RESOLUTION No. 16-22362	RE
-------------------------	----

(R80-1579)

Adopted on <u>MAY 2 9 1979</u>

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

That pursuant to California Public Resources Code,

Section 21081, those findings made with respect to Environmental

Impact Report No. 78-11-35, are those findings marked "Exhibit A"

which are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney

Frederick C. Conrad

Chief Deputy City Attorney

FCC:ps 2/28/80 Or.Dept. Clerk 36-79-1

MICROFILMED



13

POST OFFICE BOX AG SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92075 TELEPHONE: (714) 755-1552 / 276-3020

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FINDINGS
FOR
BRITTANY VILLAGE
EIR No. 78-11-35P

The following findings are recommended relative to the conclusions of the final environmental impact report (EIR) for the proposed Brittany Village Tentative Map, Planned Commercial Development, Land Development Permit and Rezoning from R $\sim$ 1-5 to CN (EIR No. 78-11-35P). These findings have been prepared pursuant to Sections 15088 and 15089 of the California Administrative Code and to Section 21081 of the California Resources Code.

#### FINDINGS

A. The City Council, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR for the proposed Brittany Village Tentative Map, Planned Commercial Development, Land Development Permit and Rezoning from R-1-5 to CN (EIR No. 78-11-35P), finds that changes or alterations have been required in or have been incorporated into the project which mitigate or avoid those significant environmental effects of the project identified in the final EIR.

#### 1. Biological Resources

Conclusion: Development of the property will result in complete destruction of the natural ecosystem occurring on-site. Some animals will be able to move to adjacent areas temporarily; others will be killed during vegetation removal. A rare and endangered plant species, the Ophioglossum californicum, is abundant on the site. The fern grows in vernally moist seeps on shallow slopes within a 3.5-acre area. Although the species gains significance in more normal association with vernal pools, loss of the plant habitat will be significant in that it will add incrementally to the regional loss of habitat of this apparently relic species.

No on-site measures to reduce adverse biological impacts of the project are recommended. The relatively small area within which the species occurs diminishes its potential for preservation as a representative portion of the Ophioglossum population. Further,

R-223621

the site location within an area planned or under development for intensive urban use would render site protection impractical and inconsistent with the adopted University Community Plan. In the opinion of Pacific Southwest Biological Services, off-site mitigation through the payment of fees into a fund for acquisition of vernal pool and watershed habitat, to which Ophioglossum californicum is native, will serve to partially offset expected significant adverse effects associated with on-site Ophioglossum removal.

Finding: The payment of a fee of \$3,500 by the project applicant into a fund for acquisition of vernal pool and watershed habitat, to which Ophioglossum californicum is native, will serve to partially offset significant adverse effects associated with on-site removal of the Ophioglossum species. No on-site measures are proposed because: (1) the relatively small area within which the Ophioglossum species occurs would diminish its potential for preservation as a representative portion of the species population; and (2) the location within an area planned for or under development for intensive urban use would render site protection impractical and inconsistent with the adopted University Community Plan.

## 2. Highway Traffic and Parking

Conclusion: It is estimated that the Brittany Village complex will generate an estimated 17,600 trips per day at full development with about 60 percent of the total trips attributable to commercial uses. Project impacts will primarily affect key intersections at La Jolla Village Drive and Genesee Avenue where critical conditions will result from 1995 ADT of about 42,500 trips at that point, and Genesee Avenue and Miramar Street, where a heavy north to west turning movement will occur. It is important to note that complete build-out of the northern area of the University Community as anticipated, using the densities allowed in the proposed University Community Plan as a quideline, would result in a high potential for significant adverse impact communitywide.

No significant parking impacts should occur since the project will provide an adequate number of on-site parking spaces to accommodate projected "normal" demands (excepting some periods involving seasonal snopping

Resident and visitor parking will inevitably occur
segments of Regents Road and Miramar Street.

Finding: To mitigate future traffic impacts, the following

To sures shall be implemented:

and restriping to permit double left turns for traffic moving west on Miramar Street; widening and restriping of the west side to permit three lanes; establishment of the outside

L-223621

lane for right turns only at La Jolla Village Drive; and future construction of a City staff recommended pedestrian overcrossing of Genesee Avenue between the Brittany Village complex and the proposed office complex to the east through joint participation by the respective developers.

- b. <u>Miramar Street</u>: Right-of-way widening of four feet on the south side; widening of the pavement by 21 feet on the south side; and striping for two lanes in each direction.
- c. <u>La Jolla Village Drive</u>: Establishment of three moving lanes westbound (through a six-foot narrowing of the median) and the provision of a deceleration lane-right turn only access to the project site.
- d. Regents Road: Restriping for two lanes in each direction and the provision of a single left turn lane at La Jolla Village Drive.

Partial mitigating measures for community-wide effects include action beyond planned capital improvements to substantially reduce anticipated adverse effects on circulation. A program for multifaceted transportation and public access improvements must be developed, including additional street and highway improvements. The applicant will financially participate in the offsite improvement programs which would insure adequate mitigation.

#### 3. Growth Inducement

Conclusion: The development of Brittany Village will not significantly contribute to growth inducement in the University Community since the complex is designed to respond to community needs for housing and related services.

Finding: No mitigation measures are deemed necessary since the project should not induce or accommodate any growth not already foreseen and projected by public planning policies for this area and because the complex is designed to provide community-related housing and supporting commercial services contemplated in the adopted University Community Plan as well as revisions to the University Community Plan currently under study.

