



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 1141390  
SCH No. 2026051208

**SUBJECT:** **1855 Spindrift Drive:** COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP) and SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP) for the demolition of an existing three-story, 3,221 square-foot (sf) single-dwelling unit and existing in-ground pool and the construction of a new 2,759 square-foot three-story single-dwelling unit over a subterranean garage and basement. The project also includes a 778-square-foot detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU), a landscaped rooftop of the main residence and a new in-ground swimming pool. The 0.10-acre site is located in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Single Family (LJSPD-SF) zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (appealable and non-appealable) Zone, the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, and the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Beach Impact) within the La Jolla Community Plan. Council District 1. (APN: 346-451-11-00)  
APPLICANT: Chandra Slaven, Coastal Verite, LLC

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following areas(s): **CULTURAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)**, and **TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above Determination.

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

**A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)**

1. Prior to the issuance Bid Opening/Bid Award or beginning any construction related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD), (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the MMRP requirements have been incorporated.
2. In addition, the ED shall verify that the MMRP Conditions/Notes that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM, under the heading, "ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS."
3. These notes must be shown within the first three (3) sheets of the construction documents in the format specified for engineering construction document templates as shown on the City website:  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/information/standtemp.shtml>
4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.

**B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II**

**Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)**

1. **PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING IS REQUIRED TEN (10) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY WORK ON THIS PROJECT.** The PERMIT HOLDER/OWNER is responsible to arrange and perform this meeting by contacting the CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER (RE) of the Field Engineering Division and City staff from MITIGATION MONITORING COORDINATION (MMC). Attendees must also include the Permit holder's Representative(s), Job Site Superintendent and the following consultants:

***Qualified Archaeologist***  
***Qualified Native American Monitor***

**Note: Failure of all responsible Permit Holder's representatives and consultants to attend shall require an additional meeting with all parties present.**

CONTACT INFORMATION:

- a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the **RE** at the **Field Engineering Division – 858-627-3200**

b) For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, it is also required to call **RE and MMC at 858-627-3360**

2. **MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, PRJ-1141390, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's ED, MMC and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc.)

**Note: Permit Holder's Representatives must alert RE and MMC if there are any discrepancies in the plans or notes, or any changes due to field conditions. All conflicts must be approved by RE and MMC BEFORE the work is performed.**

3. **OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS:** Evidence that any other agency requirements or permits have been obtained or are in process shall be submitted to the RE and MMC for review and acceptance prior to the beginning of work or within one week of the Permit Holder obtaining documentation of those permits or requirements. Evidence shall include copies of permits, letters of resolution or other documentation issued by the responsible agency. ***Not Applicable for this project***
4. **MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit, to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11x17 reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the **LIMIT OF WORK**, scope of that discipline's work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.
5. **OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:** The Permit Holder/Owner's representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

| <b>Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist</b> |                                             |                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Issue Area</b>                              | <b>Document Submittal</b>                   | <b>Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes</b>        |
| General                                        | Consultant Qualification Letters            | Prior to Preconstruction Meeting                    |
| General                                        | Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits | Prior to Preconstruction Meeting                    |
| Cultural Resources (Archaeology)               | Monitoring Report(s)                        | Archaeology/Historic Site Observation               |
| Tribal Cultural Resources                      | Monitoring Report(s)                        | Archaeology/Historic Site Observation               |
| Bond Release                                   | Request for Bond Release Letter             | Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter |

### **C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA REQUIREMENTS**

#### **ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

##### **I. Prior to Permit Issuance**

###### **A. Entitlements Plan Check**

1. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring have been noted on the applicable construction documents through the plan check process.

###### **B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD**

1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40-hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.
2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.
3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

## **II. Prior to Start of Construction**

### **A. Verification of Records Search**

1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site-specific records search (quarter-mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
  2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
  3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼ mile radius.
    - a. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings
1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.
    - b. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

The applicant shall submit a letter to MMC acknowledging their responsibility for the cost of curation associated with all phases of the archaeological monitoring program.

### **2. Identify Areas to be Monitored**

- a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.
- b. The AME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).
- c. MMC shall notify the PI that the AME has been approved.

### **3. When Monitoring Will Occur**

- a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
- b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as age of existing pipe to be replaced, depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

### **III. During Construction**

#### **A. Monitor(s) Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching**

1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.
2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.
3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

#### **B. Discovery Notification Process**

1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.

2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.

#### C. Determination of Significance

1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
  - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
  - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) and obtain written approval of the program from MMC, CM and RE. ADRP and any mitigation must be approved by MMC, RE and/or CM before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.
  - c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.

### IV. Discovery of Human Remains

If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken:

#### A. Notification

1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.

2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.

B. Isolate discovery site

1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenience of the remains.
2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenience.
3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.

