

**213776**

**JUL 10 1975**

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Planned Residential Development Permit No. 93

WHEREAS, JAMES and VIRGINIA WILSON, individuals, Owner, and ROBERT G. STEWART, individual, both hereafter referred to as "Permittee," filed an application to construct and operate a planned residential development located south of Jutland Drive, between Morena Boulevard and Idlewild Way, more particularly described as a portion of Pueblo Lots 1225 and 1226, in the R-1-15 zone; and

WHEREAS, on December 4, 1974, the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego made its findings of facts, granted said Planned Residential Development Permit No. 93, and filed said decision in the office of the City Clerk on December 10, 1974; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Section 101.0900 of the San Diego Municipal Code, SAVE JUTLAND CANYON COMMITTEE, by Alice M. Buck, Chairman, appealed the decision of the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, said appeal was heard on January 23, 1975 whereat testimony was given, evidence was submitted, and the City Council after considering the matter and being fully advised concerning the same, by a vote of 5 to 4 denied the appeal of the SAVE JUTLAND CANYON COMMITTEE and granted, by

**MICROFILMED**

**MAY 17 1978**

**00291**

Resolution No. 212475, to JAMES and VIRGINIA WILSON and ROBERT G. STEWART, Planned Residential Development Permit No. 93 in the form and with the terms and conditions as set forth in the permit attached to said resolution and by Resolution No. 212474 certified that the information contained in the Environmental Impact Report on file in the office of the City Clerk as E.Q.D. No. 73-12-1010P had been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 and the State Guidelines pursuant thereto, and that said Report had been reviewed and considered by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Save Jutland Canyon Committee filed a lawsuit in the Superior Court of San Diego County, California, No. 364148, on March 10, 1975 alleging, among other things, that the actions of the Planning Commission and City Council were invalid in that the findings of fact made merely recited the language of the Municipal Code and were insufficient and that no findings of fact were made to support the granting of a deviation from the minimum required usable open space; and

WHEREAS, the Superior Court in its memorandum opinion of April 9, 1975, held that the Planning Commission and City Council were required in granting or denying a P.R.D. permit to set forth findings in writing sufficient to bridge the analytical gap between the raw evidence and ultimate decision and to specify facts upon which they rely; and

**MICROFILMED**

**MAY 17 1978**

WHEREAS, on April 25, 1975, the Court issued its Order directing the Planning Commission and City Council to make specific written findings to support the granting of the permit; and

WHEREAS, on June 4, 1975, the Planning Commission by Resolution, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein, adopted findings of fact in support of its December 4, 1974 action in granting Planned Residential Permit No. 93.

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of the City of San Diego, as follows:

I. That, to the extent not inconsistent herewith, the Planning Commission's Resolution adopting findings of fact in support of their decision to grant P.R.D. No. 93 be adopted as the findings of this Council in support of its January 23, 1975 decision to deny the appeal of the Save Jutland Canyon Committee and grant P.R.D. Permit No. 93, and certify the proper completion, review and consideration of Environmental Impact Report No. 73-12-1010P.

II. That the following additional findings of fact are made based upon evidence presented at the City Council hearing on January 23, 1975:

A. Relative to finding that the proposed use at the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute

**MICROFILMED**  
**MAY 17 1978**

to the general well-being of the neighborhood or community it is found that:

1. The site is located close-in to the inner core of the City.

C. Trans. p. 62

2. The site is within one of the corridors of population heretofore designated by the Council to allow for future transit facilities.

C. Trans. p. 55

3. The site has been identified as a portion of the 20,000 acres of vacant and undeveloped land surveyed in the urbanized area of San Diego by the Planning Department Report of December 17, 1974.

C. Trans. p. 56

B. Relative to finding that the use, under the circumstances, will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity it is found as follows:

1. The City has the power through the provisions of the P.R.D. ordinance (Municipal Code Section 101.0900 (S), FAILURE TO MAINTAIN) to insure, on a continuous basis, that the lakes

MICROFILMED

MAY 17 1978

will not become choked with weeds or a mosquito breeding location.

