

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I22

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

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

Mark Slovick, Project Manager  
 Planning & Development Services  
 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310, San Diego, Ca 92123  
[Mark.Slovick@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto: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 sever 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

122-1

122-2

122-3

122-4

I22-1 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project. The 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. The comment is introductory in nature.

I22-2 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the proposed increase in density. See response to comment I4-1 and I5-3 for details related the project's General Plan consistency and community character, respectively. Impacts to agricultural resources are addressed in subchapter 2.4 of the FEIR. This comment does not raise a specific issue with regard to the content or adequacy of the FEIR.

I22-3 The nature of the on-site soils was evaluated in subchapter 2.4 of the FEIR. The analysis determined that a significant impact to 43.8 acres of agricultural resources would occur and requires mitigation at a 1:1 mitigation ratio (M-AG-1). In addition, the project would retain approximately 20 acres within the project site that would continue in agricultural use and provide agricultural buffering to the surrounding agricultural uses. Regarding the potential for pesticides and herbicides to leach into the soils, affecting the groundwater aquifer, the meaning of the comment is unclear since the project would not increase the potential for pesticide and herbicide use associated with agricultural use. This comment does not raise a specific issue with regard to the content or adequacy of the FEIR.

I22-4 The FEIR includes an analysis of water supply, taking into account existing drought conditions and potential future drought conditions. Water supply for the project would come from the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) which is imported from San Diego County Water Authority. 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 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.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>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. } 122-4 cont.</p> <p>- 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. } 122-5</p> <p>- 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! } 122-6</p> <p>- 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. } 122-7</p> <p>- 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. } 122-8</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Francois L. Cyr, MBA, BS Theresa A. Cyr, DO, ACOFP, ABIHM</p>	<p>122-5 The sustainability features of the project will be implemented through the Specific Plan and through project conditions during Tentative and Final Map processing. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of the FEIR. This 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.</p> <p>122-6 The comment makes a general comment and does not raise a specific issue with regard to the content of the FEIR. The adequacy of fire protection and emergency evacuation along with public services were analyzed in the FEIR. This 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.</p> <p>122-7 The commenter makes a general comment about noise, congestion, and traffic that were analyzed in the FEIR. Noise impacts are addressed in subchapter 2.8, transportation impacts are addressed in subchapter 2.3, and consistency with the County General Plan (with regard to the comment on sprawl) is addressed in subchapter 3.1.3 of the FEIR and in Appendix W. The comment does not raise a specific issue with regard to the content or adequacy of the FEIR. This 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.</p> <p>122-8 Please refer to Global Response: Fire and Medical Services.</p>
---	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I22-9 The project will be required to improve West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Main Street to meet the General Plan Mobility Element classification of 2.2C, subject to exceptions as approved by the County (M-TR-4). As detailed in the Traffic Study (Appendix E) and subchapter 2.3 of the FEIR, the impacts along this segment of West Lilac Road will be mitigated through implementation of M-TR-4, as stated above. Under build-out conditions (traffic scenario E), this segment is expected to operate at LOS D. In addition, none of the exception requests for this segment of West Lilac Road affect roadway capacity because they do not modify the required width of travel lanes. Modification requests affect shoulder and parkway widths, not the actual drivable portion of the road. Additional improvements at Old Highway 395 and West Lilac Road include a signalized intersection and a left-turn lane at the westbound West Lilac Road approach. As a result of these measures, and as demonstrated in the Traffic Study, West Lilac Road and the Lilac Road Bridge would be able to handle projected traffic.</p>
--	---