

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

From: Ken Hoppenrath <kenhoppenrath@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 1:37 AM
To: Chan, Michelle
Cc: Sibbet, David; Wardlaw, Mark; Fitzpatrick, Lisa; Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Gaspar, Kristin; ron-roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov; Horn, Bill
Subject: Comment on Valiano — Recirculated Draft EIR

- R-Y-1 I wish to comment on the Valiano —Recirculated Draft EIR; PDSS2013-SP-13-001, PDS2013-GPA-13-001, PDS2013-REZ-13-001, PDS2013-TM-5575, PDS2014-MUP-14-019, PDS2013-STP-13-001, PDS2013-ER-13-08-002.
 The Valiano project, which is grossly inconsistent with both the County General Plan and the Harmony Grove Community Plan, is proposing to remove part of their project from the guidelines and protections of the existing Community Plan to avoid having to study the full range of adverse impacts of their project. I cannot support this action, which is taken solely to benefit the developer by increasing density, and for which the community has demonstrated strong opposition.
 - R-Y-2 This area is very prone to wildfires; I have had to evacuate several times myself. More density will only endanger those of the community, who may become trapped in traffic while surrounded by wildfire and trying to evacuate through narrow, two lane highways. In addition, the area is better suited to homes of the same large-lot equestrian style that is already supported by the current General Plan and Community Plan.
 - R-Y-3 There is no need for any GP amendment. Further, this action of a developer-initiated removal of property from a Community Plan could cause far reaching lack of confidence in the County Planners and, if supported, in the supervisors. I do not wish to have my taxes wasted in defending the County from any legal battles that may ensue from this senseless action.
 - R-Y-4 These very serious risks have not been fully described in this RDEIR, and the proposed benefits have been poorly supported and overestimated. Please do not approve this RDEIR or the requested GPA.
- Thank you,
- Ken Hoppenrath
 1575 Tanglewood Lane Apt E217
 Escondido, CA 92029

- R-Y-1 The comment claims the Project is grossly inconsistent with the General Plan or the EFHGCP Subarea of the San Dieguito CPA. The Project varies from these documents relative to base lot size (density) and use of a WTWRF, but conforms relative to open space uses, park provision, conformance with the County Resource Protection Ordinance, etc. Please also see Topical Response: General Plan Amendment and Subarea Boundary Line Adjustment CEQA Analysis.
- R-Y-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-Y-3 The comment questions the need for the General Plan Amendment and provides the commenter’s opinion of potential consequences. Please see Response R-G-36 regarding the requirement to allow property owners to propose uses that vary from approved plans, and for the County to evaluate such requests.
- R-Y-4 The comment expresses the opinions of the commenter, but is not at variance with the environmental document.