

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Ehsan, Beth

From: Natasha Kay <orangemoth13@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2015 4:25 PM
To: Sibbet, David; Ehsan, Beth; Loy, Maggie A; Blackson, Kristin; Wardlaw, Mark; Fitzpatrick, Lisa; Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Roberts, Dave; Ron-Roberts; Horn, Bill; bruce.bettyliska@gmail.com; douglas.dill@att.net
Cc: Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Town Council
Subject: Valiano project

To whom it may concern,

I am writing today about the proposed EIR related to the Valiano Project in Eden Valley. We moved here in 2009 from Carlsbad. The reason I, and everyone else I've talked to moved here, is due to the rural atmosphere. We moved here to have quiet, dark night skies, privacy and to be in and around nature.

I am about a half mile around the corner from the Harmony Grove Village and I cannot express how much that project has negatively affected our lives and experience here. It has created noise, lights, more traffic and completely changed Harmony Grove for the worst, in more ways than I will mention here.

The reason for my letter today is to express my concern about the proposed Valiano project in Eden Valley. I read through parts of the EIR and it was strange to see that almost every topic brought up ended with a statement like: the "_____ impact would be less than significant". It was as if it had been written by them (Valiano). I think that almost everything in the report would have a very significant impact on this community. Everything from vector control, historical land uses, wildfire hazards and water have been mentioned and all of these cause us deep concern.

For us (my family here at 9237 Harmony Grove Road) the Valiano project will double the negative effects we are already suffering with from the HGV project. The traffic is already going to more than double and we fear that if Valiano is approved we may lose our homes due to having to widen the road. We are right on the road and see this as a reality. Being right on the main road we already have almost non-stop traffic day and night which again is only going to be worse once HGV fills up all those homes. With Valiano the traffic will increase even more. The issue of wildlife and open space is one of our largest concerns. Each pair of owls for instance, requires a certain amount of square acres to mate/breed, they will lose even more space. All of the animals will be losing space/habitat and some may die off altogether. When we moved here we had deers and coyotes frequently and now it is far less, Valiano will make this even worse. The dark sky policy is another issue that has been ruined by HGV, and again Valiano will worsen this as well. Water is now an issue for all of us and I just dont see how another 326 homes will be sustainable.

In conclusion I would just like to express my sadness and anger about the idea of another development down here in Harmony Grove when we havent even seen the affects of HGV. Another "project" (Valiano) will only exacerbate all of the issues we are now coming to terms with and learning to deal with.

Thank you for your consideration,
Natasha Kay (and family)

BC-1 The comment does not raise an environmental issue with respect to the Project EIR. The Harmony Grove Village project is not a part of the Proposed Project. However, the amount of noise and light from Harmony Grove Village you mention has (to date) primarily been associated with construction activities.

Currently at Harmony Grove Village, homes are for sale, and increased amounts of night-lighting are assumed in the near-term. This information cited in the comment is consistent with the information in the Harmony Grove Village EIR,

Immediately following project construction and sale, safety and other resulting lighting effects would result in increased glow over existing conditions. While street trees and internal landscaping, when mature, would help buffer the homes from views to the Proposed Project from off site, softening sharp edges, unifying the project, and diminishing project lighting and glare, this would not be the case in the short-term. While temporary in nature and ultimately addressed through project design and landscaping over the long-term, short-term adverse visual impacts would be significant and unmitigable pursuant to Threshold No. 4. (AL I-8)(County 2006:2.4-27).

And

Nightlighting effects would increase for the period between initiation of habitation and landscaping (particularly street trees) attaining heights exceeding the light source. While relatively temporary in nature and ultimately addressed through project design and landscaping, short-term visual impacts would be significant and unmitigable. (County 2006:2.4-34).

As stated, these adverse effects are expected to diminish as street trees and Project landscaping achieve maturity.

BC-2 In a CEQA document, each potential impact of a project is analyzed and requires a determination of being "potentially significant," "less than significant," or "no impact." Applicable thresholds established by the County and regulations are utilized to determine the level of impact. See Table S-1 for a summary of the significant impacts and the mitigation

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

<p>BC-9 Response</p> <p>BC-10 Response</p> <p>BC-11 Response</p>	<p>BC-2 cont. that would be implemented to reduce those impacts. The PDS staff independently reviews iterations of technical reports and the EIR prior to accepting the document for public review and then the public participates in finalizing the document prior to its consideration by the decision-makers. It is a goal of County staff and in everybody's interest to achieve a mitigated project with less than significant impacts.</p> <p>BC-3 See Subsection 2.9.1.4 for discussion of vector control.</p> <p>BC-4 See Subsections 2.1.2.2, 2.1.2.4, and 2.3.1.3, and Subchapter 2.5 regarding historic land uses. The historic use of the site as an agricultural operation would be partially maintained through the 35.4-acre agricultural easement, discussed in Response I-69a.</p> <p>BC-5 See Subsection 2.9.2.6 for discussion of wildfire hazards.</p> <p>BC-6 See Responses C-2, C-8, and C-10 regarding water usage.</p> <p>BC-7 The concern cited in the comment including cumulative traffic analysis is fully addressed in the EIR (Section 2.8), based on a TIA prepared to analyze the Project's traffic impacts (Appendix H of the EIR). Mitigation measures would be implemented that would reduce the traffic impacts. No changes to the EIR resulted from the comment. The cumulative analysis accounted for the Proposed Project traffic and the Harmony Grove Village traffic and did not find a significant impact on Harmony Grove Road in front of your house. The Project does not propose, and would not cause, for the road to be widened and for eminent domain to occur on your house. The great majority of Project traffic would not head west on Harmony Grove Road (see Response K-165 for further information).</p> <p>BC-8 Comment noted. Your appreciation of wildlife is understood. The Project site, however, is not considered a priority area for conservation under the draft North County MSCP. The draft NCMSCP identifies proposed PAMAs, which are intended to be the future NCMSCP preserve areas. These future preserve areas would provide a network of conserved lands to protect north county's native plants and animals, including both common species and rare species. Except for a small area in the southeast corner of the site associated with the former Harmony Grove Equestrian Facility, the Project site does not include habitat areas designated as proposed PAMA in the draft NCMSCP. The lack of PAMA designation over the site underscores the site's history of agriculture use which has disturbed much of the land, as well as the site's lack of connectivity to large open space areas. Mitigation would be provided for Project impacts to biological resources pursuant to County and Resource Agencies requirements. In addition, habitat for wildlife would continue to exist on the Project site following Project development, including a 47.5-acre block of land in the northwest portion of the site, as well as smaller areas of designated biological open space. These areas could still be used by owls and other wildlife.</p>
--	---

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

BC-9 See Response K-109 regarding lighting and night skies.

BC-10 See Responses C-2, C-8, and C-10 regarding water usage.

BC-11 The direct impacts of Harmony Grove Village are not part of the Proposed Project and are therefore not analyzed in this CEQA document. Cumulative impacts from the Proposed Project and other nearby projects, such as Harmony Grove Village, were analyzed in the EIR for aesthetics, air quality, agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, paleontological resources, transportation/traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, geology and soils, and utilities and service systems. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the significant cumulative impacts. Your position regarding the negative effects of the Project is hereby included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to the final decision on the Project.