

Mike Strong

Written Communications

From:	Bernadette Bjork	10/24/17 PC Meeting
Sent:	Monday, October 23, 2017 11:30 AM	Agenda Item No. G.1
To:	Mike Strong	SUB 16-0009
Subject:	FW: Please vote NO on the proposed Villages Project	

-----Original Message-----

From: Ed Gallo
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 11:18 AM
To: Bernadette Bjork <bbjork@escondido.org>
Subject: FW: Please vote NO on the proposed Villages Project

-----Original Message-----

From: Ozzie Ahlers [mailto:fingers@ozzieahlers.com]
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 9:30 AM
To: Ed Gallo <egallo@escondido.org>
Subject: Please vote NO on the proposed Villages Project

I am a resident near the Golf Course. I may not be as impacted as others, but the traffic, congestion and lack of insight in the present EIR should be enough to cause any reasonable planner and civic leader to reexamine and ask for a better plan.

PLEASE VOTE NO on this EIR until a group with a proper perspective, other than profit, comes forward.

Sincerely,

David Ozzie Ahlers
1711 Muirfield Glen
Escondido, CA 92026

Mike Strong

From: Pat Hunter <phunter92026@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 2:49 PM
To: Mike Strong
Cc: Pat Hunter
Subject: Planning Commission talk - photo to show during my talk please (1 of 2 I will send separately)



Pat Hunter
1240 Portola Ave., Escondido 92026

Mike Strong

From: Pat Hunter <phunter92026@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 2:55 PM
To: Mike Strong
Subject: Planning Comm 2nd photo to show during my talk please



Thank you, Pat Hunter
1240 Portola Ave Esc 92026

Mike Strong

From: Bernadette Bjork
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 4:40 PM
To: Mike Strong
Subject: FW: Contact Council (select recipient from drop-down list): Escondido Country Club

From: noreply@www.escondido.org [<mailto:noreply@www.escondido.org>]
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 3:13 PM
To: Sam Abed <sabed@escondido.org>; Olga Diaz <Odiaz@escondido.org>; Ed Gallo <egallo@escondido.org>; Michael Morasco <Mmorasco@escondido.org>; John Masson <jmasson@escondido.org>
Subject: Contact Council (select recipient from drop-down list): Escondido Country Club

Brandi Ortiz
razonbranortiz@aol.com

Dear Council Members,

I invite you to come to the corner of El Norte Parkway and Country Club tomorrow morning between 7:15 and 7:45 where traffic is backed up 4 lights long, then tell me that adding 380 new families will help an already taxed roadway. Approving this development is not in the best interest of our quiet neighborhood. How and why is this development being approved? This is an established neighborhood that will be negatively impacted by so many new homes being crammed into the middle of a neighborhood.

Getting in and out of Country Club will become a hassle and cause more angry drivers and traffic problems in the future. I hold this council accountable for the decline in our quality of living. No more will we hear the sounds of nature rather more garage doors and cars zooming in and out of our community.

What a disappointment, here goes Escondido again, approving projects that generate revenue for the city but gives not value to the quality of life Escondido can provide. You realize, Escondido's recent decline in reputation is directly affected by these types of decisions. I moved to the last street in Escondido to avoid exactly this scenario. I feel so let down and underrepresented by the council at this time.

It is my hope that someone will take a drastic stand against allowing this development to be approved at 380 homes. I really wanted a compromise of under 200 homes so that our shopping, gas, schools and roads wouldn't be so severely impacted. I guess if you don't live here, you really don't get it.

Citizen still hanging on to hope,

Brandi Ortiz

Mike Strong

From: Bernadette Bjork
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 4:45 PM
To: Mike Strong
Subject: FW: Contact Council (select recipient from drop-down list): Escondido Country Club

From: noreply@www.escondido.org [mailto:noreply@www.escondido.org]
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 4:09 PM
To: Ed Gallo <egallo@escondido.org>
Subject: Contact Council (select recipient from drop-down list): Escondido Country Club

DEBBIE A ROSE
cdnrose55@gmail.com

Councilman Gallo,

I have lived in the Escondido Country Club since 1995. I purchased my home here in large part because of the serenity and quiet (lack of traffic).

