

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

**Ehsan, Beth**

**From:** Sadie Rose <sadierose82@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 15, 2015 12:25 PM  
**To:** Sibbet, David; Ehsan, Beth; Loy, Maggie A; Blackson, Kristin; Wardlaw, Mark  
**Cc:** Fitzpatrick, Lisa; Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Roberts, Dave; Ron-Roberts; Horn, Bill; bruce.bettyliska@gmail.com; douglas.dill@att.net; efhgtc@gmail.com  
**Subject:** DEIR Comments please consider

Hello fellow citizens,

As city/county/federal workers we have voted you in to see to OUR best interest. I hope you will do this when considering your vote on the Valiano Project in Escondido.

I am a mother of 2 (second coming in September) and we moved to the Harmony Grove area just over 2 years. We love the peace and tranquility of this area and we are afraid that we are going to lose that. While we are all for development...we are not sure this developer has our best interest at heart. That is capitalism I suppose, profits before people. That is why we have elected officials to help keep these things in check. We have a number of issues in opposition with this...al I am sure you are familiar with.

Please reject this project. Your community is speaking to you and it is your civic duty to listen to us. The people. :) Thank you. Sadie, Ryan, Jackson, new baby, our goats, chickens, and dog. The Auers 2725 Kauana Loa Drive Escondido, CA 92029

Below I've outlined a few major problems.

**Community and Land Use Example**

• **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. 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. We played fair because that is who we are. We are not NIMBYS who reject any and all application. HGV is a clear example of that. AND, it maintained the Community Development model by

CK-1 Your opposition to the Project is hereby included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

CK-2 This is a repeat of comment AD-2. See Response AD-2 and Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Adjustment CEQA Analysis.

CK-3 This is a repeat of comment AD-3. See Response AD-3.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

CK-3  
cont.

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, frankly, would destroy any trust our community (and many others) have in our County administration.

CK-4

• **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.

CK-5

• **Community Plan:** Our community plan calls for a rural community with rural zoning and rural environment. The applicant claims it is a semi-rural development and claim to have rural themes. If houses tightly clustered together, with 1000 foot walls, 20 feet high, manufactured slopes, street lights, fencing and gates and cul-de-sacs can be defined as rural, I think they are looking at the wrong dictionary. Please, look "rural" up in the dictionary. Valiano is not it. For me, rural means... [INSERT MORE OF WHAT RURAL MEANS TO YOU PERSONALLY, EG RANCH FENCING, BARNs, OPEN SPACE, WILDLIFE, ANIMAL SMELLS, SOUNDS ETC.] Valiano is none of these things. Not only is this a significant impact but it is an existential impact: our community would be destroyed if Orange County-style developments like Valiano are squeezed into our little bucolic valley.

CK-6

• **Septic:** Our community plan calls for septic, not sewage treatment plants (again, not rural). This is inconsistent.

CK-4

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

CK-5

This is a repeat of comment AD-5. See Responses U-2a and AD-5 regarding area character, clustered housing, walls, grading and manufactured slopes, street lights, fencing, lack of gates, visual effects of cul-de-sacs, and use of the word rural.

CK-6

This is a repeat of comment AD-6. See Responses G-3 and G-7 for discussion of the EFHGCP's direction regarding septic and Response AD-6 regarding design and screening of the WTWRF.