C. Trans. p. 53

2. The fact that the lake design provides for the movement of water and that the Engineering Department through the subdivision process may impose appropriate design criteria, minimizes health hazards relative to the lakes.

C. Trans. p. 54

3. The project will not generate automobile traffic in excess of the design capacities of the serving streets.

C. Trans. p. 47

C. Relative to the granted deviation to the usable open space requirements it is found that:

1. This application is not treated differently from other similar applications under similar circumstances thereby creating a grant of a special privilege.

C. Trans. p. 31

2. The lakes are included to provide a visual amenity and for limited recreational purposes and may be considered as part of the usable open space.

C. Trans. p. 52

**MICROFILMED**

**MAY 17 1978**

**00295 213776**

D. Relative to the issues raised concerning school availability it is found as follows:

1. The San Diego School District's determination that school facilities would be available to serve P.R.D. No. 93 was based upon the development of the property in five phases over a period of time.


C. Trans. pp. 21, 49, 56,  
& 58

Letter: District to Serrano  
dated January 21, 1975; Item 5

2. To mitigate school availability the occupancy of the project shall be at no faster rate than that represented to the school district by the applicant in September of 1974, and the same shall be and become a condition to granting said permit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council action represented by Resolution No. 212475, granting P.R.D. Permit No. 93, and Resolution No. 212474, certifying the E.Q.D. No. 73-12-1010P, both on 23 January 1975 are hereby reaffirmed.

Approved: John W. Witt, City Attorney

By:   
Frederick C. Conrad  
Chief Deputy City Attorney

MICROFILMED

MAY 17 1978

PLANNING COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION OF JUNE 4, 1975  
ADOPTING SPECIFIC FINDINGS  
IN SUPPORT OF P.R.D. NO. 93

MICROFILMED

MAY 17 1978

213776

00297

NO. 338  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION MAKING FINDINGS OF FACTS IN SUPPORT OF  
PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 93

WHEREAS, JAMES and VIRGINIA WILSON, individuals, "Owner", and ROBERT G. STEWART, an individual, "Permittee", filed an application for a Planned Residential Development Permit to construct and operate a Planned Residential Development located southerly of Jutland Drive between Morena Boulevard and Idlewild Way, in the Clairemont Community, more particularly described as portion of Pueblo Lots 1225 and 1226, Map No. 36, in the R-1-15 (LC) zone; and

WHEREAS, on June 4, 1975, the Planning Commission of The City of San Diego has considered the record of the hearing before the Planning Commission on December 4, 1974, relating to Planned Residential Development Permit No. 93; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego hereby makes the following findings of fact:

1. That the Planning Commission adopts as the findings of the Planning Commission the following:

1. That all of the following facts exist with respect to Planned Residential Development Permit No. 93 in favor of "Owner/Permittee":

A. Relative to findings required by Section 101.0900 (F) (1) of the Municipal Code of the City of San Diego, and the Subdivision Map Act of the State of California.

1. That the proposed use at the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhood or the community based upon the following facts:

a. By clustering units, utilizing split-level structures, and retaining natural green belts, the subject project is well adapted to the natural topographic features of the site. This approach serves to minimize grading as well as maximize the views of the future residents of the development and the present rim owners and would therefore contribute to the general well-being of the community.

PDR p. 2  
Ex. C, F, G & H  
Trans. pp. 12, 14, 15, 16 & 19

b. The City Engineering Department has advised that sewer, water, storm drainage, power and telephone services are available to serve the proposed project. The School District has advised that schools have the capacity to accept the generated demand from the project. Fire and police protection are

MICROFILMED

MAY 17 1978

213776

00298

RECEIVED  
CITY ENGINEER'S OFFICE  
MAY 25 JUN 30 PM 12:30  
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.



available. There are public libraries, parks, recreation centers, shops and hospitals available in the neighborhood. The site is served by collector streets, arterials and freeway access. Public transportation is available.