### 4. Planning Policies

Conclusion: The intensity of development is below that permitted in the existing University Community Plan (adopted 1971), and is consistent with the type and intensity of development shown in the proposed revised University Community Plan.

<u>Finding</u>: Since the project will be compatible with the currently adopted University Community Plan and revisions under study, no mitigation measures are necessary.



Findings (cont.) Page 4

# 5. Geology and Soils

Conclusion: Geologic conditions do not appear to constrain the intended use of the property, provided that the design includes recommendations by Woodward-Clyde Consultants (on file in the office of EQD) in connection with its initial investigation and any subsequent analyses provided during design and construction of the proposed complex.

Finding: Ground preparation, earthwork, and foundation design shall conform to the recommendations provided by Woodward-Clyde Consultants in its initial investigation or any subsequent analyses provided during design and construction of the complex in order to minimize any adverse soil conditions related to the presence of potentially expansive soils, prior fills, and alluvial soils.

### 6. Archaeological Resources

<u>Conclusion</u>: Record searches revealed no recorded sites within the subject property, and an archaeological reconnaissance conducted by Archaeological Systems Management in February, 1978, revealed no prehistoric resources in any form.

<u>Finding</u>: No mitigation measures are necessary since no cultural resources exist on the site.

#### 7. Aircraft Noise and Safety

Conclusion: The project site lies within, but at the very edge of the Area of Influence for NAS Miramar, as developed by the Comprehensive Planning Organization (acting as the Airport Land Use Commission). The site is not within any "Aircraft Produced Accident Potential Zone", as developed by the U. S. Navy's 1976 AICUZ Study, and, therefore, is not restricted in terms of use or intensity of use. Further, the site is situated outside noise impacted areas since the 60 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour lies just northeasterly of the intersection of Miramar Street and Genesee Avenue.

Finding: Since the site will not be significantly impacted by NAS Miramar-generated aircraft operations and would be impacted by 60 dB CNEL or less, no special measures are deemed necessary to mitigate the effects of aircraft noise and operations.

## 8. <u>Highway Noise</u>

Conclusion: Projected highway noise on La Jolla Village Drive and Genesee Avenue will impact most of the site by less than 65 dB. However, even were noise levels to exceed this value, the Uniform Building Code requires noise attenuation for months family dwellings to reduce interior noise levels.

R- 223621

Findings (cont.) Page 5

Finding: In order to mitigate highway traffic noise, those residential buildings impacted by 60 dB CNEL or more shall be designed and constructed to obtain interior levels of 45 dB or less in accordance with State of California Noise Insulation Standards and/or City requirements.

B. Specific economic, social, and public planning policy considerations make infeasible possible mitigating measures associated with project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

#### 1. Project Alternatives

Conclusion: Alternatives have been considered, including (1) No project: While preserving the ecological habitat, the no project alternative would be inconsistent with both the adopted and proposed revised University Community Plan; (2) Alternative Site for Development: This would be inconsistent with goals of the plan to provide housing and commercial mix near the Town Center; and, (3) Project of Reduced Scope: A smaller scale development would result in lesser traffic impacts and some mitigation of highway noise impacts from La Jolla Village Drive but would not preserve the ecological habitat, and would be inconsistent with the goals, objectives and proposals of the University Community Plan. Reduced traffic effects would be marginal unless coupled with actions to reduce development intensities for other areas within the Town Center and larger community. In effect, such an alternative would imply a significant revision of the University Community Plan in order to achieve a suburban, rather than urban, scale of development. Conversely, if the revision to the University Community Plan does not include the transportation recommendations as now proposed (see draft report, Transportation Element of the University Community Plan) Brittany Village and all proposed projects in this area must reduce their scale in order to mitigate the projected heavy traffic impact on the community.

Finding: Project alternatives are not considered feasible or desirable for the following reasons: (1) All alternatives considered would be inconsistent with the goals, designations, and proposed intensities of use set forth for this element of the University Town Center within both the adopted University Community Plan and revisions of that Plan currently under consideration; (2) while a "no project" alternative would eliminate impacts associated with traffic generation and removal of the natural on-site ecosystem, it is not clear that such an open space alternative would necessarily result in the long-term retention of the Ophioglossum species because of urban-associated depredations from adjacent areas; (3) implementation of the "no project" alternative would probably require an expensive public open space acquisition of a site designated for intensive urban use by long-standing planning policies and adopted plans; (4) an alternative site for the complex within the University Community would produce comparable traffic generation and could result in a level of biological effects as great as that found for the proposed site (e.g., the Ophioglossum

MICROFILMED 2-223621

# Findings (cont.) Page 6

species is known to occur in areas to the east); and (5) a reduced scale project would have only a marginal affect on identified impacts and would serve to increase the costs of housing and commercial development in a manner inconsistent with University Community Plan objectives.

LOMAS SANTA FE, INC.

Ron Parks

Vice President

Original: January 8, 1979

Amended per Planning Commission action: April 19, 1979

MICROFILMED

	and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on ollowing vote:			MAY 2 9 1979			
Bill I Mau Bill I Leor Fred Tom Larr Lucy	Councilmen Mitchell reen F. O'Connor Lowery n L. Williams l Schnaubelt Gade y Stirling y Killea or Pete Wilson	Yeas	Nays	Not Present	Ineligible		
	AUTHENTIC	ATED BY:					
(Seal)		 By	PETE WILSON  Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.  CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR  City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.  By Lita Andrew, Deputy				

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California

Resolution R-223621 Adopted MAY 291979

CC-1276 (REV. 10-78)

MICROFILMED