

Supplement EIR, December 2006, Summary of Comments.

http://www.laplayaheritage.com/Documents/CITY%20OF%20SAN%20DIEGO/Density_Bonus_Supplement_EIR_December_2006_.pdf
<http://www.laplayaheritage.com/CEQA.htm>

Page: 1

Supplement to an Environmental Impact Report, Project No. 63422, Supplemental to EIR No. 96-0333, SCH No. 96081056. Land Development Code Revisions: Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program, December 2006.

- Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 7, Affordable Housing Density Bonus Regulations.
- Chapter 14, Article 1, Division 3, Housing for Senior Citizens.
- Chapter 12, Article 6, Division 7, Coastal Development Review Procedures, Supplemental Findings, Environmentally Sensitive Lands Within the Coastal Overlay Zone.

Page: 2

In addition, and according to the City Attorney, the local proposition, Proposition D, limiting height in the coastal zone would have to yield to the State law mandating density bonuses and incentives.

Page: 3

This increased density could be higher than the density allowed by the underlying zone, community plan, and/or Planned District Ordinance (PDO).

In addition, and according to State law, CEQA only applies to discretionary projects.

Page: 4

The new density bonus regulations would allow up to three regulatory development incentives, based on the number of the affordability of the units provided in a common interest development, through a Process One action.

However, deviation requests for projects exceeding the 30-foot Proposition D height limit in the Coastal Zone would yield to the state law mandating density bonuses and incentives.

Page: 5

Proposed Project Impacts - The density bonus incentives included in the revised ordinance would potentially allow for up to three deviations from the bulk and scale regulations of the underlying zones without requiring the project to process a discretionary permit. The deviations allowed would be on a case-by-case basis, and could include deviations from the underlying zone requirements related to height, lot size, FAR, and setbacks. The allowed deviations and additional density could result in structures that are larger and taller than surrounding buildings, closer to adjacent structures and roadways, and/or cover a larger portion of the property. These differences may result in direct impacts on neighborhood character and aesthetics. Larger structures also have the potential to block public views. Construction of several projects with bulk and scale deviations in any one area may also result in localized cumulative visual quality impacts.

Mitigation. Ministerial projects are not subject to CEQA, and such project would not undergo environmental review or be required to provide mitigation.

Page: 6

Mitigation. Substantial view blockages could not be mitigated. Severe contrast with community character resulting from increased height and bulk may be reduced through architectural treatments, but likely not to a level below significance in every case.

Significance of Impact. For Process 1 projects the aesthetic impacts may not be mitigated.

Impact Conclusion of the LDC EIR. The LDC EIR anticipated that there might be increased development due to the removal of some "obstacles" to development. This development could be accompanied by a corresponding increase in traffic on already overcrowded street and potential reduction in Level of Service (LOS) at existing intersections. Therefore the EIR concluded that the adoption of the LDC could result in future development that could incrementally increase the potential for cumulatively significant traffic impacts.

Page: 7

The implementation of the ordinance could exacerbate existing transportation congestion.

Significance of Impact. The density achieved with the implementation of this ordinance could result in new potentially significant direct and cumulative parking impacts. In addition, the project could result in new direct transportation impacts and would add to the cumulative impacts already identified in the LDC EIR.

Therefore, it is possible that the adoption of the proposed ordinance could exacerbate current or future public service deficiencies.

Page: 8

Conclusion: The proposed revisions could result in new direct and cumulative significant environmental impacts requiring that the decision maker adopt Finds and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

This alternative may result in direct visual quality and transportation/parking impacts which may not be reduced to below a level of significance in every case. Cumulative impacts would remain significant.

Page: 9

However, the proposed revision to the Density Bonus Ordinance have the potential to result in significant impacts to visual quality and transportation/parking, as well as cumulative impacts to visual quality and parking.