, walls, edging, pathways, turf areas, tot lot surfacing, trellis materials, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	54	Landscape Tentative Map	Sht. 7 - coordinate street cross sections with figures within Specific Plan and any updates on information identified in comments from review of Specific Plan text. Identify which streets these sections apply to.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	55	Landscape Tentative Map	Verify with the Department of Public Works for median planting within the public right of way that a 2'-3' wide concrete access path along the perimeter will be required for maintenance crews. Make revisions as necessary. All planting within the medians and parkways along public streets shall be required to maintain sight line distances. Provide notes on detail and discussion within the Specific Plan text. Please also identify who would maintain the proposed landscaping within the median.		6/14/12	12/10/12
18	56	Landscape Tentative Map	The landscape plan indicates off-site planting. Please provide evidence that these improvements can be made or remove them from the plan.	Off-site landscaping is for slopes associated with West Lilac Road, which is allowed based on Parcel Map 17355.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
18	57	Landscape Tentative Map	Please coordinate the plantings along the roundabouts with the detailed design work. The plantings could potentially impact sight distance, etc.	Resolved	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
18	58	Landscape Tentative Map	The landscape plan indicates planting within the proposed biological open space easements. Please revise as necessary.	Resolved	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
19	1	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	Please add the Tentative Map number to the plans (TM 5571).		6/14/12	12/10/12
19	2	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	Please make all the same revisions requested on the Master Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
19	3	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	Please provide approval from SDG&E and Valley Center Municipal Water District for the proposed grading/improvements within their easements.	Comments provided	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
19	4	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	Note 6, add that all existing utilities will be undergrounded.		6/14/12	12/10/12
19	5	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	The plans indicate off-site improvements (catch basins, roadways, etc.). Please see Major Project Issue #3.	The Master Preliminary Grading Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
19	6	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	The cross-sections need to be revised to meet the minimum Fire Code requirement of 24-feet improved unobstructed access.	The Master Preliminary Grading Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
19	7	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	The hammerhead lot layout does not meet Fire Code. Fire Code requires a cul-de-sac when serving more than 2 lots. Please revise accordingly.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
19	8	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	Please indicate the grade of all proposed roadways.		6/14/12	12/10/12
19	9	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	The Fuel Management Zone should be revised to indicate a proposed Limited Building Zone (LBZ) easement. The LBZ is a minimum of 100-feet from the edge of the proposed biological open space easement. Grading is allowed within the LBZ; however, habitable structures are not allowed. All required fuel modification must be provided on-site as required by the Fire Code.	The Master Preliminary Grading Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
19	10	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	It appears that there are a number of drainage facilities proposed within the biological open space easements (head walls, culverts, and riprap). Please remove these improvements from the open space. <u>It still appears that there is riprap proposed within the biological open space. Please revise the plan to remove the riprap from the open space easements.</u>	Riprap has been removed from the proposed biological open space.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
19	11	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	The Master Preliminary Grading Plan does not match the Implementing Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan. Please explain why the two plans do not match.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
19	12	Master Prelim. Grading Plan	Please provide details on all the off-site improvements, including widening of West Lilac Road and Mountain Ridge Road. If additional right-of-way is required, it will be the applicants responsibility to obtain the right-of-way prior to the project moving forward. <u>The plans indicate off-site improvements outside of existing right-of-way easements. Please see the exhibit in the lower left corner of sheet 6. Please see Major Project Issue #3.</u>	All improvements are proposed within existing easements.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
20	1	Master Tentative Map	Please clarify the gross site acreage. The site acreage is indicated as 610 or 611 acres in a number of different documents.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	2	Master Tentative Map	Please add the net acreage of the site to the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	3	Master Tentative Map	Please indicate the Tax Rate Area. The Subdivision Ordinance states that no lot shall be located within more than one Tax Rate Area.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	4	Master Tentative Map	Please indicate that the project is within the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plan areas.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	5	Master Tentative Map	Please remove the topography (topo lines) from the Tentative Map exhibit. It should be included on the Preliminary Grading Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	6	Master Tentative Map	Please revise note 6 to indicate that all existing utilities would also be undergrounded.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	7	Master Tentative Map	Please remove note 13.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	8	Master Tentative Map	Please remove the Condominium Map Statement.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	9	Master Tentative Map	Please remove APN 128-290-73-00.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	10	Master Tentative Map	Please remove 128-280-03-00 and add APN 128-280-42-00.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	11	Master Tentative Map	Please remove APN 128-440-37-00 and add 128-280-37-00.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	12	Master Tentative Map	Please clarify the acreages in the Lot Summary Table. The numbers do not add up to the site acreage.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
20	13	Master Tentative Map	The Master Tentative Map indicates off-site improvements. Evidence must be provided that these improvements can be accomplished before the project can move forward. <u>Please provide evidence that demonstrates that off-site improvements can be accomplished.</u>	The Master Preliminary Grading Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
20	14	Master Tentative Map	Please clarify the proposed Zoning Boxes. They should correspond to the Zone Boxes identified in the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	15	Master Tentative Map	On sheet 2, please clearly indicate existing West Lilac Road along the northern property line and add the right-of-way width.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	16	Master Tentative Map	Please include the Fallbrook Union High School District on the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	17	Master Tentative Map	Please clarify dimension L11 (504.43 feet). The Assessor Map indicates a dimension of 460 feet.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	18	Master Tentative Map	Please clarify dimension L43 (317.90 feet). The Assessor Map indicates a dimension of 289.38 feet.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	19	Master Tentative Map	On sheet 4, please make the assessor parcel lines lighter or less prominent.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	20	Master Tentative Map	Please remove all references to off-site parcels on the Tentative Map exhibit.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	21	Master Tentative Map	The Tentative Map indicates numerous easements to be vacated. All easement holders must agree to vacate these easements prior to Tentative Map approval. In addition, please provide a list of all proposed street and easement vacations.	To be a condition.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
20	22	Master Tentative Map	Please change "County of Flood Control District" to "County Flood Control District" in Note # 17.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	23	Master Tentative Map	Easement note # 15 does not appear to be plotted on the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	24	Master Tentative Map	Easement Note #42 does not appear to be plotted on the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	25	Master Tentative Map	Easement note 124 does not appear to be plotted on the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
20	26	Master Tentative Map	On sheet 2, please use the same double circle notation that is shown on sheet 3 under easement notes.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	27	Master Tentative Map	Please verify the proposed lot line associated with Lot D. It does not appear to match the open space easements indicated in the Biological Resource Report, specifically within the proposed Remainder Parcel.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	28	Master Tentative Map	Please clarify when the proposed open space lots (A-K) would be dedicated to the County. As separate lots of a phased map, the lots should be dedicated in conjunction with the adjoining phase. For example, Lots A and B should be dedicated on the Final Map for Phase 1 and 2. This should also be included in the Specific Plan Phasing Plan.	Please see the biology comments regarding phasing.	6/14/12	3/20/13
20	29	Master Tentative Map	On sheets 4 and 5 indicate a 100-foot minimum Limited Building Zone (LBZ) from the proposed biological open space. A larger LBZ may be required based on the Fire Protection Plan, but the minimum is 100-feet per Fire Code.	The Master Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
20	30	Master Tentative Map	Please indicate where access rights would be relinquished. It should be indicated as hatched lines along the right-of-way on the Tentative Map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	31	Master Tentative Map	Please explain the purpose of the Remainder Parcel. This should be a proposed Lot within the project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	32	Master Tentative Map	Please explain the design of Lot 5. It exceeds the County standard of 3:1 depth to width ratio.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	33	Master Tentative Map	Please explain the design of Lot 7 and 8. They do not appear to conform to the County's Subdivision Ordinance design criteria.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	34	Master Tentative Map	Please indicate all proposed public dedications on the Tentative Map, including public parks, trails, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	35	Master Tentative Map	Please indicate all proposed private dedications on the Tentative Map, including trails, overlooks, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
20	36	Master Tentative Map	The Tentative Map proposes to dedicate Biological Open Space easements over existing SDG&E easements. Please exclude the SDG&E portions of these easements and provide written permission from SDG&E to dedicate them adjacent to their easements.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	37	Master Tentative Map	Please indicate the setbacks to the existing and proposed property lines for the existing single family residences that would remain.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	38	Master Tentative Map	Please revise the Zone Boxes to indicate a "D" Designator for the single-family residential portions of the development. The "D" Designator Site Plan would ensure that any future development is consistent with the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
20	39	Master Tentative Map	The Tentative Map indicates improvements to Covey Lane; however, the existing IOD's do not include the whole area proposed to be improved. Please provide evidence that the improvements can be accomplished without resorting to County of San Diego assistance. Please note that the Board of Supervisors would need to accept the IOD's prior to the proposed roadway becoming public. <u>Please note that additional dedications (IOD and Private Road Easements) may be required prior to the project moving forward.</u>	Required prior to the project moving forward for a decision.	12/10/2012 3/20/13	6/13/13
20	40	Master Tentative Map	The Tentative Map indicates rip-rap within the proposed biological open space easements. Please revise as necessary.		12/10/12	3/20/13
20	41	Master Tentative Map	Please indicate the width of the existing or proposed easement that runs north of Covey Lane (off-site). It appears that the improvements are proposed without any right-of-way or easement. Prior to the project moving forward, the project must demonstrate that an easement has been recorded across the property to ensure that access is available as proposed.	Required prior to the project moving forward for a decision.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
20	42	Master Tentative Map	The Master Tentative Map does not indicate a Limited Building Zone easement. Please revise to indicate a LBZ from the edge of the proposed Biological Open Space.	The Master Tentative Map has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
21	1	MUP Plot Plan	Please provide comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District on the proposed temporary and permanent wastewater treatment facilities.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
21	2	MUP Plot Plan	It appears that there is a Parcel Map covenant on the proposed Major Use Permit property. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit for the Wastewater Treatment Plant, the covenant will need to be satisfied. Please refer to Parcel Map 17704 for additional information.	Comment noted by applicant.	6/14/12	12/10/12
21	3	MUP Plot Plan	The Plot Plan needs to indicate the entire property(s) boundary and should be dimensioned with setbacks. <u>The Plot Plan indicates future property boundaries for the wastewater treatment plant that are not associated with a proposed Tentative Map. Please revise the Plot Plan to indicate the property boundary (existing legal lot).</u>	Plan has been revised to show the property boundary.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
21	4	MUP Plot Plan	Please indicate the Assessor Parcel Number(s) of the property(s).		6/14/12	12/10/12
21	5	MUP Plot Plan	Please have the engineer stamp and sign the plans.		6/14/12	12/10/12
21	6	MUP Plot Plan	Please have the owner sign the plans.		6/14/12	12/10/12
21	7	MUP Plot Plan	The elevation drawing is not adequate. Please indicate what the proposed structures would look like from the exterior. The elevation drawings should indicate the material and provide details on the appearance of the facility.		6/14/12	12/10/12
21	8	MUP Plot Plan	Please provide a cross-section of the proposed access roadway and indicate the proposed improvement. <u>The access road is less than 24-feet in width, which is the minimum required by the Fire Code. Please revise as necessary.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
21	9	MUP Plot Plan	The proposed facility needs to be setback a minimum of 100-feet from the proposed open space easement or the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal must grant an exception to allow a smaller setback.	The Fire Protection Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
21	10	MUP Plot Plan	The proposed facility may need to be moved further away from the proposed residential use types depending on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
21	11	MUP Plot Plan	On sheets 2 and 3, remove the reference to a "park" as part of the detention basin.		6/14/12	12/10/12
21	12	MUP Plot Plan	Per Grading Ordinance, Section 87.402, all cut or fill slopes exceeding forty feet in vertical height shall have drainage terraces.		6/14/12	12/10/12
21	13	MUP Plot Plan	Please provide a conceptual Landscape Plan for the proposed Wastewater Treatment Plant.		12/10/12	3/20/13
22	1	Noise Report	Staff has reviewed the Noise Report dated September 11, 2012 prepared by Recon and submitted to the County on September 14, 2012. The report requires revisions as detailed in the following comments.		6/14/12	12/10/12
22	2	Noise Report	On page 3, Section 1.0, please update the Noise Element reference to reflect the General Plan Update Noise Element. The "2006" reference should be removed.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	3	Noise Report	On page 21, Table 5, include the during of time for the Leq measurements (if available).	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	4	Noise Report	On page 24, Section 2.1, Section County General Plan, please include a copy of Tables N-1 and N-2 within the current County Noise Element.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	5	Noise Report	On page 27, Figure 6, please include model point references as indicated on Table 7 (specifically the receptors exposed to levels of 60 dBA CNEL and over).	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
22	6	Noise Report	On page 26, Section i. Exterior Locations, please include additional information that describes single family and senior housing to be subject to the exterior 60 dBA CNEL requirement; multi-family residential and schools to be subject to the exterior 65 dBA CNEL; and parks subject to the 65-70 dBA CNEL. Please revise as it relates to the proposed project.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	7	Noise Report	Page 32, Section 2.3.1 describes existing residences off-site. Please include an additional figure illustration or use an existing Figure illustration to show the location of some of these sampled homes. For example, where is the location of the existing residence that would be exposed to 58 dBA CNEL. Additional Note: Please identify potentially impacted existing homes located along the proposed roadways such as (but not limited to) "Lilac Hills Ranch Road". It appears existing homes may be exposed to project related traffic noise exceeding 60 dBA CNEL and/or exposed to a substantial 10 dB increase according to Figure 6. Please identify these homes and evaluate accordingly.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	8	Noise Report	On page 26, Section i. Exterior Locations, please include additional information that describes single family and senior housing to be subject to the exterior 60 dBA CNEL requirement; multi-family residential and schools to be subject to the exterior 65 dBA CNEL; and parks subject to the 65-70 dBA CNEL. Please revise as it relates to the proposed project. Note that Mitigation Measures revisions would be required to include multi-family residential and schools to be subject to the exterior 65 dBA CNEL; and parks subject to the 65-70 dBA CNEL.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
22	9	Noise Report	On page 26, Section i. Exterior Locations, please include additional information that describes single family and senior housing to be subject to the exterior 60 dBA CNEL requirement; multi-family residential and schools to be subject to the exterior 65 dBA CNEL; and parks subject to the 65-70 dBA CNEL. Please revise as it relates to the proposed project.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	10	Noise Report	Page 32, Section 2.3.1 describes existing residences off-site. Please include an additional figure illustration or use an existing Figure illustration to show the location of some of these sampled homes. For example, where is the location of the existing residence that would be exposed to 58 dBA CNEL.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	11	Noise Report	On page 35-38, Section 2.3.2, please further clarify why the project cumulative increase of 2 to 3 dBA CNEL is not cumulatively considerable on these segments. Does this segment occupy any existing sensitive receptors? Or does this segment have an increase below the 60 dBA CNEL threshold. Please clarify.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	12	Noise Report	On page 39, Table 10, please revise to reflect the County Noise Ordinance Table 36.404 as shown within the Am legal website. Changes are minor and involve a different density reference.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	13	Noise Report	General Comment: On page 41, Section 3.2, please revise these sections under Section 3.2 to reflect the property lines of the project as oppose to the actual location of the noise sensitive receptor. Please note the County Noise Ordinance compliance is subject to a property line standard, while construction noise is subject to the property line shared with an existing sensitive receptor.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	14	Noise Report	On page 42, Section 3.2.1.3, please replace the statement "While. . . operation and maintenance of emergency generators are exempt from the County Noise Ordinance. . ." with a reference to the County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.417 and related excerpt deemed necessary.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
22	15	Noise Report	On page 44, Section 3.2.1.9, please revise to include a quantitative analysis for the recycling facility, similar to the proposed Wastewater Treatment Facility described in Section 3.2.1.8.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	16	Noise Report	On page 45, DC-1, please revise to reference the setback distance requirement to the project property lines. Note that Section 36.404 within the Noise Ordinance establishes noise level requirements at the project property lines and not at the sensitive receptor.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	17	Noise Report	On page 45, MM N-3, at the end of the sentence ". . . Is required to minimize noise impacts to receptors.", please include that it would also reduce levels at the project property lines.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	18	Noise Report	On page 48, Section 3.3.1, identify existing residence closet to the project site. It states 100 feet from project site, please support, verify on a figure illustration. This would show the worst-case existing receptor location(s) associated with the project.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	19	Noise Report	On page 48, Section 3.3.1.1, Construction off-site discussion will be further discussed with staff and noise consultant.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	20	Noise Report	On page 51, DC-6, please revise to reference section 36.409 and to discuss the setbacks in relation to the residential property lines.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	21	Noise Report	On page 51, Section 3.4, please include a drilling operation discussion and analysis as it relates to blasting. Additionally, include the potential drilling and blasting locations (if available).	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	22	Noise Report	On page 52, Section 3.4.2, MM N-7, please include a drilling reference to the required plan.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
22	23	Noise Report	On page 53, Section 3.4.3, Summary section, please revise to include a reference to the project property lines. Please note that a global change shall be implemented to address the "property lines" as specified within the County Noise Ordinance. For example: ". . . The project property lines where an existing sensitive receptor is located. . .".	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	24	Noise Report	Please evaluate all internal components associated with the project that have not yet been mentioned in the report. Project internal uses such as (but not limited to) the dog park area, special private events , etc. This uses must demonstrate compliance with the property line sound level limits pursuant to the County Noise Ordinance.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
22	25	Noise Report	Additional noise comments may follow as staff continues to work with the Noise Consultant and applicant directly.	The Noise Report has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
23	1	Open/Space Encroachment Map	The encroachment map needs to be revised. The encroachment allowance is calculated per lot, not the entire project site. Please see Form 374 for additional information: http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us/luegdocs/DPLU%20FORMS/Cover%20Sheets/Zoning%20Forms/DPLU-374,%20Resource%20Protection%20Study.pdf . Please provide a conceptual development plan for this portion of the project that demonstrates that it could comply with the RPO encroachment requirements based on a per lot basis.	Please see the comments regarding the Specific Plan.	6/14/12 12/10/12	3/13/13
23	2	Open/Space Encroachment Map	Please add the areas of the site over 25% slope (shown in orange on the slope map) are included on the open space/encroachment map.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
24	1	Photometric Study	<p>Please provide a Photometric Study for the Implementing Tentative Map. The study should include the details requested in the Major Pre Application Summary letter and include the details of the shielding and mounting height of the fixtures.</p> <p>The Photometric Study indicates that the proposed street lights would consist of LED lights. The Light Pollution Code regulates lighting by lumen value. The maximum lumen value allowed within Zone B is 4050 lumens. LED provides an equivalent amount of light at 40-50% lumens. Therefore, a maximum of 2,000 lumens of LED would be allowed. Please revise the photometric study to demonstrate compliance with the ordinance based on the lumen output of the proposed fixtures.</p>		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
25	1	Project Facility Availability Forms	The Project Facility Availability Forms will need to be updated based on the additional details regarding the project. In addition, the updated forms should reflect the correct APNs.	The forms have been updated; however, the Fire form indicates that service will not reasonably available within the next five years. Conditions have been received from the DSFPD.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	1	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan needs to be rewritten to address a number of issues, including the requirements of Section 65451 (a) of the Government Code. County staff can schedule a meeting to discuss the revisions in detail and provide guidance on how to revise the plan to address the Government Code requirements for a Specific Plan. The following is a list of specific concerns that should be addressed. Please note that there are a number of other items that need to be revised and can be discussed in the meeting.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	2	Specific Plan	Please add the project numbers to the coversheet of the draft Lilac Hills Specific Plan, GPA 12-001/SP 12-001. <u>Please revise the project number on the coversheet from SPA 12-001 to SP 12-001.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	3	Specific Plan	Please indicate who prepared the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	4	Specific Plan	Please revise the number of the SP provided on page 2 (i) to indicate SP 12-001. Please revise the project number on page (i) from GPA 12-0001 to GPA 12-001.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	5	Specific Plan	On Page I-1, the Specific Plan should specify the types of minor changes the would be allowed without the approval of a Specific Plan Amendment.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	6	Specific Plan	The Project Description provided in the Specific Plan does not contain the detail required by Section 65451 (a) of the Government Code. For example, the Specific Plan does not indicate the amount of acreage allotted for residential, commercial, recreation or institutional development. The Specific Plan needs to be revised to include more detailed information on all the proposed uses within the project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	7	Specific Plan	Please remove all unnecessary subjective language, including references to sustainability and smart growth. The Specific Plan needs to be revised to remove all this unnecessary language and provide the details of the development as required by Government Code Section 65451 (a). For example, the Community Concept and Community Goals and Objectives should be rewritten to address these concerns. The Sustainability Community Goals, Smart Growth Community Goals and Smart Growth Community Policies should be removed. Please coordinate with staff on the changes prior to resubmittal of the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	8	Specific Plan	Please remove all references to "Escondido" throughout the Specific Plan. The project is located within the unincorporated portion of San Diego County within the communities of Valley Center and Bonsall.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	9	Specific Plan	Please clarify the acreage of the project site and the number of properties (parcels) throughout the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	10	Specific Plan	In paragraph 2 on page I-1, please clarify "sizeable limited access senior citizen village." The Specific Plan needs to provide details on the proposed development, including the proposed size, specifically square footage, height, number of beds, access, including location and improvements, and the age of the restricted community. Please note that any senior units containing a kitchen will qualify as a dwelling unit and count toward the maximum number of units (1,746 du).		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	11	Specific Plan	Please remove all references to "limited access", which conflicts with the County Subdivision Ordinance and General Plan regarding roadway connectivity. For example, Policy M 1.2 of the Mobility Element states "provide an interconnected public road network with multiple connections that improve efficiency by incorporating shorter routes between trip origin and destination, disperse traffic, reduce traffic congestion in specific areas, and provide both primary and secondary access/egress routes that support emergency services during fire and other emergencies. Please see Major Project Issues #6 and #7 for additional information regarding access and roadway connectivity.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	12	Specific Plan	Please confirm to the overall acreage of the project site. The Specific Plan on page I-1 indicates a site acreage of 608 acres, while many of the technical reports indicate 610 acres.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	13	Specific Plan	Please add "Open Space Vacation" to the list of discretionary permits submitted with the Specific Plan at the end of paragraph 2 on page I-1.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	14	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should include an analysis of the number of units allowed under existing Zoning Regulations, RPO density calculations and General Plan Land Use Designations.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	15	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates that overall density of the development is 2.9 dwelling units per acre. This calculation is based on the maximum number of dwelling units (1,746 du) divided by the entire site acreage (608 acres). Additional information is required on the "senior citizen village" in order to verify that the overall density is 2.9 du/ac.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	16	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should also indicate if any visitor centers are proposed within the development and indicate their location.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	17	Specific Plan	Under School Site, please discuss the two proposed locations, the type of school proposed, size of the area(s) to be reserved for the school, the applicable districts, setbacks, height, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	18	Specific Plan	<p>Under Recycling and Waste Transfer Facility (RWTF), please remove "proposed." If this is part of the proposal it should be indicated as such. For example, the Specific Plan should read "a RWTF will be provided on-site and will consist of..." The description provided lacks the necessary details, including acreage, operator, location, access, staffing, height, etc.</p> <p>If included, the purpose of the RWTF should be to collect, recycle, and sort on-site trash with the potential for green waste to be reused throughout proposed common areas and by homeowners. Other household waste may be sorted to remove recyclable materials.</p> <p>Suggested for MUP:</p> <p>Prior to the implementation of the Transfer Facility and or Green Waste Recycling Center, proper permits and oversight must be obtained or a letter stating no permit or oversight is required from the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency (LEA).</p> <p>Please note that a regular recyclable buy back center for things like cans and bottles would not require any LEA oversight. If the recycling center is expanded to include household hazardous, electronic or universal waste would need review and possible health permit from the DEH hazardous materials division. Any building permits for the structure or surrounding area to be used</p>		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	19	Specific Plan	Please revise "On-Site Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) to "On-Site Wastewater Treatment Plant and Reclamation Facility."		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	20	Specific Plan	Under "On-Site Water Reclamation Facility (WRF)", the description should be revised to reflect the phasing of the project and the temporary and permanent facilities. Based on the information provided the "water reclamation" facility could not begin operation until a certain number of dwelling units are developed. Additional information should also be provided, such as square footage, operator, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	21	Specific Plan	In the second paragraph under WRF, please review Major Project Issues #11 and #12 regarding public parks. The project is required to dedicate additional public parks and trails. This section should be revised accordingly.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	22	Specific Plan	In the third paragraph under WRF, please remove the word "distressed." Please remove all references to distressed agriculture.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	23	Specific Plan	In the last sentence of the third paragraph under WRF, it states that "solar facilities will be integrated throughout the community." This should be clarified and explained further. It is unclear whether this is in regards to the proposed solar facility or to be incorporated throughout the community in different locations or utilizing roof-top solar. If no solar facility is proposed, please remove this discussion from the Specific Plan text.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	24	Specific Plan	In the fourth paragraph under WRF, it states that the project includes off-site improvements. Please see Major Project Issue #3 for additional information regarding off-site improvements.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	25	Specific Plan	In the fourth paragraph under WRF, it states that "access to the County maintained road system to the south of the Community will be provided by a legal, physical connection to Circle R Road. No information has been provided on how this connection would be made. Access to Circle R Road (Mountain Ridge Road) is by a private road easement that is not available for use by the public, specifically for the proposed commercial, civic or institutional use types. Please provide additional information that demonstrates that the access is legally and physically feasible for use by the community.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	26	Specific Plan	The project proposes to utilize groundwater as a secondary source of water for irrigation purposes. Staff has requested additional information on the proposed use of groundwater, including potential impacts to existing groundwater users and on-going monitoring. The Department will determine whether this is appropriate based on the additional information provided and comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District . Please also see the Groundwater Investigation attachment G.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	27	Specific Plan	In the third paragraph on Page I-3, please clarify where the existing storm water and agricultural runoff is conveyed.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	28	Specific Plan	<p>The fourth paragraph on Page I-3 should be revised to reflect the rural agricultural nature of the site and surrounding area.</p> <p>The draft Specific Plan indicates that "the area has a predominance of single family residential homes on parcels ranging from less than 3,000 square feet up to and exceeding 2 acres." This should be revised based on the additional information requested by staff in the Land Use/Community Character Analysis regarding lot sizes in the surrounding area. For example, there are two parcels adjacent to the development that are over 40 acres in size, but are not reflected in this description. In addition, the draft Specific Plan also states that there are small commercial and office buildings and an industrial rock crushing manufacturing and concrete batch plant nearby. Please revise this section of the draft Specific Plan to conform to the analysis provided in the Land Use/Community Character Analysis.</p>		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	29	Specific Plan	Section D, Community Concept needs to be rewritten to remove unnecessary language and description that does not specifically describe the theme and concept of the project. Sections like the following need to be removed as they are not necessary and do not discuss the theme or concept of the project: "To some it will evoke feelings of a rural village nestled among rolling hills of fruit trees and valleys of natural open space." This section should be shortened and simplified to indicate the theme and concept. For example, the plan can indicate that the project would provide a range of housing types, including detached single family, multi-family and mixed uses, including a main Village Center with two smaller Village nodes located throughout the development. In summary, this section of the plan should discuss the amenities and overall theme of the development and omit any unnecessary language. Please coordinate with staff on the requested revisions prior to resubmittal.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	30	Specific Plan	Section D, paragraph 6, the draft Specific Plan indicates that there would be a bell tower located in the Village Center. Additional information needs to be provided on the height, operating characteristics and design of the bell tower. There could be an issue with the overall height of the tower based on the 35-foot height limit, including visual impacts and an issue with whether it is consistent with building heights in the surrounding area. A Major Use Permit will likely be required for this facility, but will be determined based on a review of the information provided.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	31	Specific Plan	Section D, paragraph 6, the draft Specific Plan indicates that the Village Green would host holiday celebrations and other events for resident families and the community at large. Additional information needs to be provided on the operating characteristics of the Village Green, including the location of the events, frequency, and any additional facilities required. A concept plan should be provided in the Specific Plan for the Village Center and bell tower. A Major Use Permit will likely be required for this facility, but will be determined based on a review of the information provided. The Noise Study requested in attachment H should also evaluate any potential noise impacts resulting from the proposed bell tower. Please provide additional information regarding the operational characteristics of the private park (P-6), specifically special events, etc.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	32	Specific Plan	In the first paragraph on page I-5, the draft Specific Plan indicates that the Village Center may provide sidewalk cafés. The Zoning Ordinance contains specific regulations for sidewalk cafés. Please review Section 6158 (a) to determine if the project would comply with these requirements or if different standards should be provided within the Specific Plan. Please provide additional detail in the Specific Plan regarding the requirements for the sidewalk cafés.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	33	Specific Plan	In the second paragraph on page I-5, the draft Specific Plan indicates that the Village Center would provide a Farmers' Market. The Zoning Ordinance contains specific regulations for Farmers' Markets. Please review Section 6122 to determine if the proposed project would comply with these requirements or if different standards should be provided within the Specific Plan. Please note that additional permitting requirements would be required through the Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	34	Specific Plan	The discussion regarding Cultural Resources will need to be updated based on the revisions and updates to the Cultural Resource Report, including all off-site impacts resulting from road improvements. Please see the Cultural comments under #9 in this checklist.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	35	Specific Plan	The discussion regarding Water Resources will need to be updated based on the results of the Groundwater Analysis, Water Supply Assessment and additional information provided by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	36	Specific Plan	Please reword the last sentence in the first paragraph on page I-7.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	37	Specific Plan	The discussion regarding Biological Resources will need to be updated based on the results of the Biological Resource Report, including the indication that mitigation would be provided on-site. Additional information will need to be included regarding the project's conformance with the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) regarding wetland impacts. Please see the Biology comments under #9 in this checklist.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	38	Specific Plan	The discussion regarding Geology will need to be updated based on the results of the Geological Technical Report and RPO Steep Slope and Encroachment Analysis. Please see the comments under RPO Steep Slope and Encroachment Analysis for additional information.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	39	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan indicates that the existing Land Use Designations are Semi-Rural 4 (SR-4) and Semi-Rural 10 (SR-10), which are slope dependent Land Use Designations. The draft Specific Plan should provide a table and discussion of the number of dwelling units allowed under the existing designation based on the slope of the site. The draft Specific Plan should also provide a table and discussion of the number of dwelling units allowed under the existing Zoning Regulations, including the proposed elderly residential component.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	40	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan indicates that the project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation to Village Residential 2.9 (VR-2.9) and Village Core Mixed Use (C-5). A table should be provided that indicates each proposed use type, estimated acres, and number of dwelling units. Furthermore, an exhibit should be provided that indicates each phase or planning area, the acreage and the maximum number of dwelling units allowed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	41	Specific Plan	Please reword the first sentence under Proposed Zoning on page I-10.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	42	Specific Plan	Under Proposed Zoning, please indicate that the proposed Zoning Use Regulations are Urban Residential. There are no longer residential densities associated with the Zoning Use Regulations. The residential density is assigned under the General Plan and in this case, the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	43	Specific Plan	Under Relationship to General Plan, please revise the second sentence.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	44	Specific Plan	Please add an Open Space Vacation to the list of permits under Project Applications.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	45	Specific Plan	Please revise Figure 3, Steep Slopes, to address comments regarding the RPO steep Slope Analysis and Encroachment Map. <u>Please add a policy in the Specific Plan that future phases would need to prepare a RPO steep slope analysis and encroachment map in conformance with the RPO prior to approval of any discretionary permits.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	46	Specific Plan	Please remove Figure 4 from the draft Specific Plan. It is not necessary or required.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	47	Specific Plan	Please revise Figures 5 through 10 to indicate the Bonsall and Valley Center Community Plan areas.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	48	Specific Plan	Please revise Figure 9 to indicate the Limited Agricultural (A70) and Rural Residential (RR) Use Regulations.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	49	Specific Plan	Please revise Figure 10 to remove all references to densities in the Zoning Use Regulations. For example, RU2 should be labeled as Urban Residential (RU). The figure that depicts the Zoning Boxes will be used to differentiate the different lot sizes and development regulations. A separate figure should be provided that identifies each phase or planning area and the number of dwelling units and proposed uses.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	50	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan refers to areas for orchards and vineyards under the Specific Plan Summary on page II-1; however, it is unclear throughout the report where these areas		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	51	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan under Specific Plan Summary indicates the project proposes to make off-site infrastructure improvements to streets, trails and water and drainage facilities. No information has been provided regarding off-site improvements or whether the applicant has the ability to construct these off-site improvements. Please clarify what off-site improvements are required or proposed or delete this statement. <u>This section to be updated after acceptance of the Traffic Study.</u>	The Tentative Map and Specific Plan have been revised to indicate the required off-site improvements, including existing right-of-way or easements.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	52	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan under Specific Plan Summary indicates that the majority of the residential neighborhoods would be located within one half mile of the Village Center. This should be clarified and updated to reflect which phases or planning areas would be located within one half mile of the proposed Village Center. It should also be noted that the project is proposed to be phased and the first phases of the project would not contain any Village Centers or commercial uses.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	53	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan under Specific Plan Summary indicates that the circulation pattern provides a variety of routes through the community. The Project Internal Circulation Plan provided in Figure 16 indicates a portion of a public road from the realigned West Lilac Road. The figure provided does not indicate a variety of routes through the community. Please clarify or provide additional details on the proposed circulation plan for the project.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	54	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan under Specific Plan Summary indicates the community would include pedestrian-scaled lighting. No details have been provided on the proposed lighting of the community. Additional information including a Street Lighting Figure and discussion should be provided in the Specific Plan. The Department has also requested a Photometric Study to determine whether the project would conform to the County's Light Pollution Code (Dark Sky Ordinance).		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	55	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan under Community Design and Operation Policies indicates the Single Family Residential portions of the project would not contain "B" or "D" Special Area Regulations for Design Review. At a minimum, a "D" Special Area Regulation should be applied to the Single Family Residential portions of the project in order to ensure that the architectural design is consistent with the Specific Plan. The "D" Special Area Regulation would require a Site Plan to be submitted, reviewed and approved by the Department prior to issuance of a Building Permit.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	56	Specific Plan	Community Goals and Objectives needs to be rewritten to remove subjective language regarding the project, the project site and the surrounding area. For example, the discussion should not include statements about "sustainability" or "area at the extreme edges of Escondido."		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	57	Specific Plan	Under Community Goals and Objectives (d), it states that the project would provide a transition between the existing off-site uses and proposed on-site uses. There is not enough information provided to verify that there are appropriate buffers or transitions between the existing uses off-site and uses proposed on-site. Based on a review of the Implementing Tentative Map for Phases 1 and 2 it appears that there are 6,000 square foot lots adjoining the property line. Please provide additional information in the Land Use/Community Character Analysis to demonstrate that there are appropriate buffers between existing uses and the proposed development. Please see comments under Fire Protection Plan, Agriculture, and Traffic Study for additional information.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	58	Specific Plan	Under Community Goals and Objectives (g), please remove the reference to Smart-Growth.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	59	Specific Plan	Please remove the Sustainability Community Goals section.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	60	Specific Plan	Please remove the Smart Growth Community Goals section.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	61	Specific Plan	Please remove the Smart Growth Community Policies section.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	62	Specific Plan	Under Land Use Plan, it states that every effort has been made to avoid or minimize impacts to drainage features. This section will be need to be updated to address Major Project Issue #4 regarding impacts to RPO wetlands.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	63	Specific Plan	Under Land Use Plan, it states that impacts to "some" man made agricultural ponds and drainage areas have also been avoided and provide opportunities for restoration projects. This section needs to be revised to indicate which man made agricultural ponds have been avoided and what areas are going to be restored.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	64	Specific Plan	Under Village Center, the draft Specific Plan indicates that the "New" West Lilac Road has the ability to be split into a couplet with two parallel one way two-lane streets. This will need to be evaluated in the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan. Additional revisions to the Specific Plan may be necessary after a review of the additional information. <u>The Specific Plan may need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	65	Specific Plan	Under Village Center, the draft Specific Plan does not indicate how many dwelling units will be allowed (single-family and multi-family). It also does not discuss the amount of commercial square footage proposed within the Village Center. This section should detail all proposed uses within the Village Center in detail.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	66	Specific Plan	Under Village Center, it states that recreational vehicle (RV) storage is allowed. The Zoning Ordinance requires a Major Use Permit in the C34 Use Regulations for Automotive and Equipment: Storage, Recreational Vehicles and Boats. Staff recommends that this use type be removed from the description of the Village Center.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	67	Specific Plan	Under Village Center, it states that most of the development will be two stories, but a few select buildings will be three stories in height. The Specific Plan should indicate in detail which structures will be over two stories in height. These structures will need to be analyzed in the Fire Protection Plan. In addition, there is no mention of height limits (in feet) within the Village Center. The Specific Plan should indicate how tall the three story structures would be along with all other proposed projections, including the clock tower or dormers, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	68	Specific Plan	Under Neighborhood Center (North), the draft Specific Plan does not indicate the square footage of the proposed private recreational site or commercial uses. It also does not indicate how many attached single-family dwelling units are allowed or the square footage of the park.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	69	Specific Plan	Under Neighborhood Center (North), it states that most of the development will be two stories, but a few select buildings will be three stories in height. The Specific Plan should indicate in detail which structures will be over two stories in height. These structures will need to be analyzed in the Fire Protection Plan. In addition, there is no mention of height limits (in feet) within the Village Center. The Specific Plan should indicate how tall the three story structures would be along with all other proposed projections, including clock towers.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	70	Specific Plan	Neighborhood Center (South), the draft Specific Plan does not indicate the square footage of commercial uses or the private park. Furthermore, it does not indicate how many single-family dwelling units will be provided or any details regarding the senior community center, senior Group Care or Independent Living Facility, such as square footage, number of beds, age or other restrictions, number of kitchens (dwelling units), etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	71	Specific Plan	Under Neighborhood Center (South), it states that most of the development will be two stories, but a few select buildings will be three stories in height. The Specific Plan should indicate in detail which structures will be over two stories in height. These structures will need to be analyzed in the Fire Protection Plan. In addition, there is no mention of height limits (in feet) within the Village Center. The Specific Plan should indicate how tall the three story structures would be along with all other proposed projections, including clock towers.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	72	Specific Plan	Please rewrite the Residential Development section, specifically, remove words like "substantial", "tranquil", and "intimate."		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	73	Specific Plan	Please remove the "Limited Access" title from the Senior Citizen Village section title. Please also verify that the font size is consistent throughout the title.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	74	Specific Plan	Under the Senior Citizen Village, the draft Specific Plan states that the community would be age restricted. Please specify the age restriction, along with the number of beds, square footage, number of kitchens (dwelling units), etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	75	Specific Plan	Under the Senior Citizen Village, please provide the number of single-family dwellings, multi-family dwelling units and square footage of commercial uses.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	76	Specific Plan	Under the Senior Citizen Village, please revise the section to identify a site for the facility.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	77	Specific Plan	Under the Senior Citizen Village, please revise the section to remove the statement that the use is "encouraged" by the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan should clearly indicate whether a Senior Citizen Village is proposed as part of the project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	78	Specific Plan	Under Public and Semi-Public Development, the draft Specific Plan should indicate the acreage of the proposed public park site and private park sites.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	79	Specific Plan	Under Public and Semi-Public Development, the draft Specific Plan should indicate that a Site Plan is required for the proposed parks and will be submitted with each applicable phase.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	80	Specific Plan	Under Recycling and Waste Transfer Facility (RWTF), please provide additional details regarding the square footage and operator of the facility. In addition, please clarify whether off-site trash would be brought to the facility and whether green waste would be reused throughout the common areas.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	81	Specific Plan	Under Recycling and Waste Transfer Facility (RWTF), please remove the last sentence.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	82	Specific Plan	Please revise the Water Reclamation Facility to Wastewater Treatment Plant and Reclamation Facility.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	83	Specific Plan	The Water Reclamation Facility section needs to be updated based on information provided by the Valley Center Municipal Water District and other Regulatory Agencies.	The Specific Plan has been updated to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	84	Specific Plan	Please revise the Solar Farm section to clearly indicate whether or not a solar farm is proposed within the development. The intent of the Specific Plan is to indicate in detail the location and distribution of all land uses. The Specific Plan should clearly identify whether a solar farm is proposed and indicate the acreage of the proposed site, height of the panels, and type of technology allowed. The description should also clarify if a on-site substation is included in the proposal along with the specific location, acreage of the site, height of the facilities, and other associated facilities (transmission lines). If no Solar Farm is proposed, please remove the entire section from the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	85	Specific Plan	Under Open Space and Recreation Plan, item 2 (b), please clarify who would own and maintain the open space lots within the development.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	86	Specific Plan	Under Open Space Recreation Plan, please remove item 2 (f). The Biological Resource Report indicates the site would provide secondary connections not primary. Please clarify in the Specific Plan text.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	87	Specific Plan	Under Dedicated Open Space, please remove all discussions regarding manufactured slopes, agriculture, and detention basins. The plan should indicate that the project would provide a total of 72-acres of biological open space and 37-acres of recreational open space. The other items are not considered dedicated open space. The plan can include a discussion of landscaped areas (slopes and agriculture) and the acreage provided, but it should not be under Dedicated Open Space.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	88	Specific Plan	Please remove the Biological Open Space section as this information is provided in the previous section. The plan can include a separate section on biological open space, but it should not be within both sections.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	89	Specific Plan	Under Biological Open Space, please remove all references to wildlife corridors and linkages.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	90	Specific Plan	Under Biological Open Space, please remove items (a) and (b). The proposed Biological Open Space easements should not include trails or other passive recreation activities. These should be provided outside of the open space within the Limited Building Zone (LBZ).		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	91	Specific Plan	Under Biological Open Space, item (c), please spell out Resource Management Plan (RMP). Also, this section will need to be updated to include a discussion of the Final RMP's consistency with the conceptual RMP.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	92	Specific Plan	Under Biological Open Space, please update item (e) to address the comments under Biology regarding the phasing of the Open Space Easement dedications.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	93	Specific Plan	Under Biological Open Space, please remove item (f). The draft Specific Plan does not propose to Rezone the Open Space areas to the "Open Space Use Regulations."		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	94	Specific Plan	The Community Recreational Elements section will need to be revised based on the comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	95	Specific Plan	The Water Conservation section will need to be revised based on the results of the Groundwater Investigation and comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	96	Specific Plan	Circulation Policy (c) regarding "controlled limited access" is not accepted and will need to be revised after discussions with the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and San Diego County Fire Authority.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	97	Specific Plan	Circulation Policy (f) regarding fair share contributions may need to be revised based on the results of the Traffic Impact Analysis. <u>This will be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	98	Specific Plan	Circulation Policy (g) indicates that the project includes alternative modes of circulation, such as transit. Please see the attached comments from the North County Transit District regarding transit opportunities. As NCTD has indicated, a corollary funding agreement from the developer would be required due to shrinking Transnet revenues.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	99	Specific Plan	The Trip Distribution section will need to be updated following the results of the Traffic Impact Analysis. This will be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	100	Specific Plan	The Streets section is not accepted as written. This section will need to be revised based on the resolution of the Major Project Issues regarding dead-end road length and roadway connectivity. <u>This section may need to be updated upon approval of the Traffic Study.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	101	Specific Plan	The Transit section should be revised to address the comments of the North County Transit District.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	102	Specific Plan	The Non-Vehicular Circulation System needs to be revised to address the comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation regarding public trails.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	103	Specific Plan	The Fire Protection Plan portion of the Specific Plan needs to be revised based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection Plan and San Diego County Fire Authority. The sections regarding fuel modification do not comply with Fire Code requirements. A minimum of 100-feet of fuel modification is required around all habitable structures and must be maintained on-site. <u>This section will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	104	Specific Plan	The Water and Wastewater Plans section will need to be revised based on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District and the results of the Water Supply Assessment and Groundwater Investigation. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the water and wastewater plans by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	105	Specific Plan	The Recycling and Waste Transfer Facility section should be revised to address the comments from the Department of Environmental Health Local Enforcement Agency. This type of proposed use should require a Major Use Permit within the Specific Plan. Further details on this proposed use are required, including exact location, square footage, structures, operator, etc.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	106	Specific Plan	The Solar Farm section should be revised to clearly indicate whether a solar farm is proposed as part of the project or if the area would be used for residential development. The plan should clearly specify all the proposed uses associated with the project and not identify alternatives for the proposed uses.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	107	Specific Plan	The Law Enforcement section may need to be revised based on further discussions with the Sheriff's Department. Please update this section of the Specific Plan based on the attached comments from the Sheriff's Department.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	108	Specific Plan	The Schools section will need to be revised based on information provided by the applicable school districts and the County.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	109	Specific Plan	The Conceptual Grading Plan section should be revised to address the comments on the Preliminary Grading Plan, specifically in regards to RPO wetlands and RPO steep slopes. This section needs to be updated based on the comments regarding RPO steep slopes and wetlands.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	110	Specific Plan	The Drainage Plan section will need to be revised to address the comments on the Preliminary Drainage Study and Biology Report, specifically in regards to RPO wetland crossings.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	111	Specific Plan	The proposed Specific Plan Map is incomplete and needs to be updated to address Major Project Issue #2. For example, the Specific Plan map should indicate all of the proposed land uses. The land uses should have specified boundaries. The map should also match the rest of the Specific Plan. For example, the project proposes a school, temporary and permanent wastewater treatment plant, recycling facility, an age restricted community, biological open space, parks, and a solar farm, but none of the uses are shown on the Specific Plan Map. At a minimum, a table should be provided that indicates the acreages of each proposed use type and indicate the number of dwelling units within each land use area. The Specific Plan Map also needs to clearly illustrate access to each use area and specify whether the access is private or public.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	112	Specific Plan	The School Plan Map provided does not provide enough information. The school site and alternative school site should be clearly identified with boundaries. The type of school should also be provided (K-8) and access to each site should be clearly shown. The School Plan Map should include the acreages of both sites. In addition, please revise "Valley Center School District" to Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District."		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	113	Specific Plan	The Park Plan provided should be revised to address the comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation. The Park Plan should also identify all the proposed parks, including public and private. The plan should also identify the acreage of each park along with access. The plan should also clearly identify the types of facilities provided. For example, the plan should indicate any recreational facilities or ball parks.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	114	Specific Plan	The Biological Open Space Plan should be revised based on the revisions to the Biological Resource Report. Furthermore, the plan should clearly indicate the acreage of the proposed open space areas. The plan should also identify the proposed fuel modification zones (LBZ), which are a minimum of 100-feet from the edge of the open space easement. <u>This section will need to be updated based upon acceptance of the Biological Resource Report and Fire Protection Plan.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	115	Specific Plan	The Mobility Element Plan should be revised based on the results of the Traffic Analysis and comments from the Department of Public Works. For example, the geometry of the proposed realigned West Lilac Road will need to be evaluated in the Traffic Study to the satisfaction of the County. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	116	Specific Plan	The Illustrative Street Sections are not accepted as proposed. The County Fire Code requires a minimum unobstructed improved width of 24-feet. The sections should be revised to address comments from the Department of Public Works, Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal. At a minimum, the sections should include dimensions, detailing the width of the right-of-way, median, parkway, etc. The section should also detail the construction material to be used on the proposed trail/pathway. These sections should also be reviewed in accordance with the Valley Center Community Development and Right-of-Way Standards. <u>This section will be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	117	Specific Plan	In the section for the One-Way Collector, it shows a wall or structure adjacent to the right-of-way. Proposed structures adjacent to the right-of-way need to be addressed in the Fire Protection Plan for the project. This section may need to be revised based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	118	Specific Plan	The Trails Plan should be revised to address the comments of the Department of Parks and Recreation. Please see the attached revised trails map for additional information.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	119	Specific Plan	The Recycling and Waste Transfer Facility section should be revised to address the comments from the Department of Environmental Health Local Enforcement Agency. This type of proposed use should require a Major Use Permit. The plan should clearly identify the location of the facility (boundaries), the size of the facility and access to the facility.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	120	Specific Plan	The Interim Water Reclamation Plan may need to be revised based on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District. Furthermore, the plan should clearly identify the location of the facility (boundaries), the size of the facility and access to the facility. The location does not appear to match the location shown on the Major Use Permit.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	121	Specific Plan	The Permanent Water Reclamation Facility Plan may need to be revised based on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District. The plan should clearly identify the location of the proposed facility (boundaries), the size of the proposed facility and access to the facility. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the wastewater treatment plan by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	122	Specific Plan	Please remove the Alternative Energy Plan to address the previous comments or delete the word "potential" and clearly indicate what type of facility is proposed, the location of the facility (boundaries), size of the facility, infrastructure associated with the facility (transmission lines, substations, etc.) and access to the facility.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	123	Specific Plan	The Grading Concept Plan should be revised to address comments on the Preliminary Grading Plan. <u>This section will be updated upon acceptance of the Preliminary Grading Plans.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	124	Specific Plan	The Project Cross Sections need to be enlarged because they are illegible.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	125	Specific Plan	The proposed Storm Drains plan may need to be updated to address comments from the Department of Public Works. Furthermore, the plan indicates a number of off-site improvements. Please see Major Project Issue #3. The plan should also indicate the proposed detention basins or it should be noted in a separate plan (Drainage Facilities).		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	126	Specific Plan	The Design Concept section needs to be rewritten to remove subjective language and unnecessary information.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	127	Specific Plan	The Community Circulation Plan will need to be updated based on the Traffic Impact Analysis. <u>This section will be updated based upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	128	Specific Plan	The Public Roads - West Lilac Road section is not accepted as written. This section will need to be revised based on comments from the Department of Public Works on the Traffic Impact Analysis. The discussion regarding trails and pathway improvements will need to be updated to address the comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation. <u>This section will need to be updated based upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The project proposes to downgrade West Lilac Road to a 2.2F; however, a 2.2C EIR alternative is proposed.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	129	Specific Plan	The Public and Private Road System sections will need to be revised based on the comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District, County Fire Marshal and Department of Public Works. <u>This section will need to be updated based upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The public and private road sections have been revised.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	130	Specific Plan	The Parking Section will need to be revised based on the Parking Analysis to be provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis and comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal. Please see the comments on the Parking Exhibit for additional revisions.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	131	Specific Plan	The Trails Section will need to be revised based on comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	132	Specific Plan	The Zoning Section indicates lots sizes less than 6,000 square feet, which is the minimum allowed by the Subdivision Ordinance. The Specific Plan should include a discussion of all the project subdivision design requirements contrary to the requirements in the Subdivision Ordinance. Some of these items include lot size, width, depth, width to depth ratio (3:1), radial lot lines, etc. Please see the Tentative Map comments for additional details on the design criteria.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	133	Specific Plan	Please revise the Zoning Section to indicate that a Site Plan is required for all development within the Village Center.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	134	Specific Plan	The Residential Areas section should be revised to remove the numbers indicated in connection with the RU Use Regulations. For example, the zone is Urban Residential (RU).		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	135	Specific Plan	The Zoning boxes should not include density designations. The density or number of units within each portion of the development should be indicated in the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	136	Specific Plan	The Zoning boxes do not indicate any private or group useable open space. The Zoning Ordinance requires an Open Space Designation when the multi-dwelling residential building type or the attached three to eight dwelling units residential building type is or may be permitted within the zone. <u>The Valley Center Design Review Guidelines have specific requirements for Group and Private Usable Open Space. Please see pages 62 and 63 for the specific requirements. This may require a change to the proposed Usable Open Space Designator.</u>	The project does not propose multi-family development. The project proposes single family attached development. The proposed Zoning has been revised to include a "B" Open Space Designator.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	137	Specific Plan	The Single Family Lots within the development need to be zoned with a "D" Designator, which requires Site Plan review. This will ensure that any homes constructed within the development will be in conformance with the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	138	Specific Plan	There are a number of different zone boxes associated with the project and it is unclear where they apply. Please provide an exhibit that indicates where each zone box applies.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	139	Specific Plan	Please add Site Plan under the Development Approvals Needed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	140	Specific Plan	Please add Major Use Permit under the Development Approvals Needed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	141	Specific Plan	Additional detail should be provided in regards to Lighting Concepts. For example, please provide exhibits showing the types of street lights proposed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	142	Specific Plan	Please clarify the reference to a grocery store under Village Character on Page III-31.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	143	Specific Plan	Please indicate under Single Family Residential Design Guidelines that "D" Designator Site Plans are required for the single family residential portions of the project to ensure that they are consistent with the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	144	Specific Plan	Under Site Planning it indicates that there are illustrations to depict the design criteria; however, none are provided.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	145	Specific Plan	Under Multi-Family Residential Guidelines, please revise Major Use Permit to Site Plan throughout.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	146	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates that some structures would be three stories in height. The Fire Protection Plan should evaluate the ability of the Deer Springs Fire Protection District to provide fire protection to these structures. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan indicates that structures would be 3-stories with a maximum height of 35-feet. Therefore, the project does not propose any structures over the existing 35 foot height limit.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	147	Specific Plan	Please revise the discussion under the Limited Access Senior Citizen Village Design Guidelines to indicate that a "D" Designator Site Plan is required for all single family residential development to ensure that it is consistent with the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	148	Specific Plan	The Fire Protection Plan section will need to be revised to address Major Project Issue #13. A minimum of 100-feet of fuel modification is required on-site and should be implemented through a Limited Building Zone (LBZ) easement. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	149	Specific Plan	The Open Space and Maintenance Standards section will need to be revised to address the comments on the Biological Resource Report. For example, the proposed Biological Open Space Easements will need to be maintained by an entity other than the County of San Diego. This information should be provided in a Conceptual Resource Management Plan (RMP). <u>Please update all sections of the Specific Plan that discuss maintenance of the Biological Open Space to the allowed managers listed within the Biological Resource Guidelines.</u>	The Specific Plan indicates that the open space would be maintained by one of the entities listed in the County's Biological Resource Report Guidelines.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	150	Specific Plan	The draft Specific Plan appears to have two Grading Plan Development Standards sections (H and 7). Please revise as needed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	151	Specific Plan	The Grading Plan Development Standards may need to be revised based on comments from the Department of Public Works and Project Planning.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	152	Specific Plan	The Drainage Plan and Development Standards section may need to be revised based on comments from the Department of Public Works on the Drainage Study.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	153	Specific Plan	The Water and Wastewater Development Standards section will need to be updated based on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District and Groundwater Geologist. <u>This section will need to be updated based upon acceptance of the proposed water and wastewater facilities by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	154	Specific Plan	The Biological Habitat Maintenance Areas section will need to be updated based on comments from the Biologist.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	155	Specific Plan	Please revise the third bullet under the General Use and Performance Standards section to remove the County of San Diego as the entity that would manage the open space areas. A Resource Management Plan will be required along with a private manager. <u>Please see previous comments regarding the management of the on-site biological open space.</u>		6/14/12	3/20/13
