

Attachment E – Public Comment Letters



Valley Center Community Planning Group

P.O. Box 127
Valley Center, CA 92082

Dori Rattray - Chair
Seat 3
drattray524@aol.com

Lisa Adams - Vice Chair
Seat 6
lisa.adams.valleycenterca@gmail.com

James Garritson - Secretary
Seat 12
vc@garritson.com

Chris Barber
Seat 11
chris.barber1959@gmail.com

Michelle Bothof
Seat 1
busybrunette@protonmail.com

Vlad Ciupitu
Seat 8
vciupitu@gmail.com

Susan Fajardo
Seat 14
sfajardo247@gmail.com

Delores Chavez Harmes
Seat 5
dee.valleycenter@gmail.com

Mary Hodson
Seat 13
mhodsonvalleycenter@gmail.com

Steve Hutchinson
Seat 2
hutchisonsm@gmail.com

Karen Lieber
Seat 7
klieber.vccpg@gmail.com

Bob Littlejohn
Seat 9
robert.g.littlejohn@gmail.com

Dr. Matt Matthews
Seat 4

LaVonne Norwood
Seat 10
lavonnenorwood@gmail.com

Tom Stinson
Seat 15

October 8, 2025
To: The San Diego County Planning Commission

Dear Commissioners,
On behalf of the Valley Center Community Planning Group, I am writing to officially submit our decision regarding the Draft Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

Following a detailed review and comprehensive discussion, **the Planning Group voted 12 to 1 in favor of opting out of the Draft ADU Zoning Ordinance Amendment.** Our decision was driven by a range of significant concerns raised by the group, specifically related to the potential local impacts of the Amendment. Key concerns that informed our vote include:

- **Increased Density and Infrastructure Strain:** A primary concern is the potential for increased residential density, particularly in already developed areas like the Park Circle community. This increased volume of units is anticipated to strain critical local resources and infrastructure, including water resources, waste management, educational capacity, and emergency response capabilities.
- **Mandatory Development Concerns:** There is apprehension that the ordinance may eventually lead to requirements for large landowners to develop ADUs on their properties to meet State housing mandates, potentially coupled with penalties for non-compliance.
- **Impact on Property Value and Assessment:** Concerns were voiced regarding the potential for an existing property to be reassessed at current market rates upon the construction or sale of an ADU.
- **Homeowners Association (HOA) Regulations:** Clarification was sought regarding the rights of existing HOAs. While an HOA cannot deny a homeowner the ability to build an ADU, there is a concern that it can deny the subsequent sale of the ADU as a separate unit.
- **Setback and Development Requirements:** Concerns exist regarding potential new setback requirements for ADUs built adjacent to existing properties.
- **Affordability:** While recognizing the need for more creative solutions to homeownership affordability for younger Californians and families, the group is concerned that this specific ordinance, without addressing the underlying infrastructure concerns, may not be the most effective solution for Valley Center.
- **Requirements for Sale:** There is a concern that a property owner may be subject to additional requirements before being legally permitted to sell an ADU.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our formal position and the rationale behind it. We believe these concerns must be addressed before the Amendment is enacted in our community.

Best regards,
Dori Rattray - Chair
Valley Center Community Planning Group



FIRE PROTECTION IS EVERYONE'S BUSINESS

LOWER SWEETWATER FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

2725-B Granger Avenue, National City, CA 91950

Board of Supervisors
County of San Diego
1600 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Ordinance Allowing Separate Sale of ADUs

Dear Chair Lawson-Remer and Members of the Board,

The Lower Sweetwater Fire Protection District respectfully submits this letter to express our opposition to the proposed ordinance permitting the separate sale of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in San Diego County.

Our District's mission is to safeguard life, property, and the environment through effective fire protection and emergency response. The proposed ordinance would increase residential density beyond current zoning limits, creating significant risks to public safety that our existing emergency infrastructure is not equipped to manage.

