



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

ADDENDUM

Project No. 1132845
Addendum to PEIR No. 586601
SCH No. 2017071007

SUBJECT: Bunker Hill Lofts 2: COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP) for the construction of a new, three-story, 20-unit multi-dwelling unit, totaling 13,981 square feet (SF). The project includes 19 at-rate units with one affordable unit, utilizing a density bonus request via the affordable housing regulations. The project would also construct various site improvements, including construction of a sidewalk, improvements to the existing sidewalk, removal of a driveway and light pole, new water and sewer services, and landscaping. Allowable waivers from development regulations are being requested pertaining to the Floor Area Ratio, open space requirements, motorcycle parking, and lockable bicycle enclosures. The 0.143-acre site project site is located on an existing vacant parking lot located between Mission Bay Drive and Revere Avenue at 0 Bunker Hill Street, and is zoned as Community Village (O-109 DU/AC) per the Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan. This is in Geologic Hazard Category 31, Culture Sensitivity Activity: high; Parking Standards Transit Priority Area, Transit Priority Area, Complete Communities: Mobility Choices Mobility Zone 2, within the Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable) and Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, CC-3-9 Base Zone, within the Balboa Specific Plan area of the Pacific Beach Community Plan, Council District 1. Assessor's Parcel Number: 425-321-0300 and 424-321-0400). Applicant: Arch5 Design Studio.

I. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

As outlined herein, the Development Services Department (DSD) has determined that the proposed project is consistent with the following environmental document and its appendices, which is hereby incorporated by reference: Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (SCH No. 2017071007) for the Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan (Project No. 586601) certified by the City Council on September 10, 2019, per City Council Resolution No. R- 313753, and certified by the California Coastal Commission on December 17, 2021 (LCP-6-SAN-19-0165-3).

As used herein, the term "BASASP PEIR" refers to the 2019 Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan PEIR.

The Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan (BASASP) is a Specific Plan that amended the Pacific Beach Community Plan/Local Coastal Program (LCP) to revise figures and text to be consistent with the land use and mobility recommendations of the BASASP. The BASASP area encompasses a total of approximately 210 acres (0.33 square miles) and is bounded by Rose Creek on the west, Morena Boulevard on the east, Grand Avenue and Mission Bay Drive on the south, and Avati Drive on the north. The Community Plan Amendment for Pacific Beach redesignated and rezoned lands within the BASASP area to encourage and allow for public and private transit-oriented development (TOD) in the vicinity of the Balboa Avenue Station. The BASASP provides recommendations and guidelines for the public right-of-way (ROW) that emphasize access to the Balboa Avenue Station (trolley station) and capitalize on the regional transit connection in the BASASP area. The BASASP promotes increasing mobility options, decreasing dependency on single occupancy vehicles, and reducing traffic congestion at local intersections and roadways. The Clairemont Mesa Community Plan would also be amended to revise figures and text within the Community Plan to be consistent with the mobility recommendations of the BASASP. The BASASP did not redesignate or rezone any property within the Clairemont Mesa planning area. The BASASP further expresses General Plan and Community Plan policies within the Pacific Beach and Clairemont Mesa communities through the provision of area-specific recommendations that implement citywide goals and policies by allowing for TOD and multi-modal improvements.

Buildout of the BASASP allows up to 4,729 residential units, including 895 multifamily and two single-family dwelling units within the residentially designated areas, and up to 3,832 multifamily residential units within the Community Village designation. In addition, up to 614,313 SF of commercial retail uses and 423,444 SF of industrial uses could be developed within the BASASP area. An active commercial frontage is proposed along the main roadways in the BASASP area. In addition, the BASASP also identifies multi-modal improvements within the planning area to increase bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access to the Balboa Avenue Station.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located between Mission Bay Drive and Revere Avenue at 0 Bunker Hill Street in the Pacific Beach community of the City of San Diego (City), approximately 500 feet west of Interstate 5 (I-5), and consists of a 0.143-acre property on Assessor's Parcel Numbers 425-321-0300 and 424-321-0400 (Figure 1, *Regional Location*). The project site is currently fully developed as a vacant parking lot (Figure 2, *Aerial Photograph*). The street frontage along Bunker Hill Street currently features a non-contiguous sidewalk. The south end of the property is adjacent to an unnamed alley, and the west and east sides are adjacent to vacant parking lots. The site is topographically level at an elevation range of 18 to 20 feet above mean sea level (ASL). The nearest bus stop is on Grand Avenue 0.1 miles away, and the property is approximately 0.7 miles walking distance from the Balboa Avenue Transit Center. The direct project is currently surrounded by a parking lot. The area surrounding the site consists of urban and developed uses including a party bus rental service to the south across the alley, a medical plaza building with a dentist office, and several other health and beauty services to the east on the other side of Revere Avenue. The project site is served by existing public services and utilities.