PDR p. 3  
Trans. pp. 1, 3, 23 & 42

- c. The Progress Guide and General Plan and the Clairemont-Mesa Community Plan provide for low density residential use of the property at a density of five units per acre or less. The zoning of the property is R-1-15 and R-1-15 (LC) which is restricted to residential use. The proposed use is residential at a density of 2.3 units per acre, less than is allowed in the zone and than permitted pursuant to the adopted plans.

The proposed use is residential in an area developed for residential purposes which has all necessary public and private community service facilities.

- d. Development in this area is in concert with the ideas of the Planning Commission and Department to fill in areas closer to the City core and the need for housing is going to be an on-going need in the City. Therefore, this project is necessary for the community, which is defined as the entire City of San Diego.

2. That such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity based on the following facts:

- a. The overall street system which is not a dominant feature of the proposal is designed to discourage through traffic and the meandering street system will encourage slower traffic movements. The proposed western mound adjacent to the Solar and Rohr warehouse and the tree planting thereon will reduce noise and obstruct unsightly views for those residents who will reside in the project and for some rim owners.

Ex. B & C  
Trans. pp. 16, 18 & 19

- b. The proposed use is residential in an area developed for residential purposes which has all necessary public and private community service facilities. Such use would not normally give rise to health or safety hazards. Nevertheless, specific hazards have been alleged as to which we find:

- i. A branch of the Rose Canyon Fault exists on the property but is inactive.

**MICROFILMED**

**MAY 17 1978**

EIR p. 3  
Trans. pp. 49, 63, & 64

**00299**

- ii. Grading under the supervision of a soils engineer upon the site is not likely to cause subsidence of adjacent properties.

Trans. pp. 62 & 64

- iii. The design for impounding of lake water does not create a dangerous condition. The lakes add to the mitigation of the visual effect of the project.

Trans. p. 68

- iv. Traffic impacts will not create health or safety hazards; grading will not cause subsidence of adjacent properties; the existing fault is inactive and will not create a danger to residents or adjacent property owners.

- 3. That all design criteria and minimum standards for a Planned Residential Development will be met, except for the requirement for usable open space, as follows:

- a. The overall plan is comprehensive, embracing land, buildings, landscaping and their interrelationships and conforms in all respects to all adopted plans of all governmental agencies for the area in which the proposed development is located.

Exhibits B, C, D, E, F, G and H, together with the floor plans and elevations and the conditions imposed by this Commission, the ordinances of this City and State law, indicates compliance with the statutory design criterion, except the usable open space requirement.

- b. The plan provides for adequate open space, circulation, off-street parking and pertinent amenities. Buildings, structures, and facilities in the parcel are well integrated, oriented and related to the topographic and natural landscape features of the the site, based upon the following facts:

- i. Required open space is 1,350,000 square feet; proposed is 62.2 acres or 2,709,000 square feet, an excess of 1,359,000 square feet or 200 percent.

PDR p. 3  
Ex. C  
Trans. pp. 3, 55 & 59  
Brochure p. 3

- ii. Internal streets are tortured to discourage through traffic; open space is connected to the units via a pedestrian pathway system.

Ex.  
Trans. p.

**MICROFILMED**  
18  
MAY 17 1978

- iii. Units are clustered and split-level with grade differentials

00300

taken up beneath units.

Ex. C & F  
Trans. pp. 15 & 18

- iv. Parking for 480 automobiles is proposed (3.2 parking spaces per dwelling unit). 300 spaces are in enclosed garages attached to units, 150 are curb parking spaces, and 30 are bay parking spaces.

Ex. C  
PDR p. 3

- c. The proposed development is compatible with existing and planned land use and with circulation patterns on adjoining properties; it does not constitute a disruptive element to the neighborhood and community, based upon the following facts:

- i. Jutland Drive and Geddes Drive are designated collector streets in the community plan and improved to the standards of collectors. Each has a capacity of 5,000 average daily trips ("ADT"). The project will generate 1,100 "ADT". Distribution of the 1,100 "ADT" generated by this project to two access routes, Jutland and Geddes Drives, will alleviate the traffic associated impacts.

