

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I13

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

} I13-1
I13-2

I13-1 The County acknowledges your opposition to the project and your support for the report of the Valley Center Community Planning Group – Lilac Hills Ranch Sub-Committee. Your comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

I13-2 Property owners may request a General Plan Amendment pursuant to Government Code Sections 65300 et seq. Prior to the sunset of Board of Supervisors Policy I-63, in order to initiate an amendment to the General Plan, an applicant was required to process a Planned Authorized Amendment (PAA). An application to amend to the General Plan was allowed to proceed by the approval of a PAA by the Planning Commission on December 17, 2010 A General Plan consistency analysis is provided in subchapter 3.1.4, Land Use Planning of the FEIR. In addition, a General Plan Consistency Analysis Matrix is provided in Appendix W. Ultimately, the information contained in this analysis will be provided to the Board of Supervisors for consideration prior to a final decision on the project.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>DEFEND THE GENERAL PLAN: The law gives the Board impunity but states that they work for the citizens.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5. CONSIDERING THAT THIS AREA HAS BEEN DESIGNATED AS AN AGRICULTURE AND ESTATE HOME S AREA BY THE EXISTING GENERAL PLAN, IF THE ACCRETIVE DEVELOPMENT IS APPROVED AND</p>		<p>I13-2 cont.</p> <p>I13-3</p> <p>I13-4</p> <p>I13-5</p> <p>I13-6</p> <p>I13-3 The FEIR acknowledges that the project would result in additional trips to roads in the area and provides detailed analysis of the potential impact of additional trip generation on area roadways. Refer to subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR. Roadway and intersection improvements, including along West Lilac Road, would be constructed to ensure roadways can handle projected traffic volumes and would not create a hazard to the public. Regarding the acquiring easements on private property, the FEIR analyzes impacts that could occur should land be required for road improvements outside the existing right of way. For details on the easements that would need to be obtained to construct required improvements, refer to the Global Response: Off-Site Improvements – Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table. With respect to the use of Eminent Domain, if easements are required from private property owners and the developer is unable to obtain easements, ultimately the Board of Supervisors will decide whether to initiate proceedings to acquire additional easements at the expense of the developer.</p> <p>Regarding significant and unavoidable impacts along the I-15, refer to the Global Response: Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to I-15 included in the introduction to these responses to comments. In addition, the FEIR does include analysis of cumulative projects in the area; including the developments at I-15 and SR-76 (refer to Table 6.1 of the Traffic Analysis included in Appendix E).</p> <p>I13-4 The project includes performance measures related to water conservation. Specifically, all phases of the project subject to Title 24 code requirements shall be designed to achieve a minimum 20 percent reduction in indoor/potable water demand and a 20 percent reduction in outdoor water use relative to baseline (2008 Title 24 Plumbing Code) indoor/outdoor water use. Water supply for the project would come from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) which is imported from San Diego County Water Authority. While water districts have goals for water conservation, they also plan and anticipate additional growth and associated water needs. Pursuant to Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221, a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) was prepared for the project by the VCMWD (see Appendix Q of the FEIR). The WSA report evaluates water supplies that are or will be available during normal, single-dry year, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection to meet existing demands, existing plus projected demands of the project, and future water demands served by the VCMWD. Based on the VCMWD’s water supply</p>
--	--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

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.



I13-6
cont.

I13-4 (cont.)

reliability analysis contained in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the WSA concludes that the VCMWD would have adequate water supply to meet and exceed expected demands for a 20-year planning horizon, including the project. In addition, the VCMWD issued an updated letter dated May 6, 2014 verifying that the conclusions of the WSA are still valid considering recent drought conditions and associated water use restrictions. This letter has been included as a cover letter to Appendix Q of the FEIR.

This comment also includes general statements about subject areas that received extensive analysis in the FEIR (grading, air quality), however as detailed comments were not provided; a specific response cannot be provided and is not required. However, your comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

I13-5

This comment includes general statements about subject areas that received extensive analysis in the FEIR. Chapter 3.0, subchapters 3.1.3, 3.1.5, and 3.1.7 of the FEIR address hydrology and water quality, schools, and water reclamation, respectively. Emergency plans and emergency response is addressed in subchapter 2.7 and Appendix K. The biological resources subchapter 2.5 of the FEIR addresses impacts to biological resources and open space. As specific comments were not raised with regard to these issue areas, a specific response cannot be provided and is not required. However, your comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

I13-6

The Board of Supervisors would have discretion over future General Plan Amendments that could be requested in the project area. With regard to the potential for continued sprawl, Chapter 1.0, subchapter 1.8 discusses the potential for the project to be growth inducing. This subchapter recognizes that the project could encourage intensification of land uses in area surrounding the project site.