26	156	Specific Plan	The Single Family Residential Areas section should be revised to clarify that the proposed density transfer would not increase the maximum number of units within each designated neighborhood. Based on the language in the Specific Plan, the first phase of the project could result in 1,746 units without a Specific Plan Amendment. This is not in keeping with the proposed 2.9 dwelling unit per acre density. Please revise the plan to address this issue. Under Allocation and Transfer of Dwelling Units, please clarify that the overall number of dwelling units would not exceed 1,746. In addition, please see the additional comment regarding type of units to be transferred.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	157	Specific Plan	The Multi-Family Single Family Residential areas should be revised to address the previous comment regarding the transfer of units within the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	158	Specific Plan	The Open Space and Trails section should be revised to address comments from the Biologist and Department of Parks and Recreation.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	159	Specific Plan	The Street Sections should be revised to address the comments from the Department of Public Works, Deer Springs Fire Protection District and San Diego County Fire Authority. All proposed roadways should have an unobstructed improved width of 24-feet per Fire Code. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan. The proposed alleys do not meet the 24-foot minimum width.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	160	Specific Plan	The Street Sections should be combined with the Illustrative Street Sections provided earlier in the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	161	Specific Plan	The Zoning Map should be revised to indicate where all of the different zone boxes apply. For example, the Zoning Boxes indicate a range in minimum lot sizes, including 3,200 square feet, 4,000 square feet, and 1 acre.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	162	Specific Plan	Please revise the Zoning Map to remove the density designations after the RU (Urban Residential). For example, RU7 should be revised to RU.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	163	Specific Plan	Please revise the Project Entry Monuments figure to indicate the height, length and whether there is any proposed lighting. The Specific Plan should also indicate where this entry sign would be installed within the community.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	164	Specific Plan	The conceptual plans provided for the Joint School, Public Park Concept and Village Square Concept should be revised to include more details as to where they would be located in the development and additional information on what the graphics show. For example, the Joint School and Public Park Concept Plan should identify the location of the school facilities and parking.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	165	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should also include a conceptual elevation plan for the following uses: school, recycling and waste transfer station, clock tower, community center, and any proposed recreational facilities.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	166	Specific Plan	The Conceptual Village Center and Retail Mixed-Use Elevations indicates three story structures. The plan should indicate the height of the proposed structures. The maximum height allowed based on the proposed Zoning is 35-feet.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	167	Specific Plan	The number of Single-Family Conceptual Elevations should be reduced. The Specific Plan should identify a reasonable range of housing types for the single-family residential portion of the development.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	168	Specific Plan	The Single Family Residential Development Standards should be revised to clearly identify the location of the different standards. For example, does the Town Center (TC) designation apply within the Village Center?		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	169	Specific Plan	The Single Family Residential Development Standards should be revised based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and San Diego County Fire Authority, specifically the designations that allow a zero setback.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	170	Specific Plan	The Single Family Residential Development Standards don't seem to match up with the Zoning Boxes provided. For example, the first column indicates that the Cottage Detached Garage lots are 1,800 square feet. Please ensure that the table matches the Zoning Boxes indicated in the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	171	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should identify where each of the Single Family Residential Development Standards apply within the community.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	172	Specific Plan	Please remove the density information provided under the Single Family Custom Lot Layout graphics.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	173	Specific Plan	Please indicate the height of the proposed homes shown in the Single Family Custom Lot Layout.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	174	Specific Plan	The Concepts for the Single Family and Multi-Family Attached dwellings need to be evaluated in the Fire Protection Plan, specifically the setbacks.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	175	Specific Plan	The Six-Pack Shared Court Concept does not comply with Fire Code, which requires a cul-de-sac when serving more than two dwelling units. <u>This may need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Tentative Map has been revised to remove the six-pack shared court design.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	176	Specific Plan	The Multi-Family Development Standards indicate lots widths of 16 and 22-feet. The plan needs to clearly indicate where these are located within the development.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	177	Specific Plan	The Multi-Family Development Standards need to be evaluated in the Fire Protection Plan, specifically the setbacks.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	178	Specific Plan	The Fire Protection Plan needs to be updated based on the comments regarding the Fire Protection Plan. The two special conditions have not been accepted or approved. The Fire Code requires a minimum of 100-feet of fuel modification, which should be implemented through a Limited Building Zone (LBZ) easement. <u>The fire sections will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	179	Specific Plan	The Fire Protection Plan should be revised to indicate that 30-feet of fire clearing is required adjacent to all existing and proposed roads. <u>The Specific Plan is unclear how vegetation along roadways would be maintained. The Specific Plan states that fuel management would be maintained as feasible. This should be revised pending the approval of the Fire Protection Plan and should state clearly what type of vegetation maintenance would be performed for roadways, etc.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to clarify the vegetation maintenance responsibilities along existing and proposed roadways.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	180	Specific Plan	The Implementation section needs to be updated based on the results of the Traffic Study. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	181	Specific Plan	Please update the Phasing Plan based on the results of the Traffic Study. In addition, the plan is unclear as to what phase the open space areas would be dedicated. The phasing plan within the Specific Plan does not match the construction phasing plan submitted. Please revise/update as necessary. This section may need to be updated upon the approval of the Fire Protection Plan and Traffic Study.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
26	182	Specific Plan	Please revise the Subsequent Actions section to indicate that public, private schools, public and private parks require Site Plan approval, not Major Use Permit approval.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	183	Specific Plan	Please add a discussion regarding the proposed "D" Designator Site Plan requirement for the Single Family Residential portions of the project.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	184	Specific Plan	Please remove the discussion regarding the State of California requirements pertaining to "senior citizen housing developments."		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	185	Specific Plan	Please indicate what minor changes can be approved by PDS without requiring a Specific Plan Amendment under the Amending the Specific Plan section.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	186	Specific Plan	Please update the Maintenance Responsibilities based on the previous comments and comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	187	Specific Plan	Please revise the Circulation Improvements section based on information from the Traffic Study. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	188	Specific Plan	Please revise the Drainage Facilities and Storm Water Management Improvements section based on comments from the Department of Public Works.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	189	Specific Plan	Please update the Water Facilities section based on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District and County Groundwater Geologist. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the water service studies.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	190	Specific Plan	Please revise the Water Reclamation Facilities section to address the comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the wastewater and reclamation facilities plans.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	191	Specific Plan	Please update the Fire, Paramedic and Law Enforcement Services and Facilities based on the comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and County Fire Marshal. <u>This section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	192	Specific Plan	Please revise the Schools, Parks, Open Space and Trails section to address the comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	193	Specific Plan	The Financing Options proposed in the Specific Plan need to be revised after a discussion with County Special Districts. The Board of Supervisors has adopted Board of Supervisors Policy I-136 regarding the formation of CFDs (attached). Please see Major Project Issue #14 for additional information. <u>Further discussion with staff will take place once the project issues have been resolved.</u>	<i>Informational</i>	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	194	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan needs to include a General Plan Consistency Analysis. County staff will work with the applicant to incorporate an analysis of the Specific Plan with the General Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to include a General Plan consistency analysis (Section V).	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	195	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should include a discussion regarding wireless facilities. The Specific Plan can reference the Zoning Ordinance for wireless facility requirements (Section 6980).		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	196	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should include a discussion regarding the General Plan Amendment.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	197	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should include a discussion regarding existing structures that would remain within the Specific Plan area and any future renovations that would be subject to the requirements of the Specific Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
26	198	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should be revised to address Major Project Issue #1. Please revise all figures that relate to access, etc.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	199	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan is required to show the proposed distribution, location, and extent and intensity of major components of public and private transportation. Therefore, the Specific Plan should be revised to include the roadway that runs north from Covey Lane (off-site), connecting to Lilac Hills Ranch Road.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	200	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should be updated to address the recommendations provided in the Deer Springs Fire Protection District Capabilities Assessment and discussions with the fire district.	The Specific Plan has been updated to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	201	Specific Plan	Please clarify throughout the Specific Plan what is a required measure or design feature and what is optional.	The Specific Plan has been revised to clarify what measures are required and what measures are optional.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	202	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should clearly explain what water and sewer facilities would be required per phase. If there are different options, the Specific Plan should explain both options and address phasing. <u>The Specific Plan states that wet weather storage would be needed for the recycled water system. Please explain or identify the location of the wet weather storage.</u>	The Specific Plan has been updated to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	203	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates connections to Shirey Road and Rodriguez; however, there is no analysis of how these connections would function, what improvements would be made, or whether the project has access rights to use these existing roads. Furthermore, the project will be required to perform sight distance certification at all intersections prior to the project moving forward. Additional revisions may be required pending review of the requested documents.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	204	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should identify the location of the existing and proposed agriculture on-site. This should include common area open space that could be used for agricultural uses.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	205	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should include a 1-mile analysis of lot sizes and discuss the surrounding area adjacent to the project site along with the 5-mile analysis.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	206	Specific Plan	Please remove Road 3A from all exhibits provided in the Specific Plan (context, Specific Plans, etc.).		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	207	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan may need to be updated to include mitigation measures proposed in the technical studies. For example, energy efficiency standards, building construction, etc. Additional revisions may be required upon acceptance of the technical studies.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the EIR and Mitigation Measures.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	208	Specific Plan	Please remove all references to habitable on the building height measurements provided in the figures.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	209	Specific Plan	Please update the numbering under II. Specific Plan Summary, under the Table of Contents.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	210	Specific Plan	Please update the numbering under III. Development Standards and Regulations, D. Site Design/Landscape Design.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	211	Specific Plan	Please update the numbering/formatting under IV. Implementation, B. Subsequent Government Actions.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	212	Specific Plan	Under Project Description, please clarify that agricultural uses would be promoted within the project's "common" areas and remove the reference to open space.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	213	Specific Plan	Under Project Description, specify where the "existing and new agricultural uses" would be located and remove the reference to "other development areas."		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	214	Specific Plan	Under Project Description, please specify that the project includes two Site Plans; one for the single family residential units and one for the parks.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	215	Specific Plan	Throughout the Specific Plan, please remove the reference to Village Residential 2.5. The General Plan does not have a VR 2.5 designation. Please use the next available designation of VR 2.9.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	216	Specific Plan	Under Residential Component, please clarify that 468 of the single family lots would be age-restricted within the senior community.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	217	Specific Plan	Under Table 1 - Land Use Summary, please clarify the acreages of the public and private parks.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	218	Specific Plan	Under Table 1 - Land Use Summary, please recalculate the Total Gross Acreage.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	219	Specific Plan	Under F. Residential Yield Analysis (Existing Land Use Regulations), please clarify that under the Semi-Rural 4, slopes over 50% allow 1 du/16 acres.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	220	Specific Plan	Under Parcel Size Distribution in the Vicinity of Lilac Hills Ranch, please revise the statement that the project includes a great diversity of parcel sizes and specify the exact range of parcel sizes proposed.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	221	Specific Plan	Please remove the results of the analysis performed by Chicago Title and Corelogic. This information is not necessary for the Specific Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	222	Specific Plan	Under Development Approvals Needed, please add a Site Plans for Parks.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	223	Specific Plan	On the exhibits, please clarify the boundary between the Bonsall and Valley Center Community Plan areas.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	224	Specific Plan	On the proposed Community Plan Land Use Designations exhibit, please revise the VR 2.5 Designation to VR 2.9.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	225	Specific Plan	Under II. Specific Plan Summary, please correct the spelling under item C.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	226	Specific Plan	Under Specific Goals, please remove the reference to the creation of an identity for the area.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	227	Specific Plan	Under Specific Plan Policies, item 4, it states that rock outcroppings would be maintained. Please specify where these rock outcroppings are located and how they would be maintained or remove this section.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	228	Specific Plan	Please clarify the purpose of the Sustainable Community Policies. These policies are not required based on the proposed language and do not seem necessary.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	229	Specific Plan	<p>Under Open Space/Conservation Policies, please clarify that the biological open space easement would be managed by one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservancy group • Natural resources land manager • Natural resources consultant • County Department of Parks and Recreation • County Department of Public Works • Federal or State Wildlife Agency (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game) • Federal Land Manager such as Bureau of Land Management • City Land Managers, including but not limited to Departments of Public Utilities, Park and Recreation, and Environmental Services. 		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	230	Specific Plan	The Open Space Conservation Policies will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Biological Resource Report.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	231	Specific Plan	The Circulation Policies will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan and Traffic Study.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	232	Specific Plan	The Planning Areas section needs to be updated to clarify the exact square footage of commercial proposed within each commercial area (Village Center, Neighborhood Center (North) and (South)).		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	233	Specific Plan	Under Planning Areas, please clarify the acreage of Phase 1. The Specific Plan states that the phase is 119 acres, while the Tentative Map indicates 115 acres.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	234	Specific Plan	Under Planning Areas, please clarify the number of units proposed. The Specific Plan indicates 345 units while the Tentative Map indicates 342 units. <u>The Implementing Tentative Map states 352 single family dwelling units, but the Specific Plan indicates 350. Please clarify.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	235	Specific Plan	Under Planning Areas, please clarify the acreage of the 5 public parks. The Specific Plan indicates 1.5-acres while the Tentative Map indicates 1.19 acres. <u>Please verify that the acreages for Phase 1 are consistent between the Implementing Tentative Map and Specific Plan.</u>	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	236	Specific Plan	Under Planning Areas, please clarify that the 105 dwelling units are proposed within the multi-family area and not the mixed used area.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	237	Specific Plan	Under the Group Residential/Assisted Living Facility, please clarify that the 200 bed group residential units are not classified as a dwelling unit because they have a common kitchen facility.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	238	Specific Plan	Under Parks, please clarify the number of private and public parks along with the square footage of each.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	239	Specific Plan	Under Parks, please clarify and explain how park P-6 would operate. It states that it would be a private park open to the public. Please clarify if there would be special events and whether those events would be open to the public. Also, please provide a list of potential uses for the park. For example, would the park be used for the farmers market, movies, concerts, special events, etc.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	240	Specific Plan	Under Parks, please clarify and explain how park P-6 would operate. It states that it would be a private park open to the public. Please clarify if there would be special events and whether those events would be open to the public. Also, please provide a list of potential uses for the park. For example, would the park be used for the farmers market, movies, concerts, special events, etc. <u>Please indicate that all private parks, including P-8 would require approval of a Site Plan.</u>		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	241	Specific Plan	Page II-16 of the Specific Plan includes the following statement "Only passive recreation activities such as hiking, biking, horseback riding, and bird watching will be allowed within biological open space". Recreation activities are not an allowed use within biological open space easements. Please clarify if these uses are proposed throughout the entire open space area or only within approved trail locations.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	242	Specific Plan	Under Manufactured Open Space, please clarify that agriculture would be promoted within the common area open space and not the biological open space.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	243	Specific Plan	Under Community Trail Network, please clarify if any of the 17 miles of trails are private trails. The Specific Plan should clearly identify the public and private facilities.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	244	Specific Plan	The Circulation Plan is not accepted as proposed. The Circulation Plan will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	245	Specific Plan	The Water and Wastewater Plans section will need to be revised based on comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District and the results of the Water Supply Assessment and Groundwater Investigation. This section will need to be updated upon approval of the Valley Center Municipal Water District.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	246	Specific Plan	Under Potable Water Supply, please clarify the reference to lots 11 and 12 of the Master Tentative Map. The Tentative Map only includes 8 lots.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	247	Specific Plan	Under On-site Wastewater Treatment Plant and Reclamation Facility, please clarify where the wastewater would trucked off-site prior to operation of the interim or permanent facility.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	248	Specific Plan	The Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	249	Specific Plan	The Sustainable Community Design section is not accepted as written and will need to be updated based on Major Project Issue #1.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	250	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should include the right-of-way of Lilac Hills Ranch Road that runs off-site through the central portion of the project site. The location of public and private transportation facilities are required to be included in a Specific Plan pursuant to Government Code section 65451(a)(2). Please update all the figures throughout the Specific Plan to include this section of the road.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	251	Specific Plan	Please remove the scale from the figures within the Specific Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	252	Specific Plan	The Phasing Plan needs to be updated to address the comments on the Fire Protection Plan and Traffic Study. In addition, the plan is not clear what improvements are proposed for each phase.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	253	Specific Plan	Please clarify the acreages within Phase 1 Table in Figure 15. The table indicates that phase 1 includes 119 acres and 345 units while the Implementing Tentative Map indicates 115 acres and 342 units.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	254	Specific Plan	Please clarify what Single Family units in Table A are age restricted (senior village).		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	255	Specific Plan	Please clarify what Parks are private and public in Table A.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	256	Specific Plan	Please clarify what Parks are private and public in Figure 17.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	257	Specific Plan	Please revise the colors in the Legend in Figure 19. It is difficult to discern where each proposed use is located.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	258	Specific Plan	Please clarify what trails are private and public in Figure 20.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	259	Specific Plan	Please add "Trail Head" to figures 40 and 41.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	260	Specific Plan	The Project Internal Circulation Map is not accepted as proposed. The map will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	261	Specific Plan	Please clarify what "restricted access points" are in Figure 24.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	262	Specific Plan	Please ensure that the Street Sections provided in Figures 25 through 33 are clearly labeled in the Project Internal Circulation Plan in Figure 24. The street sections should also match the cross-sections on the Tentative Map.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	263	Specific Plan	Please remove all references to other figures and phases in Figure 35.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	264	Specific Plan	Please remove all references to other figures and phases in Figure 36.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	265	Specific Plan	The Onsite Sewer Collection System provided in Figure 36 does not match the proposed improvements on the Preliminary Grading Plan, specifically the force main extension to the Moosa Creek wastewater facility.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	266	Specific Plan	Please revise Figure 39. The exhibit is unclear and difficult to read and does not appear to match the proposed Major Use Permit Plot Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	267	Specific Plan	Please revise Figure 41 to indicate that the maximum building height is 35-feet and remove all references to habitable.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	268	Specific Plan	Please ensure that Figure 49 matches the Preliminary Grading Plan. It appears that a number of storm drains/culverts are not shown in the figure.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	269	Specific Plan	Please remove the blank pages following section III. Development Standards and Regulations.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	270	Specific Plan	Under Design Concept, please number the General Plan guiding principles to match the numbering in the General Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	271	Specific Plan	The Public Road System Improvements section will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	272	Specific Plan	Under Street B there is a reference to the Dawson easement road. Please clarify where this roadway segment is located. It is not labeled on any of the exhibits provided. The Specific Plan should provide a description of each roadway, including off-site roadways.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	273	Specific Plan	Please update the font and formatting on page III-8.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	274	Specific Plan	Under Single Family Residential Areas, the Specific Plan states that single-family structures will be 40-feet; however, the proposed zone box indicates a "G" Height Designator, which allows a maximum building height of 35-feet. Please revise so that it is consistent.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	275	Specific Plan	Please update the Allocation and Transfer of Residential Units to clearly indicate that units could be relocated within the Specific Plan area; however, the type of units cannot be changed. For example, the 468 age restricted single family residential units could not be transferred to another phase and converted to single-family. It should also specify that the transfer would not reduce the commercial square footage within the village center or neighborhood centers.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	276	Specific Plan	Please remove the last sentence under Landform Grading Guidelines or revise it to explain that recycled water may or may not be used depending on the Valley Center Municipal Water District.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	277	Specific Plan	Under Monumentation, please update the reference from Figure 39 to 95.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	278	Specific Plan	Under Public Parks, please update the reference from Figure 30 to Figure 101.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	279	Specific Plan	The private park within the Village Square should require a Major Use Permit based on the C35 Use Regulations. Please revise the Private Parks section to indicate that the private park within the Village Square will require a Major Use Permit in order to address the proposed special events, which are classified as Spectator Sports and Entertainment.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	280	Specific Plan	Please update the Lighting Concepts section to address the comments on the Photometric Study.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	281	Specific Plan	Please clarify under Village Center Commercial and Mixed Use Design Guidelines that the Village Center includes both a "B" and "D" Special Area Designator.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	282	Specific Plan	Under Architecture, please revise the discussion regarding useable open space to address the previous comments. In addition, please see the Zoning Ordinance definitions for Group and Private Usable Open Space.	See previous response to Group Useable Open Space.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	283	Specific Plan	Under Site Planning and Building Orientation, item 3, there is a reference to an adjacent illustration; however, none is provided.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	284	Specific Plan	Under Lighting, Signing and Street Furnishings, please update to indicate how the sign program will be developed. For example, will a comprehensive sign program be required before any commercial development and would it be created through a Site Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	285	Specific Plan	Under Parking, Carport and Garage Design, item 6, please clarify that 100 percent of the parking would be allowed on the adjacent street. The Parking Exhibit does not indicate that parking is allowed on every street within the Specific Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	286	Specific Plan	Under Senior Neighborhood Design Guidelines, please clearly indicate that the single family residential dwelling units would be age-restricted and for seniors only.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	287	Specific Plan	Under Single Family Residential, please remove the reference to minimum lot size. The Site Plan is for the purpose of ensuring that the architecture of the proposed dwelling units and setbacks are established in conformance with the Specific Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	288	Specific Plan	Under Group-Residential - Assisted Living (Group Care) and Senior Center Design Concept, please reference the architectural drawings provided in the figures.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	289	Specific Plan	Under Site Planning and Building Orientation, there is a reference to an adjacent illustration; however, none is provided.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	290	Specific Plan	The Fire Protection Plan portion of the Specific Plan needs to be revised based on comments from the Deer Springs Fire Protection Plan and San Diego County Fire Authority.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	291	Specific Plan	Under Grading Plan Development Standards, the Specific Plan indicates that the grading for the project would be balanced; however, the Implementing Tentative Map indicates that the project would require import. Please clarify how the project site would be balanced.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	292	Specific Plan	Under Grading Plan Development Standards, please remove the reference to the Air Pollution Control District and reference the Grading Ordinance.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	293	Specific Plan	Under General Use and Performance Standards, item 9, please add Major Use Permit(s), Site Plan(s), etc.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	294	Specific Plan	Under Village Center, item 2, please clarify that a Minor Use Permit would be required for the tower pursuant to Section 4622 (g).		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	295	Specific Plan	Under Neighborhood Centers, there is a reference to Neighborhood Center 2. Please clarify where this neighborhood center is located. The Specific Plan previously refers to the centers as north and south.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	296	Specific Plan	Under Single Family Residential Area, item 1, please clarify that minor variations would be subject to review and approval of the Director of DPDS.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	297	Specific Plan	Under Attached and Multi-Family Areas, please clarify that minor variations would be subject to review and approval of the Director of DPDS.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	298	Specific Plan	Under Open Space and Trails, item 1, please clarify the reference to nature study areas. None have been identified within the Specific Plan area.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	299	Specific Plan	Under Open Space and Trails, item 1, please clarify the reference to nature study areas. None have been identified within the Specific Plan area.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	300	Specific Plan	Please provide the proposed General Plan Amendment language for the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	301	Specific Plan	Under Existing Structures to Remain, please describe each existing structure (residential, etc.).		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	302	Specific Plan	Under the Standards Tables, please provide a definition for the "-" provided in the tables.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	303	Specific Plan	The concepts provided will need to be updated upon acceptance of the Fire Protection Plan and Traffic Study.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	304	Specific Plan	Please clearly indicate where the front yard is located in the concepts provided in the Specific Plan. Also, ensure that all dimensions are provided and the right-of-way is clearly indicated.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	305	Specific Plan	Please explain how that the setbacks for accessory structures would be pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance or provide standards.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	306	Specific Plan	Under Multi-Family Residential Development Standards Table, please clarify the minimum lot size under number 1 (Motor Court with Duplex). The lot dimensions provided are for a 25,000 square foot lot while the minimum lot size is 10,000 square feet.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	307	Specific Plan	The Multi-Family concept indicates a 5-foot setback to what appears to be stairs. Please clarify if this is correct or if the setback should be measured to the porch or unit.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	308	Specific Plan	In the Attached Residential Development Standards Table, under number 1, please clarify if the exterior yard setback should be 5-10-feet and the rear yard 4-feet based on the concept drawing provided.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	309	Specific Plan	In the Attached Residential Development Standards Table, under number 2, please clarify if the front yard should be 5 or 10-feet and the rear yard 4-feet based on the concept drawing provided.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	310	Specific Plan	In the Attached Residential Development Standards Table, please clarify if the rear yard setbacks based on the concept drawing provided.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	311	Specific Plan	The drawings provided in Figure 66 indicate 110-foot corner side yard setbacks, but it is unclear why this is a corner side. Please clarify why this side of the lot is considered a corner side yard.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	312	Specific Plan	Please ensure that the height dimension provided in Figure 70 is to the top of the tower, including any attached architectural features.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	313	Specific Plan	Please ensure that the height dimension provided in Figure 73 is to the top of the structure, including any architectural towers or gables.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	314	Specific Plan	Please clarify the title of Figure 74 as it appears to be the Senior Center. Also, please ensure that the height dimension is accurate. The structure appears substantially smaller than the height dimension provided.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	315	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should identify development standards for the Mixed Use/Commercial areas as well as for single and multi-family.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	316	Specific Plan	Under the Single Family Residential Development Standards, please define the exterior side yard setback.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	317	Specific Plan	Under the Single Family Residential Development Standards, under item 1, please clarify whether there should be a Porch setback or a "-".		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	318	Specific Plan	Under the Single Family Residential Development Standards, item 2, please clarify the 4-foot garage setback. The figure shows 10-feet minimum.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	319	Specific Plan	Under the Single Family Residential Development Standards, item 6, please clarify the unit front yard setback. The figure shows 10-feet, but the table lists 5-feet.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	320	Specific Plan	Under the Single Family Residential Development Standards, please clarify the Minimum Lot Size of the item 7. Based on the lot dimensions, the lot size should be 3,900 square feet.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	321	Specific Plan	Under the Single Family Residential Development Standards, item 13, please define a rear yard setback or indicate a "-".		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	322	Specific Plan	Under the Single Family Residential Development Standards, item 18, please clarify if the model should be called Front or Side Load to match the figure. Also, please clarify the lot dimensions. The figure shows 100-feet by 85-feet, not 100-feet. This change may result in a change to the minimum lot size.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	323	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts provided in Figures 77 to 88, please clearly label the front, side, rear and exterior side yards or define under the Development Standards.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	324	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts provided in Figures 77 to 88, please label the location(s) of the street(s).		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	325	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts provided in Figures 77 to 88, please enlarge all text. It is difficult to read some of the items in the exhibits. For instance, in Figure 85, the 6-foot block wall with gate is difficult to read and may not be acceptable to the fire district if the units are to be accessed from Old West Lilac Road.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	326	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts provided in Figures 77 to 88, please remove all unnecessary lines. For example, in figure 85 it is difficult to determine the property line, setbacks, porch location, etc. for the units located at the southern end.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	327	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts provided in Figures 77 to 88, please make sure that all labels are clearly identified. For example, on figure 77, the labeling at the top is cut off.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	328	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts provided in Figures 77 to 88, please clarify how to address double-fronted lots or lots surrounded by roadway access like the lots depicted in figure 78.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	329	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts provided in Figures 77 to 88, please revise all measurements to indicate feet. For example, in Figure 79, the measurement is in inches.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	330	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts, please clarify the title of the Paseo Court Cluster. Should this be relabeled as Hillside Paseo?		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	331	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts, in Figure 84, please clarify the measurements in the top left exhibit. The measurements to the porch and unit are unclear.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	332	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts, in Figure 84, please clarify the measurement to the garage in the top right exhibit. It states 4-feet to garage, but the garage is located 15-feet from the rear property line.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	333	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts, in Figure 85, please clarify the setback from the motor court to the front of the units. Also, ensure that all setbacks are clearly labeled on the exhibits.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	334	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Lot Layouts, in Figure 88, please clarify the lot dimension listed. It indicates 100' x 100'/85'. Please also see the previous comment on the table.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	335	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Small-Lot Conceptual Elevations, please number the elevations to correspond to the table and remove all alphabetical references.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	336	Specific Plan	In the Single Family Small-Lot Conceptual Elevations, please indicate the height dimension of each model.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	337	Specific Plan	Please number the conceptual elevation of the Single-Family Duplex to correspond to the table.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	338	Specific Plan	In the Senior Neighborhood Gated Entry Concept - Typical, please clarify the dimensions of the gate entry structure. This exhibit needs to be reviewed and approved by the Deer Springs Fire Protection District.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	339	Specific Plan	Please clarify the height dimension on the Church Site Concept Plan in figure 94. If the church or architectural element of the church extends over the height limit an exception would be needed with the Major Use Permit. Please clarify this in the Specific Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	340	Specific Plan	In the Project Entry Monuments in Figure 95, please provide a key map showing the proposed location of the entry signs.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	341	Specific Plan	The Park concepts provided in Figures 96 through 101 should be labeled to match the parks shown on the proposed Site Plan. For example, Park P-1 should be labeled as Sports Park.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	342	Specific Plan	Please label the parks (P-6 and P-7) in Figure 100.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	343	Specific Plan	The Fire Protection Plan in Figure 107 will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan by the Deer Springs Fire Protection District.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	344	Specific Plan	The Fuel Management Setback Zones in Figure 108 will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan by the Deer Springs Fire Protection District.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	345	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should provide a discussion regarding fire access and how the roadway network would function in an emergency. For example, the Specific Plan should explain how the gates would function and whether traffic could flow in any direction.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	346	Specific Plan	The Community Phasing Plan Description will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan and Traffic Study.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	347	Specific Plan	Under Community Phasing Plan Description, the discussion regarding the maximum assumed grading/construction conditions does not match the Air Quality Study. For example, the Air Quality states that the maximum area graded within one day would be 20 acres.	The Specific Plan indicates that less than 50 acres would be graded within one day.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	348	Specific Plan	Under Site Plans, please remove the discussion regarding appeal privileges. The Zoning Ordinance governs appeal privileges for Site Plan applications.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	349	Specific Plan	Under Site Plans, please add a discussion regarding the "V" Setback Designator, which also requires a Site Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	350	Specific Plan	Under Maintenance Responsibilities, please revise Item 4 as indicated previously.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	351	Specific Plan	The Water and Water Reclamation Facilities sections will need to be updated upon approval of the Valley Center Municipal Water District.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	352	Specific Plan	The Fire, Paramedic, and Law Enforcement Services and Facilities section will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan and attached comments from the San Diego County Sheriff's office.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	353	Specific Plan	Under Recreational Facilities & Open Space, please clarify that the project includes multiple public parks.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	354	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan refers to Appendix A. Please provide a copy of this analysis with the next submittal.	This analysis has been added to the EIR under Land Use.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	355	Specific Plan	Under Guiding Principle number 4, please remove the statement regarding the loss of wetlands.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	356	Specific Plan	Please remove the last sentence under Guiding Principle number 7.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	357	Specific Plan	Please update the analysis under Guiding Principle number 8 upon approval of the Agricultural Report.	The discussion under Guiding Principle 8 is consistent with the analysis provided in the Agricultural Report.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	358	Specific Plan	The analysis under Guiding Principle 9 will need to be updated upon approval of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.	The discussion under Guiding Principle 9 is consistent with the analysis provided in the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	359	Specific Plan	Please remove the last sentence from Guiding Principle 9.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	360	Specific Plan	Under Guiding Principle 10, please add a discussion regarding the Bonsall Community Sponsor Group, Valley Center Design Review Board and Valley Center Community Plan group.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	361	Specific Plan	The analysis under Goal LU-1 should be revised to address Major Project Issue #1.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	362	Specific Plan	Remove the reference to distressed agriculture under the analysis of Goal LU-1.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	363	Specific Plan	The Mobility Element section will need to be updated upon approval of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	364	Specific Plan	The Housing Element section will need to be updated to address previous comments regarding surrounding lot sizes.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	365	Specific Plan	The Safety Element will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan and the attached comments from the San Diego County Sheriff's office.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	366	Specific Plan	Please provide the proposed General Plan Amendment language for the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	367	Specific Plan	The discussion under the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans will need to be updated to address previous comments on phasing, traffic and fire protection.		12/10/12	3/20/13
26	368	Specific Plan	The appendices will need to be updated upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan, water and wastewater facilities.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
26	369	Specific Plan	The net acreage provided in Table 1 - Land Use Summary on page I-4 does not add up to 608 as indicated. Please revise as needed.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	370	Specific Plan	Please clarify the discussion regarding density calculation and refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 4115. "The maximum number of dwelling units permitted within the exterior boundary lines of any subdivision or a single lot shall be equal to the product of the total of the net lot area of that subdivision, or lot expressed in acres multiplied by the applicable maximum density designator."	The Specific Plan indicates that the project proposes 1,746 dwelling units on 608 acres.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	371	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates that the 200 bed Group Residential/Care Facility may include kitchens. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1265 regarding Group Residential, which states that "if in addition to the common kitchen facility, any living unit includes a separate kitchen, that living unit shall be counted as a dwelling unit in calculating density pursuant to Section 4115." If the 200 bed facility could include kitchens, the 200 units shall be added to the 1,746 and included in the density calculation. Please note that the proposed Land Use Designation of VR 2.9 may not allow that number of units and may need to be increased.	This discussion has been removed from the Specific Plan.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	372	Specific Plan	The Implementing Tentative Map indicates 352 dwelling units; however, the Specific Plan indicates that Phase 1 includes 350 dwelling units. Please revise the Specific Plan or Implementing Tentative Map to clarify the number of dwelling units proposed within Phase 1.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	373	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates that the project includes detached single family, attached single family and mixed-use development. Figure 72 indicates "MF" on a number of structures and the Site Plan Concepts also indicate multi-family development. The Zoning Ordinance defines multi-family development as "a structure or structures containing a total of 3 or more dwelling units in any vertical or horizontal arrangement on a single lot or building site." Please revise the Specific Plan, including the figures and exhibits, to clarify whether the project includes multi-family development.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	374	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates that multi-family development is allowed within the C34 Use Regulation and subject to the Valley Center Design Review Guidelines. In addition, the proposed zone box indicates a "P" Building Type, which also allows multi-family dwellings. The proposed "B" Open Space designation does not meet the Valley Center Design Review Guideline requirements for multi-family development. Please revise as necessary.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	375	Specific Plan	A number of roadway cross-sections do not conform to the Fire Protection Plan, Specific Plan or Consolidated Fire Code. For example, the Specific Plan, Fire Protection Plan and Fire Code require a roadway that has separate lanes of one way travel be a minimum of 14-feet in width. The cross-sections indicate one way roads less than 14-feet wide. Please revise as necessary.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	376	Specific Plan	The elevation drawings within the Specific Plan indicate three story structures; however, the proposed zoning only allows a maximum of two stories. Please revise as necessary.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	377	Specific Plan	Figures 18, 19 and 135 do not indicate any fuel modification zones adjacent to the proposed biological open space easements. Please revise the figures to show all proposed fuel modification zones.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	378	Specific Plan	Please provide a more detailed description of the proposed Country Inn and Casitas. For example, please identify whether any of these units have independent kitchens. Please see the previous comment regarding density and the definition of a dwelling unit.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	379	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan states that "appropriate wet weather storage will be needed as part of the overall recycled water system." No wet weather storage has been identified within the Specific Plan. Please revise to indicate where the wet weather storage would be located. Please note that the EIR will need to include an analysis of any impacts resulting from the storage ponds.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	380	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan states that "the recycled water infrastructure would consist of a conveyance pump station, a transmission pipeline, a possible recycled water storage tank, and recycled water distribution pipelines." Please ensure that the Specific Plan identifies the location of these facilities. Please note that the EIR will need to include an analysis of any impacts resulting from the infrastructure.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	381	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates on Page III-55 that the proposed school site may revert to residential if the school district does not accept the site. Please clarify that the maximum number of dwelling units would not be increased above 1,746 dwelling units.	The Specific Plan has been revised to indicate that the number of dwelling units will not be increased.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	382	Specific Plan	The Lot Layouts provided in the figures do not appear to match or correspond to the different lot configurations in the Development Standards. Staff recommends that we resolve these inconsistencies through working meetings.	The Specific Plan has been revised to indicate that the number of dwelling units will not be increased.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
26	383	Specific Plan	Please ensure that all text is legible in the Lot Layouts. For example, Figure 101 has two words cut-off at the top of the page. Please revise as necessary.	The Specific Plan has been revised to indicate that the number of dwelling units will not be increased.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	384	Specific Plan	Please ensure that the Lot Layout titles are consistent in the figures. For example, Figure 102 indicates "Single Family Attached" in the figure, but the title at the bottom of the page indicates "Detached." Please revise as necessary.	The Specific Plan has been revised to indicate that the number of dwelling units will not be increased.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	385	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan proposes road standards that are different than the Public Road Standards. Please provide an analysis of how the roads would differ from Public Road Standards for similar type public roads that would accommodate the projected traffic. This analysis does not need to be included in the Specific Plan text and can be a separate analysis.	An analysis has been provided describing the differences between the proposed private roads and Public Road Standards.	3/20/13	6/13/13
26	386	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should identify a site reserved for a Fire Station. Staff recommends that the applicant coordinate with PDS and the Deer Springs Fire Protection District on the specific requirements.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
27	1	Steep Slope Map	The slope analysis indicates areas of the site that have 25% slope (orange) that appear to have a minimum rise or run of 50-feet that need to be added to the encroachment/open space map.		6/14/12	12/10/12
27	2	Steep Slope Map	Please indicate the portions of the site that are not a part (N.A.P.).		6/14/12	12/10/12
27	3	Steep Slope Map	Please provide the source of the topographic information.		6/14/12	12/10/12
27	4	Steep Slope Map	Please make sure that the entire project site is shown on the map. The northwest corner of the site is not included in the plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
28	1	Vectors	A Vector Management Plan must be completed. Guidelines for completing the Vector Management Plan can be found at: http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/Vector_Report_Formats.pdf . Additional County Guidance with regard to addressing vector issues is available at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/Vector_Guidelines.pdf .		6/14/12	12/10/12
29	1	Visual Resources Report	Please add the project numbers to the coversheet.		6/14/12	12/10/12
29	2	Visual Resources Report	The Visual Resource Report is incomplete and lacks any analysis that could be used to determine the projects potential visual impacts. Please provide a complete Visual Resource Report in accordance with the County's Guidelines for Visual Resource Reports. The next submittal will be rejected if it is incomplete.		6/14/12	12/10/12
29	3	Visual Resources Report	Under project description, the report indicates that there are "small lot townhomes" and several hundred homes in the project area. This section may need to be updated after a lot study is done of the surrounding area. <u>This section needs to be updated based on the previous comments regarding the lot study analysis.</u>		6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	4	Visual Resources Report	Please revise the discussion regarding the projects consistency with other developments in the area. A number of the projects indicated have not been constructed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
29	5	Visual Resources Report	The report will also need to evaluate off-site impacts (roadway construction).		6/14/12	12/10/12
29	6	Visual Resources Report	Under the discussion regarding the County's General Plan, indicate that the site is also subject to the SR10 Land Use Designation.		6/14/12	12/10/12
29	7	Visual Resources Report	Please correct the project numbers to match the numbers provided at the top of this checklist.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
29	9	Visual Resources Report	In general, an analysis should not assume failure of implementation of a project condition, such as "failure to provide long-term maintenance of the landscaping." The report should assume each specific plan requirement would be implemented, especially those meant to avoid a significant effect and is required by County Code for erosion control. Please discuss approach and conclusion with staff.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	10	Visual Resources Report	The analysis should include a description of existing elements of views from I-15. Also, what is the duration of the view for travelers along I-15? Please also more specifically describe the "residential and park" components of the project that will be seen from this view (e.g. lot sizes, heights, materials and variation of built forms). Please also add to the I-15 discussion on page 2.1-10.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	11	Visual Resources Report	Impacts to proposed Community Pathway. Please discuss with staff the feasibility of discussing impacts to future land uses. In general, the report should focus on existing conditions and not those created by the project.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	12	Visual Resources Report	Off-Site Improvements. Please revise this section per resolution of the project's roadway network.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	13	Visual Resources Report	Glare Impacts. Does the specific plan include solar building requirements?		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	14	Visual Resources Report	Consistency with Land Use Policies. Please revise this section once the general plan conformance issue is resolved.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	15	Visual Resources Report	Cumulative Impact Analysis. Please revise this discussion to include the properties which are part of the Property Specific Request (PSR) process.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
29	16	Visual Resources Report	Cumulative Impact Analysis. Please explain how the "minor residential subdivision" and other cumulative development would "blend into the existing character of the viewshed." In part, cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced through development consistent with the County General Plan and VCCP, and BCP.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	17	Visual Resources Report	Please include a description of other site specific features that contribute to valued visual character. For example, open areas of agricultural and rural residential.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	18	Visual Resources Report	Staff disagrees with the significance determination for Issue 3. In particular, for views from West Lilac Road. The conversion of open, rural residential land to smaller lot, suburban type housing (as demonstrated in Figure 2.1-3) would result in a degradation of the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. Please also see planning comments on conformance with the Community Development Model. Implementation of the intent of the Community Development Model would also serve to avoid this significant impact.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	19	Visual Resources Report	For all impact discussions and associated visual simulations, the text and figures should show how the project's specific plan guidelines serve to avoid visual impacts to the surrounding communities. For example, the guidelines should require a variation of building materials, types, and styles would result in variations of roof form and color. Please reference or incorporate appropriate specific plan figures and illustrations which depict housing and commercial types. Please also note, pending resolution of the planning Major Project Issue regarding the Community Development Model, these figures should reflect larger lots sizes.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	20	Visual Resources Report	Please revise the lot size discussion to address the previous comments regarding the Specific Plan.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
29	21	Visual Resources Report	The report should address County Scenic routes and whether the project would be visible from any nearby scenic routes identified in the General Plan.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	22	Visual Resources Report	The report should also address the proposed change in the height designator from 2-stories, 35-feet to 40-feet.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	23	Visual Resources Report	The report should address the proposed 60-foot tall clock tower. If the tower would be visible from surrounding roadways, a photosimulation should be provided that shows the tower.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	24	Visual Resources Report	Staff disagrees with the conclusion that the project would mitigate the visual impact from surrounding area residences. Please see the previous comments regarding the introduction of features that contrast with the existing visual character and/or quality of the neighborhood or community.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
29	25	Visual Resources Report	Additional changes to the report may be required pending revisions to the project as a result of comments on the technical studies.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
	26	Visual Resources Report	Conclusion. Please update per comments above.		12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
30	1	Wastewater Service Report	Please provide comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District on the wastewater service report. <u>The wastewater services analysis will need to be approved by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.</u>	The Valley Center Municipal Water District has conceptually approved the Wastewater Report.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
30	2	Wastewater Service Report	The report indicates a number of alternatives for wastewater service, including expanding the Lower Moosa Canyon Water Reclamation Facility. The facility is currently under a Major Use Permit (P73-018). Any proposed expansions or alterations to the facility would require a Major Use Permit Modification. Please indicate which alternative the project proposes to implement.		6/14/12	12/10/12
30	3	Wastewater Service Report	All impacts associated with the proposed facilities will need to be analyzed in the technical studies.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
31	1	Water Service Report	Please provide comments from the Valley Center Municipal Water District on the water service report. <u>The water services analysis will need to be approved by the Valley Center Municipal Water District.</u>	The Valley Center Municipal Water District has conceptually approved the Water Service Report.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
31	2	Water Service Report	All impacts associated with the proposed facilities will need to be analyzed in the technical studies.		6/14/12	12/10/12
32	1	Water Supply Assessment	As required by Water Code Section 10915 (referred to as Senate Bill 221) and 10631 (referred to as Senate Bill 610), the project is required to complete a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) and Water Verification Report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
32	2	Water Supply Assessment	Please clarify whether the District has demonstrated its ability to supply the Lilac Hills project without on-site conservation, the use of on-site groundwater, or the use of recycled water that the project may generate.		12/10/12	3/20/13
33	1	Zoning Ordinance	A Designator is required for the Single Family Residential portions of the project to ensure that future development is consistent with the Specific Plan. The "D" Designator and any specific requirements should be included in the proposed Rezone.		6/14/12	12/10/12
34	1	Site Plan (Single Family)	Please add "V" Setback Designator to the Site Plan.	The Site Plan indicates "V" setbacks.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
34	2	Site Plan (Single Family)	Please add the project number to the Site Plan (3500 12-017).		12/10/12	3/20/13
34	3	Site Plan (Single Family)	Please ensure that the proposed residences will not encroach into the ultimate building line setback from existing West Lilac Road or proposed West Lilac Road. The plan may need to be updated pending approval of the Traffic Study.		12/10/12	3/20/13
34	4	Site Plan (Single Family)	Please see the comments on the Single Family Residential Development Standards under Specific Plan. The same changes should be made to sheet 5 of the Site Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
34	5	Site Plan (Single Family)	Please indicate the height of the proposed homes shown on sheet 6. The height should be measured to the midpoint of the roof.	Resolved	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
34	6	Site Plan (Single Family)	Please see the comments on the Preliminary Grading Plan and Tentative Map. Additional corrections may be required pending approval of the technical studies.		12/10/12	3/20/13
34	7	Site Plan (Single Family)	The conceptual architectural elevations depict wider homes than what the proposed lots may allow. The elevation renderings should more closely resemble the proposed homes in size, especially width.		12/10/12	3/20/13
35	1	Parking Exhibit	The parking exhibit indicates that Phase 1 has a total of 344 dwelling units; however, the Implementing Tentative Map indicates only 342 dwelling units. Please revise as necessary.		12/10/12	3/20/13
35	2	Parking Exhibit	The parking exhibit assumes that 286 dwelling units have 2 parking spaces available in the proposed driveways. However, a standard parking space is 9-feet by 19-feet and the proposed driveways do not appear to be this long in length. For example, a number of the single family dwelling units have garage access directly off proposed roadways. Please revise as necessary.		12/10/12	3/20/13
35	3	Parking Exhibit	The parking exhibit should remove the word "assume" and state whether all the dwelling units have 2 car garages. This should correspond with the Specific Plan figures.		12/10/12	3/20/13
35	4	Parking Exhibit	The parking exhibit will need to be revised based upon approval of the Fire Protection Plan and Traffic Study.		12/10/12	3/20/13
35	5	Parking Exhibit	The parking exhibit should also address phasing. Staff recommends that a table be provided indicating the number of parking spaces within each phase (1a, 1b, 1c).		12/10/12	3/20/13
36	1	Phasing Exhibit	The proposed construction phasing exhibit does not appear to meet dead-end road length standards. Please see Major Project Issue #4.		12/10/12	3/20/13
36	2	Phasing Exhibit	The proposed construction phasing exhibit does not match the Traffic Study. In the Traffic Study, phase 1 is all one phase and not divided up into three separate phases as indicated in the construction phasing exhibit. Please revise as necessary.		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS (Department of Planning & Development Services) Planning and CEQA Comments