Of particular concern:

- **Emergency Response Strain:** Increased density without proportional expansion of fire stations, personnel, and equipment will lengthen response times and reduce effectiveness.
- **Evacuation Hazards:** Additional independently occupied residences will complicate evacuation planning and execution in wildfire-prone areas.
- **Access and Congestion:** More households per parcel will worsen roadway congestion, impeding fire engines, ambulances, and law enforcement.
- **Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS):** The County's Green Building Incentive Program encourages renewable energy adoption, often paired with residential BESS. While beneficial for sustainability, lithium-ion battery systems present unique fire hazards, including thermal runaway, toxic gas emissions, and

difficult-to-extinguish fires. Increased density combined with widespread BESS installations compounds the risks faced by first responders.

For these reasons, the Lower Sweetwater Fire Protection District formally opposes the ordinance in its current form. We urge the County to prioritize public safety by ensuring that any housing policy changes are matched with adequate fire protection and emergency response capacity, and that the hazards of residential BESS are fully addressed in planning and permitting processes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kurt Worden". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'K'.

Kurt Worden

Board President

Lower Sweetwater Fire Protection District

HIDDEN MEADOWS COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

“Community Representation to the County of San Diego”

- Bret Sealey
Chair
- James Chagala
Vice Chair
- Joseph Michalowski
Secretary
- Craig Cook
Member
- Mark Delin
Member
- Michael Richman
Member
- Robert Riha
Member
- Edward Van Liew
Member

October 13, 2025

County of San Diego
 Planning and Development Services
 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 210
 San Diego, California 92123

Subject: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Zoning Ordinance Amendment

On September 25, 2025, the Hidden Meadows Community Sponsor Group determined group feedback as part of the Public Review period for the draft Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Zoning Ordinance Amendment was critical due to overall concerns with the proposed changes. These proposed changes not only increase the density of homes on a single property, but also allow for the sale of the units, amounting to the creation of small subdivisions without any analysis of impact to supporting infrastructure and related changes that would normally be required to account for the increased population. These impacts affect a wide range of topics including general plan elements, environment, schools, traffic patterns, emergency services, along with other areas. Our immediate concerns are detailed below.

General/Community Plans: The County, as well as local communities, has spent considerable time preparing these plans to preserve local character and have a balanced approach of sustainable population growth and infrastructure. The ADU changes would not only change the intent of the rural and semi-rural designations that make up the majority of the Hidden Meadows area, but have also not been addressed in the Land Use or Housing elements. The overall intent of the General Plan would essentially be rendered useless if each parcel is permitted to become a de facto subdivision without the normal processes being enforced.

Environment: The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemptions extended by AB3057 and earlier legislation did not take into consideration the proposed massive increase in ADUs. Without proper environmental review there is a high potential for significant and unmitigated impacts, undoing decades of work by the County and others to protect our environment and native species.

Schools: Each new dwelling unit has the potential to generate students which must be accommodated by the local school district. The potential is that hundreds of students would place an increased burden on local school districts without the normal process mitigations allowing local districts to apply a fee structure for each potential student.

Traffic Patterns: Streets and roads within an area are carefully studied to determine if the road network will operate at an acceptable level. Subdivisions are scrutinized to determine if there will be adverse impacts and if they are aligned with the General Plan Mobility element. The ADU proposed changes do not include even single ADU traffic analysis, let alone aggregate level when several ADUs are potentially approved. Without mitigating factors and transportation infrastructure improvement, roadway traveler capacity will continue to degrade.

Subject: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Water: Sustainable water supplies across San Diego County continue to be a challenge. The potential impacts of subdivisions is carefully monitored by the responsible Water District, in the case of wells County Department of Environmental Health. Without this standardized scrutiny, there is increased risk of water supplies and sources being unable to meet future demand.

Fire: Especially in the rural and semi-rural areas such as Hidden Meadows, the fire threat continues to grow. The latest maps from the State Fire Marshal show a significant increase in High and Very High Fire Severity Zones. Increasing the population in the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) areas without appropriate mitigations endangers both current and potential future residents. Specifically, at least three developments in the Hidden Meadows area have not been approved during the last decade due to community egress limitations. The proposed ADU ordinance changes would circumvent this safety restriction by potentially adding more dwelling units than all the recent attempted projects combined, while not addressing the primary egress concerns.

