

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Ehsan, Beth

From: Norman Lesser <ndlesser@att.net>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 1:53 PM
To: Ehsan, Beth; Sibbet, David; Loy, Maggie A; Blackson, Kristin; Wardlaw, Mark
Subject: Edan Valley Valiano Project

Dear Ms. Ehsan:

First, I want to thank you and your colleagues at Planning and Development Services for all the time and work you've put into reviewing the Valiano project. It really means a great deal to our community and appreciate that you are giving it the due diligence it deserves. My name is Norman Lesser and I've lived at 2462 Live Oak Road in Edan Valley for 28 years.

As you know, the project, as proposed, threatens to destroy the wonderful community we are part of and that has existed, undisturbed for over 125 years. It is a unique and special place in San Diego County, the last of its kind west of the 15. I am taking the 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 the Community.

Community and Land Use

General Plan Update: In the 2000s, the County staff and many members of our community (upwards of 60+ over many 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, in order to protect the rural nature and the values of our community. We agreed with this compromise. This project violates that compromise and it violates the Community Development Model as it creates higher density outside the village core after the "feathering out" has occurred. This is significant.

Harmony Grove Village: Then came New Urban West proposing a massive development now selling homes. We worked with them over several years to come up with a project that fits in with the Community Development Model and our community plan previously elaborated with County Staff. It fulfilled our obligation to accept our fair share of density and growth in San Diego County. HGV has maintained the Community Development model by keeping density in "the village" and feathering out with lower density the further you get away from the village. In fact, the lots to the north of HGV right next to Valiano's proposed area, are large lots (some as big as 10-20 acres), as are virtually every surrounding property to Valiano. The majority of the properties are 1 acre or more. So Valiano violates the word AND the spirit of our community plan and the compromise we made by clustering houses closely together in very high density clusters. To approve this increase in density would be a slap in the face to the community and suggest that creating a General Plan is a waste of time.

NC17: This property had already received an up zone from SR2 to SR1. Then they came back in front of the BOS to ask for yet another up zone to SR0.5. This time, the BOS denied them for the reasons mentioned above: it violates the CDM, this community has already accepted its fair share and it violates the spirit of the agreement we made with county during the general plan process. Now, they are trying a third time to get an up zone. Nothing has changed on the ground since it was rejected the last time. The same logic applies and BOS should not approve this up zone for the same reasons as before.

Community Plan: Our community plan calls for a rural community with rural zoning and rural environment. With a community of higher density homes surrounded by home owners who

BJ-1 Introductory comment noted. . 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.

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

BJ-3 See Response AD-3 regarding Community Development Model. Please also see Response K-11b regarding variation in lot size in the vicinity of the Project.

BJ-4 This is a repeat of comment AD-4. See Response AD-4.

BJ-5 See Response U-2a regarding the semi-rural nature of the Project, as well as Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Adjustment CEQA Analysis. Project conditions require a notice to future residents in proximity of off- and on-site large animals about the nature of the community, which may include other large animals besides horses. See Response AZ-2.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

BJ-5 cont. have farm animals there will be complaints of fowl odors, flies, obnoxious noise from roosters, geese, peacocks and other assorted farm animals. This is the nature of a rural community that new home owners do not think about until after they have purchased their home.

- **The Fire Protection Plan (FPP):** Makes no mention of evacuating horse trailers and how that would impact evacuation. We have twice as many horses in Eden Valley than we have houses. Trailers are slow, hard to maneuver, big and, importantly very hard to load animals on. There is only one way out of that valley: Country Club Drive towards Auto Park way. If the fire comes west, like it did during Cocos there will be a massive traffic jam (LOS F means bumper to bumper traffic in non-evacuation circumstances) that could doom residents to a death trap. This is significant and not mitigated.
- The response times from San Marcos Fire District would be 7.5 minutes (above the 5 minutes standard). The DEIR assumes mutual aid from a fire station that hasn't been funded (at HGVS) so that fire station cannot be used in the analysis. They are offering to pay into that fire station, but not Escondido Fire which will likely be the first responder. This is significant
- **Evacuation concerns:** Consideration that 80% of the new home owners will have more than one vehicle, during an evacuation, home owners will be taking as many vehicles as possible and will exacerbate the congestion as everyone is leaving.
- No analysis was made of the traffic heading West towards Elfin Forest Road. We know, from observation, that the traffic flow is more than 6% as stated in the DEIR. There is also a bottle neck at San Elijo Road.
- The intersection of Country Club and Auto Park Way (the main ingress and egress of the project) is already majorly congested. Even now, with HGVS built out, we sometimes have to wait two light cycles just to turn left onto Auto Park Way. What's going to happen when all the houses from HGVS and Valiano go in? This is an unacceptable, unmitigated impact.
- Furthermore, when the Sprinter comes by every 30 minutes (and soon, it will come every 15 minutes, according to NCT) it becomes even more congested. This impact is significant and unmitigated properly in the plan.

BJ-12 My wife and I have enjoyed living on Live Oak Road for the past 28 years, however, the thought that over 1000 new homes could be coming into our HOOD will change the whole feel that we have enjoyed. The general Plan was put in place for a reason. People are elected to protect the environment. Please think about the greater good on Eden Valley and the impact this development will have.

Thank you for viewing my concerns about this DEIR.

Respectfully,

Norman Lesser
ndlesser@att.net

BJ-6 See Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations regarding evacuations, including large animal evacuations.

BJ-7 This is a repeat of comment AD-10. See Responses K-199 and AD-10.

BJ-8 See Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations regarding fire evacuation.

BJ-9 This is a repeat of comment AD-14. See Response AD-14

BJ-10 See Responses E-12 regarding proposed improvements to Country Club Drive and the intersection with Auto Park Way and K-167 regarding the analysis and mitigation of that intersection.

BJ-11 See Response I-61 regarding potential traffic impacts of the SPRINTER. Information was added to the EIR but the added information did not result important new information as defined by CEQA that would require recirculation of the EIR.

BJ-12 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. Refer to the design features the Project has incorporated to retain the rural to semi-rural character of the area (Table 1-4 of the EIR). Regarding General Plan compliance, see Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Adjustment CEQA Analysis.