Item	No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
36	3	Phasing Exhibit	The construction phasing exhibit needs to provide cross sections and details for the proposed temporary access roads associated with each phase (1a, 1b, and 1c). Additional revisions may be required depending on the details of the roadway exhibits.		12/10/12	3/20/13
36	4	Phasing Exhibit	Phase 1a of the construction phasing exhibit does not match the Specific Plan regarding the dedication of biological open space. Please revise the exhibit as necessary.	The biological open space phasing is addressed in the biology report.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
36	5	Phasing Exhibit	The construction phasing exhibit will need to be revised upon approval of the Traffic Study and Fire Protection Plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
36	6	Phasing Exhibit	Additional information may be required depending on the revisions to the phasing exhibit. For example, sight distance certification may be required for any access roads entering West Lilac Road.		12/10/12	3/20/13
36	7	Phasing Exhibit	The Preliminary Grading Plan should be updated to account for the information provided in Phase 1a and 1b, including width, grade, material, access rights, etc.		12/10/12	3/20/13
37	1	Mineral Resources	Please provide an assessment of the quality of the alluvium within the active drainages and canyons at the project site and whether or not it would be PCC-grade material. If the answer is yes, please quantify the amount of PCC-grade sand that might be present within areas underlain by alluvium and whether there would be enough to exceed the construction materials threshold of \$12,500,000 (in 1996 equivalent dollars).		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	1	General Comment	Pending resubmittal of the project's CEQA Drainage Study, Stormwater Management Plan and Hydromodification Report, further improvements may be required to the surrounding area as mitigation for drainage/stormwater impacts caused by this project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
1	2	General Comment	Pending applicant submittal and review of the project's Traffic Impact Study and proposed access, further improvements may be required to the surrounding area as mitigation for traffic impacts caused by this project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
1	3	General Comment	Pending applicant submittal and review of the project's Traffic Impact Study by Caltrans, further improvements may be required to the surrounding area as mitigation for traffic impacts caused by this project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
1	4	General Comment	Pending resubmittal of the project's Fire Protection Plan, further improvements may be required to the site and the surrounding area as required mitigation.		6/14/12	12/10/12
1	5	General Comment	It is the applicant's responsibility to provide suitable evidence that off-site improvements (which includes grading) and dedications, grants (if any), and/or easements can be accomplished without resorting to the County of San Diego assistance. This evidence can be provided in several differenced forms: A title report showing applicant has the right to construct improvements along with a title company guarantee (\$20,000) acknowledging those rights, a recorded grant deed or recorded right to purchase for the area where improvements are to be constructed, or other evidence satisfactory to the County that clearly shows an existing and continuing right to construct the required improvements. If suitable evidence is not provided, then PDS may recommend denial of the project.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
1	6	General Comment	Street knuckles shall meet the minimum requirements of San Diego County Design Standard DS-15 or a formal exception request is required.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	7	General Comment	Identify and process formal exception requests for public and private streets that do not meet County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards.	Submitted and in process.	6/14/12 12/10/12	
1	8	General Comment	The total number of lots has changed on the Implementing TM. Make sure this revision is made on all necessary studies and exhibits.		12/10/12	3/20/13
1	9	General Comment	The proposal to have a public storm drain systems within the proposed private streets needs to be approved by Field Operations.		12/10/12	3/20/13
2	1	Master Tentative Map	Add TM Number "5571" to plans.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	2	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 1: The existing West Lilac Road street section shows a 48' R/W dedication and the improvement of minimum 8 foot meandering trail. Additional improvements may be required on existing West Lilac Road pending approval of the TIS. The proposed West Lilac Road has to be fully improved and accepted by the County before existing West Lilac Road can be declassified. Pending approval of the TIS.	Resolved	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
2	3	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 1: Remove street sections that are not required for Master TM Improvements. For remaining street sections, list the name of the street that the section pertains to.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	4	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 1: An alternative street section is provided for Lilac Hills Ranch Road. Will the final section be determined with the approval of the TIS or are both sections going to be optional at final engineering? Please advise for conditioning purposes.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	5	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 2: Several easements are proposed to be vacated or quit claimed. The easement are to be shown on the final map and the vacations processed through the Department of Real Estate Services. Quitclaim documents should also be provided. All easements holders need to agree to vacate or quitclaim easements prior to approval of the Tentative Map.	To be a condition.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
2	6	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 3: Provide excel spreadsheet that lists proposed easements to be vacated by ownership rights and type.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	7	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: The grading plan includes a note that existing West Lilac Road will be improved westerly to the I-15 bridge. Add the same note to tentative map and show the proposed off-site improvement on the plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	8	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Add centerline information on the plan (i.e. street stationing, BCs, ECs, street grades, horizontal radius, etc.).		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	9	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Off-site improvements are proposed for existing West Lilac Road, Lot 2 and "A" Street. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide suitable evidence that off-site improvements and dedications, grants (if any), and/or easements can be obtained without resorting to the County of San Diego for assistance. Evidence must be provided that demonstrates that the applicant has the ability to construct the off-site improvements.	The Master TM has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
2	10	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Show limits of HOA Lot "DD" adjacent to round-about at the westerly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	11	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Show access information for the NAP Lots.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	12	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Show limits of HOA Lot "HH" adjacent to round-about at the easterly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	13	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Provide additional details for proposed round-about at the easterly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road. The connection does not appear to line-up with existing West Lilac Road. Will additional improvement be required off-site to make the connection? Provide up large scale detail of proposed connection.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	14	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Lot 9 label missing. Please add.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
2	15	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 5: The grading plan includes a note that existing Mountain Ridge Road will be improved southerly to Circle R Drive. Add the same note to tentative map and show the proposed off-site improvement on the plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	16	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Add street section on Sheet 1 for Mountain Ridge. Add Mountain Ridge Road Cross Section to Title Sheet.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
2	17	Master Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Off-site improvements are proposed for Lilac Hills Ranch Road. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide suitable evidence that off-site improvements and dedications, grants (if any), and/or easements can be accomplished without resorting to the County of San Diego assistance.		6/14/12	12/10/12
2	18	Master Tentative Map	NOTE: Final street sections subject to change based on the final acceptance of the project TIS. The sections will need to be revised pending approval of the TIS.	Resolved	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
2	19	Master Tentative Map	NOTE: Final public trail easement locations/dimensions pending approval from the Department of Parks and Recreation. The location/dimension of the trails are pending approval of the Department of Parks and Recreation.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
2	20	Master Tentative Map	Title Sheet: Traffic calming detail notes the road narrows down to 18 feet for one way streets. Fire must approve proposed width.		12/10/12	3/20/13
2	21	Master Tentative Map	Title Sheet: I-15 Detail: Fix concrete sidewalk note.		12/10/12	3/20/13
2	22	Master Tentative Map	Sheet 4: Label Street "Z" as public. Label West Lilac Road on eastern section and label as public.		12/10/12	3/20/13
2	23	Master Tentative Map	For off-site improvements, provide easement document numbers and any other easement information affecting proposed improvements. If right of way is to be dedicated, clearly dimension proposed right-of-way dedication and label as "proposed future dedication."		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
2	24	Master Tentative Map	Sheet 8: Include proposed wall height in dimension. Include ROW dimension for Covey Lane.		12/10/12	3/20/13
2	25	Master Tentative Map (Traffic Planning)	Street section 1C should put 6 foot shoulder/BL on the south side and 4 foot shoulder/BL on north side. This will put the uphill (eastbound) shoulder as wider, and the downhill (westbound) as narrower making the facility more favorable for cyclist riding in the BL/shoulder.	Resolved	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
3	1	Implementing Tentative Map	Add TM Number "5572" to plans.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	2	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 1: The existing West Lilac Road street section shows a 48' R/W dedication and the improvement of minimum 8 foot meandering trail. Additional improvements may be required on existing West Lilac Road pending approval of the TIS. The proposed West Lilac Road has to be fully improved and accepted by the County before existing West Lilac Road can be declassified.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
3	3	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 1: Add cross section for proposed 20 foot wide utility and access easement to temporary detention basin and sewer treatment plant.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	4	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 1: An alternative street section is provided for Lilac Hills Ranch Road. Will the final section be determined with the approval of the TIS or are both sections going to be optional at final engineering? Please advise for conditioning purposes.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	5	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 1: On street sections, list the name of the street that the section pertains to.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	6	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 3: Several easements are proposed to be vacated or quit claimed. The easement are to be shown on the final map and the vacations processed through the Department of Real Estate Services. Quitclaim documents should also be provided. All easements holders need to agree to vacate or quitclaim easements prior to approval of the Tentative Map.	To be a condition.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	7	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Show the proposed off-site improvement limits for existing West Lilac Road westerly to the I-15 bridge on the plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	8	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Add centerline information on the plan (i.e. street stationing, BCs, ECs, street grades, horizontal radius, etc.).		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	9	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Provide street name for cul-de-sac serving lots 92 through 96.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	10	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 4: Show the NAP lots located south of Street "Z". Will access to these lots be provided from the project site? It appears there is an existing dirt road that traverses the in the north-south direction.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	11	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 4: How will proposed improvements to existing West Lilac Road be accomplished? Is there a proposed off-site transition? Currently, the TM shows full improvements to the project boundary and no transitional improvement to existing. Please clarify.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	12	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Provide additional details for proposed round-about at the easterly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road. The connection does not appear to line-up with existing West Lilac Road. Will additional improvement be required off-site to make the connection? Provide up large scale detail of proposed connection.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	13	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Label new West Lilac Road. Identify it as "Public."		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	14	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Provide names for the hammerhead streets.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	15	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Label HOA Lot "II" on provide acreage		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	16	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Will Street "O" connect APN 128-280-56? Curb returns are shown on Lot 138 and HOA Lot "II."		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
3	17	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Off-site improvements are proposed for Lilac Hills Ranch Road. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide suitable evidence that off-site improvements and dedications, grants (if any), and/or easements can be obtained without resorting to the County of San Diego for assistance.	The TM has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
3	18	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 6: Label Temporary Sewer Treatment Plant and Detention Basin location.		6/14/12	12/10/12
3	19	Implementing Tentative Map	Show proposed public trail easement locations on the TM. Note that final public trail easement locations/dimensions are pending approval from the Department of Parks and Recreation.	The TM has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
3	20	Implementing Tentative Map	NOTE: Final street sections subject to change based on the final acceptance of the project TIS.	The TM has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
3	21	Implementing Tentative Map	Revised Note 17 on title sheet to read as follows: "Storm drain system will be private except for storm drain within public streets. All public storm drain shown on this TM ..."	The TM has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
3	22	Implementing Tentative Map	SHEET 5: Is triangular northwest corner of Lot 352 being dedicated as a road easement?	The TM has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
4	1	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Add TM Number "5571" to plans.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	2	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Obtain and submit letters of permission to grade and construct improvements off-site.	Required prior to the project moving forward for a decision.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	3	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 1: Remove street sections that are not required for Master TM Improvements. For remaining street sections, list the name of the street that the section pertains to.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	4	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 1: Legend: Provide description for fill slopes and add symbol with carrots shaded. Use on grading plan to differential cut and fill slopes.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	5	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 1: Legend: Add retaining wall symbol and description.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	6	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Add centerline information on the plan (i.e. street stationing, BCs, ECs, street grades, horizontal radius, etc.).		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	7	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Show limits of HOA Lot "DD" adjacent to round-about at the westerly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	8	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Show limits of HOA Lot "HH" adjacent to round-about at the easterly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	9	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Show the limits of off-site grading associated with proposed improvement of existing West Lilac Road westerly to the I-15 bridge.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	10	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Show off-site grading (if any) required for proposed roundabout at the easterly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	11	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Lot 9 label missing. Please add.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	12	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Major grading (contiguous grading that supports multiple pads) shall also show adequate cross-sections to illustrate the proposed change in land form.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	13	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Include Q ₁₀₀ information at outfall locations. Add basin sizing information. Some outfall locations are missing Q100 Information.	Resolved	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
4	14	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Provide graded radius information for roundabouts.		6/14/12	12/10/12
4	15	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Per Grading Ordinance, Section 87.402, all cut or fill slopes exceeding forty feet in vertical height shall have drainage terraces.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	16	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	The proposal to have a public storm drain systems within the proposed private streets needs to be approved by Field Operations. Include the easement information for the public storm drain proposed within private roads and properties.		12/10/12	3/20/13
4	17	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Show how access will be provided for proposed public storm drain systems not within the County ROW. Applies only to storm drain improvement on Covey Lane which is proposed as public. Remainder of system is private.	The plans have been resolved to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
4	18	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	For off-site improvements, provide easement document numbers and any other easement information affecting proposed improvements. If right of way is to be dedicated, clearly dimension proposed right-of-way dedication and label as "proposed future dedication."		12/10/12	3/20/13
4	19	Master Tentative Map Preliminary Grading Plan	Sheet 7: Sections should clearly identify existing roads, i.e. Covey, Rodriguez, Mountain Ridge.	Resolved	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
5	1	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	Add TM Number "5572" to plans.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5	2	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	Obtain and submit letters of permission to grade and construct improvements off-site.	Required prior to the project moving forward for a decision.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
5	3	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 1: Remove street sections that are not required for Master TM Improvements. For remaining street sections, list the name of the street that the section pertains to.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5	4	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 1: Legend: Provide description for fill slopes and add symbol with carrots shaded. Use on grading plan to differential cut and fill slopes.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5	5	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 1: Legend: Add retaining wall symbol and description.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
5 6	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 1: Add cross section for proposed 20 foot wide utility and access easement to temporary detention basin and sewer treatment plant.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 7	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Show the limits of off-site grading associated with proposed improvement of existing West Lilac Road westerly to the I-15 bridge.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 8	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Add Q ₁₀₀ information at all outfall locations. Some outfall locations are missing Q100 Information.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
5 9	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Provide street name for cul-de-sac serving lots 92 through 96.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 10	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Correctly label Street "T." Currently, knuckle section of Street "S" is labeled incorrectly as Street "T."		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 11	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 3: Provide names for the hammerhead streets.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 12	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 3: Label HOA Lot "II" on provide acreage		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 13	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 3: Show off-site grading (if any) required for proposed roundabout at the easterly intersection of existing West Lilac Road and New West Lilac Road.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 14	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 3: Include Q ₁₀₀ information at outfall locations. Add basin sizing information. Some outfall locations are missing Q100 Information.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
5 15	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 3: What is purpose of Low Flow Water Quality Pipe? How does this work? Not discussed on Drainage Study.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5 16	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 4: Include Q ₁₀₀ information at outfall locations. Add basin sizing information. Some outfall locations are missing Q100 Information.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
5	17	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	Provide graded radius information for roundabouts.		6/14/12	12/10/12
5	18	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	The proposal to have a public storm drain systems within the proposed private streets needs to be approved by Field Operations. Include the easement information for the public storm drain proposed within private roads and properties.		12/10/12	3/20/13
5	19	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	Show how access will be provided for all proposed public storm drain systems not within the County ROW.		12/10/12	3/20/13
5	20	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	Revised Note 12 on title sheet to read as follows: "Storm drain system will be private except for storm drain within public streets. All public storm drain shown on this TM ..."	The plans have been resolved to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
5	21	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 2: Remove retaining wall shown outside the boundary limits of the TM. Adjacent to Bio Open Space Lot "C."	The plans have been resolved to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
5	22	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 3: Is triangular northwest corner of Lot 352 being dedicated as a road easement? Approval from existing easement holders will be required for proposed emergency access gate on Street "U."	The plans have been resolved to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
5	23	Implementing TM Preliminary Grading Plan	SHEET 3: Change "Future CL West Lilac Road" label to "Future . . . Main Street."	The plans have been resolved to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	1	Traffic Analysis	The next submittal should address potential project access to/from the south connecting to Circle R Drive. The current submittal only addressed the northern portion of the project site and sole access to/from West Lilac Road. The project's traffic analysis must address the whole project and not only the proposed northern development.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	2	Traffic Analysis	The next submittal must provide detailed information/data regarding the project's proposed onsite/internal public and private road system. The submittal must clearly identify which onsite road are proposed to be public or private and provide detailed traffic and design data/information such as projected traffic volumes, road classification, cross-section widths, curve radius, centerline location, and intersection controls.	Information provided by the applicant.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	3	Traffic Analysis	The project's traffic analysis should demonstrate the projected traffic volumes resulting from the proposed project can be adequately accommodated by the proposed roadway classifications and adopted Mobility Element Plan.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	4	Traffic Analysis	The next submittal should provide detailed information/data regarding the project's required offsite road improvements in addition to the proposed onsite road improvements.		6/14/12	12/10/12
6	5	Traffic Analysis	The project's traffic analysis must analyze the project's proposed phasing plan and identify onsite/offsite traffic impacts resulting from each development phase and the corresponding recommended mitigation measures. Pending approval of the TIS.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	6	Traffic Analysis	It should be noted that the project will be required to develop according to the sequence of phasing assumed in the TIS unless phasing alternatives are provided. The project applicant/consultant should consider the Construction Phasing Plan (CPP) guidelines (attached) that resulted from the recent Major Subdivision Improvement Process/Subdivision Ordinance revisions. The findings from the CPP can be incorporated into the project's Improvement Agreement. Pending approval of the TIS.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	7	Traffic Analysis	Tentative Map (TM): The TM and road cross-sections cannot be fully reviewed because the traffic study with the detailed traffic data has not been submitted for evaluation. Pending approval of the TIS.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	8	Traffic Analysis	The TM should identify the intersection treatment at the transition from Old W. Lilac Road to (new) West Lilac Road. The TM shows a footprint that may encompass a roundabout. Pending approval of the TIS.	Resolved	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	9	Traffic Analysis	Note that unlike intersection design which can be done in the final design stage, roundabout design has to be done with the map as the roundabout geometry can have a big influence on the ROW. <i>Public Roads Standard Section 6I</i> <i>Roundabouts are also acceptable traffic control devices at intersections. Prior to placement of a roundabout a comprehensive engineering design prepared by a licensed civil engineer experienced in the design and construction of roundabouts must be prepared. A peer review of the roundabout design should also be provided prior to installation of a roundabout on a mobility element Road. "Roundabouts: An informational Guide" published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) should be consulted as a guide in the design of the roundabout. Striping and pavement markings for the roundabout should conform to the CA MUTCD. Pending approval of the TIS .</i>	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	10	Traffic Analysis	The project roundabouts shall be designed in accordance with NCHRP 672. "Roundabouts: An informational Guide" published by (FHWA) has been updated to "NCHRP Report 672 - Roundabouts: An Informational Guide, Second Edition". Pending approval of the TIS.	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	11	Traffic Analysis	The project shall provide a peer review of the proposed roundabout designs. The peer review shall consist of a narrative summarizing the Roundabout analysis contained in the project traffic study (Chapter 21 HCM 2010) and expand on that to include an analysis of the sizing and spacing requirements as outlined in Section 3.5 of NCHRP Report 672 as well as comparative performance analysis as outlined in Section 3.6 of NCHRP Report 672. The peer review shall include geometric exhibits prepared at 40 scale detailing ROW, sidewalk, curb and gutter, outer circle, inner circle, center island median detail, 300' of all approaches, splitter islands, crosswalks, bicycle access, lines of sight on all approaches, complete dimensions and cross sections. A separate truck turning exhibit shall be provided as well. Pending approval of the TIS.	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	12	Traffic Analysis	The roundabout designer shall pay particular attention to the design criteria for approach flare, exit flare, splitter island, and crosswalk location. In addition, note the sight distance requirements (approach, circulatory and sidewalk). These important design elements will enlarge the footprint of the roundabouts beyond what is shown on the current TTM. Pending approval of the TIS.	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	13	Traffic Analysis	The design vehicle for the roundabout design will be a AASHTO WB-50. The vehicle must track completely within the asphalt portion of the roundabout. Note that roadways intersecting at a roundabout with angles less than 90° may require a separate right turn facility serving the two roadways. Per section 6.1.D that any intersecting roadways with centerline intersection angles less than 70° or greater than 110° require a design exception. Pending approval of the TIS.	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	14	Traffic Analysis	The TM shows Lilac Hills Ranch Road transition from a private to Public Road, south of the couplet. The public road should terminate with another public road or identify where the private road will continue to the next road connection. Pending approval of the TIS.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	15	Traffic Analysis	The TM should address the maintenance responsibility of Old West Lilac, since it will no longer be a Mobility Element Roadway. Pending approval of the TIS.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	16	Traffic Analysis	Street 'O' has a close intersection with Street 'Z' and the intersection of West Lilac Road and should be reviewed. Pending approval of the TIS.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
6	17	Traffic Analysis	The TM should show the centerline radius of all public and private roads. Pending approval of the TIS.	Resolved	6/14/12 12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	18	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should add the Camino Del Rey/Old River Road intersection to the study analyses.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	19	Traffic Analysis	The consultant should review the Public Road Standards LOS table to verify the accuracy of the Table 2.2 information (Pg.8). There are errors in the Major Road 4.1A LOS capacity thresholds.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	20	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should identify/clarify the date(s) when the existing traffic count data was collected. The Appendix A and footnotes information indicates the existing traffic count data is based on 2008 and 2011 counts plus SANDAG 2008 model data.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	21	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should clearly identify what onsite roads assumed to be built with each phase of the project.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	22	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should clearly identify what frontage and offsite road improvements are assumed to be built with each of the project phases. The phased road improvement listing and figures should include road improvements needed to mitigate the project's impact, project design features, and/or road improvements required by Centerline/Subdivisions Ordinances.	The TIS has been updated to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	23	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should explain how the internal and external trip factors were derived for the land use categories and by project phases. Examples include what is the basis for the 50% Commercial internal capture rate or what is the basis for the 24% internal capture rate at Phase 3.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	24	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should provide more detailed information about the trip attraction and distribution assumptions for the proposed schools. If the schools are charter based, that would expand the potential catchment area for the student population. The relation of the school population and neighborhood proximity has direct correlation to the distribution and internal capture assumptions posed.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	25	Traffic Analysis	The TIS identifies proposed Elementary and Middle schools. The trip generation estimate for the proposed schools is based on acreage. If known at this time, the maximum number of projected students for each school should be the basis of the schools' trip generation estimate.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	26	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should identify the location of the nearest high school(s) that could serve the project site.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	27	Traffic Analysis	The trip generation factor for church (30 trips per acre) should note that is the weekday rate. SANDAG guidelines state that the church weekday trip rate should be quadruple for Sundays/days of assembly.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	28	Traffic Analysis	The TIS (Pg. 239) should include an Override (in the EIR) for the "over-capacity" condition of West Lilac Road in the Horizon Year analysis.	Resolved	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	29	Traffic Analysis	The TIS (Table 6.2) identifies cumulative impacts to numerous locations with mitigation as TIF payment. The TIS should note that the project is a non-conforming GPA and thus not included in the TIF program. Mitigation for cumulative impacts may include payment of TIF, however, additional measures should be included for considerations	Resolved	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	30	Traffic Analysis	The TIS (Table 9.3 and 9.8) should remove 'cumulative' from the impact header of the Horizon Year impacts.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	31	Traffic Analysis	The TIS (Pg. 239) should acknowledge the planning level impacts of the project to West Lilac Road and Old Highway 395 and propose 'planning level' over-rides due to the marginal deficiencies exceeding volume to capacity. The arterial level-of-service results can be incorporated as part of the justification to accept the over-ride.	Resolved	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	32	Traffic Analysis	The TIS should discuss the potential of early phase development traffic combined with construction traffic for the project's latter phases and potential impact to project site traffic conditions. This should also include any traffic associated with transporting wastewater off-site.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	33	Traffic Analysis	<p>2. TIS uses residential trip generation rates that are more conservative than standard SANDAG (and ITE) rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Single Family: TIS = 6.9 / DU vs. SANDAG = 10 / DU b. Multi Family: TIS = 4.8 / DU vs. SANDAG = 8 / DU <p>The reduced trip generation rate results in a significant overall trip reduction of 3,983 trips (32%) for the Single Family and Multi Family land uses. Staff does not support the reduced trip generation estimation. The TIS should use the standard 10/8/DU for residential and multi-family, respectively. The example provided as justification is of a limited sample size. The applicant is advised to use regional standards. They are also encouraged to engage SANDAG to update the trip generation manual to better reflect the findings of their research.</p>		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	34	Traffic Analysis	<p>3. The TIS (Sec. 4.2.2) should remove discussion of other project internal capture rates (Campus Park/Meadowood). The internal capture rate of project is unique to each project and should be derived from the complementary land uses within (or adjacent) to the project as justification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Single Family: TIS = 6.9 / DU vs. SANDAG = 10 / DU b. Multi Family: TIS = 4.8 / DU vs. SANDAG = 8 / DU 		12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
			The reduced trip generation rate results in a significant overall trip reduction of 3,983 trips (32%) for the Single Family and Multi Family land uses. Additional clarification should be provided to justify the use of the lower residential trip generation rates for the proposed project.			
6	35	Traffic Analysis	3. The TIS (Sec. 4.2.2) should remove discussion of other project internal capture rates (Campus Park/Meadowood). The internal capture rate of project is unique to each project and should be derived from the complementary land uses within (or adjacent) to the project as justification.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6	36	Traffic Analysis	4. The following Table 10.5 (Pg.267) errors/inconsistencies should be corrected: a. E+P (Buildout) i. Gopher Canyon Road (E.Vista to I-15) "No" 1. Table 5.2.1 = Direct Impact "Yes" ii. E. Vista Way (Gopher Canyon to Osborne) "No" 1. Table 5.2.1 = Direct Impact "Yes" b. Horizon + Project (with Road 3) No Roadway Cumulative Impacts i. Table 9.3: "Yes" Roadway Cum. Impacts 1. W. Lilac Road (Old Hwy 395 to "A") 2. Old Hwy 395 (E. Dulin to W. Lilac) c. Horizon + Project (without Road 3) No Roadway Cumulative Impacts i. Table 9.8: "Yes" 1. Old Hwy 395 (E. Dulin to W. Lilac) 2. Lilac Road (Old Castle to Anthony)		12/10/12	3/20/13
			Traffic Calming at Intersections (Exhibit 2): The project engineer should coordinate with County Traffic staff to refine the proposed design features for traffic calming measures at onsite project site intersections. Some general comments include:			3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6 37	Traffic Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ø The proposed bulbouts do not accommodate the SU30 without crossing the centerline. Ø The proposed design should accommodate SU30 legally and WB-50 should be able to make the turn Ø Crosswalks should be removed/not included at a non-control intersection. 		12/10/12	
6 38	Traffic Analysis	West Lilac Road couplet: West Lilac Road is a Mobility Element road. County staff's initial recommendation is not to create a split/couplet design road. However; if a couplet road continues to be proposed then the project applicant/engineer should work closely with County Traffic staff to develop the striping and signage plan.		12/10/12	3/20/13
6 39	Traffic Analysis	Roundabout analyses: The following comments are regarding the roundabout design analyses. The project traffic consultant/engineer and roundabout designer are strongly encouraged to coordinate with County Traffic staff in the review and development of the roundabout designs. In addition to the comments below, the project consultant/engineer should address all roundabout design comments included the Project Issue Checklist.	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6 40	Traffic Analysis	All proposed public roads shall meet Public Road Standards.	Exception requests in process.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6 41	Traffic Analysis	An IOD will not be acceptable for the portion of West Lilac Road the traverses the property. This is a property frontage improvement. Construct per Public Road Standards.	An EIR alternative has been provided that includes 2.2C frontage improvements.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6 42	Traffic Analysis	Please explain how the reduced shoulder associated with the 2.2F vs. 2.2C for West Lilac Road will improve public safety.	An EIR alternative has been provided that includes 2.2C frontage improvements.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6 43	Traffic Analysis	Only identify cross sections of proposed public roads as per County Standards if the roadway meets all classification requirements. Refer to the cross section as a 'modified' if the cross section only meets a portion of the Private Road Standards.	Information provided by the applicant.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	44	Traffic Analysis	The proposed ROW is insufficient for Roundabouts. Please provide the Roundabout design for review. The traffic study will not be able to be formally approved until the roundabout design has been deemed acceptable.	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	45	Traffic Analysis	SHEET 1 OF 8: Minimum clear recover zone is 8' min to 20' max for any fixed object within R/W,	The Tentative Maps have been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	46	Traffic Analysis	SHEET 1 OF 8: Please continue structural section under curb and gutter.	The Tentative Maps have been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	47	Traffic Analysis	SHEET 6 OF 8: Taper length shall be $WS^2/60$ for speeds 40mph or less and WS for speeds greater than 40 mph.	The Tentative Maps have been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	48	Traffic Analysis	SHEET 7 OF 8: Retaining wall shall meet clear recovery zone criteria for the fixed object within R/W.	The Tentative Maps have been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
6	49	Traffic Analysis	Traffic will do complete review of the plans when a complete submittal is made for the project.	The Tentative Maps have been revised to address the comments.	3/20/13	6/13/13
Torus 4.0 Roundabout Summary Report:						
6	40	Traffic Analysis	<p>The summary report should address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should be design based on WB-50 vehicle type (Semi trailer combination truck). For many non-Mobility Element Residential and Rural Street, a SU-30 (Single Unit Truck) may be used. 2. Use design speed to generate all appropriate radii for all approaches and within roundabout (i.e. flare radii, entry radii, exit radii, and etc.) 3. Minimum initial entering speeds must conform to the design speed of the roadway. 4. Minimum lane width is 12 feet. 5. All Stopping sight distances results to shall meet current County Sight Distance Standards. (I.e. approach sight distance, sight distance on circulatory roadway, sight distance to crosswalks, and etc.) 6. Distance from the front should be a minimum of 10 feet. 7. Distance from Driver's side should a minimum of 2 feet. 	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
6	41	Traffic Analysis	<p>Typical Roundabout Exhibit Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exhibit should display design for proper vehicle type and speed. • The exhibit should address the following items: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inscribed circle diameter 2. Entry width 3. Circulatory roadway width 4. Central island 5. Approach curves/radii 6. Entry curves/radii 7. Exit curves/radii 8. Pedestrian crossing location and treatment 9. Splitter islands 10. Stopping sight distance 11. Intersection sight distance 12. Vertical consideration 13. Bicycle provision 14. Sidewalk treatment 	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
6	42	Traffic Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exhibit should show the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design vehicle swept paths for all approach, directions, and movements. 2. Truck aprons design and dimensions. 3. Typical signing and striping on all approach and within roundabout 4. 300 foot on all approaches 	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
7	1	Specific Plan	The TM and SP should reference the Valley Center Community Right of Way Development Standards. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	2	Specific Plan	The SP (Pg. II-5, II-15) should be more specific about the "couplet" condition of new West Lilac Road. The TM and SP should show this potential ultimate configuration as part of the GPA. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	3	Specific Plan	The SP (Pg. II-14) should note that the first implementing TM does not include a full public road connection of West Lilac Road and therefore Old W. Lilac Road will remain in use. Further to that point, frontage improvements will need to be made to Old W. Lilac to accommodate additional project traffic until the full connection with New W. Lilac is completed. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	An EIR alternative has been provided that includes 2.2C frontage improvements.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	4	Specific Plan	Figure 16 should show more explicit connections from the southern boundary of Lilac Hills Road to public or private roads. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	5	Specific Plan	Figure 21, Lilac Hills Ranch Road should include a Bike Lane symbol and provisions. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	6	Specific Plan	The SP (III-3) should refer to roundabouts not traffic circles at project intersections. Design and implementation of these features should follow MUTCD and FHWA guidance and close consultation with Public Works staff when implemented on public roads as noted in the TM comments. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	7	Specific Plan	The SP (Page II-15) – New West Lilac Road dimensions look correct for a light collector but in the narrative there is mention of bike lanes. There are no bike lanes on a light collector. There are shoulders. The addition of a bike lane will add 10' to the total ROW (5' each side) or a parking prohibition should be proposed. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	8	Specific Plan	The SP (Pg. II-15) Lilac Hills Ranch Road is identified as a residential collector but described as 33' curb to curb on 62' of right of way. That should be 40' on 60' per PRS. A design exception is required for the two way traffic portion to remain, however, the couplet portion can be identified as such and documented in the SP/TM. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	9	Specific Plan	The SP (III-16) should describe that the GPA will also require relocation of the Mobility Element West Lilac Road (and any potential reclassification). Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	10	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan describes the proposed project as a walkable mixed use community. The project's traffic study should clearly document an internal capture rate (i.e. reduced trip generation estimate) assumptions derived from the proposed walkable mixed use community. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The traffic study and Specific Plan have been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	11	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should also discuss the proposed project's walkability as it relates to the proposed Senior Citizen Village. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The traffic study and Specific Plan have been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	12	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan should identify if any proposed onsite road designs will deviate from Public Road Standards and require a design exception for approval. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	Exception requests in process.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	13	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates (III-5) that all public streets comply with County Standards for public streets in urban development areas. The Specific Plan should clarify what portion of the proposed project would be considered an "urban" area. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	14	Specific Plan	The project's traffic study will provide the information/data needed to determine if the project's proposed onsite road classifications/designs will be adequate to accommodate projected traffic volumes. Subsequently, the project's proposed internal circulation (Fig.16) can only be considered conceptual at this time. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	15	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan shows trees/vegetation planted within the right of-way. If public onsite roads are identified, the documents should identify how the roads will be landscaped and maintained. A landscape maintenance district may need to be provided. The Homeowners Association should consider owning and maintaining all of the onsite streets/roads. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	16	Specific Plan	The SP/GPA Report/Streetscape Plan should note that trees/vegetation planted within the right-of-way must maintain adequate lines of sight and sight distance along the roadways. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	17	Specific Plan	The Specific Plan indicates (Pg. IV-6) that public road improvements and mitigation measures for traffic impacts are identified in the Traffic impact Analysis (TIA). The TIA was not available for staff's review at the time the Specific Plan document was reviewed. Pending approval of the Specific Plan.	The Traffic Study has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
7	18	Specific Plan	Figure 52 (III-58) should consider moving the market to front any of the adjacent streets. Having the market face an internal sea of parking will discourage non-driving trips to the store, which is the point of the central village and mixed use core.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Figure 52, elements such as the banquet facility should show direct person access from the surrounding sidewalks and streets.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Design exceptions for road cross sections that do not meet Public Road Standards will be necessary before conditional approval in order to move forward with the project's proposed GPA and SP. Specifically, West Lilac Road as a 2.2C and the project's proposed downgrade of West Lilac Road to a 2.2F.	Exception requests in process.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Page 11-20 incorrectly references 12 foot pathway, please correct to reference "parkway"	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	19	Specific Plan	Figure 20 and Trail guidance siting should provide vertical profiles to ensure grades meet trail standards.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Figure 27 should move the 6 foot shoulder to the south side and have the 4 foot shoulder/bike lane on the north side (unless centerline/crown is an obstacle) or balance with 5 foot shoulder/bike-lanes on both sides.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Page III-8 (d. Feeder Trails) should remove language about the Feeder trails being located within the public road ROW. Only Type D pathways shall be within road ROW's. The feeder trails can be on private property within a public easement.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Page III-9 includes the statement that "all trails will be dedicated to the public....except those", the paragraph should state that public trails will be located in main Lilac Hills Ranch, while private trails are within the senior citizen neighborhood.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Ranch Multi-Use Trail appears to enter the senior citizen community and should remain a public trail as it provides connections from the northern pathways and trails and links to southern regional trails. 	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maps and figures should identify where the public dedicated trails and private trails are located. 	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Figure 47 shows a 2 foot public trail easement on Covey Lane section. Expand the easement to a standard size (and tread) or explain why it the narrow easement is necessary.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	19	Specific Plan	Figure 70 (Master Landscape Concept Plan) should remove the trail designations as they are hard to read (even at full scale) or provide more contrast (square symbols). Also the roundabout symbol should note every location or be removed completely and only deal with the landscape plan.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	19	Specific Plan	Figure 76 (South Main Street Section) shows a 4 foot parking lane on the right side, correct to show 8 foot parking lane as on the left side of the section.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
7	20	Draft EIR	Table S-1 and in Section 2.4 Transportation/Traffic TR-1 through TR-12 should reference Final Map as the timing of mitigation not occupancy.	The Draft EIR has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
7	21	Draft EIR	TR-13 through TR-19 (TIF payment) may reference building permits as the timing of cumulative impact mitigation.	The Draft EIR has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
7	22	Draft EIR	The project proposes to move the Mobility Element designation of existing West Lilac Road to a new road alignment and construct a portion as one-way couplets. The proposed realignment of a Mobility Element (ME) may by itself not warrant a General Plan Amendment (GPA) but the proposed change in the West Lilac Road ME road design should be part of the project's GPA. The Project Description should identify that the project's GPA proposes to change the classification of West Lilac Road from the current 2.2C Light Collector to the one-way couplet design.	The Draft EIR has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
7	23	Draft EIR	The DEIR include a Horizon Year scenario. The applicant should confirm that the Horizon Year, which is a planning assessment, needs to be included in the EIR analysis.	The Draft EIR has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
7	24	Draft EIR	The DEIR should address the over-capacity ("planning level" of West Lilac Road west of the project site and Old Highway 395 and propose an over-ride for acceptance of LOS E for the marginal deficiency.	The Draft EIR has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	25	Draft EIR	The TIS in some cases uses HCM Arterial Analysis to demonstrate adequate roadway segment LOS conditions and that the project's impacts would be less than significant (Ex. Gopher Canyon Road). It is recommended that the DEIR and TIS identify the project's direct impacts based on Public Road Standards road segment LOS criteria (TIS Table 2.2), but that the Arterial Analysis be used as the justification for an override and no mitigation requirement.	The Draft EIR has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
7	26	Draft EIR	The DEIR should address comments regarding the TIS that are applicable to the DEIR (and vice-versa).	The Draft EIR has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12	6/13/13
8	1	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	Streets 'WW', 'Z', and 'ZZZ' should not assume parking toward the entrance of the roundabouts at W. Lilac Road.	The Parking Analysis has been revised to address the comment.	6/14/12 12/10/12	6/13/13
8	2	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	Exhibit 3 (Typical Roundabout) should show the yield striping at the flare entrances.	A third party review is pending. Changes to the ROW or design may be required.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
8	3	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	The exhibit should show typical bike lanes and when they would drop before the intersection.	The Parking Analysis has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
8	4	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	The exhibit should include optional entrances to the sidewalk network for bicycles to access the sidewalk and exit the roadway before entering the roundabout.	The Parking Analysis has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
8	5	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	The exhibit should specify what improvements continue along W. Lilac Road north and south of the roundabout for the sidewalk portion, or trail?	The Parking Analysis has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
8	6	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	Roundabout Exhibit and TM Sheet 4 do not have matching radius.	The Parking Analysis has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
8	7	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	Parking Analysis exhibit and Roundabout exhibit should be consistent. Parking shown on the west and south-east leg of Street "Z" that may be too close to the entrance of the roundabout.	The Parking Analysis has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13
8	8	Parking Analysis / Exhibits	Parking analysis should and street sections should show additional ROW and road surfacing for Old W. Lilac Road if parking is proposed.	The Parking Analysis has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9	1	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Add TM Number "5571" to report title sheet.		6/14/12	12/10/12
9	2	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	On Peak Discharge Rate Summary Table: The "C" values shown on the post-development conditions column do not coincide with values shown on the calculations. Revised "C" values accordingly.		6/14/12	12/10/12
9	3	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Clarify on "Proposed Mitigation" column header that it is specifically to mitigate velocity increases.		6/14/12	12/10/12
9	4	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Pre-Development Exhibit: Screen back existing topo to make it more legible. Include elevations, flow lengths/paths, basin areas and Q ₁₀₀ information at outfall locations.		6/14/12	12/10/12
9	5	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Post-Development Exhibit: Screen back existing topo to make it more legible. Include elevations, flow lengths/paths, basin areas, detention basin locations and sizes, storm drain system and Q ₁₀₀ information at outfall locations.		6/14/12	12/10/12
9	6	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	The post-development calculations use "C" based on anticipated uses within the delineated basins. If changes to the proposed uses are made, the "C" values will need to be revised accordingly.		6/14/12	12/10/12
9	7	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Note: Comments are based on the information available as of the April 30, 2012 submittal. If additional information is received on the ultimate layout of the project site, the drainage study must be revised to address said revisions.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9	8	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	On Calculations for Off-Site Improvements Conclusion, it states that the proposed drainage system at the intersection of Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road is adequate to handle the anticipated flow from the upstream areas. Extend discussion to address what will happened to flow once it enters the County ROW. Is it going into an existing inlet/drainage system? Will it create an issue at the intersection? From the headwall will it sheet flow across the road?		12/10/12	3/20/13
9	9	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Pre-Development Hydrology Map: The total area listed on the Basin 100 table is 618.9 acres. The outfall label and drainage study show 617.5 acres. Address discrepancy.		12/10/12	3/20/13
9	10	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Post-Development Hydrology Map: The total area listed on the Basin 100 table is 588.27 acres. The outfall label and drainage study show 596.7 acres. Address discrepancy.		12/10/12	3/20/13
9	11	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Submit one copy of the Master Drainage Study in final format. The approved copy of the study on file should not be strikeout and underline.		12/10/12 3/20/13	4/25/13
9	12	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Drainage Study must be signed and stamped by EOW.	Master Drainage Study Has Been Accepted as Adequate for CEQA Level Review. Submit One Hard Copy, Signed and Stamped by EOW, For the Land Development Project File.	3/20/13 4/25/13	6/13/13
9	13	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Page 14: Summary Table: Change Node 1131 Q Value from 937.00 to 933.00		3/20/13	4/25/13
9	14	Master Tentative Map Drainage Study	Once all pending items have been addressed, submit hard copy of Drainage Study for final acceptance.		3/20/13	4/25/13
10	1	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Add TM Number "5572" to report title sheet.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.	Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
10 2	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	On Description of Watershed discussion, the discretion specifies that 320 single family pads are proposed. The project actually proposes 350 units. Revise accordingly.		6/14/12	12/10/12
10 3	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	On Peak Discharge Rate Summary Table: The "C" values shown on the post-development conditions column does not coincide with values shown on the calculations. Revised "C" value.		6/14/12	12/10/12
10 4	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Declaration of Responsible Charge must be signed and dated by Registered Engineer.		6/14/12	12/10/12
10 5	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Pre-Development Exhibit: Screen back existing topo to make it more legible. Include elevations, flow lengths, basin areas and detention basin sizes.		6/14/12	12/10/12
10 6	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Post-Development Exhibit: Screen back existing topo to make it more legible. Include elevations, flow lengths, basin areas, detention basin sizes, storm drain system and Q ₁₀₀ information at outfall locations.		6/14/12	12/10/12
10 7	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Note: The pre-development exhibit is showing the existing conditions per the proposed Master mass grading. If there is no intention to mass grade the site, the exhibit should reflect existing conditions not the mass graded condition. If the mass grading will be pursued, any changes that are made to the Master TM mass grading plan should be incorporated into the pre-development exhibit.		6/14/12	12/10/12
10 8	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	The post-development calculations reference nodes 1120 and 1118, but they are not shown on the hydrology map. Please show location of these nodes.		12/10/12	3/20/13
10 9	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Pre-Development Hydrology Map: The total area listed on the Basin is 417.9 acres. The outfall label and drainage study show 395.5 acres. Address discrepancy. The basin summary table on the exhibit still shows a total area of 417.9 acres. This is 22.4 acres more than what analyzed on the calculations.	The Drainage Study has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13 4/25/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
10	10	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Post-Development Hydrology Map: Add mitigated Q ₁₀₀ information on exhibit.		12/10/12	3/20/13
10	11	Implementing Tentative Map Drainage Study	Submit one copy of the Implementing Drainage Study in final format. The approved copy of the study on file should not be strikeout and underline.	<i>Pending Final Acceptance of Study</i>	12/10/12 3/20/13 4/25/13	6/13/13
11	1	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Add TM Number "5571" to report title sheet and on Sheet 3.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	2	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 2: Item 1: Include the community of Bonsall in the project description.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	3	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 2: Item 2: Include the existing zoning and proposed zoning information.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	4	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 2: Item 3: In this section describe the exiting and proposed topography for the project site. Move the drainage summary to Item 6.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	5	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 3: Remove "X" from Numbers 2 through 12. Add "X" to Item Number 13 Yes Column.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	6	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 4: Remove "X" from Numbers 2 through 4, and Number 6. Add "X" to Item Number 5 Yes Column.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	7	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Step 4: Include Hydrologic Sub-Area 903.12, Bonsall.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	8	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 7: Add "X" to "Anticipated" Column for Pesticides.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	9	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Step 6: Up-date this page to latest version in the County SUSMP document.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	10	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 9: The "Potential Source of Runoff Pollutants" listed must match the items selected from tables on Pages 21 through 31. On these tables, add "X" on Item G (Refuse Areas), Item L (Fuel Dispensing Areas) and Item M (Loading Docks) since they have been selected as either Permanent Controls or Operational BMPs. Pending: Table 9: Items Selected from tables on pages 23 - 33 should be listed as follows: Column 1 items checked off should be listed under "Potential source of runoff pollutants" column. Column 3 items checked off should be listed under "permanent source control BMPs" column. Finally, Column 4 items checked off should be listed under "Operational source control BMPs" columns.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
11	11	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 12: Use the latest version of this table. The latest version includes two additional columns to identify if the are proposed for LID and/or HMP uses.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	12	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Page 35: Add Maintenance Category for Vegetated Swale (1), Fossil Filter (2) and Pervious Pavement (1).		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	13	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Table 13: Select Categories 1 and 2 on table.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	14	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Provide Source Control Exhibit. Exhibit should include items selected on Table 9.		6/14/12	12/10/12
11	15	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Attachment D: Use Chapter 4 of the County of San Diego SUSMP. The table should be included that clearly identifies self treating, self retaining, areas draining to self retaining areas and the IMPS. These areas must be clearly shown on the exhibit. Pending: Attachment D: Revise DMA tables as discussed during our working meeting of October 5, 2012.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	16	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Step 1: On Priority Development Project Determination table, Item I should be marked as "Yes." Even though it is anticipated that no improvement will be constructed as part of the Master TM, the TM does show improvements to access road serving the proposed lots. As such, the SWMP should reflect this.		12/10/12	3/20/13
11	17	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Step 2: On Project Stormwater Quality Determination table, Please confirm that Items B and C reflect existing conditions and proposed improvements on the Master TM respectively.		12/10/12	3/20/13
11	18	Master Tentative Map SWMP	Submit one copy of the Master SWMP in final format. The approved copy of the SWMP on file should not be strikeout and underline.	<i>Master TM SWMP Has Been Accepted as Adequate for CEQA Level Review. Submit One Hard Copy, Signed and Stamped by EOW, For the Land Development Project File.</i>	12/10/12 3/20/13 4/25/13	6/13/13
12	1	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Add TM Number "5572" to report title sheet and on Sheet 3.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	2	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 2: Item 1: Include the community of Bonsall in the project description.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	3	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 2: Item 2: Include the existing zoning and proposed zoning information. Change the number of proposed unit to 350 residential dwelling units.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	4	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 2: Item 3: In this section describe the exiting and proposed topography for the project site. Move the drainage summary to Item 6.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	5	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 3: Remove "X" from Numbers 2 through 12. Add "X" to Item Number 13 Yes Column.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	6	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 4: Remove "X" from Numbers 2 through 4, and Number 6. Add "X" to Item Number 5 Yes Column. Pending: From Item 2, move "X" from Yes Column to No Column.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
12	7	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Step 4: Include Hydrologic Sub-Area 903.12, Bonsall.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	8	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 7: Add "X" to "Anticipated" Column for "Bacteria & Viruses" and "Pesticides."		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	9	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Step 6: Up-date this page to latest version in the County SUSMP document.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	10	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 9: The "Potential Source of Runoff Pollutants" listed must match the items selected from tables on Pages 21 through 31. On these tables, add "X" on Item G (Refuse Areas), Item L (Fuel Dispensing Areas) and Item M (Loading Docks) since they have been selected as either Permanent Controls or Operational BMPs. Pending: Table 9: Items Selected from tables on pages 23 - 33 should be listed as follows: Column 1 items checked off should be listed under "Potential source of runoff pollutants" column. Column 3 items checked off should be listed under "permanent source control BMPs" column. Finally, Column 4 items checked off should be listed under "Operational source control BMPs" columns.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
12	11	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 12: Use the latest version of this table. The latest version includes two additional columns to identify if the are proposed for LID and/or HMP uses.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	12	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Page 35: Add Maintenance Category for Vegetated Swale (1), Fossil Filter (2) and Pervious Pavement (1). Pending: Per previous working meeting, permeable pavement is no longer proposed. Remove from BMP table.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
12	13	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 13: Select Categories 1 and 2 on table.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
12	14	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Provide Source Control Exhibit. Exhibit should include items selected on Table 9.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	15	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Attachment D: There are three DMAs identified each with a designated IMP. The IMPs should be named (i.e. IMP 1 for DMA 1) and clearly delineated/shown on the exhibits.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	16	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	On BMP/LID Exhibit, you provide label for proposed storm drain but the system is not shown. Show proposed storm drain system on exhibit. Label IMPs.		6/14/12	12/10/12
12	17	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	On DMA Exhibit, clearly delineate limits of DMAs. Based on the grading plan, you are creating three basins. All three should be identified on the exhibit. Label the IMP facilities on exhibit also. Pending: Clearly delineated DMA boundaries. Not clear on exhibit.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
12	18	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Attachment D: Revise DMA tables as discussed during our working meeting of October 5, 2012.		12/10/12	3/20/13
12	19	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Submit one copy of the Master SWMP in final format. The approved copy of the SWMP on file should not be strikeout and underline.		12/10/12 3/20/13	4/24/13
12	20	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Submit one copy of the Master SWMP in final format. The approved copy of the SWMP on file should not be strikeout and underline.		3/20/13	4/24/13
12	21	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	SWMP must be signed and stamped by EOW.		3/20/13	4/24/13
12	22	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Page 12: Step 4: Change "903 - Sub area Las Lomas Muertas" to 903.11 - San Luis Rey River." Add "Lower San Luis" to column 1 of Ground Water Table next to 903.1. On this table, remove dot from "PROC" and "FRESH" columns.		3/20/13	4/24/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
12	23	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Page 38: On table only list the BMPs associated with the Implementing TM. Per Table 12, that would only be Bioretention Areas and Settling Basins. On the description, you only describe vegetated swales which are not selected on Table 12. Select them on Table 12 if they are one of your BMP selections. Also select catch basin inserts on Table 12 if they will be used. The description should be extended to discuss the bioretention and basins selected on Table 12 as well as the filters.		3/20/13	4/24/13
12	24	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Table 13: You have listed several BMPs which were not selected on Table 12. Again, if you are not proposing those BMPs on the Implementing TM, don't list them on the SWMP. You should only list the basins and bioretention areas; all Category 1. Please be Consistent throughout the SWMP.		3/20/13	4/24/13
12	25	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	On Table 12: On Fossil Filer Row, select Water Quality Treatment Only Column.	Make Minor Revision and Prepare Final Copy of SWMP for Final Approval.	4/24/13	4/24/13
12	26	Implementing Tentative Map SWMP	Once all pending items have been addressed, submit hard copy of SWMP, Signed and Sealed, for final acceptance.	Implementing TM SWMP Has Been Accepted as Adequate for CEQA Level Review. Submit One Hard Copy, Signed and Stamped by EOW, For the Land Development Project File.	3/20/13 4/24/13	6/13/13
13	1	Master TM HMP	HMP Study Returned as Incomplete. Review once Resubmitted.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	1	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	HMP Study was deemed incomplete and returned to EOW. Revised Study submitted and currently being reviewed. Comments will be forwarded when review complete.		6/14/12	12/10/12

