

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Ehsan, Beth

From: Nicole Sestina <nsestina@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 2:32 PM
To: Sibbet, David; Loy, Maggie A; Wardlaw, Mark; Blackson, Kristin; Ehsan, Beth
Cc: HO 2 HO; Fitzpatrick, Lisa; Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Roberts, Dave; Ron-Roberts; Horn, Bill; bruce.bettyliska@gmail.com; efhgtc@gmail.com; douglas.dill@att.net
Subject: Valiano Draft Environmental Impact Report: PDS2013-SP-13-001, PDS2013-GPA-13-001, PDS2013-REZ-13-001, PDS2013-TM-5575, PDS2014-MUP-14-019, PDS2013-STP-13-003, PDS2013-ER-13-08-002

County Planning and Development Services:

CO-1 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above mentioned Draft EIR. I reside at 3007 Hill Valley Road in the beautiful area of Eden Valley. Our family moved to this wonderful community 2 years ago to escape living among clustered tract developments. As you may know, our property, along with all surrounding properties, are located in a semi-rural area with minimum acre lots zoned A70 – Limited Agriculture, intended for crop or animal agriculture. Currently I look out from my front porch and see about a dozen custom built homes scattered among the hill side of Coronado Hills. Since living in this property we have observed numerous creatures including deer, countless coyotes, hawks, numerous species of snakes, vultures, and even a weasel. Our current view and experience of encountering wildlife is congruent with what we would expect living in a semi-rural area. With the current Valiano proposal, nearly 50 tract homes would be packed into neighborhood 4 along that same hill side and with the current proposal, over 85% of these properties would be slotted to have lot sizes under .5 acres. This neighborhood, along with the entire Valiano project, is completely out of character for this valley.

CO-2 In learning about this proposed project I have conducted research and have learned that based on years of work and data, in recent years, the county adopted a General Plan. The County General Plan “reflects the County’s commitment to a sustainable growth model that facilitates efficient development near infrastructure and services, while respecting sensitive natural resources and protection of existing community character in its extensive rural and semi-rural communities.” As proposed, with a majority of lots under an acre, some even less than 6000 sq ft, making houses tightly clustered together, constructing artificial retaining walls, manufactured slopes, street lights, fencing and cul-de-sacs; the Valiano project in no way respects the sensitive natural resources or protects our existing community character. My hope is that the developer takes note of the importance of our community and build to the specifications of the San Diego General Plan

CO-3 Besides the potential loss of wildlife, the beautiful rolling hill topography and the threat to our community character, I have numerous concerns with this project as proposed. After losing a home in the 2003 Cedar fire, my greatest concern is safety.

- Wildfire and Evacuation
 - As a homeowner who had to evacuate during the Cocos fire, I fear that my family or neighbors would not be able to evacuate the area in a safe and timely manner. There is currently only one road providing ingress and egress to this valley. As our neighbors to the west living in San Elijo Hills learned, one exit strategy does not adequately address the danger of wildfires. My children attend San Elijo Middle School and the traffic congestion the day of the Cocos fire was terrifying. A simple shift of the winds and the outcome of no lives lost on that horrifying day could have been very different.

CO-4

- Traffic
 - Traffic already backs up, and at times takes numerous light cycles before being able to proceed at the intersections of Country Club/Auto Parkway, Auto Parkway/Mission, Mission/Barham and Nordal/78 Interstate. Two of these intersections are also impacted by the Sprinter track. My understanding there are talks of the Sprinters running every 15 minutes instead of every 30.

CO-1 Comment noted. See Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Adjustment CEQA Analysis and Response AD-5 regarding the Project community character consistency.

CO-2 Comment noted. The need for a GPA is addressed in Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Adjustment CEQA Analysis. See Responses K-11b, AD-3 and BH-3 regarding Eden Valley lots near the Project that are less than 1 acre in size. See Response U-2a regarding the clustered nature of the development and planned benefits of that consolidation. Also see Responses AF-23 and CC-22 regarding Project retaining walls, and Response AF-22 regarding manufactured slopes. In general, use of retaining walls results in reduction in grading footprint, and can result in preservation of additional habitat above perimeter walls as grading for (otherwise required appropriate slope gradient) can be eliminated. Response AG-1 provides information relative to street lights. Fencing and cul-de-sacs are addressed in Responses U-2a and AD-5, which also contain information relative to some of the other specified concerns noted here in more general terms. Additional information regarding consistency with community character is addressed in Responses G-7 and I-65.

CO-3 See Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations regarding fire evacuation.