The proposal to re-zone the golf course property has me very concerned. I wrote a letter stating my concerns to the city council on July 27, 2017.

I am certain that Councilman John Masson and Mayor Abed are against this re-zoning as the neighborhood is against it. I am also fairly certain that Councilwoman Diaz will vote for it as Mr. Schlesinger helped fund her run for mayor.

My question to you, is where do you stand on this issue?

When Vista Superior Court Judge Earl H. Maas III made his ruling on the "takings" of this property he stated that the zoning was NOT to be changed. Leaving it zoned R-1-7 is a compromise that the citizens in this district can accept.

I voted for you when last I could as you stood behind us against this bully property owner and I hope that you will stand with us now. Please let me know your thoughts on this issue. It is a sad day when government rides roughshod over its citizens desires as this re-zoning would be. And especially sad when it's to the aid of a non-citizen.

Thank you

Debbie Rose

1411 Westwood Place

Escondido, CA 92026

Mike Strong

From: noreply@www.escondido.org
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 7:34 PM
To: Mike Strong
Subject: [Website Feedback]: PC11-The Villages; Is this proposal a good "FIT"?

Gary Erickson
garyemasd@aol.com

Honorable Commissioners

Planning Commission

City of Escondido

Ultimately, the overriding question faced in evaluating this proposal is as stated. While having crossed all the "t's" and dotted all the formal "i's" of statutory and local planning guidelines and regulations to attain Planning Department Approval, that alone doesn't necessarily make the proposal a winner that "fits" the overall community's needs. So let's delve into this a little further.

Please extend me the latitude to review some of the criteria that I as a neighborhood resident feel is important for any proposal to be measured against, followed by my conclusions on each one.

I. Will it....

A. Provide a good "fit" into the existing, surrounding community.

1. Style
2. Scale
3. Adherence to existing zoning

B. Overburden any facilities and place unplanned costs upon the City

1. Fire & Police...
2. Recreational Open Space/Other

C. How well have the major environmental issues been "mitigated" and what would remain after as an ongoing

level to affect the quality of life?

D Result in a homogeneous, well blended integration into what exists now?

E. Has the applicant truly listened to what the community has stated it wants and is this what's best for them or for the City or for the developer/landowner?

F. Complied with existing claims to Open Space Use encumbered upon the property?

II. My take on the responses.....

A. Overall a poor/marginal plan in attempting to attain a good "fit"

1.The styles in some cases are reasonable; in other cases, ex. Monterey Spanish for a whole village

and community center, do not blend. What does the 30's-40's have to do with styles prevalent in the

late 60's, 70's and 80's that represent the current neighborhood? Sure, maybe a Spanish style here

or there, but not a clustered, large homogeneous grouping.

2. Being predominantly two story homes and condo complexes, the proposal creates a stark comparison to the predominance of single story homes in the surrounding community. The

inclusion of a community center complex is primarily for those residents residing within the new

enclave community. Without a golf course centerpiece the concept of a new complex as featured

holds little outright appeal for the older, surrounding neighborhood; and it would come with some

as yet undefined price tag. While a nice talking point, it is primarily to help market their housing

product to new buyers. This point is further accentuated by the proposed permanent perimeter

fence to, using their words....."deny human access". This is not for inclusion, but exclusion, let's

be honest. Lastly, the high density spacing, especially of the numerous condo complexes throughout

the villages, along with very small side-yard setbacks stand out distinctively different than what

already existing in the adjacent neighborhood. Therefore, the scale is mismatch and wrong.