The following 7 Items are required for every HMP review cycle and are referenced from the checklist titled "*Minimum Submittal Requirement for Hydromodification Management Studies*." The following 7 Items will be verified by Rick Engineering Company at the beginning of each review cycle. If upon completion of review, it is determined that the Minimum Submittal Requirements are not included in the HMP, Rick Engineering Company will stop the review and coordinate with the County Project Manager. The County will determine if Rick Engineering Company will continue review or if the submittal will be sent back to applicant and not be considered a complete submittal in the review cycle.

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	2	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Does report have CD or DVD containing rainfall data, continuous simulation model executable input files and output, and external processing files when applicable? Are the digital continuous simulation files executable? Did hardcopy of continuous simulation files match executable files? The cd submitted with the hard copy report did not contain the required .wdm files for the project. The files were emailed from David Yeh of Landmark Consulting to Laura Henry of Rick Engineering Company on June 7, 2012. The digital file for POC1 does not match the hard copy report (see comment 8 for further detail).		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
14	3	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Does report have project description, hydromodification management description, vicinity map, proposed maintenance entity identified for hydromodification management features included in text? Proposed maintenance entity is not identified.		6/14/12 12/10/12	3/20/13
14	4	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Does report have a geotechnical investigation? (Reference checklist for the geotechnical information necessary for a Preliminary Design and Final Design phase submittal.)		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	5	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Does report have a legible and adequate Drainage exhibit? Pre- and Post-Project?		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	6	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Does report have a tabular summary of the pre- and post-project pervious and impervious land parameters along with supporting backup.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	7	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Does report have a tabular summary of the proposed mitigation measures.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	8	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Does report have drawdown calculations for proposed mitigation measures? SDHM drawdown calculations were provided that were suitable to determine that a vector control plan will be required for proposed HMP Facility #2. Please note that during final design of the project, pursuant to the Final HMP page 6-29, drawdown for all basins needs to be measured from the peak operating level in the facility (such as the elevation at the riser overflow or emergency spillway overflow). Note to County of San Diego: Proposed HMP Facility #2 has greater than 96 hour drawdown time. Vector Control Plan will be required with final design of the project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
The following items are specific to the project's HMP:						
14	9	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	For POC1, the hard copy report output does not match the executable file. The hard copy frequency result is displaying the mitigated condition frequency in the pre-project condition table (see page 29 of the report). Also, the duration analysis has been run from 0.1Q2 to Q10 of the mitigated condition rather than 0.1Q2 to Q10 of the pre-project condition. The duration analysis needs to be corrected.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	10	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Update the SDHM version number in the text of the report.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	11	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Although the total areas (sum of POCs 1, 2, 3) input in the model are the same for pre- and post-project condition, the drainage maps show off-site area included in the pre-project condition boundary that is not included in the post-project condition boundary. Outside of the project boundary, the existing drainage boundaries should remain the same. Please refer to Lilac_Hills_Ranch _ HMP_Review_2012-06-14-001.pdf for further detail.		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	12	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	The maximum water surface elevations reported in the computer output are contained within the basin geometry provided in the model and therefore the basin depth is suitable for HMP modeling purposes. However, please note the basins do not have 1 foot of freeboard as reported in the text. The model output shows 0.5-0.7 feet of freeboard in the basins at their maximum water surface elevations. Further, do not rely on SDHM output for determination of freeboard. Additional depth will need to convey undetained peak flows through the emergency spillway. During final design of the project refer to the County of San Diego Drainage Design Manual for freeboard requirements and methodology.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	13	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	The areas bypassing the HMP facilities were not included in the frequency and duration analyses (bypass basins were not connected to the POCs in the model).		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	14	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	The model utilized the Bonita rain gauge, not the Lake Wohlford rain gauge as reported in the text. Revise the model to use an appropriate rain gauge for the project.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	15	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Provide backup for the selection of the Lake Wohlford rain gauge (i.e., mark the project location on a copy of the rainfall map that was used to determine that the project site and the Lake Wohlford station are on the same curve as stated on page 12 of the text).		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	16	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	The landscaping soil type needs to be based on the underlying soil type (i.e., do not change soil type C to soil type B as described on page 11 of the text).		6/14/12	12/10/12

