

RESOLUTION No. R-251563

(R-80-2244)

Adopted on APR 8 1980

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. 79-11-05, are those findings marked
Exhibit "A" which are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney

BY 

Frederick C. Conrad
Chief Deputy City Attorney

FCC:ps
5/19/80
Or.Dept. Clerk
61-80-1

00072

FINDINGS

Set forth below are findings submitted for purposes of satisfying the California Environmental Quality Act as it applies to the Scripps Westview project.

Findings

1. **Noise** - The majority of the Scripps Westview site would be subject to noise in excess of 65dB(A) CNEL. The noise impact would be mitigated to insignificance over most of the site and partially mitigated at the hillside units.
 - a. Interior noise levels will be reduced to 45 dP(A) in accordance with state standards by installation of insulation, double-glazed windows, and air conditioning systems. Units on the western portion of the site have been designed to have minimal window area facing the freeway.
 - b. Group outdoor recreation areas would be shielded from the freeway noise by surrounding structures.
 - c. On the lower portions of the site, individual patios would be located on the east side of each unit, shielded from the noise source.
 - d. These measures would effectively mitigate noise impacts in all interior areas, at individual outdoor patios, and at group recreation areas. No further mitigation in those areas would be necessary.
 - e. Approximately 68 hillside units would have decks on the western sides which could be exposed to excessive noise levels. Effective mitigation of noise at the exterior patios would not be economically feasible. However, these units would also have interior patios that would be sheltered from noise. The decks on the hillside units have been designed to maximize views to the west.

2. **Archaeology** - Several archaeological sites of varying age and significance were found on the property.
 - a. A complete surface survey has been completed by qualified archaeologists.
 - b. The applicant has agreed to conduct detailed field investigations to the satisfaction of the City Planning Director in order to mitigate the potential impacts prior to submittal of the final map.
 - c. The potential for indirect offsite impacts would be minimal since all known nearby cultural resources occur on the opposite side of the freeway from the proposed project. Offsite sewer extensions would follow road align-

AC-251563 EXHIBIT A
00073

ments which have already been approved in conjunction with subdivisions in the area.

- d. No further mitigation has been suggested by archaeological consultants pending the results of additional field study mentioned in item "b". Preservation of the site would not be economically feasible and would not ensure that the sites would be protected from indirect impacts.
3. Biology - Implementation of the project would remove the vegetation from about three-fourths of the site prior to grading and construction. Because no highly sensitive species or habitats occur on the site, this impact is not considered to be significant.
 - a. A biological survey has been performed; no highly sensitive habitats or species were found.
 - b. About one-fourth of the site, including the steepest area, would not be disturbed.
 - c. No further mitigation would be required.
 4. Air Quality - This project would incrementally increase the amount of air pollutants in the region and would be located adjacent to a significant pollution source, Interstate 15.
 - a. The incremental addition of pollutants would not be significant in relation to regional emissions. The development is in conformance with the community plan and with air quality management strategies.
 - b. The location of the project in close proximity to employment centers, commercial areas, a park-and-ride facility, bus routes, and bicycle lanes serves to reduce the length and number of automobile trips which would be necessary.
 - c. Additional mitigation of air quality impacts is the responsibility of governmental agencies such as the Air Pollution Control District. No further mitigation by the applicant would be feasible.
 5. Topography/Visual Quality - Implementation of the project would alter the site from a vacant, semi-disturbed area to a residential development with 244 two-story units and would result in permanent alteration of hillsides.
 - a. Designation of the project as a Planned Residential Development ensures thorough review of all aspects of the project, including grading plans, building elevations and landscaping plans.

