

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

From: Andy Laderman <aladerman@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 10:02 AM
To: Sibbet, David; Chan, Michelle; Wardlaw, Mark; Fitzpatrick, Lisa; Jacob, Dianne; Gaspar, Kristin; Roberts, Ron; Horn, Bill; douglas.dill@att.net; efhgtc@gmail.com
Subject: RE: VALIANO SPECIFIC PLAN: PDS2013-SP-13-0012, PDS2013-GPA-13-001, PDS2013-REZ-13-001, PDS2013-TM-5575, PDS2013-STP-13-003, PDS2014-MUP-14-019, LOG NO. PDS2013-ER-13-08-002 .

Dear Planning and Development staff and Board of Supervisors:

R-AD-1 I have lived in Eden Valley for over 30 years and have spent the last several years following the evolution of the proposed Valiano project and Integral's maneuvering to get the project approved with blatant disregard for the existing residents whose lives would not only be disrupted but would actually be put at risk if is project was approved. It is time for you to kill this project once and for all. We have all wasted far too much time considering and re-considering a project that is fatally flawed and whose only value is to provide profit for the applicant.

R-AD-2 The Board of Supervisor's primary responsibility is the safety of the citizens living within the County. Allowing 300+ homes to be built in this area without a complete and costly infrastructure project to build multiple new evacuation routes in the case of wild fire would not only put the lives of existing residents at risk but also Valiano residents. This is a high fire risk area that has seen many fires in the 30 years that I have lived there, including the fatal Harmony Grove fire and the Cocos fire. This should be reason enough to reject the project.

R-AD-3 In addition there are many other indisputable justifications for rejecting the project including non-compliance with the County's General Plan, the developer's proposal to have a sizable portion of the project's footprint removed from the Harmony Grove community plan so they don't have to comply with it and inadequate analysis of green house gas impacts. The list goes on and on. If the County decides to approve this project, any one of these flaws could result in lengthy litigation which the County would have to defend at a considerable cost to tax payers. That is not how I would like to see my taxes spent.

R-AD-5 It is time to stop flogging a dead horse and firmly reject this project.

Respectfully submitted,
 Andrew Laderman
 2710 Surrey Lane
 Eden Valley

Sent from my iPad

R-AD-1 The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, but is not at variance with the environmental document.

R-AD-2 The comment is not related to the topics that were the subject of the recirculation and Revised Draft EIR. Please refer to response to comment R-A-1 regarding relevance to the changes in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

R-AD-3 The comment lists reasons the commenter believes the Proposed Project should be rejected. Please see Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Line Adjustment CEQA Analysis for a discussion on the project's consistency with the General Plan.
 Please see Topical Response: Greenhouse Gases Analysis. The comment does not address the adequacy of the REIR, therefore, no further response is required or necessary.

R-AD-4 The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, but is not at variance with the environmental document.

R-AD-5 Your opposition to the Project is noted.