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	17	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	The outfall of proposed HMP Facility #1 is on a hillside with no defined flow path. At the outfall of proposed HMP Facility #1 there is a distance of approximately 200 feet of natural area between the basin outlet and the location of POC1 in the main stream. This reach from the basin outfall to the stream would be subject to erosion from the increased flows from the project unless outflow can be conveyed safely to the main stream. Demonstrate how the outflow will be conveyed to the main stream.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	18	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Show the outfalls of proposed HMP Facilities #2 and #3.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	19	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	The post-project exhibits show grading to widen West Lilac Road entering the project from the west. If this grading is part of the Lilac Hills Ranch Implementing TM, hydromodification management must be addressed.		6/14/12	12/10/12
14	20	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Provide detailed vector control plan. The plan will be forwarded to the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) for review. Their approval at this discretionary stage is required.		12/10/12	3/20/13
14	21	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Include the Flow Frequency Graphs in the report.		12/10/12 3/20/13	4/27/13
14	22	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Page 17: The "Outside of Dev Footprint" numbers shown on the table and the numbers shown on the exhibit do not match. Address discrepancy.	The Hydromod has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13 4/27/13	6/13/13
14	23	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	On "Existing Impervious Areas Routed to HMP Facilities" exhibit, add table for Basin 300 to coincide with information shown breakdown table on Page 17.	The Hydromod has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13 4/27/13	6/13/13
14	24	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	On "Undisturbed Areas Routed to HMP Facilities" exhibit, add table for Basin 200 to coincide with information shown breakdown table on Page 17.	The Hydromod has been revised to address the comment.	12/10/12 3/20/13 4/27/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	25	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Include Inside of Dev Footprint exhibit which shows which areas are bypassing HMP facilities that coincides with breakdown table on Page 17.		12/10/12 3/20/13	4/27/13
14	26	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Include Inside of Dev Footprint exhibit which shows which areas are routed to HMP facilities that coincides with breakdown table on Page 17.		12/10/12 3/20/13	4/27/13
14	27	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	Revised HMP Study was Submitted Without the Executable Electronic Files. Study Will be Reviewed Once Complete Study is Submitted.		3/20/13	4/27/13
14	28	Implementing Tentative Map Hydromod	The POC 3 Analysis Failed. The analysis has to achieve a passing rating in order to be accepted.	The Hydromod has been revised to address the comment.	4/27/13	6/13/13
15	1	Access	It is recommended that the project engineer analyze the offsite and onsite roadways serving the proposed project to verify compliance with the applicable road standards and necessary certifications. The engineer should also verify that access easements are in place pursuant to the Subdivision Ordinance.	<i>Informational</i>		
16	1	Solid Waste and Recycling	The project is required to have adequate space allocated for recycling bin enclosures. Staff can provide the applicant with a copy of the State's Recycling Space Allocation Guide.		6/14/12	12/10/12
16	2	Solid Waste and Recycling	The project will be required at the permitting phase to recycle their construction and demolition debris. This is a County Ordinance and more information can be found here: http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/recycling/cdhome.html .		6/14/12	12/10/12
17	1	Exception Request	The seven exception requests have been received and reviewed. Upon acceptance of the TIS and resolution of Major Project Issue #1, it will be determined which exception requests can move forward as proposed and which will need to be modified.	Exception requests in process.	12/10/12 3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	1	Drainage	The existing culverts along the proposed road improvements should be replaced to meet the current County standards of a minimum 18-inch storm drain pipes in the right-of-way and have a minimum design life of 60 years.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	2	Landscape	DPW Road Maintenance crews will not maintain landscaping (planting and irrigation) within the medians and parkway. The developer should provide Landscape Maintenance Agreement with the County for the landscaped areas in the R/W.	The Specific Plan has been revised to address the comment.	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	3	Drainage - Improvements	Road Segment B, from Sta. 34+31 to Sta 38+67, the existing 12" CMP should be replaced.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	4	Drainage - Improvements	Road Segment C, from westerly roundabout to northerly boundary, new culverts should be designed and installed per project drainage study and County drainage design manual.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	5	Drainage - Improvements	Road Segment C, from westerly roundabout to northerly boundary, existing 12" CMP culvert at the new driveway connection should be replaced per current County standards requirements.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	6	Drainage - Improvements	Road Segment D, along the project northerly boundary, existing 12" CMP culverts should be replaced per current County drainage design standards.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	7	Drainage - Improvements	Road Segment D, along the project northerly boundary, existing 18" CMP culvert should be replaced or extended as required per county drainage design manual.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	8	Drainage - Improvements	On Typical Section for Road Segment D, revise the 2% shoulder surface to be at the top of AC dike, Type E. The runoff otherwise will pond behind the dike.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
18	9	Pavement	Road Segment A, the proposed retaining wall should be outside of the R/W.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Land Development Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
18	10	Pavement	Road Segment B, the landscape in proposed median should be per Water Efficient Landscape Design Manual. Note that a 1.5' wide maintenance walkway should be installed adjacent to the curbs.	Resolved	3/20/13	6/13/13
19	1	Sight Distance	A sight distance analysis for the intersection of Circle R Drive and Mountain Ridge Road was received and reviewed.	Since Sight Distance can be Achieved with Minor Clearing and the County has Access Rights for Clearing, No Further Action Required Unless it is Determined that Access Rights are Non-Existing.	3/20/13	6/13/13
19	2	Sight Distance	A sight distance analysis for the intersection of West Lilac Road and Covey Lane was received and reviewed. Since adequate sight distance can't be achieved looking south, an exception request must be processed. Please note that an exception may not be supported without adequate justification. Furthermore, traffic warrants will need to be met in order to install a traffic signal.	The sight distance study indicates that an off-site clear space easement would be required in order to achieve adequate sight distance. It is the applicant's responsibility to acquire the off-site easement.	3/20/13	6/13/13