3. In an effort to maximize density and potential profit from the property, the proposal requests new

specific zoning from R-1-7 down to some lots with only 3630 SF with "some" offsetting equivalency

via designated Open Space. The result is an overwhelming 380 housing units, tightly packed together, indifferent to that generally prevailing in the immediate surrounding neighborhood.

B. From a "surface" analysis, it appears there are no major issues and will not result in any major burdens

upon the City.

1. Police and Fire coverage will not add any substantial burden upon those services. However, the

applicant's stated intent to attempt to transfer maintenance of the Open Space to the City raises a

flag. Informally the City does not need nor want responsibility. With a pressed budget already, this

would further add new expenses with funding sourcing, except for maybe newer/higher taxes.

Additionally, were the proposed roundabouts built, experience in other communities shows a continuing

need for power-washing to remove tread marks from the curbing. Is the City ready for the complaints?

2. The allocation of Open Space is a positive outcome in the overall design which adds to the availability

of public recreational facilities without additional burden upon the city. Accessibility still has some minor

issues, but appear workable.

Additionally, were the proposed roundabouts built, experience in other communities shows a continuing

need for power-washing to remove tread marks from the curbing to maintain appearances. Is the City ready

for the complaints and burden to maintain them?

C. In studying the mitigation of those environmental factors that were judged to be significantly impacted, in

large part and somewhat in proportion to the number of housing units sought for development, one

concludes that most have been dealt with. However, there are a couple areas, like traffic that still have

remain issues of safety concerns, as I have previous documented in PC8 to you.

The further question needed to be asked is what will the quality of life look like with the "less than significant"

levels that remain for the immediate neighborhood? As implied, based on 380 new housing units, it will

noticeably deteriorate and with associated safety concerns in the marginal areas like traffic, but are now

supposedly acceptable according to some governing criteria. But we are left to figure out if that's okay to live

with in the end. One way to reasonably address that is to re-consider the number of units to something more

palatable, perhaps 160-190 units based upon the preliminary analysis of some alternatives.

D. By choosing to create 3 distinctive "Villages", each embodying their own design theme, the proposed

development will stand in sharp contrast to the existing, surrounding neighborhood of mixed styles on

every street. And as already referenced, the predominance of two-story new structures compared to

the opposite in the existing neighborhood will be very noticeable. With no through streets connecting

the new to the old, the result is clearly an enclave community within a community. This doesn't pass

the litmus test.

E. While going through the motions of holding neighborhood "kitchen" meetings and reviews to get input,

it appears NUWI chose to proceed according to their own agenda. Those ideas were okay as long as they

fell within the ultimate objectives it appears NUWI sought. Parties attending such meetings pointed out

what was said by them and to them and this has made it readily apparent that there is a big

disconnect. No lists were ever published or circulated detailing the ideas of the attendees for community

review. One only has what formally has made it into the Specific plan to go with.

Further to the point, NUWI held only one discussion meeting with ECCHO to talk about

their input for the development. ECCHO reports that it was very apparent in the meeting that their

comments were falling on deaf ears; their ideas weren't going to meet with NUWI's objectives.

Comparing this resultant proposal against the list of ideas from ECCHO's membership in January 2015

bears out this large gap in concept and substance.

F. The applicant has chosen to not honor prior existing density transfers for Open Space use that already

exist onto the property by taking that space to maximize their number of housing units without adding

in any new Open Space equivalency of their own. In fact the total of their proposed Open Space is less

than the total of prior existing claims of Open Space! Furthermore, they have moved those prior areas

to fit their plan layout (without approval by those holding the density transfers) and/or have proceed to

put housing structures on them. This clearly stands out as a "taking of rights" from those current

private covenant holders. If this project is approved, the City could risk possibly finding themselves

embroiled in the middle of a class action suit by those parties for not honoring and defending what the

City itself granted to them in substance in past years.

Bottom line, the proposal has serious issues in meeting the overall implied objective of FIT. While the threshold of adhering to statutory and local planning guidelines has been met, it fails on the all-important question of seamlessly fitting into the existing surrounding neighborhood and appears to detract from the 2012 quality of life baseline.