In summary, while we understand the need for more low-cost housing in the County, we feel that there are other, less impactful, ways to accomplish these goals around infrastructure that is capable of handling the increased population density. Adding thousands of additional dwellings to rural and semi-rural areas actually creates more problems than it solves.

Best regards,



Bret A. Sealey
Chair

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED “OPTIONAL LANGUAGE” RELATED TO SEPARATE SALES OF ADUs

Don't devalue existing property rights! The proposed optional language related to the separate sale of ADUs authorized by AB1033 should not be included in a new or amended County Ordinance, and the Board of Supervisors should vote NO on any such proposed language.

The Board should vote NO on the proposed optional language related to the separate sale of ADUs authorized by AB1033 (“*Optional Language*”) for the following reasons:

1. It is an unlawful taking without due compensation to existing property owners;
2. It is an ex post facto law by its effect;
3. It violates the Subdivision Map Act; and
4. It changes the character of existing neighborhoods by failing to require on-site parking of ADU-related vehicles.

The *Optional Language* Is An Unlawful Taking

The California Constitution, specifically Article I, Section 7, provides a provision against unlawful taking without compensation. It states that a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws. The Fifth Amendment Takings Clause, which is applicable to the States through the Fourteenth Amendment, ensures that private property is not taken for public use without just compensation. This provision is crucial in safeguarding property rights and ensuring that government actions do not impose due burdens on private property owners.

As stated in the “Guide For Public Feedback” related to the *Optional Language*, said language “*supports the County’s priority to expand homeownership opportunities and more attainable price points...*” The *Optional Language* clearly supports a public purpose or use.

The *Optional Language* constitutes an unlawful taking for which there is no compensation to existing homeowners for the loss in value to their homes caused by ADUs creating a higher density of people, greater traffic on residential streets, and more vehicles parked on streets.

The *Optional Language* Is An Ex Post Facto Law By Its Effect

People purchase homes in a particular area based on a number of factors. Initially, it may be location, but a close second is the appearance of the neighborhood. Factors affecting appearance may include the cleanliness of the neighborhood; whether existing homeowners maintain their properties; whether existing homeowners park their personal

vehicles in garages, on driveways, or in the streets; the number of vehicles associated with a particular residence; space between one home and another (privacy considerations); and views associated with the particular home to be purchased or the area in general. (Collectively, *Appearance Factors*). Among many other things, the *Appearance Factors* are often determinative of the sales price for a home. For this reason, homes in one area often sell for multiple times the price of homes in other locations.

The *Optional Language* has the effect of changing every one of the *Appearance Factors* referred to above. While it is true that a homebuyer in the same neighborhood may change several of the *Appearance Factors*, the *Optional Language* allows privacy and views to be directly affected by the higher density of people and traffic after an existing homeowner has purchased his or her property.

The *Optional Language* should not be allowed as it effectively retroactively changes the *Appearance Factors* and character of neighborhoods.

The Optional Language Violates The Subdivision Map Act

The Subdivision Map Act plays a crucial role in California's land use planning and development, ensuring that subdivisions are designed and built in a manner that benefits the community while protecting the interests of buyers and the public. The *Optional Language* violates the Subdivision Map Act by allowing additional residential structures in existing subdivisions that were previously zoned for specific size structures for residential occupancy. Allowing the separate sale of ADUs is little more than an end run around the purpose and requirements of the Subdivision Map Act.

The Optional Language Changes The Character of Existing Neighborhoods by Failing to Require for On-Site Parking of ADU-Related Vehicles in All Situations

The numerous exceptions to when additional parking is or is not required for ADU-related vehicles changes the character of existing neighborhoods by increasing traffic on residential streets and by increasing the number of vehicles parked on residential streets.