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
1	1	Format and Content	Staff would like to note that the 1st Iteration DEIR was well written and conformed to the County's EIR Format Guidelines.	Informational Only	12/10/12	N/A
1	2	Format and Content	The 1st Iteration DEIR included duplicate chapters for Traffic and Aesthetic Resource Area. Please revise.	Revisions resolved.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
1	3	Format and Content	The 2nd Iteration DEIR should have final references to the Appendices.	Revisions resolved.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
1	4	Format and Content	For each resource area, please ensure that all comments made by specialists on the technical studies are addressed in the corresponding EIR sections.	Informational Only	12/10/12	N/A
1	5	Format and Content	Please discuss with staff as to whether or not the DEIR should include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes resultant from project implementation pursuant to CEQA section 15126.2©, 15127 and the County's EIR Format and Content Guidelines (page 33).		12/10/12	N/A
2	1	Global	For all significant and unmitigated impacts, the DEIR should not summarily state that no mitigation measure is available to alleviate an identified impact. Generally, mitigation measures must be identified for each significant effect of a project. A mitigation measure can then be determined to be infeasible. Adverse effects must be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible, even if it is still determined to be significant. Revise all Mitigation sections as necessary.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/1013
2	2	Global	For all conclusion sections, this subchapter must clearly and specifically describe how each significant impact is reduced by the proposed mitigation measures - why the mitigation measure would work. The discussion must be supported by a synopsis of the rationale for the conclusion.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
2	3	Global	For all conclusion sections where the DEIR concludes that there are unmitigated adverse impacts, the EIR should have an alternative which would avoid that significant impact. The conclusion shall be supported by a discussion of why the impact could not be mitigated or otherwise reduced to a level below significant.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
3	1	Summary	Section S.1.2. General Plan Conformance: (1) Please discuss with staff whether or not essential services proposed in the commercial areas should be required rather than encouraged by the Specific Plan. (2) Please provide a table of proposed services per commercial area (e.g. central and neighborhood commercial center), to be included in either the Summary Chapter or Chapter 1.0.	EIR has been revised to clarify commercial areas would include retail, office, civic, and mix use.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
3	2	Summary	Please clarify with staff why the project would require a Section 7 Permit.	The requirement for a Section 7 was deleted from the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
3	3	Summary	Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses. Staff recommends draft two discussions for surrounding land uses – local and regional. The local or immediate vicinity surrounding land use study area would generally fall into the immediate project view shed (or as described in the DEIR as the local cumulative impact study area). The regional or I-15 corridor land use study area would encompass the 5 mile radius (or the Traffic Cumulative Impact Area).	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	1	Project Description	Please provide a figure, or revise the current Open Space Figure 1-8, to distinguish the proposed HOA agricultural areas.	Figures 1-9 and 1-10 were included to address this comment.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	2	Project Description	Project Objectives - Please see staff's revisions to the project objectives and discuss any concerns. Also, please confirm with staff where on-site rock outcroppings would be preserved.	Project Objectives have been revised.	12/10/12	5/3/2012
4	3	Project Description	Section 1.2. Please see planning comments regarding project MUP requirements and revise this section as necessary.	MUP requirements have been clarified.	12/10/12	5/3/2012