C. If Human Remains ARE determined to be Native American

1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, ONLY the Medical Examiner can make this call.
2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
  - a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being granted access to the site, OR;
  - b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance, THEN
  - c. To protect these sites, the landowner shall do one or more of the following:
    - (1) Record the site with the NAHC;

(2) Record an open space or conservation easement; or

(3) Record a document with the County. The document shall be titled "Notice of Reinterment of Native American Remains" and shall include a legal description of the property, the name of the property owner, and the owner's acknowledged signature, in addition to any other information required by PRC 5097.98. The document shall be indexed as a notice under the name of the owner.

**V. Night and/or Weekend Work**

A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract

1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
2. The following procedures shall be followed.
  - a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVr and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.

b. Discoveries

All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV - Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.

c. Potentially Significant Discoveries

If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.

d. The PI shall immediately contact the RE and MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.

B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction

1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.

C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

**VI. Post Construction**

A. Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report

1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC via the RE for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe as a result of delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.
  - a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program or Pipeline Trenching Discovery Process shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
  - b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation

The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.
2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI via the RE for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC via the RE for approval.
4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.

B. Handling of Artifacts

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.

C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the E or BI and MMC.
3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.

D. Final Monitoring Report(s)

1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC of the approved report.
2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

**TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures outlined under Historical Resources (Archaeology).

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

State Clearing House

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Mayor's Office

Council member Joe LaCava, Council District 1

Development Services:

Development Project Manager: Veronica Davison

Engineering Review: Layth Al Ani

Environmental Review: Kelli Rasmus

Planning Review: Jose Vergara

Landscaping Review: Rey Rebolledo

Historic Review: Alvin Lin

MMC (77A)  
City Attorney's Office (93C)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

California Coastal Commission (47)  
La Jolla Library (81L)  
Historical Resources Board (87)  
South Coastal Information Center (210)  
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)  
Save Our Heritage Organization (214)  
Ron Christman (215)  
Clint Linton (215B)  
Frank Brown - Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Council (216)  
Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)  
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)  
Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)  
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)  
La Jolla Village News (271)  
La Jolla Town Council (273)  
La Jolla Historical Society (274)  
La Jolla Community Planning (275)  
La Jolla Light (280)  
La Jolla Shores Association (272)  
La Jolla Shores PDO Advisory Board (279)  
Patricia K. Miller (283)  
Richard Drury  
Molly Greene  
John Stump  
Chase Preciado


APPLICANT

Chandra Slaven, Coastal Verite, LLC

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- ☐ No comments were received during the public input period.
- ☒ Comments were received but did not address the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document. No response is necessary and the letters are incorporated herein.
- ☐ Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document were received during the public input period. The letters and responses are incorporated herein.

Copies of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be accessed on the City's CEQA webpage at <https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/final>.

  
Jeff Szymanski  
Senior Planner  
Development Services Department

May 27, 2026  
Date of Draft Report

July 7, 2026  
Date of Final Report

Analyst: Kelli Rasmus

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist  
Figure 1: Location Map  
Figure 2: Site Plan

Appendices (bound separately)

Appendix A, Archaeological Test Plan  
Appendix B, Geotechnical Investigation  
Appendix C, Geotechnical Investigation Addendum, Report of Geologic Fault Investigation

## COMMENT LETTER



### San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee

June 16, 2026

To: Ms. Kelli Rasmus  
Development Services Department  
City of San Diego  
7650 Mission Valley Road, MS-DSD-2A  
San Diego, California 92108

Subject: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration  
1855 Spindrift Drive  
Project No. 1141390


Dear Ms. Rasmus:

I have reviewed the subject DMND on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Archaeological Society.

Based on the information contained in the DMND and its Appendix A, as posted on the City's website, we agree with the proposed archaeological testing program defined in Appendix A. Depending on the results of the testing, a data recovery program may be required, following which the monitoring program defined in the DMND would be appropriate.

Thank you for including SDCAS in the public review of this project's environmental documents.

Sincerely,

  
James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson  
Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President  
File

P.O. Box 81106 San Diego, CA 92138-1106 (858) 538-0635

## CITY RESPONSE

**A-1.** Comment noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft MND. As stated in the Draft MND, Section V, because the project is located within the Spindrift Archaeological site, archaeological and Native American monitors were present during preliminary geotechnical borings in 2023. An archaeological and Native American monitoring report was prepared by BFS A Environmental Services. The report documented that during monitoring, no SDI-39 elements or other cultural resources were identified in any of the 6 excavated borings. City staff reviewed the report and concurred with the recommendation for monitoring during ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project due to the location of the project site within the Spindrift Archaeological site. Therefore, archaeological and Native American monitoring is required as a mitigation measure, as identified in Section IV of the MND.

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: 1855 Spindrift Drive / PRJ-1141390
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 7650 Mission Valley Road, MS DSD-1A, San Diego, CA 92118
3. Contact person and phone number: Kelli Rasmus / (619) 557-7990
4. Project location: 1855 Spindrift Drive, San Diego, CA 92037
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Chandra Slaven, Chandra Slaven Consulting, 375 Camino de la Reina #235, San Diego, CA 92108 (858) 402-8595
6. General/Community Plan designation: Low Density Residential (5-9 du/ac)
7. Zoning: LJSPD-SF
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

The project proposes a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and a Site Development Permit (SDP) for the demolition of an existing three-story, 3,221 square foot (sf) single-family residence and the construction of a new 2,759-sf three-story single-family residence over a subterranean 2-car garage and mechanical room. Other features of the home include a rooftop balcony and garden. The project also includes a two-story, 778-square-foot detached ADU and an in-ground swimming pool.

