

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Ms. Michelle Chan
Planning & Development Services
County of San Diego
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
Michelle.Chan@sdcounty.ca.gov

Re: Valiano Project—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

To whom it may concern:

R-AV-1 I am a 14 year resident of Eden Valley and am writing to comment on the recirculated EIR for the Valiano Specific Plan.

R-AV-1 I agree 100% with the San Dieguito Planning Group's comment letter provided and sent on 1/12/17. As my representative planning group I am proud of the work they put in to capture a good portion of what is so deplorable about Integral and their proposed Valiano project. 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.

R-AV-2 Our community, along with those of Harmony Grove and Elfin Forest have made multiple attempts to work in good faith with Integral. We have made several requests for Integral to sit down with us to discuss an alternative plan that would benefit all parties. This plan would allow Integra a zoning change to SR1 on the acreage that is not already designated as such. This effectively provides them the ability to build approximately 225 homes on lot sizes that would fit into our community. It would also have less visual, noise, traffic, and pollution impacts on our valley. Sadly, Integral has refused to consider such an alternate that has community support. Instead they rather forge ahead with a plan that simply does not fit or belong in our community. Also, Integral states they held several community meetings, which they have. However, every meeting has been met with some hostility from Integral representatives and a consistent message of, we will not reduce the number of homes no matter what. So essentially those meetings were simply held so that Integral could check off a box that they had community meetings.

R-AV-3 The plan our community has put forth to Integral would also allow the new residents to keep horses on a property that is suited to keeping of farm animals and horses. Their currently proposed "horse keeling lots" are unrealistic due to their size and lack of space to accommodate hay storage and manure disposal. I have not seen any mention of either hay storage or manure disposal in any documents produced by Integral thus far.

R-AV-4 I also would like to express my outrage at the attempt to omit Eden Valley from the EIR. Integral even went as far as to state that we are not a community within the document. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary a community is "a unified body of individuals: such as the people with common interests living in a particular area; broadly: the area itself" and "a group of people with a common characteristic or interest living together within a larger society." As you are well aware based on the letters received, comments on the DEIR, and the number of people from Eden Valley who attended meetings regarding this development, our community more than meets this definition. Prior to moving to Eden Valley I lived in a condo in Carlsbad where I loved for four years. I knew one neighbor. Here in Eden Valley I know a large portion of those who live here. We help each other when we are in need and socialize together. Our community helps one another to mend neighbor's fences, we help each other with animal care, we work to keep our community clean, we sharing ideas, we gathering for summer BBQs, and so much more. We are a community! I ask that at each point where Eden Valley was redacted from the DEIR that it be added back in.

R-AV-1 Response

R-AV-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-AV-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-AV-4 Please see Responses R-F-63 regarding the focused modifications citing Eden Valley, and R-K-1 regarding the well-understood sense of community.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

R-AV-5

Regarding the removal of Neighborhood 5 from Elfin Forrest Harmony Grove Town Council. This is an outrageous move by Integral to circumvent the restrictive policies that the community worked diligently with the county to create. Neighborhood 5 in the current plan is separated from the other neighborhoods in the plan as there are now connecting roadways within the development. They will not share entry points and for someone in neighborhoods 1 through 4 to access neighborhood 5, they will have to leave the proposed development in order to reach neighborhood 5. When Integral purchased the property, they were fully aware of the constraints of that area and they should be held to them.

R-AV-6

Lastly, when Measure B was defeated by a fairly wide margin despite the developer spending millions of dollars on an ad campaign, county residents sent a clear message about how they feel about developers pushing beyond the General Plan. They do not want it. The General Plan meets the housing needs for the foreseeable future. I have not seen any solid evidence in the EIR that displays a need for this project at its proposed size.

Regards,
Bill and Kathryn Osborn
2952 Milpas Drive
Eden Valley, CA 92029

R-AV-5

As a point of clarification, please note that the boundary clarification would affect the EFHGCP Subarea within the larger San Dieguito CPA (please see Response R-D-3). The cited Town Council is a community group.

There is no intent to circumvent community policies. Please see Topical Response: General Plan Amendment, Subarea Boundary Line Adjustment and Community Character CEQA Analysis regarding EFHG Subarea policies, which were analyzed in the publically circulated Draft EIR. The constraints of the existing plans are described and analyzed as well in the Final EIR, including the responses to comments received on these issues. The property owner is not, however, constrained by law to strictly meet plan goals and policies; please see Response R-H-4 regarding modification of community plans. Please see Responses R-F-4 regarding issues of separation and connection between proposed Valiano neighborhoods.

R-AV-6

Comment noted. Please see Response R-AM-4.