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	4	Project Description	Section 1.2. Please identify the additional discretionary permits in the DEIR, or reference the page/section of the Specific Plan where the list can be found.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2012
4	5	Project Description	Page 1-4. Increase in C34 commercial density. Please see planning comments regarding density transfers and revise this section as necessary.	The density transfer option has been removed from the Specific Plan.	12/10/12	5/3/2012
4	6	Project Description	Page 1-4. Please also include the "D" designator requirement for the multi-family and mixed use areas.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	7	Project Description	Page 1-6. Please see major planning issue regarding the Community Development Model. The Specific Plan should require larger residential lots on the perimeter of the Specific Plan Area. On page 1-21 of the DEIR, the text states, <i>"The larger sized lots, including the custom lots, which are similar to lot types in the area, would be placed on the perimeter of the project to provide a smooth visual transition into and out of the community."</i> Staff agrees that a design which requires large lots on the perimeter would be consistent with the intent of the Community Development Model of the County General Plan. Demonstrating where the lot variations occur is important. Both the Specific Plan and the DEIR should be revised to (1) require this type of development and (2) graphically demonstrate the lot variations for each phase.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	8	Project Description	Page 1-7. Please confirm with staff that the traffic analysis includes the interim traffic distribution for Phases I and II that do not include an on-site school. E.g. that traffic distribution for the project accounted for trips to and from the schools listed on Page 1-7.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	9	Project Description	Page 1-11, <i>Lilac Hills Ranch Road</i> . Please discuss the alternative road design with staff. Who will decide which road design would be implemented? What is the reason for the alternative design?	Both options for Lilac Hills Ranch Road are analyzed in the DEIR. The option will be chosen during the tentative and final map process for the implementing phase.	12/10/12	5/3/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	10	Project Description	The project proposes to move the Mobility Element designation of existing West Lilac Road to a new road alignment and construct a portion as one-way couplets. The proposed realignment of a Mobility Element (ME) may by itself not warrant a General Plan Amendment (GPA) but the proposed change in the West Lilac Road ME road design should be part of the project's GPA. The Project Description should identify that the project's GPA proposes to change the classification of West Lilac Road from the current 2.2C Light Collector to the one-way couplet design.	The project has been redesigned so that West Lilac will not be realigned.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	11	Project Description	Page 1-11, Transit. Please provide specific distances from existing bus stops to the project site.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	12	Project Description	Page 1-11, Transit. Please provide the standards for which the NCTD would decide to provide a route to the community. What is the NCTD criteria to determine whether new or revised bus route is needed?	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	13	Project Description	Page 1-12. Please revise the text to state exactly where and how tall any necessary walls would be for this roadway. Are the walls for retaining purposes or for noise retention?	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	14	Project Description	Please discuss the HOA agricultural restrictions with staff. Please also revise this section pursuant to comments on the Agricultural Technical Report and EIR chapter.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	15	Project Description	Page 1-16, <u>Water Service and Infrastructure</u> . Please insert VCMWD's approval of the WSA.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	16	Project Description	Page 1-17, <u>Wastewater Service and Infrastructure</u> . Please update this section once the remaining wastewater issues are resolved with VCMWD.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	17	Project Description	Page 1-19, Greywater Systems. Please confirm the gray water system would also not require State Permits from RWQCB or locally approved by VCMWD.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	18	Project Description	Page 1-20, <u>Residential Recycling</u> . Please clarify which entity this facility would obtain the permits from. What do the permits accomplish in terms of avoiding environmental impacts?	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	19	Project Description	Page 1-21. Please see planning major project issue regarding the Community Development Model. The requirement that larger size lots be located on the perimeter of the project is essential in determining whether or not the project design conforms with the Community Development Model of the County General Plan. However, it is unclear how larger perimeter lots are demonstrated or required by the Specific Plan. In fact, the small lot design in Phase I is inconsistent with the intent of the Community Development Model. Please discuss with staff.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	20	Project Description	Page 1-21, <u>Commercial, Mixed-Use, and Multi-Family</u> . Please define the term "village eclectic".	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	21	Project Description	Page 1-23, <u>Section 1.2.1.9 Fire Protection</u> . Please revise this section once the FPP is finalized.	Section has been revised.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
4	22	Project Description	Page 1-25, <u>Phasing Plan</u> . The TM shows 342 single-family units. Please clarify.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	23	Project Description	Page 1-27, <u>Construction Vehicles and Equipment</u> . Please include as a traffic design measure the preparation of a traffic control plan (TCP) in or to minimize traffic impacts to the surrounding community during construction. In fact, page 2.4-3 of the Transportation/Traffic Chapter states, "If required, traffic control plans would be completed to manage construction traffic and ensure impacts are less than significant." Therefore, the preparation of a TCP should become a design measure and condition of approval for the proposed project.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	24	Project Description	Section 1.2.2. Please make a reference to any figure which demonstrates what the text is explaining. For example, the for biological resources, please reference the open space figure in the EIR.	Revisions made throughout DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	25	Project Description	Section 1.2.2, second bullet Cultural Resources. This bullet should explain how the project was designed to avoid significant cultural resources (e.g. cultural resource constraints that influenced design).	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	26	Project Description	Section 1.2.2, fourth bullet. Please revise the steep slope discussion once RPO comments are addressed.	RPO discussion is adequate.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	27	Project Description	Section 1.2.2, fifth bullet Visual Quality. Please also discuss the Landscape Plan.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	28	Project Description	Section 1.2.2, Wildfire Hazards. This bullet should briefly state how the project has been designed to be compliant with the Consolidated Fire Code in terms of fuel modification, access and services.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	29	Project Description	Page 1-30, 1st bullet. This bullet should briefly explain how the required Site Plan review accomplishes the avoidance of visual impacts.	Text deleted from DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	30	Project Description	Section 1.8.1, Growth Inducement Due to General Plan Amendment. First, staff disagrees that the project is consistent with the Community Development Model as explained in the Major Project planning issues. Please revise this section once this issue has been resolved. Second, this section must include a discussion of the Property Specific Requests currently being processed by the Advanced Planning division of PDS, pursuant to Board of Supervisor direction. Currently, page 1-38 states, <i>"property surrounding the project site would retain its adopted General Plan land use designation. . . "</i> Please include in the analysis whether or not the PAA approved for the project site and the GPA application to village designation, has influenced the surrounding area property specific requests.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
4	31	Project Description	Section 1.8.2, Growth Inducement Due to Construction of Additional Housing. Please further explain the conclusion that increasing growth at the project site by increasing the amount of homes allowed under the general plan, would not induce surrounding growth. Staff suggests explaining that the new housing would not cause additional surrounding growth because it would provide it's own commercial, public services and infrastructure.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	32	Project Description	Section 1.8.4, Growth Inducement Due to Construction of Roadways. Please revise this section once the Major Project planning issue regarding public road improvements are resolved.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
4	33	Project Description	Sections 1.8.5 and 1.8.6, Growth Inducement Due to Provision/Extension of Public Facilities. Please revise this section once the fire service issue has been resolved and wastewater service requirements are clarified with VCMWD.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
5	1	Aesthetics	Section 2.1.2.1 - Impacts to Scenic Vistas. The analysis should include a description of existing elements of views from I-15. Also, what is the duration of the view for travelers along I-15? Please also more specifically describe the "residential and park" components of the project that will be seen from this view (e.g. lot sizes, heights, materials and variation of built forms). Please also add to the I-15 discussion on page 2.1-10.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
5	2	Aesthetics	Section 2.1.2.2 - Impacts to Scenic Resources. Please include a description of other site specific features that contribute to valued visual character. For example, open areas of agricultural and rural residential. Please also revise this section pursuant to RPO Steep Slope comments.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
5	3	Aesthetics	Section 2.1.2.3 - Visual Character or Quality - West Lilac Road. Staff disagrees with the significance determination for Issue 3. In particular, for views from West Lilac Road. The conversion of open, rural residential land to smaller lot, sub-urban type housing (as demonstrated in Figure 2.1-3) would result in a degradation of the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. Please also see planning comments on conformance with the Community Development Model. Implementation of the intent of the Community Development Model would reduce or might avoid this significant impact.	Revisions made to the DEIR. Impact has been determined to be significant and unavoidable.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
5	4	Aesthetics	For all impact discussions and associated visual simulations, the text and figures should show how the project's specific plan guidelines serve to avoid visual impacts to the surrounding communities. For example, the guidelines should require a variation of building materials, types, and styles would result in variations of roof form and color. Describe these in the DEIR. Please reference or incorporate appropriate specific plan figures and illustrations which depict housing and commercial types. Please also note, pending resolution of the planning Major Project Issue regarding the Community Development Model, these figures should reflect larger lots sizes.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
5	5	Aesthetics	Impact AE-1. In general, an analysis should not assume failure of implementation of a project condition, such as " <i>failure to provide long-term maintenance of the landscaping.</i> " The DEIR should assume each specific plan requirement would be implemented, especially those meant to avoid a significant effect and is required by County Code for erosion control. Please discuss approach and conclusion with staff.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
5	6	Aesthetics	Impacts to proposed Community Pathway. Please discuss with staff the feasibility of discussing impacts to future land uses. In general, the DEIR analysis should focus on existing conditions and not those created by the project.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
5	7	Aesthetics	Page 2.1-14, Off Site Improvements. Please revise this section per resolution of the project's roadway network.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
5	8	Aesthetics	Section 2.1.2.5 - Glare Impacts. Does the specific plan include solar building requirements?	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
5	9	Aesthetics	Section 2.1.2.6 - Consistency with Land Use Policies. Please revise this section once the general plan conformance issues are resolved. Please see Planning Major project issues.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
5	10	Aesthetics	Section 2.1.3, Cumulative Impact Analysis. Please revise this discussion to include the properties which are part of the Property Specific Request (PSR) process.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	5/3/2013
5	11	Aesthetics	Section 2.1.3, Cumulative Impact Analysis. Please explain how the <i>"minor residential subdivision"</i> and other cumulative development would <i>"blend into the existing character of the view shed."</i> In part, cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced through development consistent with the County General Plan and VCCP, and BCP.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
5	12	Aesthetics	Conclusion. Please update per comments above.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
6	1	Air Quality/GHG	Please include the GHG analysis as a separate section of the EIR as opposed to combined with the Air Quality section. This is a separate resource area that needs to be addressed in its own section.	GHG chapter is now separate from AQ.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
7	1	Land Use and Planning	BOS Policy I-78. Please update this policy pursuant BOS action on October 31, 2012.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
7	2	Land Use and Planning	Analysis of San Diego County General Plan Land Use Element/Community Development Model. The analysis should discuss the proposed project's consistency with the CDM. Also, should discuss the requirements of a the General Plan for proposing a new village (e.g. leapfrog development policy).	Land Use chapter was revised to reference the Specific Plan for evaluation of General Plan and Community Plan polices.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
7	3	Land Use and Planning	Analysis of General Plan and Other Polices. Please update this section with resolution of major project issues regarding County policy conformance.	Land Use chapter was revised to reference the Specific Plan for evaluation of General Plan and Community Plan polices.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
7	4	Land Use and Planning	Analysis of Community Character. Please see staff's previous comments regarding separating the land use study areas into local and regional. Please apply to this discussion as well.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
7	5	Land Use and Planning	Analysis of Community Character. The DEIR states, " <i>lower density development and open space buffers are proposed in several areas along perimeter portions of the project in order to be sensitive to existing surrounding land uses. Grove plantings are proposed as accents throughout the project, which would relate to Valley Center and Bonsall rural agricultural aesthetic.</i> " As stated previously, demonstrating and requiring these types of land uses is essential to support the community character conclusion (similar to aesthetics).	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
7	6	Land Use and Planning	Cumulative Analysis. This section should be revised pursuant to comments above and resolution of the major project issues. Update the discussion to include analysis of the cumulative effects of the land use changes pursuant to the Property Specific Requests.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	1	Transportation and Traffic	Please confirm the traffic distribution model accounts for the interim school service situations described in Chapter 1.0. Please also include a traffic distribution analysis that accounts for no school being built on-site.	Confirmed.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A **PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST**

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
8	2	Transportation and Traffic	Table S-1 and in Section 2.4 Transportation/Traffic TR-1 through TR-12 should reference Final Map as the timing of mitigation not occupancy.	Traffic conditions and mitigation have been resolved and are tied to Phasing Plan.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	3	Transportation and Traffic	TR-13 through TR-19 (TIF payment) may reference building permits as the timing of cumulative impact mitigation.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	4	Transportation and Traffic	The DEIR include a Horizon Year scenario. The applicant should confirm that the Horizon Year, which is a planning assessment, needs to be included in the EIR analysis.	Horizon Year analysis for both County and CALTRANS facilities have been added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	5	Transportation and Traffic	The DEIR should address the over-capacity ("planning level") of West Lilac Road west of the project site and Old Highway 395 and propose an over-ride for acceptance of LOS E for the marginal deficiency.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	6	Transportation and Traffic	The TIS in some cases uses HCM Arterial Analysis to demonstrate adequate roadway segment LOS conditions and that the project's impacts would be less than significant (Ex. Gopher Canyon Road). It is recommended that the DEIR and TIS identify the project's direct impacts based on Public Road Standards road segment LOS criteria (TIS Table 2.2), but that the Arterial Analysis be used as the justification for an override and no mitigation requirement.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	7	Transportation and Traffic	Page 2.4-12 & 13, Construction Impact Analysis. Please revise this analysis to include the requirement to complete a Traffic Control Plan (TCP)	A TCP has been added as a conditon of the proposed project.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	8	Transportation and Traffic	Page 2.4-13, Project Trip Generation. Please confirm that the statement regarding the survey from LOS Engineering is still accurate. Please also see DPW comments regarding trip generation rates.	TIA has been updated to use SANDAG's standard trip generation rates.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
8	9	Transportation and Traffic	Page 2.4-19, Transportation Hazard Analysis. Please expand the discussion of transportation hazards. Currently, the analysis does not explain how or why the project has been designed to comply with applicable regulations and how those serve to avoid impacts to transportation hazards.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9	1	Agricultural Resources	Please discuss with staff indirect impacts. Additional mitigation may required, such as: preservation of on-site agriculture; fencing; wider on-site agricultural buffers; including landscaping; etc.	DEIR has been revised to include mitigation for indirect impacts.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	2	Agricultural Resources	All off site improvements must discussed in Chapter 1.0 and clearly located so that all Agricultural resources can be analyzed. Off-site areas of Farmland of Local Importance are located Gopher Road/I-15 interchange. Staff will need more information prior to concluding significance.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	3	Agricultural Resources	Page 2.5-4. Please clarify with staff whether or not the agricultural ponds would remain following project implementation.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	4	Agricultural Resources	Page 2.5-13, Off-Site Improvement Areas. Please update this section once major project road issues are resolved. In addition, please provide figure depicting the off-site improvement areas and agricultural resource areas.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	5	Agricultural Resources	Section 2.5.2. If applicable, this section should analyze County ag policies. Please see staff's comments on the Ag Report as the template.	Information added to the Ag Tech Report.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	6	Agricultural Resources	Please change all references to the Right To Farm Act to County Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance.	Revisions made.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	7	Agricultural Resources	Proposed School Site. The future school children will most likely use this park and therefore a larger buffer is needed between the park and adjacent off-site agriculture. The park as a buffer between the school and off-site agriculture is not enough. There should be an on-site buffer between the park and the off-site ag. Please also see staff's comments on the agricultural technical study.	Revisions and Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	8	Agricultural Resources	Please discuss "other compatibility issues." Please also see the Ag Report for specific changes and comments.	Revisions and Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
9	9	Agricultural Resources	Please include a cumulative analysis of Guidelines 4.2.1, 4.2.2, and 4.2.3 in the Ag Report.	Revisions and Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
9	10	Agricultural Resources	Please clarify the cumulative study area for agricultural resources. The analysis references Figure 1-22 for the cumulative study area but then provides conversion facts on a countywide basis.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
10	1	Biological Resources	As detailed above in the major project issues comments, only 92% of the RPO wetlands onsite have appropriate buffers (50-foot minimum). Several references to buffers in the EIR state that buffers are a minimum of 50-feet. Additionally, conclusions are made based on providing adequate buffer, which in accordance with the RPO has not occurred. Please address the major project issue regarding RPO wetland buffers and update the EIR as appropriate.	Information added to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
10	2	Biological Resources	The "analysis" section of Section 2.6.2.3 of the EIR states that the project will result in impacts to 8.09 acres of County wetlands. Please correct this number to correspond to the impacts identified in the biology report.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
10	3	Biological Resources	The "RPO wetland and sensitive habitat lands" section of Section 2.6.2.5 of the EIR indicates that the project would impact RPO sensitive habitat lands. Please correct this reference as it has been determined that the project site does not contain RPO sensitive habitat lands.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
10	4	Biological Resources	Please clarify in M-BIO-1a. that in addition to occurring in Valley Center, mitigation will occur within draft PAMA of the NCMSCP.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
10	5	Biological Resources	Section 2.6.6.2 of the EIR states that the preservation of sensitive natural communities are required at the ratios required by the MSCP. The project is not within an approved MSCP area and therefore the mitigation ratios are set in the County Biological Guidelines. Please revise this reference.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
11	1	Cultural Resources	Section 2.7.1.2: Regulatory Framework: Under State, add CEQA; under County, add San Diego County Local Register of Historic Resources (Local Register).	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
11	2	Cultural Resources	Section 2.7.1.4: Off-Site Improvements. This section shall be updated as the off-site improvement locations are more firmly established (refer to item 9-15). Sites CA-ASDI-5067 and 5072 are considered RPO significant and this could result in design changes to the improvement areas.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
11	3	Cultural Resources	Section 2.7.1.5 Survey Results: Change title to Summary of Survey and Testing Results. Refer to the Cultural Report to include a summary of the testing results of each of the 5 sites tested.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
11	4	Cultural Resources	Section 2.7.1.5: Off-site improvements: Revise this section to conform to the cultural report in Appendix A . There are 2 recorded sites that are RPO significant that must be addressed.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
11	5	Cultural Resources	Section 2.7.2.2: Issue 2 - Archaeological Resources, Analysis, Off-site Improvements: This section needs to be revised based on the Cultural Report Appendix A. (Refer to Checklist item 9-15)	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
11	6	Cultural Resources	Section 2.7.5.1: M-CR-1 - Staff is recommending that the site be put in an open space easement (an addition to OS-5). If not, the Data Recovery program shall be added to the Cultural Resources report. Refer to Checklist item 9-12.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	1	Noise	On page 2.9-1, Section 2.9.11, please update to be consistent with the current County Noise Element.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	2	Noise	On page 2.9-3, Section 2.9.2.1, please update to be consistent with the current County Noise Element. Please refer to Tables N-1 and N-2.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	3	Noise	On page 2.9-5 Section 2.9.2.1, under Off-site, staff is unclear to the referenced "potentially significant (Impact N-1 and N-2). This section is for off-site receptors and it appears this portion of the discussion must clearly reference on-site NSLU if this is the intent of the paragraph.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
12	4	Noise	On page 2.9-5 Section 2.9.2.1, under Off-site, if the analysis demonstrates that there are no cumulative impacts to off-site receptors, it needs to state that the project is not "cumulatively considerable".	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	5	Noise	On page 2.9-5, Section 2.9.2.2, please update the table to reflect the most current 36.404 table as shown in the Am legal website.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	6	Noise	On page 2.9-6, Section 2.9.2.2, under Emergency and Standby Electrical Generators, please include within this design feature a statement that says generators would be design to satisfy the sound level limit property line standards pursuant to Section 36.404.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	7	Noise	On page 2.9-6, Section 2.9.2.2, under Recycling and Green Waste, please include a more detailed evaluation for the recycling facility as mentioned within the updated noise report.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	8	Noise	In Figure 2.9-2. Please discuss with staff the feasibility of the Noise Protection Easement proposed to be extended off-site. The applicant will need to acquire these easements prior to the project moving forward.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	9	Noise	Global change, any temporary construction operations and permanent noise sources shall be referenced to comply with the sound level limits at the project property lines. The current DEIR noise section reference "residences". Noise Ordinance compliance is at the project property line and not at the residences.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
12	10	Noise	Global comment: Additional noise comments to the DEIR noise section are to follow after staff deems the Noise Report as complete.	Revisions made to the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
13	1	Public Services	Please revise this section after resolution of the issues related to fire service as indicated in comments from the Fire District and County Fire Authority.	Revisions to the project and EIR have been made to address Fire Service.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