An alternative proposal introduced by ECCHO for 158 housing units comes a lot closer to meeting the objectives in fitting into the existing neighborhood by size, scale and architectural equivalency. The point is that there can be a better solution for development of this property that will preserve the tranquility and quality of life of the existing planned neighborhood, whose priority should remain at the top of the checklist.

Again, this proposal will lead to a unique enclave community within the existing one and not one homogeneous, seamless blending together of the two.

That's the difference in designing to maximize profit potential versus designing to preserve the value and ambience of the existing neighborhood to achieve a win/win solution for all parties.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gary Erickson

2021 Via Alexandra

92026

HTTP_USER_AGENT: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.3; WOW64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/43.0.2357.130 AOL/9.8 AOLBuild/4346.2023.US Safari/537.36
REMOTE_HOST: 68.7.161.7
REMOTE_ADDR: 68.7.161.7
LOCAL_ADDR: 10.255.2.55

Mike Strong

From: noreply@www.escondido.org
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 7:48 PM
To: Mike Strong
Subject: [Website Feedback]: PC12::The Villages; How Big Is The "Farm"?

Gary Erickson
garyemasd@aol.com

Honorable Commissioners

Planning Commission

City of Escondido

I call your attention to the Specific Plan, pg. 60

5) Project Implementation

D) Ministerial or Administrative Approvals

4) Ag Permit

(This is new from the latest Draft and has been added into the Final version.)

In general it talks about approving area in the Greenbelt for agricultural purposes, beyond that originally designated in the Village Center Complex area.

Since the plan puts no parameters on how much area this may be limited to, my question is: "How Big Could The Farm Become?".

There really needs to be more thought put into this of where and how much area could be considered since it will have to be fenced and protected from the little varmints, including the ever present ground squirrels. That will detract from the objectives of providing an open and natural recreational space to enjoy.

Respectfully requested,

Gary Erickson

2021 Via Alexandra

92026

HTTP_USER_AGENT: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.3; WOW64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko)
Chrome/43.0.2357.130 AOL/9.8 AOLBuild/4346.2023.US Safari/537.36

REMOTE_HOST: 68.7.161.7

REMOTE_ADDR: 68.7.161.7

LOCAL_ADDR: 10.255.2.55

Mike Strong

From: noreply@www.escondido.org
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 8:16 PM
To: Mike Strong
Subject: [Website Feedback]: PC13::The Villages; DoCD Discretionary Approval L

Gary Erickson
garyemasd@aol.com

Honorable Commissioners

Planning Commission

City of Escondido

In reviewing the proposal, I wish to call your attention to the following section. I confess as to not having much experience in these matters, but commons sense of magnitude raise the question in this area.

Refer to Final Specific Plan, pg 58

5. Project Implementtion

A) Concurrent Discretionary Permit Approvals

3)Specific Plan

A. Administrative Specific Plan Amendments in conformance with the criteria described below shall be approved by the Director of Community Development. In addition, the Director shall also interpret conformance with design guidelines and features.

1. The number of single story homes shall be set by proportion for each Village as discussed elsewhere in this Specific Plan.

This proportion may be transferred to different Villages with approval by the Director,

provided that the total number of single story homes is 15% or greater than the total number of homes.

Comment: This is unclear to me for interpretation. I thought the starting point was 16% (62/380). This could lead to fewer of this type which is a more desirable fit into

the existing neighborhood. And is it the total number of homes in that Villages or OVA? Unclear.

2. Change in area of 10% or less included within the Open Space System, each of the three Villages or the Village Center land use areas, provided that the overall intent of the Specific Plan is not exceeded in some way, such as, but not limited to, conversion of some passive open space area to active recreation space or environmental resource. Changes in land use areas may require additional environmental study or supplement existing.

Comment: Given the size of this project, 10% could lead to a sizable change in any one of these areas!

