

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

From: Molenaar, Amy <Amy.Molenaar@ironmountain.com>
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2017 12:24 PM
To: dave.sibbet@sdcounty.ca.gov; Chan, Michelle; Wardlaw, Mark
Cc: Fitzpatrick, Lisa; Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Ron-Roberts; Horn, Bill; douglas.dill@att.net; efgtc@gmail.com; Gaspar, Kristin
Subject: Valiano Specific Plan: PDS2013-SP-13-0012 et al

To whom it may concern:

R-AO-1 I am a long-time resident of Harmony Grove and am highly concerned about the plans to develop Valiano. Harmony Grove is a community that has been established for more than 120 years and is one of the oldest in North County. It is a place where open space is appreciated and required for the diverse, high value ecosystem that exists in our community. We have a community plan that we created to maintain a certain way of life. We are a community.

R-AO-2 I agree 100% with the San Dieguito Planning Group's comment letter provided and sent on 1/12/2017.

R-AO-3 I would like to say that the current proposal and the recently recirculated EIR for Valiano, if approved, would divide our community and the open space we so value. The developer, in their most recent iteration of the EIR, has stated that there is no such existing community to divide and they are referring to my community – to Harmony Grove. A community that has stood here for more than 120 years. The developer has even struck out multiple references to Eden Valley as though it is a non-existent place as well. As a resident of Harmony Grove, a real community with real people and real places, I find this offensive and a tactic the developer is using to justify the build out of Valiano – an urban community that is slated to divide our rural community.

R-AO-4 Our neighborhood/community is one in which homes are on large parcels and open space is abundant and the land is of high value because of an extremely unique ecosystem of chaparral and coast live oak. Bringing in a development will overburden the land, the ecosystem and our way of life. There is already excessive traffic and excessive amounts of people trampling through the woodlands and parks.

R-AO-5 The developer has not shown that they are willing to work in good faith with our community and is, in fact, attempting to create a false reality: That there is no community here. There is a community here, one that has been active in preserving our lands and taking our fair share of growth – further growth will significantly alter our way of life and bring too much traffic to our narrow, rural, winding roads.

R-AO-6 Our community rejects this proposal and hopes that our elected officials will reject this proposal as well and protect our rights as taxpayers, property owners and citizens.

Sincerely,

 Amy Molenaar
 9115 Harmony Grove Road
 Escondido, CA 92029

The information contained in this email message and its attachments is intended only for the private and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above, unless the sender expressly agrees otherwise. Transmission of email over the Internet is not a secure communications medium. If you are requesting or have requested the transmittal of personal data, as defined in applicable privacy laws by means of email or in an attachment to email, you must select a more secure alternate means of transmittal that supports your obligations to protect

R-AO-1 Introductory comment noted. Please see responses to specific comments, below.

R-AO-2 This is a repeat of comment R-M-1. See Response R-M-1.

R-AO-3 The comment refers to a statement in the EIR regarding the existence of a neighborhood or community within the Project site and references in the EIR to the Eden Valley community. Please see Response R-K-1 regarding the lack of community quote. Please see Responses R-O-3 and R-F-63 regarding “erasure” of the Eden Valley community, and Response R-K-2 regarding developer outreach to the community. The amendment to the EFHGCP subarea northern boundary is not proposed to avoid having to follow rules; please see Response R-D-3 and Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Line Adjustment CEQA Analysis.

R-AO-4 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-AO-5 The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter regarding the developer and increased traffic. Please see Response R-K-1 regarding the lack of community quote and Response R-K-2 regarding developer outreach to the community. Please refer to response to comment R-A-1 regarding relevance to the changes in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

R-AO-6 Your opposition to the Project is noted.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

such personal data. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient and/or you have received this email in error, you must take no action based on the information in this email and you are hereby notified that any dissemination, misuse or copying or disclosure of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email and delete the original message.