Ex. C & F  
EIR p. 5  
PDR p. 3  
Trans. pp. 3 & 5

- ii. The proposed use is residential in an area developed for residential purposes which has all necessary public and private community service facilities.
- iii. Exterior architectural materials are similar to those found in the neighborhood; units are of a volume similar to those in the neighborhood.

PDR p. 2  
Trans. p. 19

- d. The internal street system is not a dominant feature in the overall design; rather it is designed for the efficient and safe flow of vehicles without creating a disruptive influence on the activity and function of any common areas and facilities based on the following facts:

- i. The through street is of a design to discourage through traffic. Streets serving units are generally cul-de-sac streets which discourage unnecessary traffic.

**MICROFILMED**

Ex. C  
Trans. pp. 18 & 19

00301

MAY 17 1978-

213776

(PRD 93)

- ii. Natural and re-landscaped common areas surround the clustered units and major natural areas are not traversed by streets.

Ex. C

- iii. The active common area is centrally located and connected to units by a pedestrian path system.

Ex. C & D

- e. Common areas and recreational facilities are located so as to be readily accessible to the occupants of the dwelling units and are well related to any common open spaces provided based on the following facts:

- i. Natural and re-landscaped common area surrounds the clustered units separating them from the existing neighbors.

Ex. C

- ii. The active common area is centrally located and connected to units by a pedestrian path system.

Ex. C & D

- iii. Parking for 30 automobiles is provided close to the recreational facilities.

Ex. D

- f. Architectural harmony within the development and within the neighborhood and community has been obtained so far as practicable based on the following facts:

- i. External architectural materials to be used are similar to those used in the neighborhood.

PDR p. 2  
Trans. pp. 18 & 19

- ii. Unit volume is similar to the houses in the neighborhood.

Trans. p. 19

- iii. The proposed units are separated from existing rim homes by a landscaped green belt and are all below the grades of adjacent pad elevations to preserve the views from existing residences.

Ex. C  
Trans. pp. 12, 16, 19 & 21

- g. The number of dwelling units to be built on the property does not exceed the maximum permitted dwelling units for a P.R.D. in the R-1-15 zone. The maximum number of units allowed is 189;

MICROFILMED MAY 17 1978

213776

(PRD 93)  
00302

150 are proposed, which is a 21 percent decrease from the maximum allowed.

Ex.	C
PDR pp.	1 & 2
EIR p.	2

- h. The open space provided on the property is not less than the total required open space for a P.R.D. in the R-1-15 zone. The required open space is 1,350,000 square feet; proposed is 62.2 acres or 2,709,000 square feet; the proposal contains an excess of 1,359,000 square feet, or 200 percent.

PDR p.	3
Ex.	C
Trans. pp.	3, 55 & 59
Brochure p.	3

- i. The usable open space provided on the property is less than the total required usable open space for a P.R.D. in the R-1-15 zone. The required usable open space is 675,000 square feet; proposed is 435,600 square feet, a deficiency of 239,400 square feet, which is a deficiency of 35 per cent.

Ex.	C
Trans. pp.	3, 54 & 59
PDR p.	3

4. That the granting of this permit will not adversely affect the General Plan of the City, the adopted Clairemont-Mesa Community Plan, or the adopted plan of any governmental agency based upon the following facts:

- a. The proposed density is less than that allowed by the adopted Clairemont-Mesa Community Plan and the General Plan. The plans designate this site for very low density residential development (0-5 units per acre) if acquisition for open space is not feasible. The adopted Open space element of the General Plan proposes this area for limited development under zoning and/or acquisition initiated through private means.
- b. The Community Plan which designates this site for low density residential development or open space was adopted in 1970.
- c. There have been two general obligation bond issues before the electorate for the acquisition of open space since the adoption of the Community Plan. The first included the subject site, the second excluded it. In neither case did the issues obtain the required two-thirds affirmative vote of the electorate.