III. PROPOSED PROJECT

Project Features

The 0.143-acre site is situated approximately 500 feet west of I-5 within the eastern portion of the Pacific Beach Community Plan area in the City (Figure 1, *Regional Location*). The project is requesting a CDP to construct a new, three-story, 20-unit multi-dwelling unit, totaling 13,981 SF (Figure 3, *Site Plan*). The project includes 19 at-rate units with one affordable unit, utilizing a density bonus request via the affordable housing regulations. The units include 10 studios, 6 1-bed/1-bath, 2 2-bed/1-bath, and 2 2-bed/2-bath. Designated parking spaces for bicycles would be provided. The project would also include various site improvements, including construction of a sidewalk, improvements to the existing sidewalk, removal of a driveway and light pole, new water and sewer services, and landscaping.

The project site is located in a TPA (i.e., Mobility Zone 2). The nearest bus stop is on Grand Avenue 0.1 miles away, and the property is approximately 0.7 miles walking distance from the Balboa Avenue Transit Center. The mobility improvements envisioned in the BASASP identify a planned Class II bicycle facility along the project frontage. The project is designed to accommodate this facility. The project would remove the existing driveway and replace it with a full height curb and gutter. To comply with the Mobility Choice Regulations, the project is required to provide at least 5 points worth of transportation amenities per the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 143.1103(b)(1), in accordance with Land Development Manual (Appendix T). The project would provide the following VMT reduction measures which total 5 points and meet the minimum points required to comply with the Mobility Choice Regulations:

- Permanently anchored and secure lockable bicycle rack for 11 bicycles (3 more than required)
- 50% of the bicycle parking (6 spaces) shall be provided with independent power outlets for charging

Construction

Project construction would require 41.71 Cubic Yards (CY) of cut and 41.71 CY of fill, resulting in no export of material. The maximum cut would be 1.15 feet.

IV. DETERMINATION

The City of San Diego (City), as Lead Agency, previously prepared and certified Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) No. 586601/SCH No. 2017071007. Based on all available information considering the entire record, the analysis in this Addendum, and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164, the City has determined the following:

- There are no substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

- Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- There is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental document was certified as complete or was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous environmental document;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous environmental document;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous environmental would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based upon a review of the project, none of the situations described in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15164, and 15168 apply. Specifically, it has been determined that the preparation of a new or subsequent document is not required. No changes in circumstances have occurred, and no new information of substantial importance has manifested, which would result in new significant or substantially increased adverse impacts because of the project. Therefore, this Addendum has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164. Furthermore, public review of this Addendum is not required per CEQA.

V. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The project shall be required to comply with the applicable mitigation measures outlined within the MMRP of the previously certified BASASP PEIR, EIR No. 586601/SCH No. 2017071007. No project-specific measures are required as outlined in the analyses herein. The following MMRP identifies measures that specifically apply to this project.

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

1. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, such as demolition, grading or building, or beginning any construction-related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Environmental Designee shall review and approve construction documents (CD) (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the

applicable MMRP requirements are incorporated into the design and/or construction documents.

2. In addition, the Environmental Designee 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 of San Diego (City) website:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/forms-publications/design-guidelines-templates>.
4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.
5. **SURETY AND COST RECOVERY:** The DSD Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its costs to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

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 for arranging and performing this meeting by contacting the CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER 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:

Archaeological Monitor, Tribal Cultural Monitor

Note: If all responsible Permit Holders' representatives and consultants fail to attend, an additional meeting with all party's present will be required.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

- a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the RE at the Field Engineering Division and can be reached at (858) 627-3200
 - b) For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, contact call RE and MMC at (858) 627-3360
2. **MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, PRJ-1132845 and/or Environmental Document EIR No. 586601, and EIR SCH No. 2017071007 shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and be implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Resident Engineer. The requirements may not be reduced or changed, but may be annotated (i.e., to explain when and how compliance is being met and the location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added

to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as needed (e.g., specific locations, monitoring times, methodologies, etc.).