The CDP is required pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code Section (SDMC) 126.0707(a)-(b), where projects propose demolition of walls which exceed 50% or more in the Coastal Non-Appealable and appealable areas. In addition, pursuant to SDMC Section 1510.0201, the project requires an SDP for projects located within the La Jolla Shores Planned District.

The residence is located within the coastal height limit overlay zone and would not exceed 30 feet in height. According to the Conceptual Site Development Plans, the residence would be 29-feet, 10-inches in height and have 3 stories over a garage with exterior finishes including textured concrete, brushed finish stainless steel over wood and glass guard rails, on the fronting balconies.

The project's landscaping has been reviewed by staff and would comply with all applicable City of San Diego Landscape ordinances and standards. Drainage would be directed into appropriate storm drain systems designed to carry surface runoff, which has been reviewed and accepted by City Engineering staff. Project grading would require 892 cubic yards (cy) of cut to a depth of 14 feet and 62 cy of fill, resulting in an export of 830 cy from the site.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The 0.10-acre site is located on the east side of Spindrift Drive, south of St Louis Terrace, west of Viking Way and north of Princess Street. The project is within a developed residential neighborhood surrounded by similar existing single-family residences. The project site is developed with an existing single-family residence and is bordered by similar residential development. The street frontage along Spindrift Drive is landscaped with shrubs and trees and there are sidewalks on both sides of the street. Additionally, the project site is currently served by existing public services and utilities. The project site is within the La Jolla community planning area and is subject to the LJSPD-SF zoning requirements. The project is also subject to the Coastal Overlay Zone (Appealable and Non-Appealable), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, La Jolla Shores Archaeological Study Area, Parking Impact OZ (Beach Impact Area), Transit Priority Area, and is within Council District 1.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

None required.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code 21080.3.1, the City of San Diego provided formal notifications to the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, the Jamul Indian Village, the Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, which are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area, requesting consultation on January 6, 2026. No requests for consultation were received. Please see Section XVIII of the Initial Study for more details.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |                                                             |                                                        |                                                               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions      | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality       | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service System             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing            | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings Significance      |

**DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required but must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis.)
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses”, as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. *Section 15063(c)(3)(D)*. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- |                                                         |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Per the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (City's Thresholds), projects that would block public views from designated open space areas, roads, or parks or significant visual landmarks and scenic vistas may result in a significant impact.

The project proposes the demolition of an existing single family residence and construction of a new 2,759 square foot 3-story single family residence plus basement and detached 778 square foot, 2-story accessory dwelling unit. The project is within the allowable development footprint of the lot and would be required to meet setback and height requirements pursuant to the Land Development Code (LDC) and La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance (LJSPDO). The project is located in a residential land use area with similar residential structures and is not located within a view corridor as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan. Torrey Pines Road, located east of the project site, is identified as a Scenic Roadway in the La Jolla Community Plan Subarea D: Coast Walk-Visual Access. However, the portion of Torrey Pines Road adjacent to the project site offers no scenic views. Therefore, the subject site and proposed development would not impact any existing public views. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any scenic vistas. No impacts would occur.

- |                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response I (a) above. The project is situated within a developed residential neighborhood. The site is not adjacent to a historic building or a significant landmark. The project is not located within or adjacent to a state scenic highway and would be required to meet all setback and height requirements pursuant to the La Jolla Community Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

According to the City's Thresholds, projects that severely contrast with the surrounding neighborhood character may result in a significant impact. To meet this threshold, one or more of the following conditions must apply: the project would have to exceed the allowable height or bulk regulations and the height or bulk of the existing patterns of development in the vicinity of the

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

project by a substantial margin; have an architectural style or use building materials in stark contrast to adjacent development where the adjacent development follows a single or common architectural theme (e.g. Gaslamp Quarter, Old Town); result in the physical loss, isolation or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark (e.g., a stand of trees, coastal bluff, historical landmark) which identified in the General Plan, applicable community plan or local coastal program; be located in a highly visible area (e.g., on a canyon edge, hilltop or adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk signage or architectural projections; and/or the project would have a cumulative effect by opening up a new area for development or changing the overall character of the area. None of the above apply to the project.