Trans. pp. 10 & 11

- d. After the filing of this P.R.D. application, and while it was pending, the City Council gave notice of its intent to assess surrounding property owners to acquire the subject site for open space through the special assessment district process. On November 27, 1974, by a vote of 7 to 2, the Council determined

that the owners of a majority of the property to be included in the district objected to the assessment and they abandoned the district formation proceedings.

- e. Upon the foregoing facts it is determined that all reasonable efforts to acquire the open space alternative contained in the plan have failed, as the acquisition has not obtained the requisite affirmative support of either the voters or property owners.
- f. The proposed use at the particular location conforms to the General Plan of the City, the adopted Clairemont-Mesa Community Plan, and the adopted plan of all governmental agencies.

B. Relative to the Deviation from Usable Open Space Requirements, which deviation is hereby granted, the following findings of fact are made:

1. Because of special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings; the strict application of the requirements deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity under identical zone classification, as follows:

a. The shape of the site is such that usable open space in the south canyon would not provide a common area facility that bears a close relationship to the units.

Ex. A, B, C, F, G, & H

b. The site is in the Land Conservation Zone and has slope gradients of 35 percent or more while adjacent properties are not in the LC zone and do not have as steep slope gradients.

PDR p. 1  
Brochure p. 3  
Ex. F

c. The proposed plan grades only 11.8 percent of the area with slope gradients of 35 percent or more.

Brochure p. 3  
Trans. p. 25 (cont'd)  
Ex. E

d. The site consists of a canyon with an intervening ridge while adjacent properties are on mesas.

Ex. A, B, C, F, G & H  
EIR p. 4

e. Adjacent residential properties are developed at a density consistent with the R-1-5 zone in which they lie. There is no property in the vicinity which is zoned R-1-15 and/or R-1-15 (LC). Although the coverage factor in these standard subdivisions insures at least 3,000 square feet of total open space, consistent

**MICROFILMED**

-7-  
MAY 17 1978

213776

(PRD 93)

00304

with the requirements of the P.R.D. Ordinance, no criteria within the standard subdivision or zoning regulations stipulate the amount of usable open space that must be provided. The proposed development contains 2,900 square feet of usable open space per unit which is only 100 square feet of the open space less than the total open space required upon adjacent properties, whether usable or not.

Ex. A, B, & F  
PDR p. 1

- f. The subject site was zoned R-1-15 and R-1-15 (LC) for the purpose of limiting development so as to preserve the land for natural open space acquisition or to prevent building densities in excess of the community plan's five units per acre maximum established for the site in the Community Plan.

Trans. pp. 2, 9, 10 & 11  
PDR p. 1

- g. The proposed plan provides for 200 percent more open space than required while seeking only a 35 percent variance from required usable open space. The proposed open space per unit is 18,000 square feet which is more than 3-1/2 times larger than the minimum lot size in the adjacent R-1-5 subdivisions.

Trans. pp. 3, 54, 55 & 59

- h. The proposed density is less than one-half that permitted by the Community Plan and 39 units less than the 189 allowed in the R-1-15 zone.

PDR p. 2  
Ex. C

- i. If 4,500 square feet of usable open space per unit were provided either more of the property would be affected by grading or the density would be reduced. It is a goal of the adopted plans to preserve natural open space. The proposed development is already 39 units below the maximum density allowed for a P.R.D. in the R-1-15 zone.

2. The deviation granted does not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the property is situated because of the conditions imposed, as follows:

- a. Most adjacent residential properties having been developed to R-1-5 standards do not have 4,500 square feet of usable open space per unit as is required for a P.R.D. in the R-1-15 zone.

Ex. A, B & F

- b. Adjacent properties are not now, and will not be, burdened by an open space easement as is one of the conditions of approval of this P.R.D. upon this site.