CO-4 See Response K-160b regarding the Mission Road/Auto Park Way intersection, Response I-61 regarding SPRINTER impacts and the County Club Drive/Auto Park Way intersection, Response A-7 regarding the SR-78/Nordahl Road intersection, and Topical Response: Fire/Evacuations regarding fire evacuations. The Barham Drive/Mission Road intersection was analyzed in the Project TIA and impacts were less than significant.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

CO-4 cont. More homes = more people making trips on these same roads = longer wait times. For sure this would be an inconvenience, but again my main concern is safety. In the event of an emergency how would first responders be able to access this valley in a timely manner or how would residents be able to evacuate safely? I do not feel this concern is adequately addressed in the Draft EIR.

CO-5

- o Country Club Drive, the one and only street that provides access to residents of Eden Valley and Harmony grove is a two-lane undivided roadway with minimal shoulders and no sidewalks. Lacking sidewalks or trails, it is already quite dangerous when pedestrians are present. The proposed project will increase the traffic on this stretch of roadway increasing the safety concern for pedestrians.

CO-6

- o The same is true for Kauana Loa Drive, which provided ingress and egress to the east of our valley, it too is an undivided roadway with minimal shoulders and no sidewalks. Again, pedestrian safety is a concern.

CO-7

- Noise
 - o My property is situated overlooking the community of Coronado Hills, so we are not heavily impacted by the traffic noise Country Club. After living in clustered developments in the past my concern with noise is with potential home owners who could occupy the now quiet, agricultural setting. With people come many sources of noise; kids, dogs, lawn equipment, cars and countless other things. Currently we have one neighbor "across the street" which happens to be a dirt easement, with a 20 acre parcel. Because of the topography and the way the wind blows through this valley, typically from the northwest, we can hear our neighbors when they are outside simply talking. Just beyond our neighbors property the Valiano project is proposing constructing nearly 50 homes. The noise from all of these homes will travel through this valley, disrupting our quiet semi-rural environment. This does threaten our rural lifestyle.

CO-8

- Air Quality
 - o The project would result in a significant decline in air quality in Eden Valley that would be harmful to us as well as all other residents of Eden Valley. The topography of Eden Valley results in frequent inversion layers. The construction and operation of the project as proposed, including the additional traffic, would result in a significant deterioration in air quality. This is acknowledged by the applicant in section 2.2 of the draft EIR.
 - o "In addition, the Proposed Project would significantly contribute to cumulative construction and operational air quality impacts (Impacts AQ-2 and AQ-3, respectively). short of reducing the Project size, there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Project's contribution to a less than considerable level. Accordingly, these impacts would remain significant and unmitigated.

CO-9

CO-10a To summarize, I have numerous concerns regarding the Valiano project as proposed, Through this process I have discovered that San Diego has adopted a General Plan that was developed through years of work and given great consideration. In developing the General Plan, members looked to 10 guiding principles, many of which Valiano is in direct contradiction.

CO-10b

- Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities when planning new housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.

CO-10c

- Promote environmental stewardship that protects the range of natural resources and habitats that uniquely define the County's character and ecological importance.

CO-10d

- Ensure that development accounts for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land.
- Provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns and, when appropriate, plan for development which supports public transportation.

CO-10e

- Maintain environmentally sustainable communities and reduce greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change.

CO-10f

- Preserve agriculture as an integral component of the region's economy, character, and open space network.

CO-10g

- Recognize community and stakeholder interests while striving for consensus.

CO-5 The Project would provide mitigation along Country Club Drive from Auto Park Way to Kauana Loa Drive by implementing intersection improvements at the Country Club Drive/Auto Park Way intersection, and providing left-turn pockets onto Project access roads at Eden Valley Road, Mount Whitney Road, and the two future access driveways to improve operations along Country Club Drive. For pedestrians, at the north end of Country Club Drive south of Auto Parkway the Project would install a 5-foot wide sidewalk for approximately 830 feet on the west side of the street. This would connect two currently disconnected sections of sidewalk; one extending approximately 220 feet southerly of Auto Parkway, and one extending approximately 1380 feet north of the intersection of Country Club Drive and Hill Valley Drive. A 6-inch curb and gutter would be located between the sidewalk and street pavement. As necessary, and focused on the area in the southern third of the improvement, some downslope grading would occur from the back of the sidewalk to existing ground. Three above-ground power poles in this area would be relocated west of the sidewalk or protected in place. On the east side of Country Club Drive, paralleling the new sidewalk segment on the other side of the road and wherever existing driveways would not interrupt the improvements, a 6-inch (street-side) asphalt berm would be backed by a 5-foot wide decomposed granite pathway.