The project was reviewed by City Staff for consistency with design recommendations and policies as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan. Additionally, the project site is located within the La Jolla Shores Planned District and per §1510.0304(b)(4), and was reviewed to ensure the building and structure setbacks are in general conformity with those in the vicinity. The project complies with the La Jolla Shores design criteria and it was determined that this project would be consistent with the neighboring residences in bulk and scale and would be compatible with the neighborhood's diverse architectural styles. The neighborhood does not have a common or unifying architectural theme. This project would not adversely affect any ocean or scenic public view and the project would not result in a strong contrast with surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk, signage or architectural projections. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with the outdoor lighting standards contained in SDMC Section 142.0740 (Outdoor Lighting Regulations) that requires all outdoor lighting be installed, shielded, and adjusted so that the light is directed in a manner that minimizes negative impacts from light pollution, including trespass, glare, and to control light from falling onto surrounding properties. Therefore, lighting installed with the project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, resulting in a less than significant lighting impact.

- II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project::

- |                                                                                                                                            |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

The project is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan land use designation Low Residential Density (5-9 du/ac) and is located within a developed residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                      |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response II (a), above. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project. The project is consistent with the existing land use and the underlying zone. The project would not conflict with any properties zoned for agricultural use or be affected by a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, no impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No designated forest land or timberland occur onsite as the project is consistent with the community plan, and the underlying zone. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                      |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response II (c) above. Additionally, the project would not contribute to the conversion of any forested land to non-forest use, as surrounding properties are developed, and land uses are generally built out. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                              |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Refer to response II (a) and II (c), above. The project and surrounding areas do not contain any farmland or forest land. No changes to any such lands would result from project implementation. Therefore, no impact would result.

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations – Would the project:

- |                                                                                 |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

According to the City's Thresholds, a project may have a significant air quality impact if it could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2020). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans, and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O3).

The RAQS relies on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in the county, to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by San Diego County and the cities in the county as part of the development of their general plans. The RAQS relies on SANDAG growth projections based on population, vehicle trends, and land-use plans developed by cities and the county as part of their general plan development. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by local plans would be consistent with the RAQS. However, if a project proposes development exceeding that anticipated in the local plan and SANDAG's growth projections, the project may conflict with the RAQS and contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality.

The project would include the demolition of an existing single-family home and the construction of a new single-family residence in its place within a developed neighborhood of similar residential uses. The project is consistent with the General Plan, La Jolla Community Plan, and the underlying zoning for single-family residential development. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such, no impacts would result.

- |                                                                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

The City's Thresholds state that a significant impact may occur if a project violates any air quality standard or contributes substantially to an existing or proposed air quality violation.

#### Short-Term (Construction) Emissions

Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of air emissions. Sources of construction-related air emissions include fugitive dust from grading activities; construction equipment exhaust; construction-related trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks; and construction-related power consumption.

Variables that factor into the total construction emissions potentially generated include the level of activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on or offsite.

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land-clearing and grading operations. Construction operations would include standard measures such as Best Management Practices (BMPs), which are enforceable under San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 142.0710, which would limit potential air quality impacts. Any impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

#### Long-Term (Operational) Emissions

Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. The site contains an existing single-family residence, which will be demolished and replaced with a new single-family residence, which would produce minimal stationary source emissions. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the community plan and zone designation. As identified in the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, projects that would typically result in significant air quality impacts would include projects that would produce 9,500 Average Daily Trips (ADT). The scope and size of the project as described in the project description, does not exceed the City's Significance Determination Thresholds for Air Quality. Based on the residential land use, project emissions over the long-term are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, nor would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐
☐
☒
☐

As described in III (b) above, construction operations could temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

duration; implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to a less than significant level. The project is consistent with the land use designation and would not violate an air quality plan. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

#### Short-term (Construction)

Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### Long-term (Operational)

Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project would construct an addition to an existing single-family residence. Residential units, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. Therefore, project operations would result in less than significant impacts.

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located in a developed residential neighborhood and is currently developed with a single-family residence. On-site landscaping is ornamental in nature, and the project site does not contain any sensitive biological resources, nor does it contain any candidate, sensitive or special status species. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The project site is within an urbanized developed residential setting, no such habitats exist on or near the project site. Refer to Response IV (a), above. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other identified community, as the site currently supports non-native landscaping. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site does not contain federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands or waters as regulated by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) do not occur on-site and therefore will not be impacted by the project. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and is currently developed with structures, hardscape, and landscaping. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Wildlife movement corridors are defined as areas that connect suitable wildlife habitat areas in a region otherwise fragmented by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. Natural features such as canyon drainages, ridgelines, or areas with vegetation cover provide corridors for wildlife travel. The project site is surrounded by existing residential development and is not located adjacent to an established wildlife corridor and would not impede the movement of any wildlife or the use of any wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |                                                                                                                                     |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response IV (a), above. The project site is designated Low Density Residential (5-9 du/ac) pursuant to the La Jolla Community Plan and zoned LJSPD-SF. The project is located on a developed residential site and there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that apply to the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

| Issue                                                                                                                                                                                | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Please refer to IV (e) above. The project is located in a developed urban area and is not within or directly adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and no other adopted conservation plans affect the subject site. The project does not conflict with any other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impacts would result.

#### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

|                                                                                                             |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

#### Archaeological Resources

Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coastline, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more.