00305

MICROFILMED MAY 17 1978 213776

(PRD 93)

3. That the granting of the deviation does not adversely affect the Progress Guide and General Plan for the City of San Diego or the adopted plan of any governmental agency, based upon the following:

- a. There will be no increase in density above that which is allowed by any adopted plan nor will the use be different than the residential use permitted by the plans because of the granting of the deviation.
- b. Retaining 88.2 percent of the steep slope in its natural condition; retaining half of the land area in its natural condition; and leaving an open space area around the clustered units as a buffer between new and existing homes achieves the planning goal of maximizing open space upon the site consistent with some productive residential use.

C. Relative to the Land Conservation Zone Considerations, if a Land Conservation Permit be requested:

1. The development will result in minimum disturbance of the natural terrain commensurate with the proposed use of the lot or premises, based on the following:

- a. The proposed residential use is at a density less than that permitted for a P.R.D. in the R-1-15 zone.
- b. Grading volumes are 3,000 cubic yards per unit which is smaller per unit than those of other similar projects which have heretofore been approved for other P.R.D.'s in LC zones.

Trans. pp. 16 & 26

- c. About one-half of the site is being maintained in its natural condition.
- d. Only 11.8 percent of the area with slopes of 35 percent or more is being graded.
- e. Grading will be contoured to meet and blend into the natural slope.

Trans. p. 15

f. New slopes will be irrigated, re-landscaped and maintained.

Trans. pp. 20 & 21

2. Grading and excavation proposed in connection with the development will not result in soil erosion, silting of lower slopes, slide damage, flooding problems, or severe cutting or scarring, based upon the following:

- a. Grading will be conducted under the supervision of a competent soils engineer.

Trans. pp. 26 & 62

**MICROFILMED**

-9-

(PRD 93)

MAY 17 1978

213776

00306



- b. Architectural landscaping will mitigate soils erosion, siltation, slippage, scarring, and flooding effects.

Trans. pp. 20, 21 & 26

- c. The Engineering and Development Department of the City has reviewed the proposed grading and found it in compliance with the grading ordinance.

Trans. pp. 26 & 27

3. The proposed development will serve to preserve and enhance the natural environment and the aesthetic qualities of the site, based upon the following:

- a. 88.2 percent of the area with a slope of 35 percent or more will be retained in its natural condition.
- b. 48 percent of the total area will not be graded. (Page 4 of Planning Department report)
- c. Portions of the area to be disturbed are already eroded, barren of vegetation, or sparsely vegetated.

Ex. A & B  
Trans. pp. 14 & 19

- d. The site contains no rare or endangered species of plant or animal life.

EIR p. 4

- e. From observations as stated in the transcript, the addition of landscaping would be an asset to the particular development because that portion of the site as it stands now appears to be barren and rutted.

- f. The addition of the two lakes would serve to enhance the area.

- III. That the Environmental Impact Report has been reviewed and considered and the environmental effects have been mitigated or will be permitted based upon overriding social and economic criteria as follows:

A. Environmental Findings

1. The granting of this permit will represent the further commitment of land planned for open space to urbanized uses and it could be an inducement for further development in other canyons under similar circumstances. The proposed plan retains approximately one-half of the site. The community plan, however, also provided for development if acquisition were unfeasible. Two attempts at such acquisition since September of 1970 adequately represents the difficulty of its acquisition.

MICROFILMED  
MAY 17 1978

-10-

(PRD 93)

213776

00307

The proposed plan, on the other hand, is considerate of the open space designation and retains half of the site as natural open space. The development has 200 per cent more open space than is required in the zone which zone designation was created after adoption of the community plan in furtherance of the plan.

2. The volume of grading has less environmental effect than the extent of grading. Though land forms may be altered it is more disruptive environmentally to grade extensively. Here approximately 50 percent of the natural environment is being maintained. Water quality may be increased after grading by landscaping which will reverse the erosion trend presently existing upon the site.

Planning Department Report, P. 4.

