

LETTER

RESPONSE

Letter I76

From: Larry Evie [mailto:evielarry@gmail.com]  
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2014 9:22 AM  
To: Slovick, Mark  
Subject: LILAC HILLS RANCH, Comment Sheet, Environmental Log No. 3910 12-02-003 (ER)

Hello Mark,

In case you cannot read the attached, my response is in the body of this email.

**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 212061100**  
**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**

Why does the Board approve a General Plan and make zoning laws if a company willing to pay can have them changed for it's own benefit, not for the benefit of the community? The Plan, which was approved in 2011 by the Board of Supervisors, was written to "provide clear, unified framework for community development and conservation" and as " a consistent framework for land use and development decisions consistent with an established community vision". The Lilac Hills Ranch Planned Community is not in the public interest of the County and is not in agreement with the community

I76-1

- I76-1 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 Plan Amendment Authorization (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. Chapter 3, subchapter 3.1.4, Land Use Planning of the FEIR and Appendix W provide information demonstrating how the project would comply with the General Plan. Pursuant to Land Use Policy LU-1.2, new villages are allowed if they are (1) consistent with the Community Development Model, (2) provide necessary services and facilities, and (3) are designed to meet LEED-Neighborhood Development Certification or an equivalent. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a full discussion relevant to these issues.
- I76-2 General Plan consistency is discussed in subchapter 3.1.4 and in Appendix W of the FEIR. See response to comment I76-1 above. In addition, refer to Global Response: General Plan Consistency Analysis, included in the introduction to these responses to comments.
- I76-3 With respect to the adequacy of fire and emergency response service, see Global Response: Fire and Medical Services. The project's Evacuation Plan includes multiple components intended to create an orderly and safe evacuation of the project site in time of emergency. As discussed in subchapter 2.7 of the FEIR, the Evacuation Plan details evacuation routes, evacuation points, and implementation of a resident awareness and education program to keep future residents and employees informed and safe if wildfire occurs.

LETTER

RESPONSE

vision.

Lilac Hills Ranch is not in agreement with the County of San Diego General Plan in many ways: housing density, increasing the use of fossil fuels and their elimination into the air, destroying environmental preservation and more. 176-2

How many times does the North County constituents have to say “no” to housing that has higher density than the zoned two acre minimum? No matter what Accretive Investments, Inc. states will be done to alleviate the traffic density, to ensure safe evacuation in case of a fire or other emergency, the proposed high density population can not ensure as much or more safety to current residents. There are two roads west to the freeway and a third road which goes to Valley Center, these are the evacuation routes. 176-3

Greenhouse gas emissions cannot be lowered by building Lilac Hills Ranch. A walkability community may be feasible closer to urban areas but not in rural areas. This walkability community will not provide enough jobs for the residents and there is no public transit which can provide transportations to the jobs needed to support the “walkability” community. “Bike to work” is not feasible due to the distance to jobs and the terrain. People moving to Lilac Hills Ranch will have to drive to work, thereby emitting more gas emissions. 176-4

We are in a severe drought, to which there is no end in sight, and the County is planning to build more housing in an area where the agriculture community needs the water. 176-5

Please, Board of Supervisors, do not think that Bill Horn is working in this community’s best interest or for what this community wants. The Newland Sierra Project ( aka Miriam Mountains) is another example of his ignoring and continuing to bring before the Board projects his constituents have said over and over that they do not want. As shown by the last election, he was narrowly defeated. Since this is his last term, he has nothing to lose by ignoring his constituents. 176-6

Thank you.

Evelyn Stainbrook 7-27-2014  
 10038 Covey Lane  
 Escondido, CA 92026  
 760-749-6984

176-4 The FEIR does not assert that greenhouse gas emissions would be lowered by building the project. Rather, Appendix O and subchapter 3.1.2 of the FEIR evaluate the project’s emissions and determine that under multiple scenarios, impacts would be less than significant.

Section II of the Specific Plan describes various transit goals for the project, including that the Developer/HOA would continue to work with the North County Transit District to locate and furnish a transit stop on either the Village Green or within the Town Center based on district needs. The FEIR identifies that more greenhouse gas emissions would result from the project over the current condition; however, this does not represent a significant impact in itself based on County Guidelines for Determining Significance.

176-5 This comment makes a general statement that does not raise an issue with the content or adequacy of the FEIR. 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 EIR) that demonstrates adequate water is available to serve 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.

176-6 The comment raises issues that do not relate to any physical effect on the environment or 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.