In addition, because law enforcement does not or cannot effectively enforce California's Daylight Parking Law (AB 413), which prohibits parking within 20 feet of the approach side of any marked or unmarked crosswalk or within 15 feet of any crosswalk where a curb extension is present, the *Optional Language* will increase the likelihood of injuries or fatalities as additional ADU-related vehicles will result in increased violations of the Daylight Parking Law without meaningful enforcement. **At a minimum**, any *Optional Language* that allows for additional ADU-related vehicles to be parked off site should require that builders/developers (and owners) of ADUs located on properties contiguous to

intersections be required to paint and maintain curbing red, so the 20 foot minimum distance is clearly visible and understood by all vehicle owners.

Conclusion

The *Optional Language* effectively violates a principle even toddlers learn at an early age – you cannot fit a square peg into a round hole – or vice versa. The entire ADU concept fits more people into existing defined areas and infringes on the characteristics of a neighborhood that inspired the purchase of homes by existing homeowners. The effect is to devalue properties owned by existing homeowners. The addition of ADUs to existing neighborhoods increases the density of people and vehicles to neighborhoods and by doing so constitutes a takings within the meaning of the California and U.S. Constitutions without consideration of or compensation to existing homeowners. It also exposes individuals to increased injuries as a result of the inability or unwillingness of law enforcement to cite violators for California Daylight Law violations.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Andelson
9325 Francis Dr.
Spring Valley, CA 91977
Michael.andelson@gmail.com

Section 6156.x.A. (Page 5)

Alternative 1 (new language) incorporating AB 1033

2. ADU may be rented but is not intended for sale separately from the primary residence, unless the lot is subdivided in conformance with qualifications for the ministerial approval of a two-lot subdivision/parcel map creating a separate lot for each dwelling, or condominiums are created in conformance with requirements outlined under section 6156.XD. of the County Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the sale of ADUs. Or the conditions pertaining to nonprofits and tenancy in common agreements established under section 66341 of the California Government Code are met.

- We are in support of adopting alternative 1.

Section 6156.x.B. (Page 8)

1. b.
 - i. The total floor area of a detached ADU approved under this subsection shall not exceed 800 square feet.
 - ii. The height of detached ADU approved under this subsection shall not exceed 18 feet.

- We strongly oppose the limitation to the size and height of the detached ADU allowed in single-family lot. We recommend keeping the size at 1,200 square feet and the height at 25 feet.

Section 6156.x.D. (Page 12)

Separate sale of accessory dwelling unit (AB 1033).

3. Option 2

The condominium units and common areas were mapped prior to the construction commencement of the ADU/s that are to be sold separately. Separate sale of ADU/s as condominiums will apply to new development only, and not to ADU/s existing prior to condominium mapping.

- We strongly oppose option 2 that limits the separate sale of ADU as condominiums to new development only. It's unfair for the existing detached ADU to not have the right to be sold separately if it meets the county requirements.

BONSALL COMMUNITY SPONSOR GROUP

Position Statement: Opposition to Assembly Bill 1033 (2023)

Date: November 2025

The Bonsall Community Sponsor Group (BCSG), a local citizens' organization committed to preserving the safety, character, and quality of life in our rural community, respectfully submits this statement of **opposition to Assembly Bill 1033 (2023)** — the so-called “Opt-In” Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) legislation.

Our Position:

We do not support Assembly Bill 1033 because it undermines local control, disregards community planning, and threatens to change the unique character of our rural and semi-rural neighborhoods.

Key Concerns:

1. **Loss of Local Oversight:** AB 1033 allows cities and counties to “opt in” to state-mandated ADU sales and condominium conversions, effectively reducing the ability of local planning boards and residents to determine what is appropriate for their own communities.
2. **Increased Density & Infrastructure Strain:** The bill enables property owners to sell ADUs separately from primary residences, encouraging higher density without corresponding upgrades to infrastructure, roads, or emergency services.
3. **Erosion of Community Character:** Bonsall's rural charm and open space are vital to our residents and local environment. This legislation incentivizes urban-style development that conflicts with the community's General Plan and long-term vision.
4. **Unintended Consequences:** While framed as an affordability solution, the bill could drive speculation, inflate land values, and worsen local housing pressures rather than provide sustainable, affordable options.

