

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Ehsan, Beth

From: JoAnne Lesser <joanne.lesser@att.net>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 1:37 PM
To: Ehsan, Beth
Cc: Sibbet, David; Loy, Maggie A; Blackson, Kristin; Wardlaw, Mark; Fitzpatrick, Lisa; Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Roberts, Dave; Ron-Roberts; Horn, Bill
Subject: Draft - EIR - Valiano proposed project

Dear Ms. Ehsan:

The Planning and Development Services has expended much time and work in reviewing the Valiano project. It means a great deal to our community and we appreciate that you are giving it the DUE DILIGENCE it deserves.

My name is Jo-Anne Lesser and I've lived on Live Oak Road (Eden Valley) for 27 years.

The Valiano project, as you know, threatens to destroy the wonderful community we are part of and that has existed, undisturbed for over 125 years. We live in a unique and special place in San Diego County, the last of its kind west of the 15!!

I take this opportunity to provide my comments on the Draft EIR for this project with the expectation that the developer will seek to follow the vision of the General Plan and that of my community:

- General Plan Update: In the 2000s the County staff and many members of our community (upwards of 60 and over many meetings) collaborated on the General Plan Update and it was decided that our community should take our share of density to accommodate the growth that SD County would experience over the next 20 years. This is where the Community Development model was implemented where our share of this density would form part of a denser village and then the density would feather outwards away from the village limit line. We agreed with this compromise. This project VIOLATES that compromise and it VIOLATES the Community Development Model and creates higher density outside the village core after the "feathering out" has occurred.
Harmony Grove Village: We worked with New Urban West over a period of several years to make sure the project fits in with the Community Development Model and our community plan previously noted with the County Staff. However, Valiano violates the WORD AND SPIRIT of our community plan and the compromise we made by clustering houses closely together in very high density clusters.
Community Plan: 27 years ago I moved to this community because it was rural with rural zoning and a rural environment. This applicant claims it is a semi-rural development and claims to have rural themes. This is not true; the houses are tightly clustered together

BI-1 Introductory comment noted. This comment indicates that the Project would threaten to destroy the community (character) and the EIR analysis does not come to the same conclusion. Your hope for the developer to follow the vision of the General Plan is hereby included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project. Please see responses to specific comments, below.

BI-2 This is a repeat of comment AD-2. See Response AD-2.

BI-3 See Response AD-3 regarding the Community Development Model and the importance of community input.

BI-4 See Responses U-2a and AD-5 regarding the semi-rural density and design elements of the Project.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

BI-4 cont. with 1000 foot walls, 20 feet high with manufactured slopes, gates, cul-de-sacs etc. What rural means to me is open fields, horse corrals, barns, ranch fencing. VALIANO'S PROPOSAL IS NOT RURAL.

BI-5 • **Fire Safety:** During the CoCo's fire last year, we were stuck in traffic for over 45 minutes and we don't have horses. Country Club Road is only a two lane road with LOS F. It is facing evacuation traffic from 742 homes - with probably two cars per home. The FPP is focusing exclusively on the impacts to "the project" with no reference to how it will jeopardize the existing community.

BI-6 • **Equestrian Example:** Horses on 1/3 of an acre?? I live in a development of 80+ homes - all with 1/2 acre lots and NO ONE HAS A HORSE. Say no more.

BI-7 • **Air Quality:** According to the DEIR, the project will have significant and unavoidable air quality impacts and no way to mitigate these impacts. More than doubles the vehicle miles traveled; they don't show that a project with fewer units is infeasible; they claim green credentials by exceeding the Title 24 standards from 2008, but newer standards are currently in plan from 2013. They do not meet the 2013 standards which are more stringent.

BI-8

BI-9

BI-10

BI-11 Ms. Ehsan, these are some of my top concerns about this proposed project; I expect that you will take these concerns into consideration when making your decision not to approve the plan as written.

Thank you for your attention to this communication.

Regards,

Jo-Anne Lesser

BI-5 See Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations regarding fire evacuation.

BI-6 See Response I-59 regarding fire protection benefits to the neighborhood.

BI-7 Horses are allowed on 1/3 acre lots per County zoning designations. In addition, as stated in Section 3.1.4 of the EIR, a 15,000 s.f. lot would be able to accommodate a home, horse stable, shade structure, and horse trailer parking while meeting the proposed setbacks. The lack of horses within your development may be due to its zoning regulations (check the animal designation in the zoning box).

BI-8 See Response K-26a with respect to unavoidable air quality impacts and Response AJ-29 with respect to VMTs.

BI-9 See Response K-26b with respect to Project alternatives with fewer residential units.

BI-10 See Response K-27 with respect to compliance with the 2016 Title 24 Energy Code.

BI-11 The comment requests denial of the Project based on concerns about the Project. The comment is hereby included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to the final decision on the Project.