



*Via Email*

June 15, 2015

Beth Ehsan  
Project Planner  
County of San Diego  
Planning and Development Services  
5510 Overland Ave. Suite 110  
San Diego, CA 92123

**Re: Comments Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Valiano Project**

Dear Ms. Ehsan:

On behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”) and our tens of thousands of members who live and work in Southern California, we submit the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the proposed Valiano Specific Plan Project (“Project”).

We have several concerns regarding the proposed Project and the DEIR. The primary area of concern is the Project’s inconsistency with the San Diego County General Plan and more specifically the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove Community Plan (“Community Plan”). These plans were developed with rural aesthetic, agricultural landscape, and the sensitive and endangered habitats of the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove area in mind. The 238-acre Project threatens the rural characteristic and sensitive habitat found in these areas by undermining the goals, planning, and hard work that went into the Community Plan. Furthermore, the DEIR fails to adequately assess the General Plan Density Alternative. Such failures are the result of an imprecise assessment of the feasibility of open space and agricultural easements in the lower density alternative. Each of these concerns is explained in more detail below.

**I. The Project is Inconsistent with the San Diego County General Plan and Elfin Forest–Harmony Grove Community Plan**

The proposed Project is inconsistent with the rural and environmental preservation goals of both the San Diego County General Plan and the Community Plan. Under California law, a general plan functions as a “constitution for all future developments” and development decisions should be consistent with that general plan. (*Endangered Habitats League Inc. v. County of Orange*, (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 782.) Although perfect conformity is not required, a proposed project should be compatible with the objectives and policies of the general plan. (*Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado County v. El Dorado County Bd. Of Sup’rs*,

**NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL**

1314 2ND STREET | SANTA MONICA, CA | 90401 | T 310.434.2300 | F 310.434.2399 | NRDC.ORG

(1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1332, 1336.) Indeed, a project is consistent with a general plan if it furthers the objectives and policies of that plan and does not obstruct their attainment. (*Corona – Norco Unified School Dist. v. City of Corona*, (1993) 17 Cal.App.4th 985, 994.) Put differently, a project is inconsistent if it conflicts with a general plan policy that is fundamental, mandatory, and clear. (*Endangered Habitats League Inc. v. County of Orange*, *supra*, 131 Cal.App.4th at 782.) Furthermore, the nature of the policy and the nature of the inconsistency are critical factors to consider. (*Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado County v. El Dorado County Bd. Of Sup’rs*, *supra*, 62 Cal.App.4th at 1341.)

The proposed Project contains elements that are inconsistent with the specific policies and goals of both the San Diego County General Plan and the Community Plan. The Community Plan, which operates as a subpart to the San Diego County General Plan, includes set policies meant to achieve specific goals. These goals include: preservation of the rural unincorporated communities of both Harmony Grove and Elfin Forest; the continued preservation of the area’s sensitive and endangered habitats; preservation of agricultural resources that enhance the environment and contribute to the rural community vision; preservation of existing wildlife corridors; and creating open space preserves of coastal live oak, oak woodland chaparral, native grasslands, and coastal sage scrub.

It is our understanding that the Community Plan and its corresponding goals were the result of numerous hours of planning, cooperation and hard work from members of the community. Developing the Community Plan took over two years of grass roots efforts. According to local residents, the Community Plan is a result of comments and cooperation of more than 60 individuals from a community of 400 homes. Additionally, even before creating the Community Plan, community members evaluated varying density patterns during County-led workshops as part of the General Plan Update process. During these workshops, community members were asked to accommodate for their “fair share” of expected County-wide population growth. From these workshops, the Elfin Forest-Harmony Grove and Eden Valley communities determined that the focal point of their efforts, as well as the basis for the Community Plan, would be the preservation of open space through locating all of the increased density required within the footprint of one high density Village. According to the General Plan’s Community Development Model, density feathers out to low density development outside the Village Limit Line, hence preserving valuable agricultural and biological open space in the valley.

Unfortunately, in disregard of such a concerted effort, the Valiano Specific Plan proposed project aims to change the dynamic of a rural community by providing an exception for a high density subdivision with minimal open space preserved. The planned change from low to high density is inconsistent with the goal of preserving the rural nature of the community. Additionally, such large scale residential development is likely to counteract the goals and policies of preserving agricultural areas, sensitive habitats, wildlife corridors, and open spaces that currently exist. In its current form, the proposed Project does not do enough to preserve open space or consider sensitive habitats and species contained within the area. Instead, it attempts to change the existing nature of the community to squeeze in a new development in a location that was evaluated and rejected for higher density during the General Plan Update process, completed in 2011.

As noted above, a proposed project should remain consistent with the existing general plan for a community. Currently, this Project undermines the goals and policies of the Community Plan, as well as the public trust of the hard working community members who developed it.

## **II. The DEIR Must Fully Analyze the General Plan Density Alternative to Allow Comparisons and Informed Selection**

The current draft omits relevant information about the General Plan Density Alternative. For this alternative, the DEIR should provide more information on why the developer believes open space and agricultural easements are not feasible, especially in light of a plan that calls for lower density. How would decreasing density yield less open space than a higher density plan? Such reasoning is not clear in the DEIR.

Because of this lack of clarity, the DEIR is inadequate. A major function of a draft environmental impact report is to ensure that all reasonable alternatives to proposed projects are thoroughly assessed by the responsible official. (*Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of the University of California*, (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400.) In order to thoroughly assess alternatives, the draft environmental impact report must contain sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with a proposed project. (*Sierra Club v. City of Orange*, (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 523, 546.)

In regards to the DEIR, ambiguities exist that bar a meaningful analysis of the General Plan Density Alternative. The DEIR shows a discrepancy in open space and feasibility of agricultural easements in the proposed Project compared with the General Plan Density Alternative. According to the DEIR, the alternative would reduce biological open space from 32 acres to 15 acres and would not provide for agricultural easements. (*DEIR Project Alternatives*, 4-9, 4-10.) Although lower density could require larger lot sizes, the DEIR does not explain why this would mean the Alternative could not still retain open space or agricultural easements that are offered in the proposed project. As stated above, the DEIR must contain sufficient information to allow meaningful evaluation. Merely stating biological open space would be reduced (*Id.* at 4-9) without explaining why this reduction is necessary is insufficient. Likewise, failing to explain why agricultural easements are not feasible in a general plan compliant alternative is also insufficient. This is especially relevant given that, had the DEIR fully analyzed a General Plan Density Alternative including an agricultural easement on two-acre lots on the Prime Soils portion of the Project, the impact to onsite agriculture resources would have been significantly reduced, and likely removed the necessity for offsite mitigation.

The DEIR should be reworked to provide an explanation for why open space and agricultural easements are not feasible under the General Plan Density Alternative.

### **III. Conclusion**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this draft environmental impact report and proposed Project. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (310) 434-2300 or [dnagami@nrdc.org](mailto:dnagami@nrdc.org).

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Damon K. Nagami". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Damon Nagami  
Senior Attorney  
Director, Southern California Ecosystems Project