

Letter I65

From: linda@gnelson.com [mailto:linda@gnelson.com]
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 10:43 AM
To: Slovick, Mark
Subject: LILAC HILLS RANCH

July 11, 2014

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

e-mail: Mark.Sovick@sdcounty.ca.gov

RE: Lilac Hills Ranch

As a homeowner in the community that is adversely impacted, I am strongly opposed to the above project for the following reasons:

1. Taking our private road (Mountain Ridge) using Eminent Domaine is a misuse and abuse of power. Eminent Domaine is reserved for the greater benefit of all parties. This project is exclusively for the monetary profit benefit of a few developers and investors. Eminent Domaine does not apply for the greater benefit for all the people that currently live in Escondido and Valley Center. Taking our private road will seriously and adversely affects the property owners that currently live along this private road.

2. There is no existing infrastructure to support 1600+ homes in the area designated by the developers. This includes utilities, fire protection, adequate roads for ingress/egress, schools etc. It would be years before adequate infrastructure could be built. This puts current property owners, such as myself and my neighbors in harms way. Our existing fire department/emergency departments can only adequately handle occasional traffic accidents and occasional house/brush fires. A great concern to me and my neighbors is a major wild fire. Lives can potentially be lost in the event that a mass evacuation becomes necessary. There is a potential for this type situation at our current population levels without adding the proposed development of 1600+ of additional home owners and businesses in the proposed area. Circle R and Mountain Ridge Roads are not and will never be adequate to allow potentially thousands of vehicles to exit the area. In addition it is not wide enough to allow for adequate oversized fire equipment to enter the area with vehicles exiting at the same time.

Mountain Ridge is a two lane private road that belongs to the people that chose to purchase property in this rural setting. As a whole we do not give our permission to Lilac Hills Ranch to allow them to use our road for their development. We do not want our lives disrupted with added traffic, noise and pollution created by this unwanted development. This is a farming area, not meant for dense housing and businesses. We do not deserve to have our house values plummet with the creation of low cost, dense

- } I65-1
- } I65-2
- } I65-3
- } I65-4
- } I65-5
- } I65-6
- } I65-7

I65-1 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.

I65-2 Mountain Ridge Road is an existing private road that provides legal access to several parcels within the project (the southern portion of SRS-5 and SFS-6, and the institutional site within Phase 5) to Circle R Drive. Refer to the Global Response: Off-site Improvements – Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table for details of the specific APNs that the road easement benefits. Circle R Drive is a County-maintained public road with access to the west to Old Highway 395. The existing Mountain Ridge Road does not meet the County's Private Road Standards and the project proposes to improve this roadway to County Private Road standards, requests a design exception to allow the existing 15 mph design speed to remain. The improvements to Mountain Ridge Road are included in the Project Description as a project design feature. The project applicant has a legal right to access its property from Mountain Ridge Road and to make improvements to the roadway as further explained below. It is noted that all improvements would be within the existing private road easement.

Mountain Ridge Road is an existing access point that connects the southern portion of SRS-5 and SFS-6, and the institutional site within Phase 5 of the Project to the County's public road system. The off-site improvements made to Mountain Ridge Road will ensure that the these parcels will continue to have ingress and egress to Circle R Drive and would comply with the requirements of the County's General Plan Policies and Subdivision regulations. (San Diego County Standard Conditions for Tentative Subdivision Maps, Document Number 740858(a), approved by the Board of Supervisors, April 10, 1991.)