The subject property is located within the mapped boundaries of a significant archaeological site known as the Spindrift Site, (CA-SDI-39/17,372, SDMM-W-1). This site encompasses a large habitation area known to its Kumeyaay inhabitants as *Mut kula xuy/Mut lah hoy ya* (place of many caves). The area is composed of several large midden areas, temporary camps, pottery and lithic scatters, various shell scatters, and burials found throughout multiple, consecutive layers representative of different cultural phases found in the San Diego region. The 20-acre knoll, historically known as the Richards Tract and the La Jolla Vista Tract, was originally investigated and recorded by Malcolm Rogers during the late 1920s, and by James Moriarty in the 1960s.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

Due to the project's location within the Spindrift Archaeological site, archaeological and Native American monitors were on site during preliminary geotechnical borings in 2023. An archaeological and Native American monitoring program report (BFSA, May 9, 2023) was prepared, analyzing the project and the results of the geotechnical monitoring. The report documented that during monitoring, no elements of SDI-39 or cultural resources in general were identified in the excavated borings. However, there remains the potential to encounter buried elements of SDI-39 within the property during construction-related ground disturbance. City staff has reviewed the report and concurs with the recommendation. Therefore, archaeological and Native American monitoring will be required as a mitigation measure as identified in Section IV of the MND. The mitigation measure would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

#### Built Environment

The City of San Diego criteria for determination of historic significance, pursuant to CEQA, is evaluated based upon age (over 45 years), location, context, association with an important event, uniqueness, or structural integrity of the building. Projects requiring the demolition and/or modification of structures that are 45 years or older have the potential to result in potential impacts to a historical resource.

The project site contains a single-family residence over 45 years old. The project site was reviewed by Historic staff in January 2026 and according to the review, the property does not meet the local designation criteria as an individually significant resource under any of the adopted Historical Resource Board criteria. This determination is good for five years from the date of the determination unless new information is provided that speaks to the building's eligibility for designation. Therefore, no historical research report was required, and the project, as proposed, has no potential to impact any unique or non-unique historical resources. No impacts to the built environment would occur.

- |                                                                                                               |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response V(a) above. Impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant with the implementation of archaeological monitoring as mitigation.

- |                                                                                         |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response V (b) above. Section V of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program contains provisions for the discovery of human remains. If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken. Based upon the required mitigation measure impacts would be less than significant.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would be required to meet mandatory energy standards of the current California energy code. Construction activities might require operation of heavy equipment but would be temporary and short-term in duration. Additionally, long-term energy usage from the building would be reduced through design measures that incorporate energy conservation features in heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems, lighting and window treatments, and insulation and weather stripping. The project would also incorporate cool-roofing materials. Development of the project would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                               |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan's land use designation. The project is required to comply with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) by implementing energy reducing design measures, therefore the project would not obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impacts would result.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

According to the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazard Map 29 (2008), the site is located in Category 11, Active, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. As stated in the Report of Geologic Fault Investigation prepared by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. (July 2023), Rose Canyon Fault is located 540 feet northeast of the project site. Field investigative work conducted by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. revealed no evidence of active faulting or potentially active faulting crossing the project area. Therefore, the probability of fault rupture is considered low. Additionally,

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

the project would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

|                                    |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The site may be affected by seismic activity resulting from earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California region. The project would utilize proper engineering design and adhere to standard construction practices, as verified at the building permit stage, to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards remain minimal.

|                                                              |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Liquefaction generally occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-saturated soils are subjected to shaking, causing the soils to lose their cohesion. According to the Report of Geologic Fault Investigation prepared by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. (July 2023), the potential for soil liquefaction at the subject site is very low due to the geologic structure of the material, including soil density, grain-size distribution and the absence of a shallow groundwater table. The project would also be required to comply with the California Building Code that would reduce impacts to people or structures to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and adherence to standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards remains less than significant.

|                 |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is located in a relatively flat area. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

|                                                               |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Construction activities would temporarily expose soils to increased erosion potential. The project would be required to comply with the City's Storm Water Standards which requires the implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs). Grading activities within the site would be required to comply with the City of San Diego Grading Ordinance as well as the Storm Water Standards, which would ensure soil erosion and topsoil loss is minimized to less than significant levels. Furthermore, permanent storm water BMPs would also be required postconstruction consistent with the City's regulations, along with landscape regulations. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soils erosion or loss of topsoil. Impacts would be less than significant.

| Issue                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

As discussed in Section VII (a) and VII (b), the project site is not likely to be subject to landslides, and the potential for liquefaction and subsidence is low. The project design would be required to comply with the requirements of the California Building Code, ensuring hazards associated with expansive soils would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. As such, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

|                                                                                                                                                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project consists of demolishing an existing single-family residence and building a new two-story plus basement single-family residence. The project would be required to comply with the seismic requirements of the California Building Code, which would reduce the impacts on people or structures due to local seismic events to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

|                                                                                                                                                                                      |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located within an area that is already developed with existing infrastructure (i.e., water and sewer lines) and does not propose any septic systems. Additionally, the project does not necessitate the construction of any new wastewater facilities, as existing services are sufficient to meet the project's needs. No impact would occur.

|                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), the project site is underlain with young alluvial flood-plain deposits, which has a low probability of containing important paleontological resources. The City's Significance Determination Thresholds state paleontological monitoring during grading activities may be required if it is determined that the project's earth movement quantity exceeds the Paleontological threshold (if greater than 1,000 cubic yards and ten feet

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

deep for formations with a high sensitivity rating and if greater than 2,000 cubic yards and ten feet deep for formations with a moderate sensitivity rating). The project proposes 892 cubic yards of cut and 93 cubic yards of fill. Therefore, the grading thresholds would not be exceeded in a moderate- or highly-sensitive formation. Therefore, impacts would remain less than significant.

#### VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                             |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The 2022 Climate Action Plan (CAP) and associated CAP Consistency Regulations were adopted and became effective for all areas outside of the Coastal Overlay Zone on October 23, 2022. On June 8, 2023, these regulations became effective in the Coastal Overlay Zone as well. The project is consistent with the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan's land use and zoning designations. Compliance with the CAP Consistency Regulations would reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts associated with the project to below a level of significance.

- |                                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. The project will be required to comply with the CAP Consistency Regulations and impacts are considered less than significant.

#### IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The City's Thresholds states that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the handling, storage, and treatment of hazardous materials.

Construction activities for the project would involve using potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, transmission fluids, paint, adhesives, surface coatings, and other finishing materials, cleaning solvents, and pesticides for landscaping purposes. However, the use of these hazardous materials would be temporary, and all potentially hazardous materials would be stored, used, and disposed of per manufacturers' specifications, applicable federal, state, and local health and safety regulations. As such, impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

| Issue                                                                                                                                                                                           | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The City's Thresholds state that project sites on or near known contamination sources and/ or that meet one or more of the following criteria may result in a significant impact:

- A project is located within 1,000 feet of a known contamination site;
- A project is located within 2,000 feet of a known "border zone property" (also known as a "Superfund" site) or a hazardous waste property subject to corrective action pursuant to the Health and Safety Code;
- The project has a closed Department of Environmental Health (DEH) site file;
- A project is located in Centre City San Diego, Barrio Logan, or other areas known or suspected to contain contamination sites;
- A project is located on or near an active or former landfill
- A project is located on properties historically developed with industrial or commercial uses which involved dewatering (the removal of groundwater during excavation), in conjunction with major excavation in an area with high groundwater;
- A project is located in a designated airport influence area and where the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" , inconsistent with an Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan (ACLUP), within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan (ALP), or two nautical miles of a public or public use airport; or
- A project is located on a site presently or previously used for agricultural purposes.

The project site does not meet any of the criteria outlined in the City's Thresholds stated above. The project site was not listed in any of the databases for hazardous materials including being listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system, which includes leaking underground fuel tank sites inclusive of spills, leaks, investigations, and cleanups Program or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System, which includes Cortese sites. Impacts would be less than significant.

|                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

The City's Thresholds states that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the handling, storage and treatment of hazardous materials. The proposed project location is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No impact would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

A hazardous waste site records search was completed in October, 2025 using Geo Tracker and EnviroStor, online websites which disclose hazardous clean-up sites pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>; <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/> The records search identified that no hazardous waste sites exist onsite or in the surrounding area. No Impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The City's Thresholds state that a project may result in a significant impact if it is in a designated airport influence area and where the FAA has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration", inconsistent with an Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan (ACLUP), within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan (ALP), or two nautical miles of a public or public use airport.

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No roadway improvements are proposed that would interfere with circulation or access, and all construction would take place on-site. No impacts would result.

| Issue                                                                                                                                   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood on a site with an existing single-family residence. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires because the project is not adjacent to any wildlands. Further discussion can be found in Section XX below. Any impacts would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

|                                                                                                                                           |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project was reviewed by City Engineering staff for all applicable water quality standards and water discharge requirements. The proposed project would not have a significant impact on downstream properties and the drainage system would be engineered to adequately manage site stormwater. The project would be conditioned to comply with the City's Storm Water Regulations during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) would be utilized. Implementation of project specific BMP's would preclude violations of any existing water quality standards or discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

|                                                                                                                                                                                      |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. Furthermore, the project would include pervious design features and appropriate drainage. Therefore, the project would not introduce a significant amount of new impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge. The project as designed was reviewed by qualified City staff and would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project is located in a residential neighborhood where all infrastructures exist. The project would connect to the existing public water system. Impacts would be less than significant.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