R-251563

00074

- b. The requirement for 25 percent open space specified in the Community Plan has been satisfied.
 - c. Special hillside units have been designed which require minimal grading and retaining walls rather than large manufactured slopes.
 - d. The City Grading Ordinance would be strictly complied with during all phases of construction.
 - e. No further mitigation would be necessary.
6. Hydrology/Water Quality - The project would generate incremental pollutant loads in the Penasquitos drainage area.
- a. The City Grading Ordinance will be complied with to avoid erosion and siltation.
 - b. The project's location far upstream at the eastern end of the drainage area would reduce potential impacts upon the coastal lagoon.
 - c. A thorough landscaping plan would be implemented and re-vegetation would occur as soon as possible after grading is completed.
 - d. These mitigation measures would reduce impacts to an insignificant level.
7. Traffic - The Scripps Westview project would generate an additional 1,952 trips which would use the local circulation system and I-15. This impact is a small percentage of trips projected from the Scripps Ranch area. Mitigation of traffic problems is partially the responsibility of public agencies and other developers as outlined below.
- a. As stated above, the project is located near employment centers, transit systems, commercial areas and bicycle lanes. This proximity would serve to reduce the number and length of trips generated by the project.
 - b. Caltrans is responsible for improvements along I-15 and these improvements are outside the applicant's control. Major road widening projects and interchange improvements have already occurred in the area to facilitate traffic flow. The Mira Mesa on-ramp still experiences congestion during the morning peak hours. The Carroll Canyon interchange will be open in late 1970 and will relieve much of the existing and projected congestion in the Scripps Ranch area. Additional long-term improvement of the I-15 corridor is projected.
 - c. Improvement of the local circulation system within Scripps Ranch, especially the construction of Scripps

R-251563

00075

Ranch Boulevard between Mary Ellen Road and Carroll Canyon Road, is the responsibility of developers of land south of Pomerado Road.

- d. No further mitigation would be feasible.
8. Energy Conservation - Implementation of the project would increase local and regional energy consumption for residential and transportation uses. This increase would be an insignificant portion of regional totals.
- a. As reviewed above, the location of the project would serve to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips.
 - b. Extra insulation which will be installed to mitigate noise impacts will also reduce energy consumption.
 - c. Energy efficient appliances will be installed in all units.
 - d. No further mitigation by the applicant would be feasible; additional energy conservation measures would be the responsibility of individual homeowners.
9. Growth Inducement - The Scripps Westview project would develop 244 residential units and would require improvements to the sewer system, water system and to the adjacent frontage road. It would also represent a northward extension of the Scripps Ranch Community into an area which is currently undeveloped. For reasons outlined below, the potential for this project to induce growth would be insignificant.
- a. Road, sewer, and water improvements would be only the minimum required to serve the project and would not extend to areas which are not planned for growth in the near future.
 - b. The development is consistent with the regional growth management plan.
 - c. The project is consistent with the land use designations in the Scripps Miramar Ranch Community Plan.
 - d. No further mitigation would be feasible.
10. Special economic, social and other considerations make the alternatives of "no project," "delay of project," "reduction in density," and "alternative type, location or timing of project" infeasible. These considerations include:
- a. No Project or Delay of Project
 1. As demonstrated above, impacts of the proposed development would be sufficiently mitigated. No en-

R-251563 00076

Environmental or economic reasons exist for these alternatives.

2. Retention of the land in its vacant state would not generate sufficient income to offset taxes and other associated costs.
3. A portion of the project site would remain undisturbed at no cost to the City.

b. Alternate Location

1. This alternative would be economically infeasible since the applicant owns this site.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the community plan designation for the site.
3. Since the project impacts would be mitigated to the extent feasible, this alternative offers no advantage over the proposed development.

c. Alternate Type of Development

1. Commercial or industrial development would be incompatible with surrounding land use designations and the community plan. Grading impacts could be greater than under the proposed project in order to provide building sites and parking areas.
2. Non-residential uses would not serve the demand for moderate cost housing in the Scripps Ranch area.

d. Reduction in density

1. This alternative would provide less relatively low-cost housing for the Scripps Ranch area.
2. This alternative would be less economically feasible for the applicant.

As demonstrated above, measures have been incorporated into the project which mitigate potential significant environmental effects. These measures have been identified in the environmental impact report. Specific economic, social, or other considerations make some of the mitigation measures and project alternatives included in the environmental report infeasible.

R-251563

00077

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on APR 8 1980,
 by the following vote:

Councilmen	Yeas	Nays	Not Present	Ineligible
Bill Mitchell	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bill Cleator	<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"/>
Mike Gotch	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.

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

(Seal)

By Rita Andrews, Deputy.

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California	
Resolution Number <u>R-251563</u>	Adopted <u>APR 8 1980</u>