ATTACHMENT A
PROJECT ISSUE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

PDS EIR Comments

Item No.		Subject Area	Issue, Revision or Information Required	Issue Resolution Summary (Include Conditions)	Date Identified	Date Resolved
14	1	Recreation	Draft EIR Section 3.1.5.2 (sheet 3-60 and 61) will need to be revised once net PLDO acreages are determined.	PLDO requirements have been determined and are reflected in the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013
15	1	Utilities and Services	Please revise this section pursuant to clarification of wastewater service issues.	Wastewater service has been clarified and options and analyzed in the DEIR.	12/10/12	6/13/2013

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY

Subject

The Use of the Board of Supervisors' Power of Eminent Domain on
Behalf of Private Developers

**Policy
Number**

J-33

Page

1 of 2

Purpose

To define and limit the circumstances in which the Board of Supervisors will use their power of eminent domain, on behalf of private developers, to acquire real property rights for public facilities.

Background

Frequently, property being developed as a major or minor subdivision lacks off-site real property rights to enable the development of public facilities. These facilities are needed in order to provide the public service required by or because of the developing property. The developer may be required by the County to acquire off-site real property rights as a condition of accepting the subdivision map. In those instances involving off-site owners who are unwilling to sell to the developer, the Board of Supervisors may choose to use their power of eminent domain to obtain the needed rights.

Policy

It is the policy of the Board of Supervisors that the power of eminent domain be used to acquire property rights required by conditions of approval of subdivisions only when:

1. The subdivider has made reasonable offers based on a fair market value appraisal report and has made every reasonable effort to acquire the property rights; and
2. Alternative locations for the public facilities have been considered and none found practical; and
3. Deletion of the off-site requirements of the subdivision is not recommended by staff; and
4. The subdivider has agreed to pay full County costs of eminent domain proceedings, including all costs to purchase the real property rights required; and
5. The Board of Supervisors has prescribed the location of the proposed acquisition.

Notwithstanding the above, non-blighted, owner-occupied, residential structures cannot be condemned for transfer to another private party for purposes of more profitable economic development.

Procedure

The Director, Department of Public Works, will request the Director, Department of General Services to proceed to acquire the needed rights for the County.

The Director, Department of General Services will, at the developer's cost:

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY

Subject

The Use of the Board of Supervisors' Power of Eminent Domain on
Behalf of Private Developers

**Policy
Number**

J-33

Page

2 of 2

1. Prepare an agreement with the developer to acquire real property rights at the developer's expense; and
2. Review the developer's appraisal report for compliance with established appraisal standards; and
3. Advise owners of the proposed developer-County agreement and the date, time and location when it will be considered by the Board of Supervisors. Such notification shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, at least ten days before the meeting. The notice shall also be posted concurrently by regular mail.
4. Upon approval of the developer/County agreement by the Board of Supervisors, the Department of General Services will, following the procedures delineated in Board of Supervisors Policy F-24 (Eminent Domain Procedure), proceed to acquire the required rights for the County.
5. Docket a hearing with the Board of Supervisors to enable the adoption of a Resolution of Necessity declaring the project to be in the public interest and the real property rights necessary to be acquired all in accordance with California Civil Code of Procedure Section 1245.210 et. seq, if unable to satisfactorily negotiate an agreement with the property owner(s).

Sunset Date

This policy will be reviewed for continuance by 12-31-2019.

Board Action

11-24-81 (52)

12-15-82 (51)

6-8-83 (15)

2-19-85 (5)

7-26-88 (43)

12-12-89 (49)

12-8-98 (53)

06-21-05 (16)

11-8-05 (1)

12-09-08 (33)

12-04-12 (13)

CAO Reference

1. Department of General Services

July 14, 2014

Jon Rilling, Project Manager
Lilac Hills Ranch
32444 Birdsong Dr
Escondido, CA 92026
(858)546-0700

Dear Mr. Rilling,

Regarding your correspondence addressed to us (dated August 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014), we read your attempt at explaining condemnation of privately-owned Mountain Ridge Road and our liability for said road, and do not consent nor agree to the assumptions, assertions nor conclusions contained therein.

As part of the HOA that owns Mountain Ridge Road, from which you require easement rights for ALL of your project's parcels, since the two parcels that do have limited rights do not convey to the remainder, we thoroughly understand your dilemma.

Sincerely,

Robert & Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026

cc: Mark Slovick, Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov
Kristin Blackson, Kristin.Blackson@sdcounty.ca.gov

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <quitefranckly@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:02 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: LHR DEIR 2014 3800 12-001 et al

Lilac Hills Ranch Draft EIR 2014

Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

The submitted Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Lilac Hills Ranch (LHR), which falls [glaringly](#) outside of the County's recently adopted General Plan, includes glaring discrepancies, as well as legal issues with respect to roads safety and overburdening of easements.

The General Plan's (GPU) Village areas are where density concentrations are planned and approved, but LHR [sits](#) miles outside of the Valley Center North and South, and Fallbrook villages (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/landpdf/Docs/CountywideVillage.pdf>). Accretive Investments (Applicant) was attempting to acquire, through outright purchases or lease options, the +/-608 acres while the GPU was in process, but never requested upzoning changes for, in essence, another Village.

Why is the Applicant being offered a purported alternative that involves the County using eminent domain that would only be required to satisfy the Applicant's project? See [8_-_Taper_at_Intersection_Package](#), GPA12001-REIR-Chap4-061214 (Section 4.8.1.7 Road Design Alternative 7, Section 4.9.1.4 Circulation, Table 4-9, pages 128, 135-136), GPA12001-REIR-AppendixV-2-TrafficFireAlternative-061214, [7_-_Modification_to_road_standard_-_Reduce_design_speed_Mtn_Ridge](#), Implementing_PGP, Appendix_W_-_GP_Consistency_Analysis_6-9-14.

If not, the County should then regard the public's safety on its public and private road network in and around the proposed project. All ten road exemptions the applicant requests are out of line with the existing conditions and many jeopardize the public's safety, which, as a stand-alone concern, [clearly deems](#) denial of this project. [What justification does the County give for approving a project that cannot clear even one of the ten aforementioned road hurdles?](#)

Trash collection days on Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Road - both with high, blind hills - summarily mean lines of residents waiting behind waste vehicles to complete the collection route, or crossing into unseen oncoming traffic to pass the trash trucks: regular trash, recyclables and green waste. Approving LHR benefit's the developer, not current residents or businesses, and legal aspects considered, not the County. [What does the County consider a fair number of obstacles that existing residents must bear for the sake of a private developer's financial benefit?](#)

Other legal problems to examine in this Applicant's project include inconsistency within their DEIR, assumption of easements and overburdening of said easements.

One inconsistency exists between the DEIR Evacuation Plan and the Traffic Study. The applicant's evacuation plan states Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane will both be gated and locked at all times, with only the fire and police having keys. On the other hand, their traffic study says Mountain Ridge Road will be used only by the church and senior facility via the locked gates. If first responders are the only ones with keys to the gates, then the church and senior facility cannot have keys also. If only the church and senior facility will have access through the gates, then first responders cannot also. If you speak out both sides of your mouth, a clarity deficiency occurs with your words. [Which version is actually being offered in this iteration of the DEIR?](#)

Each plan the Applicant stated for Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane grossly overburdens the restricted easements, which are available only to a few lots in the applicant's proposed project, [and do not automatically extend to the remaining lots within the project](#). [Why did the County include eminent domain options that contradict the Board's adoption of Policy J-33?](#) [What is the County's cause for asserting eminent domain against private property owners of Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane and choosing the subsequent, lengthy, and expensive lawsuits to follow such assertions?](#)

For this purportedly stand-alone development to continue without intercession from the public, County or State, easement rights for EVERY lot within, [and leading in to / out of](#) the project need to be secured [financially, legally, and in writing](#), from the rightful owners without coercion. [What is the applicant's target date for securing said easements?](#)

Additionally, the LHR requested road exemptions include drawing roads and sewer lines on properties with no or limited easements / rights. Limited easement rights for one lot do not provide rights to any other lots. Period. [In which DEIR version will these roads and sewer lines that lack full access be removed from all of the maps, or where are the recorded documents verifying the applicant acquired all the required easements?](#)

In closing, thank you for reviewing the Applicant's DEIR and our responses to but a few problems with the project: its inconsistency with the GPU, discrepancies, and road and easement issues.

Respectfully,
Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
760-509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Josette Franck <peechus_jf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:40 PM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: 2014 Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR

Lilac Hills Ranch Draft EIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

I have four questions regarding roads in this project's 2014 DEIR.

1. If the Deer Springs Fire Protection District station alternative is recommended and approved, in what phase of construction will Mountain Ridge Road be destroyed (destruction of a working, maintained road is not an "improvement")?
2. Following Question 1 above, how will existing residents access their properties while Mountain Ridge Road is a steady state of demolition, between six months and a year?
3. If the Mountain Ridge Road alternative is promoted and adopted, how will existing residents access their properties while the sewer going down MRR and Circle R Drive is being installed over another lengthy period of time?
4. When 5,000 potential vehicles are going to be added to the current public roads network, current passing grade roads will become failing roads. So why didn't the County propose an alternative to widen Circle R Drive, West Lilac Road (from Old Highway 395 to Lilac Road), Old Highway 395 (from Highway 76 in Fallbrook to Country Club Lane in Escondido), Lilac Road (from West Lilac Road to Valley Center Road), and Old Castle Road to four lanes to accommodate the extra thousands of ADTs LHR will dump onto all of them? Why would the County want to increase their liabilities by not having the applicant fully pay for the road burdens they will cause by building this project?

I look forward to a complete response to these questions.

Respectfully,

Josette Franck
9767 Megan Terrace

Escondido, CA 92026
760-509-5308

Slovick, Mark

From: Bob & Josette Franck <franckfort@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2014 10:31 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Funding: Lilac Hills DEIR 2014 3800 12-001 (GPA) etc.

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

With regard to funding the Lilac Hills Ranch development, the applicant stated they believe school bonds, special assessment districts and other fees should be paid by taxpayers, in- and outside the project area. How is the County ensuring the applicant pays the full cost of the project, without burdening existing taxpayers not located within the project? What are the applicant's funding mechanisms, and where are they available for review?

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

Slovick, Mark

From: Bob & Josette Franck <franckfort@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2014 10:50 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Fire & Evacuation: Lilac Hills 3800 12-001 (GPA), etc.

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

In reference to the fire protection plans in the Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014, why are these four options still being considered? Deer Spring Fire Protection District will not buy off on three of the plans that were offered to them, and Cal Fire's letter to the County clearly states it wants NOTHING to do with this project.

As for the aforementioned Cal Fire letter, why was it not provided for public review with the rest of the comments received?

With respect to the evacuation plans, the 2014 Highway 76 fire left the I-15, Highway 76 and Old Highway 395 closed to traffic in all directions, and for about three hours, the West Lilac Bridge was a parking lot of existing residents who were unable to evacuate as directed. How does the County plan to evacuate proposed LHR residents - an additional 6,000-7,000 people - on winding, two-lane roads (West Lilac Road, Circle R Drive, Old Highway 395, Old Castle, and Lilac Road) in an emergency? Why isn't the applicant being tasked to build-out all these roadways to four-lanes to sustain the daily traffic, as well as in case of required evacuations? How does the County plan to assess the applicant for any injuries or loss of life that may occur from their project's insufficient evacuation plans?

Not only will the planned new residents' lives be risked, but also the lives of current residents that surround the project.

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

Slovick, Mark

From: Bob & Josette Franck <franckfort@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2014 11:04 AM
To: Slovic, Mark
Cc: Blackson, Kristin
Subject: Road Exceptions: LHR 3800 12-001 (GPA), etc.

Lilac Hills Ranch DEIR 2014
Mark Slovic, Project Manager
(858)495-5172
Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project: Lilac Hills Ranch

Project Number(s): 3800 12-001 (GPA), 3810 12-001 (SP), 3600 12-003 (REZ), 3100 5571 (TM), 3100 5572 (TM), 3300 12-005 (MUP), 3500 12-017 (STP), 3500 12-018 (STP)

Dear Mark,

Current road standards are in place for public safety. LHR wants full exemption from the 10 road standards that are hurdles to their project's plan, but damning to the public's safety. Why would the County consider lower these standards to appease the applicant, when promoting public safety should be the priority? Were the current road standards created with the thought that they were unnecessary, inefficient, and useless? Were they created in the hopes that a developer would dare tell the County their employees are idiots for having planned the necessary, efficient and useful road standards?

The County should require the LHR applicant to bring all roads leading into and out of the project up to public road standards at their expense, not at the poor taxpayers' expense. Where is this proclaimed in the 2014 LHR DEIR?

Respectfully,

Robert Franck
9767 Megan Terrace
Escondido, CA 92026
(760)751-5349

Slovick, Mark

From: Caylin F <erisednin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 12:19 AM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: Lilac Hills Project

Regarding the proposed development of 1,700 houses in the Valley Center region. I am completely opposed to it. I have lived in Valley Center for my entire life and continue to do so because it is rural and a small town. I don't want to live in a city or a suburban neighborhood. Those are the biggest reasons people move to Valley Center and stay here. If there are 1,700 new track homes built, they are literally removing all of the small town reasons we love Valley Center.

Assign from emotional reasons to keep one of San Diego's small towns as a small town there are the logistics of the plan. The increase in traffic, lack of water, and other resources are not sufficiently addressed in the proposal. IF there were to be a large housing development to be built in Valley Center, it should be done wisely and should address and solve each potential problem. Without that foresight any houses built would not improve Valley Center, but add to it's problems. How many people would want to buy a house where there are water shortages, where traffic is a daily nightmare, and where they could get trapped if there is a wildfire? The houses would either not be sold or be sold for less than is worth the building of them. Especially when you add to the cost of what it would do to the rest of Valley Center.

I have experienced the fire storms in the past decades and my biggest fear is being trapped from evacuating because of the limited number of roads out of Valley Center. Add to that the new population this housing project would bring in and the problem would only get worse. Especially since the builders are requesting exemptions to regulations on the road development. It is beyond ridiculous that anyone would actually want to put a track home neighborhood in Valley Center, and then go on to build it in a way that would result in people being trapped by fires.

This entire enterprise is just one more reason why the people in Valley Center see Bill Horn as corrupt and resent his ability to continually be re-elected. Although considering who pays for his campaigns, it's not surprising that he supports this plan.

I truly hope this plan is not accepted and that we are allowed to keep Valley Center as a small rural town.

Sincerely Caylin Frinchaboy a resident of Valley Center for 30 years.

From: Patsy Fritz
33265 Mill Creek Road
Pauma Valley, CA 92061

Date: 28 July, 2014

To: County of San Diego
Department of Planning & Development Services

Attn: Mark Wardlaw, Director
Mark Slovick, Project Manager

Subject: Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report
Lilac Hills Ranch Project
PDS2012-3800-12-001 (GPA), PDS2012-3810-12-001 (SP),
PDS2012-3600-12-003 (REZ), PDS2012-3100-5571 (TM),
PDS2012-3100-5572 (TM), PDS2012-3300-12-005 (MUP)

Gentlemen:

Here is the truth about the proposed development, Lilac Hills Ranch [LHR], and its application:

- 1) This proposed development in all its iterations is not only a developer-launched attack on the County General Plan [CGP], it is a developer's lobbyist-steered missile from within that is bent on destroying both the integrity of the CGP AND the integrity of the Department of Planning and Development Services [DPDS], should you approve it.
- 2) The County of San Diego [CSG] spent \$18.6 million taxpayer dollars plus twelve years of staff and consultant time, in addition to tens of thousands of hours voluntarily committed by community leaders across the County – as requested by Supervisor Jacob for a “bottom up” GP Update – which any approval of LHR and this DEIR will squander. Would you demolish an \$18.6 million dollar building the County constructed three years ago? Approving LHR and/or this DEIR would be identical to that action.
- 3) Following 2011 approval of the CGP by four of our County Supervisors (and despite the opposition by Supervisor Horn – the one Supervisor avowedly determined to overthrow the CGP, and LHR's lone booster – who, as a Supervisor is the beneficiary of tens of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from Accretive Investments, the applicant for LHR) the updated CGP immediately won professional awards for its thorough examination and consideration of factors emphasizing access to safe roads, fire safety, water conservation, utilization of existing infrastructure, protection of agriculture and the natural environment

and the necessity to abate global warming and air pollution by cutting commuter traffic and mileage by placing new homes contiguous to existing population centers and the jobs therein. LHR would be destructive to all of these aims.

- 4) Following the adoption of the CGP, the Board of Supervisors [BOS] adopted its recommendations for a “Red Tape Reduction Task Force” [RTRTF] including the position that it serve as judge and monitor (i.e., “tattletale”) of DPDS performance. Immediately Chris Brown, former land use aide to Supervisor Horn, frequent fundraiser for Supervisor Horn, AND paid professional lobbyist (registered with the CSD - check with the Office of the Clerk of the Board [COB]), with Accretive Investments/LHR as his sole viable client (i.e., “bread & butter” or “lifeline”) applied for, and was placed on the RTRTF committee as watchdog of DPDS activity – without any requirement that he file a Form 700 listing his source of income. Because LHR is the one major project dragging through DPDS, having the LHR’s lobbyist able to massage staff, with staff having the uncomfortable knowledge of “Hey, this guy can impact my job and the Department’s budget requests to the BOS” means that there is undue influence and pressure by the developer’s lobbyist that this flaw-filled DEIR be accepted and the basic tenets of the CGP be violated. I object to the fox in the henhouse controlling this process because staff jobs are under threat. Doubt is cast on every shred of text in the DEIR from a developer’s paid advocate.
- 5) DPDS has failed to require the simplest, most effective way to save lives for all Valley Center residents, including future LHR residents, in the event of fire or other emergencies (a constant threat in this locale). That requirement, which MUST be made to save lives: an additional bridge span across the I-15 Freeway. This would route fleeing residents toward the coast, away from approaching fire, and keep them OFF the freeway, which will be clogged and impassable, below. Reason? Too expensive for the developer. This is what you get when the developer’s lobbyist is placed in a position to bug staff.
- 6) Concurrent with approving the CGP in 2011 the BOS approved road improvements to West Lilac Road to serve the modest future population increase envisioned in the CGP. Not only is Accretive unwilling to provide adequate roads for its influx of urban traffic, the project proposal ignores even the minimal requirements for road improvements on the CGP Mobility Element voted by the BOS.
- 7) LHR is insisting on (cheaper) road widths and standards that DO NOT meet CGP requirements.
- 8) Accretive Investments bought and optioned cheap agricultural land that was cheap because it did not have road entitlements to reach a County Road, with the exception of one parcel fronting on Birdsong that could be entirely consumed for a single road. This does not meet the County Fire Code’s requirement for development as there is no secondary access. Thus, to the amazement of a public that paid \$18.6 million for the updated CGP, Accretive is proposing that the LHR project be approved with the understanding that the BOS take

private roads and property by eminent domain TO BENEFIT THE DEVELOPER and BEGGAR EXISTING RESIDENTS AND PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS – if Accretive somehow was “unable” to acquire them. This is an EXPLOSIVE issue. Just days ago Supervisor Horn avowed that the County would only acquire property from “a willing seller” for the proposed San Luis Rey Regional Park, of great benefit to the public, but you are presenting a DEIR based on the premise that the County would take private property by eminent domain (i.e., “by force”) to benefit a FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION intent on destroying the CGP. Let me predict: Accretive will always be unable to acquire them, so it will force the BOS to resort to takings, or permit Accretive to develop with roads that are even LESS SAFE than those proposed –which do not meet County standards to begin with. Question: are the inmates running the asylum?

- 9) Why is DPDS not demanding that EVERY road meet County Standards in the CGP?
- 10) Why is DPDS allowing Accretive, its consultants and lobbyist to claim the proposed LHR meets the CGP – only IF the BOS amends the CGP to meet Accretive;s subterranean standards for road safety, public safety, environmental protection, community standards, clean air – for \$18.6 million dollars, why can’t County staff protect, defend and implement the CGP? WHO DOES STAFF WORK FOR?
- 11) This project, by clear definition is leapfrog development and sprawl.
- 12) This project destroys viable agriculture, which is NOT soil-based, it is CLIMATE-based.
- 13) The wide array of light emitted from this dense urban “island” will attract and destroy the moth population that is necessary for pollination of contiguous seed-producing flower and cactus-growing agriculture – one of the robust sectors of the County’s farm economy.
- 14) The project proposes a fire station that cannot and will not be built or staffed without removing the safe protection of EXISTING Deer Springs Fire Protection District taxpayers who voted to increase their fire tax for their existing service. The DSFPD Board President has testified they will not abandon their current residents.
- 15) The project proposes putting the noise and havoc of a fire station next to the proposed Alzheimer’s facility. Have you no compassion? Have you no shame?
- 16) This project proposes an Alzheimer’s facility so remote from the bulk of the County’s population that it would be an end-of-the road warehouse for the frail elderly. Have you no compassion? Have you no shame?
- 17) This project proposes an Alzheimer’s facility remote from any hospital or medical care. Have you no compassion? Have you no shame?
- 18) This project proposes an Alzheimer’s facility that, in the event of fire, the Alzheimer’s patients should “shelter in place” because of course, there would be no safe way to evacuate them due to the lack of adequate roads. So – they die from smoke inhalation? This is your “final solution?” Have you no compassion? Have you no shame?

- 19) This project proposes a supermarket (FEATURES its supermarket!) without ANY study submitted that shows what the supermarket industry needs, population-wide, to establish and anchor store. LHR can NEVER supply that. Why did you not require a study?
- 20) Why have you not required an economic study of the cost for infrastructure that would saddle all residents' property taxes? Accretive does not care. THEY ARE ONLY SEEKING HIGH-DENSITY "ENTITLEMENTS." They are not building and selling homes. They would be wholesaling lots. My prediction based on reality: you will be taking land out of agriculture – but that will never go into housing. Because of the cost involved in seeking those entitlements, the land will then be too costly to farm. It's lose-lose-lose.
- 21) The ONLY alternative to this project should be one developed to existing CGP density, zoning and road standards with limited use of existing private roads by the parcels that now have the right to traverse them.
- 22) There will be no jobs there. It is a commuter community. Spewing fuel, bogging down existing roads, endangering the existing population in the event of emergencies, destroying agriculture and the green environment - and ABOVE ALL, it is designed as the precedent for destruction the County General Plan.

Based on all of the above, and many other factors, this DEIR has not searched out the truth and cannot provide the decision-makers the information that is needed.

This whole process has been irrevocably tainted SINCE 2006, including enabling the developer's lobbyist to influence staff and staff members' job security, because of his position on the Red Tape Reduction Task force, empowered to judge and report DPDS "shortcomings."

This lack of ethics must stop, and be corrected.

The County must show clean hands in every transaction.

Respectfully submitted,

Patsy Fritz