- |                                                                |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Proper landscaping would prevent substantial erosion onsite. No streams or rivers are located on or adjacent to the site, all runoff would be routed to the existing storm drain system and would therefore not substantially alter existing drainage patterns. The project would be required to implement BMPs to ensure that substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site during construction activities would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                             |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response X (c)(i) above. The project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, which would result in flooding on or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                            |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMPs would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iv) impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project construction would occur within a developed site surrounded by existing residential development. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows. The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction ensuring that project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is not located within a flood hazard zone, and it is not likely that a tsunami or seiche could impact the site due to the site elevation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

| Issue                                                                                                                   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction. Appropriate best management practices would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Additionally, the project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

|                                                |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would construct a new single-family residence and detached accessory dwelling unit after the demolition of an existing single-family residence at the same location. The project is consistent with the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan's land use designation (Low Density Residential, 5-9 du/ac) and is within a developed lot with access to a public roadway. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. The project would not substantially change the nature of the surrounding area and would not introduce any barriers or project features that could physically divide the community. No impacts would result.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan's land use designation which allows up to 5-9 dwelling units per acre. The project is located on a 0.10-acre lot and proposes one unit therefore it is consistent. The project also complies with the LJSPD-SF zoning requirements. Since there are no conflicts with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulations, there would be no impact.

#### XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

|                                                                                                                                        |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The urbanized and developed nature of the project site and vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. No impact would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See XII (a), above. The project site has not been delineated on a local general, specific, or other land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no such resources would be affected with project implementation. Therefore, no impacts were identified.

#### XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

#### Short-term (Construction)

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite grading, and construction activities of the project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive receptors (e.g. residential uses) occur in the immediate area and may be temporarily affected by construction noise; however, construction activities would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise) which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. With compliance to the City's noise ordinance, project construction noise levels would be reduced to less than significant.

#### Long-term (Operation)

For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated, and the project would not result in an increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. No significant long-term impacts would occur, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with the City

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

restrictions. Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise are not anticipated with construction of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project site is not located in an Airport Influence Area or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. As such, the project would not expose people to working in the area to excessive aircraft noise levels. No impact would result.

#### XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project would construct a new single-family residence after the demolition of an existing single family residence at the same location. The project is consistent with the underlying zone and is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan. The project site is currently developed with the connections to receive water and sewer service from the City, and no extension of infrastructure to new areas is required. As such, the project would not substantially increase housing or population growth in the area. No roadway improvements are proposed as part of the project. No impacts would result.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project would construct a new single-family residence and detached ADU after demolishing an existing single-family residence at the same location, situated in a neighborhood with similar residential development; therefore, no displacements would occur. No impacts would result.

#### XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project is consistent with the land use designation pursuant to the La Jolla Community Plan. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where fire protection services are already provided. The project would construct a new single-family residence after the demolition of an existing single-family residence at the same location. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Police protection; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services or create a new significant demand and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Schools; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Parks; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities over that which presently exists. Impacts would be less than significant.

v) Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### XVI. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

The project is consistent with the underlying zoning and land use designation pursuant to the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan. The project would construct a new single-family residence and detached ADU after the demolition of an existing single-family residence at the same location. The project would not adversely affect the availability of and/or need for new or expanded recreational resources. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and would not require the construction or expansion of an existing park facility. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand. As such, impacts would remain less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to XVI (a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities nor require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. As such, impacts would remain less than significant.

#### XVII. TRANSPORTATION-

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project or plan/policy conflict with an adopted program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the transportation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would construct a new single-family residence and detached ADU after the demolition of an existing single-family residence at the same location, in a neighborhood with similar development, therefore, the project would not result in design measures that would conflict with existing policies, plan, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Would the project or plan/policy result in VMT exceeding thresholds identified in the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would construct a new single-family residence and detached ADU after the demolition of an existing single-family residence at the same location in a neighborhood with similar residential development. A "Small Project" is defined as a project generating less than 300 daily unadjusted driveway trips using the City of San Diego trip generation rates/procedures. Based upon the screening criteria, the project qualifies as a "Small Project" and is screened out from further VMT

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

analysis. Therefore, the project is presumed to have a less than significant impact on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Would the project or plan/policy substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project complies with the La Jolla Community Plan and is consistent with the land use and underlying zoning in a residential neighborhood. The proposed additions to the existing single-family residence do not include any design features that would substantially increase hazards. No impacts would result.

- |                                           |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Adequate emergency access would be provided during both short-term construction (with construction operating protocols) and long-term operations of the project. Emergency access to the site would be provided from the driveway entrance on Spindrift Drive. As such, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not listed nor is it eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k). In addition, please see Section V(b) above. Impacts would not result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

Tribal Cultural Resources include sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, and sacred places or objects that have cultural value or significance to a Native American Tribe. Tribal Cultural Resources can include “non-unique archaeological resources” that, instead of being important for “scientific” value as a resource, can also be significant because of the sacred and/or cultural tribal value of the resource. Tribal representatives are considered experts appropriate for providing substantial evidence regarding the locations, types, and significance of tribal cultural resources within their traditionally and cultural affiliated geographic area (PRC § 21080.3.1(a)).

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, The City of San Diego sent notification to the Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area on January 6, 2026. No responses were received during the 30-day consultation period.