3. Change in the total number of individual housing types within the Villages project not exceeding 20% of the individual housing types.

Comment: Again, 20% is a sizable number, but may only be 1 or 2 "types". However, I haven't seen "type" clearly defined, so I don't know really how to interpret this.

In summary, I will have to yield to your guidance on this issue. However, after a looong career, spanning several organizations and executive management positions, there was always a saying that went like this: "Plan the build; the build the plan". Rarely, did one have to make any major changes as this suggests. If this happens, let it come back into the general approval process if that important.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gary Erickson

2021 Via Alexandra

92026

HTTP_USER_AGENT: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.3; WOW64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko)
Chrome/43.0.2357.130 AOL/9.8 AOLBuild/4346.2023.US Safari/537.36
REMOTE_HOST: 68.7.161.7
REMOTE_ADDR: 68.7.161.7
LOCAL_ADDR: 10.255.2.55

**N E W
URBAN
WEST
I N C**

16935 WEST
BERNARDO DR
SUITE 260
SAN DIEGO
CALIFORNIA
9 2 1 2 7

Jonathan Frankel

jonathanf@nuwi.com

Direct 925-708-3638

October 24, 2017

Planning Commission
City of Escondido
201 North Broadway
Escondido, CA 92025

*Re: The Villages-- Escondido Country Club Project—Response to DeLano Letter
dated October 23, 2017*

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

This letter is provided to respond to the comments received from DeLano & DeLano (“DeLano”), dated October 23, 2017, written on behalf of the Escondido Country Club Homeowners Organization (“ECCHO”) in opposition to the Villages-Escondido Country Club project (“Project”). Because the City is not obligated to respond to late comments pursuant to CEQA, I respectfully ask the City to consider these responses prepared on behalf of the applicant, New Urban West, Inc. in determining to approve the Project.

The October 23, 2017 letter does not raise new substantive issues but merely restates comments the City already responded to in the Responses to Comments in the Final EIR and in the Staff Report prepared for this hearing. Where the October 23, 2017 letter alleges the City inadequately responded to comments, it appears the letter selectively extracted language while disregarding the remainder of the well-reasoned, good faith responses. The Final EIR, City’s Staff Report, and associated documents provide more than enough evidence that the City has correctly addressed these issues.

**The City correctly analyzed General Plan Consistency and determined the Project is
Consistent with the General Plan in the Draft EIR and Final EIR**

The October 23, 2017 letter incorrectly asserts the Project violates several provisions of the City's General Plan. As with previous comments submitted by DeLano on August 18, 2017, no evidence or reasoning is provided to support these claimed inconsistencies. On the other hand, the Project's consistency with these General Plan provisions was evaluated in detail in the Final EIR at Chapter 3.1.5, "Land Use"; and in the Draft EIR at Appendix 3.1.5-1, "City of Escondido General Plan Policy Consistency Analysis Table." Based on ample facts, reasoning, and evidence, the Final EIR concluded the Project would be consistent with the General Plan and its applicable policies. The City also provided thorough responses to each of these claims in the Final EIR Responses to Comments, Nos. O2-26 through O2-44. Again, based on substantial evidence, the Project was determined consistent with the General Plan and its policies. The DeLano letter's assertion to the contrary is mistaken.

The Project will not Violate Proposition S as the Project will not Increase the Residential Density of the Site.

The October 23, 2017 letter incorrectly claims, "The Project will also lead to violations of voter-passed Proposition S." Proposition S added a policy to the General Plan which states, "Permitted land uses in the residential areas of the City shall be intensified only when the voters approve such changes." Voters must approve an increase in residential density; change, alteration, or increase in the General Plan Residential Land Use categories; or a change from residential to commercial or industrial designation designated as Rural, Estate, Suburban, or Urban. Proposition S also readopted and reaffirmed many General Plan policies such that the policies may not be amended or repealed without a vote of the people.

