

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, that pursuant to California Public Resources Code, Section 21081, said Council hereby makes the following findings with respect to the significant effects identified in Environmental Impact Report No. 78-03-36:

1. With respect to the Open Space, Parks and Recreation element of the La Jolla Community Plan:

a. The project preserves eighty-two percent (82%) of the property in natural and permanent Open Space. Such preservation is consistent with and carries out the Open Space, Parks and Recreation element of the La Jolla Community Plan.

b. As an alternative to Open Space preservation, the La Jolla Community Plan provides for development and very low density (0 - 5 d.u.a.). The overall project density is consistent with and carries out this alternative.

c. No further mitigation measures are necessary to mitigate the impacts.

2. With respect to potential geologic constraints:

a. A preliminary geologic investigation has been conducted, and in-depth soils and geologic investigations will be completed prior to construction.

b. The applicant is agreeable to a condition of approval that all mitigation measures identified in the soils and geologic reports be implemented. No further mitigation measures are necessary to mitigate the impact.

3. With respect to potential topography/visual quality impacts:

a. the applicant is agreeable to a condition of approval that all disturbed areas be revegetated. A comprehensive landscape plan has been submitted as part of the project, which plan will completely revegetate all disturbed areas of the property.

b. The least densely vegetated areas will be disturbed during project development, leaving the well vegetated slopes and canyon areas preserved in a natural state. All slopes will be reconstructed to be compatible with existing natural features. Residential units will be located in front of all cut slopes to mask the view of disturbed areas.

c. A supplementary irrigation system has been incorporated into the landscape plan which will establish the plant materials, and will remain as a back-up fire control measure.

d. No further mitigation measures are necessary to mitigate the impacts.

4. With respect to potential traffic impacts:

a. The applicant is agreeable to a condition of approval that requires the following mitigation measures to be performed, at the applicant's expense:

i. Traffic signals at the Caminito Ridgeway/Mount Soledad Road intersection.

ii. Crossing signals and warning signals on Mount Soledad Road; and

iii. Adjustments in land configurations to facilitate turning movements.

iv. Caminito Ridgeway, at the entrance of the project, shall be set back a minimum of 30 feet and 25 feet from the existing residential dwelling and adjacent lot to the south, respectively.

b. No further mitigation measures are required to mitigate the impacts.

5. With respect to potential biological resource impacts:

a. Approximately one hundred twenty-five (125), out of a total of approximately three hundred fifty (350), San Diego Coast Barrel Cactus may be lost through development. The remaining, approximately two hundred twenty-five (225) plants, or sixty percent (60%), would be undisturbed. The applicant is agreeable to a condition of approval that the maximum number of Barrel Cactus plants be relocated on site and that the large, mature trees near the entrance to the project be preserved, if deemed feasible by the Planning Director.

b. Balance cut and fill has been specifically designed into the overall project to reduce land form alteration and disturbance of natural areas. No further mitigation is required to mitigate the impacts.

6. With respect to potential archaeological resource impacts:

a. As identified in the Environmental Impact Report, the larger of two archaeological sites will be preserved within the area designated as Open Space. The loss of the smaller site will be adequately mitigated by a salvage,

storage and cataloging effort to be undertaken by qualified archaeologists at the applicant's expense. No further mitigation is required to mitigate the impacts.

7. Specific economic, social and other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives of: "no project," "reduced scale project" and "acquisition." Such considerations include:

a. The subject property is vacant and no income is derived therefrom. Thus, the "no project" alternative would no generate sufficient income to offset costs associated with the property, such as taxes, interest, etc. Consequently, the "no project" alternative is economically not feasible.

b. A "reduced scale project," such as the elimination of Unit 4, would result in increased costs per unit and sales prices of the remaining units. Such increases would be unavoidable because the land acquisition costs would be distributed over a smaller number of residential units. The resulting increases would be contrary to the Residential Element of the La Jolla Community Plan, which encourages housing opportunitites for persons within the widest range of incomes.

c. The La Jolla area has experienced average housing price increases of 139 percent in the past six years. Such price increases indicate a high demand and insufficient supply of housing in the area. The social need for additional housing would be not satisfied, to the extent it reasonably could be, by a "reduced scale project."

d. The "acquisition" alternative is infeasible by reason of the following:

i. As set forth above in finding "1.," the project preserves 82 percent of the property in open space and is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan.


ii. "Acquisition" would not satisfy the social need for additional housing in the area.

8. As demonstrated above:

a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects thereof as identified in the completed environmental impact report.

b. Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible certain of the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney

By   
Frederick C. Conrad  
Chief Deputy City Attorney

FCC:clh  
1/17/79  
PRD No. 133  
Or.Dept.:Clerk

MICROFILMED

222195

01289

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on NOV 7 1978,  
 by the following vote:

Councilmen	Yeas	Nays	Not Present	Ineligible
Bill Mitchell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maureen F. O'Connor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bill Lowery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leon L. Williams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fred Schnaubelt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tom Gade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Larry Stirling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lucy Killea	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR  
 City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

By Betty Luesher, Deputy.

(Seal)

RECEIVED  
 CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
 1979 JAN 22 PM 4:16  
 SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

MICROFILMED

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California

Resolution Number 222195 Adopted NOV 7 1978