Although no Tribal Cultural Resources were identified within the project site, there is a potential for the construction of the project to impact buried and unknown Tribal Cultural Resources due to its location to known recorded resources in the near vicinity, and location within the Spindrift area of La Jolla Shores. Therefore, Archaeological and Native American monitoring are included in the MMRP. Mitigation in the form of Archaeological and Native American monitoring would reduce all impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources to below a level of significance. See section V of the MND and the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for further details.

#### XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which would cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is not anticipated to generate significant amount of wastewater or stormwater. As discussed in VI (a), the project would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Existing sewer infrastructure exists within roadways surrounding the project site and adequate services are available to serve the project. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The 2020 City Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) serves as the water resources planning document for the City’s residents, businesses, interest groups, and public officials. The UWMP

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

assesses the current and future water supply and needs for the City. The 2020 UWMP emphasizes a crossfunctional, systems approach that is intended to better guide and integrate any subsequent water resources studies, facilities master planning, and various regulatory reporting and assessment activities at the City, regional and state levels beyond a basic profiling of the City's water system. (City of San Diego 2020). The project does not meet Senate Bill 610 requirements for the project to prepare a water supply assessment. Implementation of the project would not result in new or expanded water entitlements from the water service provider, as the project is consistent with existing demand projections contained in the UWMP (which are based on the allowed land uses for the project site). Therefore, the project would not require new or expanded entitlements. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water system and require the construction of new or expanded treatment facilities of which would cause significant environmental effects. The project was reviewed by qualified City staff who determined that the existing facilities are adequately sized to accommodate the proposed development. No impacts would result.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Construction debris and waste would be generated from the construction of the project. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have sufficient permitted capacity to accept that generated by the project. Long-term operation of the residential use is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with residential uses. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code requirement for diversion of both construction waste during the short-term, construction phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                    |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project would not result in the generation of large amounts of solid waste, nor generate or require the transport of hazardous waste materials, other than minimal amounts generated during the construction phase. All demolition activities would comply with any City of San Diego

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

requirements for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts would be less than significant.

XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- |                                                                                          |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The City of San Diego participates in the San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The project complies with the General Plan and is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan land use and the Land Development Code zoning designation. The project is located in an urbanized area of San Diego, and the construction of a new single-family residence after the demolition of an existing single-family residence at the same location would not disrupt any emergency evacuation routes identified in the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on an emergency response and evacuation plan during construction and operation.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is located in an urbanized neighborhood of similar residential development and is not located in a Very High Fire Severity Zone. Due to its location, the project would not have the potential to expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Therefore, impacts would remain below a level of significance.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is located in a residential neighborhood with similar development. The site is currently serviced by existing infrastructure which would service the site after construction is completed. No new construction of roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities would be constructed that would exacerbate fire risk, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

- |                                                                                                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Refer to response XX (b) above. The project site is relatively flat and is not located within a seismic hazard zone for potential slope instability or within a landslide hazard zone. Additionally, the project would comply with the City's appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP) for drainage and would not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of run-off, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

#### XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

This analysis has determined that there is the potential of significant impacts related to Cultural Resources (Archaeology) and Tribal Cultural Resources. As such, the mitigation measures outlined in this document would reduce these potential impacts to a level that is less than significant, as described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the environment, particularly with respect to Cultural Resources (Archaeology) and Tribal Cultural Resources, which could have cumulatively significant impacts. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

| Issue                                                                                                                                      | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

As discussed throughout this Initial Study, no hazardous conditions on the project site or in the surrounding area were identified that could adversely affect human beings. It is not anticipated that construction activities would create conditions that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. Any hazardous materials used at the site would be handled in accordance with applicable regulations for the transport, use, storage, and disposal of such materials, ensuring that no substantial adverse effect on human beings would occur. As described in this Initial Study, the project would not result in significant long-term impacts associated with air quality, geology, hazards or hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, or noise, and as such, would not result in an adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

## REFERENCES

BFSA Environmental Services. November 2025. Archeological Testing Plan for 1855 Spindrift Drive Project

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2025. EnviroStor Database. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>

Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. July 2023. Report of Geologic Fault Investigation for 1855 Spindrift Drive Project

Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. July 2023. Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for 1855 Spindrift Drive Project

Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200, Sacramento, 1975

San Diego, City of (City). 2023. Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan: City of San Diego Annex. 2022a. California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. September. Available at:

[https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/september\\_2022\\_ceqa\\_thresholds\\_final.pdf](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/september_2022_ceqa_thresholds_final.pdf)

2022b. Transportation Study Manual (TSM). September 19. Available at:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/10-transportation-study-manual.pdf>


2023. La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program.

2018. Land Development Code Biology Guidelines. February 1. Available at:

[https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/amendment\\_to\\_the\\_land\\_development\\_manual\\_biology\\_guidelines\\_february\\_2018\\_clean.pdf](https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/amendment_to_the_land_development_manual_biology_guidelines_february_2018_clean.pdf)

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). 2022. Final 2022 Revision to the Regional Air Quality Strategy for San Diego County.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2025. Geotracker Database. Available at: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>



1855 Spindrift Drive/PRJ-1141390

Development Services Department