The Project will not result in violations of Proposition S as the Project would not increase the residential density at the site or re-designate the site as commercial or industrial. The applicable Urban 1 Land Use designation and R-1-7 zoning standards allow a maximum density of 5.5 dwelling units per acre. As detailed in the Final EIR and Staff Report, the Project would develop 3.47 dwelling units per acre, consistent with the existing residential density applicable to the site. Accordingly, the Project would not trigger or violate Proposition S.

The City's Staff Report provides Appropriate Facts and Findings in Support of Tentative Subdivision Map Approval; and the Project's Map has been Prepared Compliant with the Municipal Code.

The October 23, 2017 letter wrongly alleges that the Project does not meet the requirements for approval of a tentative map, and that the Project violates those Municipal Code provisions requiring map and zoning code consistency. Exhibit “A” to the City’s Staff Report provides a fact-based rationale for each of the proposed findings which support approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map for the proposed Project. Regarding compliance with the Municipal Code, including the Subdivision and Zoning Codes, the Project incorporates a Zone Change of the entire site to Specific Plan (S-P) Zone. The proposed Tentative Map complies with this designation, and both applications are being processed concurrently in compliance with Municipal Code mandates.

The City’s Responses to Comments in the Final EIR provide the “Good Faith, Reasoned Analysis” required by CEQA

The letter states the Final EIR Responses to Comments were inadequate. As noted above, the October 23, 2017 letter omits the greater part of each well-reasoned, good faith response to comments as follows:

- The October 23, 2017 letter incorrectly claims the City’s response ignored citation or enforcement obligations. In fact, the City’s response stated, “an EIR is not the appropriate forum for determining the nature and consequences of prior conduct” under the law. (Final EIR, page RTC-O2-3, *citing, Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* 1999; *Banning Ranch Conservancy v. City of Newport Beach* 2012.) The EIR complied with CEQA by examining the Project’s environmental impacts; and establishing underlying Project objectives; in light of the existing environment and the site’s existing condition. (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15124 and 15125.)
- The letter wrongly claims the City failed to respond to comments alleging inconsistencies with transportation demand management strategies and merely referenced bus stop pads. This is incorrect. Response to Comment O2-36, Final EIR page RTC-02-58, highlighted that the Specific Alignment Plan (SAP) improvements have been designed to calm traffic speeds, and to enhance pedestrian and bicycle circulation; while reducing vehicle miles traveled. (*See also*, Draft EIR, Appendix 2.7-2, “VMT Evaluation.”) The Response also noted that the trail system would link the three Project villages to each other and to the existing neighborhood, further encouraging walking and biking. Bike racks would be provided at community parks/ dog park areas and at the Village Center. Additionally, the small mixed use/ community center element proposed at Village 1 would encourage non-vehicular travel by providing community serving amenities. Accordingly, bus stop pads were just one of a portfolio of methods incorporated into the Project to reduce reliance on motor vehicles, consistent with the cited General Plan policies.
- The October 23, 2017 letter also wrongly claims the City failed to adequately respond to comments regarding the characterization of San Marcos Creek. The

comment in question from the August 18, 2017 DeLano Comment letter concerned whether the remnant San Marcos Creek features onsite are “isolated” for purposes of delineating of jurisdictional water and wetland resources (*i.e.*, determining whether waters and wetlands exist onsite and are potentially subject to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, or California Fish and Wildlife jurisdiction under applicable laws). As detailed in Responses to the August 18, 2017 DeLano Comment letter, Responses to Comment Nos. O2-74 and O2-75, the Project site once supported a reach of San Marcos Creek, but such features have long been diverted into ditches, swales, and storm drains within a portion of the golf course and surrounding developments. “Developments and activities downstream of the Project have further contributed to the current isolated state of drainage features, including alteration, filling, and undergrounding of surface waters into the City’s storm drain system.” (Final EIR p. RTC-O2-119) Thus for purposes of jurisdictional delineation, “the on-site remnant segment of San Marcos Creek and other features do not appear to share this significant nexus” to navigable waters.