3. The project has been postponed to allow time for completion of the formation of an open space assessment district for the acquisition of the site. By a vote of 7 to 2 the City Council, upon determining that the owners of a majority of the property to be included in the district objected to their assessments, abandoned the proceedings. It was the feeling of the Commission that all reasonable efforts had been made to acquire the property for open space.

P.C. Minutes 9/27/74 & 11/20/74

4. The San Diego Unified School District has advised the City that it can provide school facilities for the students which they estimated will be generated by the development.

PDR p. 3

5. Additional growth in this urbanized area where all public and private services are available is considered to be within the growth capabilities of this City.

B. Adverse environmental effects mitigated by the project design are as follows:

1. Conflicts between open space use and urban residential use are mitigated by keeping approximately 33 acres of the 66.5 acre site in its present condition and granting an open space easement thereof to the City as a condition of recording a final subdivision map.

Ex.	B, C & F
Brochure p.	2
Trans. p.	25
EIR p.	2

2. Clustering of units on less than half of the site mitigates the destruction of the present land form. The grading preserves views currently enjoyed by rim property owners by putting roof tops of proposed new dwellings below adjacent pad elevations. Maintaining a density less than permitted helps reduce environmental impacts.

MICROFILMED

-11-

(PRD 93)

MAY 17 1978

213776

00308

Grading is further reduced by utilizing split-level structures which obscure cut banks beneath the structures. Graded areas will be contoured to meet existing land forms.

Ex. A, B, C & F  
Trans. pp. 16, 18 & 20  
Brochure p. 2  
EIR p. 3

3. Preservation of portions of the site mitigates the effect upon existing plant and animal life. Exhibits A and B show that disruption of plant life is minimized by grading areas scarred by erosion and/or covered by induced rather than natural weeds.

Ex. A, B, C & F  
Trans. pp. 16, 18 & 20 (cont'd)  
EIR p. 4

4. Visual impacts are mitigated by preserving portions of the site in its natural condition. Introduction of the lakes will enhance the visual appearance of the proposed project. Re-landscaping and irrigation of the graded area will enhance the visual appearance.

Ex. A, B, C & F  
Trans. pp. 16, 18 & 20

5. Traffic congestion on Jutland is mitigated by having two points of access on Jutland and Geddes which are both designated collector streets.

Ex. B, C & F  
EIR p. 5

C. Adverse environmental impacts which are not mitigated are as follows:

1. Interstate 5 traffic emission under certain conditions has the potential for adverse effects to residents of the area. The close-in location, however, may help reduce overall air-basin pollution.

EIR p. 6

2. The project will destroy the balance of the site as a plant and animal habitat; however, no endangered species of plant or animal life are found on the site.

EIR p. 4

3. Alternatives to the proposed project suggested in the Environmental Impact Report are no project, open space acquisition, or a different use. Open space acquisition and no project alternatives are the same. The proposed use is consistent with the zone and all relevant adopted plans. The proposed use provides close-in housing.

**MICROFILMED**

-12-

(PRD 93)

**MAY 17 1978**

**213776**

**00309**

2. That said Findings are supported by the minutes, maps and exhibits, all of which are herein incorporated by reference.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the findings made hereinabove are in addition to the findings previously made in support of Planned Residential Development Permit No. 93 as approved by the Planning Commission on December 4, 1975.

*Nancy H. Beck*

Nancy Beck, Acting Secretary of  
the Planning Commission.

MICROFILMED

MAY 17 1978

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on \_\_\_\_\_,  
by the following vote:

Councilmen	Yeas	Nays	Excused	Absent
Gil Johnson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maureen F. O'Connor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lee Hubbard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leon L. Williams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floyd L. Morrow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bob Martinet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jim Ellis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jess D. Haro	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor Pete Wilson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AUTHENTICATED BY:

PETE WILSON

Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.

EDWARD NIELSEN

City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

By Laverne E. Miller Deputy.

(Seal)

RECEIVED  
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
1975 JUL 14 PM 3:39  
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California

Resolution **213776** JUL 10 1975  
Number ..... Adopted .....