

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

**From:** Friends Of Eden Valley <edenvalleynews@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 30, 2017 3:55 PM  
**To:** Sibbet, David; Chan, Michelle; Wardlaw, Mark; Fitzpatrick, Lisa  
**Cc:** Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Gaspar, Kristin; Ron-Roberts; Horn, Bill; douglas.dill@att.net; efhgtc@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Valiano Specific Plan

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:

As a resident of Eden Valley for over 15 years, I am appalled at the disrespect of the current residents by this applicant, and am truly insulted by the document portion which states:

*"There is a lack of established neighborhoods, as well as public services. As such, there is no existing community on site to divide."*

When my husband retired from the Marine Corps, we sought out and bought in Eden Valley specifically because of the zoning as we have horses. The quiet rural atmosphere, natural wildlife, and sense of community was a bonus for us! We bought here knowing that the zoning and general plan would not allow us to subdivide our lot into many smaller lots. We even attended County workshops regarding the General Plan update which accounted for the future growth of our area. Integral Communities also bought land in this community knowing the zoning, but appears to be indifferent to the existing residents, setting their intentions on convincing the board of supervisors to change the rules so they can disregard our community character and turn a fast profit.

Since we have lived here, we have discovered a great **community** of people who will go the extra mile during a crisis such as the recent Coco's Fire, or step-up and help each other to keep the trails clear of brush... to name a few. We've attended multiple Community Meeting and enjoyed the Eden Valley Community Potluck. Not once has this developer requested to attend an Eden Valley Community Meeting. They HAVE gone as far as striking the Eden Valley name from the EIR documentation and now attempting to divide my neighbors. WE OBJECT! This proposal marks the first attempt ever by a developer to rewrite a community's boundaries and effectively erase the very existence of a community in order to avoid having to work with and compromise with the existing community.

Integral Communities states they've already reduced the number of homes, but this is from their first draft that didn't account for topography of the land. Since then, they've seemed to refuse to seriously consider alternate options. In an effort to work with the developer, the communities of Eden Valley, Harmony Grove and Eflin Forest together have produced alternate plans for this project that would be more in keeping with the existing Community Character, but have been received by deaf ears from the developer. This project as proposed does not belong in this valley for many reasons, including safety of the citizens living here. We can only hope the County Board of Supervisors will recognize this as a tragic loss of small agricultural farms and Equestrian properties here before it's paved over.

I oppose the project as currently presented, and hope that as elected officials you will do the right thing and protect our rights as property owners, taxpayers and citizens of San Diego County.

Sincerely,

Janean Huston & FEVRD  
 Friends of Eden Valley for Responsible Development  
*Save our neighborhood from Irresponsible Development! Donate to our fundraising campaign at [www.GoFundMe.com/FriendsOfEdenValley](http://www.GoFundMe.com/FriendsOfEdenValley)*

Like us on Facebook if you want to get updates on what's happening around town.  
<http://www.facebook.com/FriendsofEdenValley>

R-K-1

R-K-2

R-K-3

R-K-4

R-K-1

The commenter misinterprets the text identified in the comment. As noted in the quote, the lack of community was identified for within the Project boundary only (i.e., the reference to "on site"). In the same paragraph in the recirculated DEIR, the sentence one above the quoted sentence stated: In summary, the existing Proposed Project area is described as a semi-rural community [emphasis added]." It was not intended for these comments to reflect the adjacent properties within the Eden Valley. The sense of community in Eden Valley is well understood.

Regarding existing zoning and General Plan anticipations, please see Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Line Adjustment CEQA Analysis. Please also see Response R-G-36. By design, general plans and associated zoning are not static. As stated in the State of California General Plan Guidelines (2003:14) by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research:

*Most jurisdictions select 15 to 20 years as the long-term horizon for the general plan.... Remember that planning is a continuous process; the general plan should be reviewed regularly, regardless of its horizon, and revised as new information becomes available and as community needs and values change. For instance, new population projections that indicate that housing will be needed at a greater clip than anticipated, an unexpected major development in a neighboring jurisdiction that greatly increases traffic congestion, or a ballot initiative that establishes an urban growth boundary may all trigger the need to revise the general plan. A general plan based upon outdated information and projections is not a sound basis for day-to-day decision making and may be legally inadequate.*

R-K-2

The comment expresses the sense of community felt by the residents in the area, which is fully understood; please see Response R-K-1. Project developers have held over 20 community outreach meetings, 4 of them with the Planning Group, to involve residents in the area surrounding their property in the development process. Regarding the misunderstanding related to corrections in text and deletion of focused use of the term Eden Valley, please see Response R-F-63.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

R-K-3 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-K-4 Comment noted.