In addition, the Project also proposes a system of public and private trails and pathways for pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrian users within the Project site as described in Subsection 1.2.1.2 in Chapter 1.0 of the EIR.

CO-6 The Kauana Loa Drive / Harmony Grove Road intersection and street segment Kauana Loa Drive east of Country Club Drive were analyzed and impacts were calculated to be less than significant. In addition, the Project includes a Project Design Feature to improve Kauana Loa Drive from approximately 1,500 feet east of Country Club Drive to Harmony Grove Road. Improvements include traffic calming measures such as speed and curve signage, striping, "Bott's Dots" along the centerline, and radar speed signs in both directions approaching the angled curve along this segment. Figure 1-15c of the Final EIR provides a conceptual drawing of the proposed traffic calming features.

See Response CO-5 for information on pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrian users.

CO-7 General incidental neighborhood noise (sometimes termed "nuisance" noise) generated from general residential activities may be audible at the commenter's residence but would be widely distributed throughout the area; no single event would be great enough to generate a significant noise increase to the off-site neighborhood residences. The County Noise Ordinance [36.404] establishes prohibitions for disturbing, offensive,

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

CO-7 cont.	or excessive noise and sets sound level limits for residential properties (a one-hour average of 50 dBA during the daytime and 45 dBA during nighttime hours). It is unlawful for any person to cause or allow the creation of noise that exceeds the applicable limits of the noise ordinance beyond the boundaries on which the sound is produced.
CO-8	The comment reiterates the summary included in the EIR. No response is required.
CO-9	See Response K-26b with respect to reducing air quality impacts through adopting a Project alternative with fewer residential units.
CO-10a	The commenter is not specific about how the Proposed Project is in contradiction with this guiding principle. The Proposed Project would reinforce the vitality and local economy by providing housing units in proximity to major commercial and employment centers. The Project would reinforce the individual character of the existing communities through the semi-rural design of the Project, including conservation of open space, an agricultural easement, and equestrian and other recreational amenities.
CO-10b	The commenter is not specific about how the Proposed Project is in contradiction with this guiding principle. The Proposed Project would set aside biological open space to preserve habitat and natural resources. Where the Project would impact sensitive vegetation or habitat, mitigation measures have been proposed that would reduce such impacts to a less than significant level.
CO-10c	The commenter is not specific about how the Proposed Project is in contradiction with this guiding principle. The development has been designed to account for physical constraints and the natural hazards of the land.
CO-10d	The commenter is not specific about how the Proposed Project is in contradiction with this guiding principle. See Response D-1 regarding how the Project fits in and supports a multi-modal transportation network.
CO-10e	The commenter is not specific about how the Proposed Project is in contradiction with this guiding principle. Please refer to Topical Response: Greenhouse Gases Analysis with respect to Project Design Features and emission minimizing features included and the project's commitment to net zero GHG emissions.
CO-10f	The commenter is not specific about how the Proposed Project is in contradiction with this guiding principle. See Response I-69a regarding preservation of agricultural resources.
CO-10g	The commenter is not specific about how the Proposed Project is in contradiction with this guiding principle. See Response BH-2 regarding community input into the Project design

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

- CO-11a To address the health, safety and lifestyle concerns I have noted, I would ask that the following mitigation be required of the applicant:
 - Reduce the number of homes to no more than the number allowed under the existing general plan and eliminating the 54 second dwelling units
- CO-11b
 - Provide another access point to Valiano that does not come off Country Club Drive e.g. connecting the northwest corner of the site to La Moree Road
- CO-11c
 - Building sound barriers to shield our outdoor space from the increased noise from potential occupants and traffic
- CO-11d
 - Preserve the natural topography of the site rather than cutting and filling to produce level lots

- CO-11a Subchapter 4.3 of the EIR analyzes the General Plan Density Alternative. It was determined that the alternative would not meet a majority of the primary Project objectives as stated in Subchapter 1.1.
- CO-11b See Response I-63 regarding the infeasibility of connecting to La Moree Road.
- CO-11c See Response CO-7 regarding noise from Project residents. The EIR analyzed noise impacts associated with general residential noise and off-site traffic noise and impacts are less than significant at your property; therefore no mitigation is required.
- CO-11d See Responses F-2 and AD-5 regarding the nature of proposed Project grading.

I appreciate you giving consideration to those of us who will be directly impacted by this proposed development.

Nicole Sestina
3007 Hill Valley Drive
Eden Valley, CA 92029