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I65-2 (cont.)</p> <p>Regarding the need to use eminent domain to obtain easements, for improvements to Mountain Ridge Road; the Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative would potentially require use of eminent domain to accomplish improvements to County Public Road Standards. Additionally, the proposed taper at the intersection may require the use of eminent domain in order to construct the intersection to standard. Please refer to Global Response: Off-Site Improvements – Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table for a detail of all existing and required easements.</p> <p>The applicant would be required to obtain additional right-of-way for road improvements. If right-of-way could not be obtained, then they could request the Board of Supervisors to assist in obtaining the right-of-way (Eminent Domain) pursuant to Board Policy J-33. A final decision on the project, including whether to select one of the project alternatives that would potentially require Eminent Domain proceedings to acquire additional easements, is under the discretion of the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>I65-3</p> <p>The comment addresses general subject areas of public services, fire protection, roads, wildland fire, and emergency evacuation which were analyzed in the FEIR. Refer to subchapter 3.1.7 of the FEIR for details on the analysis that demonstrates water and wastewater services that would be available to serve the proposed development. In addition, the following water and wastewater services technical reports were included as appendices to the FEIR that provide details about the provision of water and wastewater service to the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater Management Alternative Report for Lilac Hills Ranch (Appendix S); • Overview of Water Service, Lilac Hills Ranch Project (Appendix T); • WSA Report for the Lilac Hills Ranch Project (Appendix Q); • Preliminary Hydrogeologic Assessment (Appendix P). <p>With respect to the adequacy of fire and emergency response service, see Global Response: Fire and Medical Services. The adequacy of roads to serve the project can be found in subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E of the FEIR. See response to comment I26-1 for details related to the Fire Protection Plan and Evacuation Plan.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>165-3 (cont.)</p> <p>The timing of providing the needed infrastructure to serve the project is provided in the Specific Plan, Section IV Implementation that includes a Community Phasing Plan, starting on page IV-1. Construction of the project is anticipated to occur over an 8- to 12-year period in response to market demands and to provide a logical and orderly expansion of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure. The developer would be required to meet various commitments prior to approval of each Tentative Map or Tentative Parcel Map such as demonstrating services are available, providing street improvements, parks, open space dedications, and satisfying the mitigation measures included in the FEIR.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I65-4 With respect to the adequacy of fire and emergency response service, see Global Response: Fire and Medical Services. The District, as stated in the Project Facility Availability Form, has the capacity and capability to provide fire and emergency medical services to the project. As detailed in the Fire Protection Plan, the additional response to emergency calls from the project could result in an increase from 2.0 calls per day to 3.9 calls per day at build-out. As detailed in Chapter 2.0, subchapter 2.7.2.4 and Appendix J of the FEIR, existing stations would be able to absorb the additional calls generated by the project at build-out.</p> <p>Details in Chapter 3.0 of the FEIR (pages 3-113 to 3-114) identify that the San Diego County Sheriff Department (SDSD) would adequately serve the project with the addition of three sworn personnel funded through property tax of future residents. This increase in personnel would achieve an adequate service level of three patrol shifts per day per 10,000 residents. See response to comment I65-3 above. The following response, I65-5 addresses evacuation.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>I65-5 The FEIR includes an Evacuation Plan (Appendix K) that demonstrates the project could be safely evacuated with the proposed project roadways and proposed roadway improvements in addition to implementation of other measures included in the Evacuation Plan. All roads proposed for use during an evacuation would be constructed to Consolidated Fire Code standards which allow for emergency equipment to utilize the roads simultaneously with evacuating residents (including Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane). Page 8 of Appendix K identifies that during an emergency evacuation, the primary and secondary roadways will be shared with responding emergency vehicles and may reduce the available useable widths of the roadways required for a smooth evacuation process. The Evacuation Plan goes on to state that “Even with available roadways, there are aspects of fire safety and evacuation that require a significant level of awareness by the residents and emergency service providers in order to reduce and/or avoid problems with an effective evacuation of the development. The key to mitigating potential impediments is through a strong educational program sponsored by the developer, the homeowner’s association, and the DSFPD with regards to this evacuation plan. The FEIR concludes that potential impacts associated with potential fire hazards would be less than significant. See response to comment I26-1.</p> <p>I65-6 See response to comment I65-2.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>housing conditions within a short distance from our houses. Each and every one of us homeowners chose to live in this rural area and do not want “change” forced upon us for the profits of this developer who will not even be living here. } I65-7 cont.</p> <p>3. Circle R is not adequate to accommodate the added burden for thousands of additional vehicle trips due to the added traffic created by this development. Circle R can not accommodate a mast evacuation due to fire/earthquake or other natural disasters. Large trucks and construction vehicles were not meant to travel this road in order to built tract housing. } I65-8</p> <p>4. A dense, low cost housing community will bring in a certain amount of people that have criminal intent. This can not be avoided, nor should it be swept aside as defined as “progress”. By allowing this community to be built you are potentially bring harm and endangering the well being and safety of the current residents that reside in this area. } I65-9</p> <p>Please use common sense when considering the uses for this very rural/farming area. This is not high density housing terrain territory. The ingress and egress roads are not adequate to support this development. Millions of tons of dirt will have to be moved in order to build housing tracts. This is NOT in keeping with the natural topography of this land. There can be many more adverse situations created by his dense housing development that may not be evident until such a major project is built out. Please stop this nonsense that will only benefit the financial advancement of the developer at the expense of us hardworking, tax paying individuals that care about our property and the use of the land surrounding us. } I65-10</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Linda M Nelson 9755 Megan Terrace Escondido, CA 92026</p> <p>760 751-1958</p>	<p>I65-7 The County acknowledges this comment. The comment raises economic issues and general opposition to the project. See subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E, subchapter 2.8 and Appendix M, and subchapter 3.1.2 and Appendix O for details related to existing conditions, impacts, and mitigation of traffic, noise, and greenhouse gases. The comment does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of the environmental document. 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.</p> <p>I65-8 Circle R Drive is a County-maintained public road with access to the west to Old Highway 395. Circle R Drive would provide secondary emergency access south of the project site via Mountain Ridge Road. Circle R Drive would not serve the entirety of the project site due to gates at Mountain Ridge Road as described in the Specific Plan at the locations shown on Figure 24. Project access and proposed gates are described in detail in the Project Description of the FEIR and are shown on Figure 1-7. The gate at Mountain Ridge Road would be opened only during emergencies to facilitate evacuation in order to enhance the safety of the project as well as the residents in the area during an emergency. For additional details as to how the project roadways, including Circle R Drive, would be adequate for purposes of evacuation, refer to Chapter 2.0, subchapter 2.7.2.4 of the FEIR, Appendices J (Fire Protection Plan) and K (Evacuation Plan), and response to comment I65-5. Also see subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E for details related to traffic impacts and required improvements. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding the adequacy of the environmental document. 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.</p> <p>I65-9 The comment raises social issues that are not related to any physical effect on the environment nor the adequacy of the environmental document. 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.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>165-10 The comment addresses general subject areas of General Plan consistency, traffic, and potential visual effects which were analyzed in the FEIR. See subchapter 3.1.4 and Appendix W, subchapter 2.3 and Appendix E, and subchapter 2.1 and Appendix C for details related to General Plan consistency, traffic, and visual resources. The comment does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental document. The County acknowledges this comment and the 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.</p>
--	--