This response is consistent with the proposed finding, which states the remnant Creek onsite consists of a “combination of natural and manmade concrete channels that do not meet current Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements or City of Escondido flood control standards.” Hence, the City correctly characterized San Marcos Creek onsite and responded to comments.

The Project will replace these inadequate drainages with open, vegetated environmental channels and stormwater treatment basins that will safely and cleanly convey stormwater from the Project site. Sensitive habitat will be enhanced within the site’s open space areas. The Project will thus result in a biologically and hydrologically superior condition at the Project site compared to existing conditions.

The City evaluated a Reasonable Range of Feasible Alternatives in the Final EIR, and the City’s Staff Report Details why the Final EIR’s analysis is Sufficient for Purposes of CEQA

Lastly, the October 23, 2017 letter erroneously contends the alternative proposed in the October 4, 2017 letter is wrongly labeled “another alternative” beyond that suggested in DeLano’s August 18, 2017 letter, and is not considered for that reason. To the contrary, the Staff Report observes the alternative proposed by the October 4, 2017 is a mere variation on the Reduced Density Alternative (158 units) already evaluated in the Draft EIR, and that the EIR correctly evaluated a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the proposed Project in compliance with CEQA. For these reasons and others noted in the Staff Report, the City need not consider another 158-unit alternative.

Further, the proposed alternative should be rejected as infeasible. The draft conceptual drawing provided in the October 4, 2017 letter is speculative, unrealistic, and

unsubstantiated. To the contrary, our company has collaborated with the City, engineers, and experts; using our extensive experience in real estate development, knowledge of anticipated construction costs, and close familiarity with the market; to develop a reasonable, desirable, and feasible development of 380-residential units.

As proposed, the Project will provide a significant benefit to the community while meeting the City's goals of increasing housing stock, diversifying the range of available housing opportunities, and providing a variety of housing types and designs. The Project develops below maximum site density to incorporate 48 acres of permanent open space with active greenbelts and parks, as well as numerous recreational, social, and community amenities to help reestablish the social fabric of the Escondido Country Club community. We have continued to work with the City to refine the Project, including reducing the total number of units and reducing 60 homes to one story in height. We have also incorporated mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts below a level of significance for all effects, with the possible exception of one traffic impact to southbound I-15 on-ramp at El Norte Parkway. If Caltrans authorizes the proposed improvement for this on-ramp, all identified impacts would be eliminated.

Conclusion

In sum, the October 23, 2017 letter does not raise any valid issues related to the Project's environmental analysis or legal compliance. Further, the City has adequately considered and addressed the majority of the issues raised by DeLano in the Final EIR, Staff Report, and associated documents.

On behalf of New Urban West, Inc., I thank you for considering the Villages—Escondido Country Club Project and these responses.

Very truly yours,



Jonathan Frankel

Project Manager

New Urban West, Inc.

Mike Strong

From: J Aly <j_aly@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2017 1:21 PM
To: Sam Abed; Ed Gallo; John Masson; Mike Strong; Kristin Blackson; Mike Strong; Olga Diaz
Subject: Country Club

Good afternoon Mayor Abed, City Council and Escondido Planning Commission members:

I am writing to again voice my concerns with the The Villages proposal of 380 dwelling at the former Escondido Country Club area.

As a resident of the area for over 12 years I have very honest and strong concerns with such a massive housing development. This area was Never supposed to support any additional housing/dwellings/traffic increase as is identified in The Villages proposal. I am not anti-growth or development of this area but I am in strong support of a realistic and honest plan that blends well to what is currently there.

I will be vocal in support of a plan that introduces less than half as many homes that are single-level with adequate plot and spacing; in addition, a significant area set aside solely as Open Space as well as the reconstruction of the current club house and the smaller buildings on site.

Thank you for keeping my concerns at the forefront as we enter a very important period of time for planning the future of my neighborhood.

Regards,

Jean Aly