Conclusion:

For these reasons, the BCSG stands in **opposition to Assembly Bill 1033 (2023)** and urges our county and state representatives **not to adopt or support “opt-in” provisions** under this legislation. We support responsible housing solutions that preserve local decision-making and maintain the integrity of our rural community.

Sincerely,

Larissa Anderson
Chairperson, Bonsall Community Support (BCSG)

Steve Norris

Jennifer Haider

Jared Rowley

Michael Collier

Sophia Kittell

Fallbrook Planning Group
P. O. Box 1419
Fallbrook, CA 92028

November 14, 2025?

The Fallbrook Planning Group is strongly opposed to the County's ADU update component, which would allow for the separate sale of ADUs.

We recognize the need for more home ownership, especially more affordable homes.

However, the addition and then the ability to sell ADUs, would change the zoning of single family residential neighborhoods into multi family.

In the unincorporated rural areas, the ability for homeowners to build attached ADUs, detached ADUs and junior ADU's, all on the same parcel as their primary residence puts an enormous strain on our already burdened roads, infrastructure, law enforcement and first responders.

Of particular concern is that most of the unincorporated towns are in high fire areas. These additional "homes" could have negative impacts on already congested roads, causing delays when residents need to evacuate especially, when time is of the essence.

Best regards,

Eileen Delaney, Chair
Fallbrook Planning Group
Fallbrook Design Review Board

Re: ADU Draft Ordinance
County of San Diego Planning Commission Meeting
December 5, 2025

To the Planning Commission, County of San Diego

My name is Story R Vogel and I am the Vice Chair of the Pine Valley Planning Group. I am reaching out to you on behalf of our Chair Vern Denham to clarify an issue that has arisen as we review the Draft ADU Zoning Ordinance Amendments that were recently sent to us.

In the "Guide For Public Feedback" portion of the Draft Ordinance, it is stated that you are seeking comment on " Local Criteria" as to the Draft ordinance provisions.

The Mountain Empire, Pine Valley, Guatay, Mt Laguna , Campo, Buckman Springs and East to Jacumba is ground water dependent. Here in Pine Valley our water source is our Pine Valley Mutual Water Company which delivers well water to each home in Pine Valley on the State limited number of water meters due to the ground water source. Some residences as well as ranches have their own wells but the water supply is all the same; groundwater from rain and runoff from Mt. Laguna.

In reviewing this County Draft Ordinance to comply with the State of California Assembly Bills seeking to increase "housing" supply, we don't see anything that references the groundwater dependent areas of the Mountain Empire and East County to the Border which would naturally limit the ability to allow further depletion of the groundwater sources through the construction of additional housing units. Naturally this would require unavailable water meters in Pine Valley specifically and further deplete the groundwater and exacerbate an already tenuous water supply dependent on mother nature.

Although Section D2 of the Draft makes reference to the compliance of any potential ADU with the County Department of Environmental Health and the State standards for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems aka Septic systems and /or well water, groundwater dependent areas in the unincorporated areas face unique challenges when it comes to water supply.

In Pine Valley in particular , we have in the past suffered through groundwater depletion causing the Pine Valley Mutual Water Company to close off some of the wells used to provide water to Pine Valley and asked residents to limit their water use.

We are concerned that a blanket ADU policy which does not take into consideration the specific groundwater needs of the backcountry , but in our case Pine Valley, as well as the unavailability of additional State regulated water meters in Pine Valley itself, would be very short sighted and cause irreparable harm to the property owners as well as resident in general. As I stated this is an issue for all communities in the Backcountry but as our Planning Group only represents Pine Valley, Guatay and Mt. Laguna our specific concerns are there.

We hope that our perspective on the issue of additional ADU's and the impact on groundwater will be considered as this process moves forward.

Thank you

Story R Vogel
Vice Chair
Pine Valley Planning Group
619-865-4901
P.O.Box 1066
Pine Valley, Ca 91962