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

3. **OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS:** Evidence of compliance with all other agency requirements or permits shall be submitted to the Resident Engineer 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.

None required

4. **MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit to Resident Engineer and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on an 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.

Note: Surety and Cost Recovery: When deemed necessary by the DSD Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its costs to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

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 Resident Engineer and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist		
Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to the Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at the Preconstruction Meeting
Archaeology	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Tribal Cultural Resources	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology Reports
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES and TRIBAL CULTURAL 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 (0.25-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 0.25-mile radius.
- B. 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.
 - a. 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.
 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).
 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 site conditions such as 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 or emailed 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) which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated 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 Guidelines Section, 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

1 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 (Section 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 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 provenance of the remains.
2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenance.
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 Guidelines 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 8 a.m. of the next business day.
 - b. Discoveries
 - All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Section III, *During Construction*, and Section 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 Section IV, *Discovery of Human Remains*, shall be followed.
 - d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8 a.m. 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. Preparation and 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 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 resulting from 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 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 for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC 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 RE 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 that the draft report has been approved.
 2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion and/or release of the Performance Bond for grading until receiving a copy of the approved Final

Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

VI. CERTIFICATION

Copies of the addendum, certified PEIR, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and associated project-specific technical appendices, if any, may be accessed on the City's CEQA webpage at <https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/final>.

Courtney Holowach

9/10/26

Courtney Holowach
Senior Planner
Development Services Department

Date of Final Report

Analyst: Stephanie Kellogg

Figures:

- Figure 1 – Regional Location
- Figure 2 – Aerial Photograph
- Figure 3 – Site Plan

Previous Environmental Document(s) and Technical Appendices (provided under separate cover):

- EIR No. 586601/SCH No. 2017071007
- Appendix A – Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis
- Appendix B – Air Quality Study
- Appendix C – Geotechnical Investigation Report
- Appendix D – Geotechnical Reconnaissance Report Addendum
- Appendix E – Cultural Resource Survey
- Appendix F – Drainage Study
- Appendix G – Water Service Analysis

CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15164 ADDENDUM ANALYSIS

I. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS PROJECT

The Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan (BASASP) is a Specific Plan that amended the Pacific Beach Community Plan/Local Coastal Program (LCP) to revise figures and text to be consistent with the land use and mobility recommendations of the BASASP. The BASASP area encompasses a total of approximately 210 acres (0.33 square miles) and is bounded by Rose Creek on the west, Morena Boulevard on the east, Grand Avenue and Mission Bay Drive on the south, and Avati Drive on the north. The Community Plan Amendment for Pacific Beach redesignated and rezoned lands within the BASASP area to encourage and allow for public and private transit-oriented development (TOD) in the vicinity of the Balboa Avenue Station. The BASASP provides recommendations and guidelines for the public right-of-way (ROW) that emphasize access to the Balboa Avenue Station (trolley station) and capitalize on the regional transit connection in the BASASP area. The BASASP promotes increasing mobility options, decreasing dependency on single occupancy vehicles, and reducing traffic congestion at local intersections and roadways. The Clairemont Mesa Community Plan would also be amended to revise figures and text within the Community Plan to be consistent with the mobility recommendations of the BASASP. The BASASP did not redesignate or rezone any property within the Clairemont Mesa planning area. The BASASP further expresses General Plan and Community Plan policies within the Pacific Beach and Clairemont Mesa communities through the provision of area-specific recommendations that implement citywide goals and policies by allowing for TOD and multi-modal improvements.

Buildout of the BASASP allows up to 4,729 residential units, including 895 multifamily and two single-family dwelling units within the residentially designated areas, and up to 3,832 multifamily residential units within the Community Village designation. In addition, up to 614,313 SF of commercial retail uses and 423,444 SF of industrial uses could be developed within the BASASP area. An active commercial frontage is proposed along the main roadways in the BASASP area. In addition, the BASASP also identifies multi-modal improvements within the planning area to increase bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access to the Balboa Avenue Station.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The site is substantially the same as described in the BASASP. The project site is located between Mission Bay Drive and Revere Avenue at 0 Bunker Hill Street in the Pacific Beach community of the City of San Diego (City), approximately 500 feet west of Interstate 5 (I-5), and consists of a 0.143-acre property on Assessor's Parcel Numbers 425-321-0300 and 424-321-0400. The project site is currently fully developed as a vacant parking lot. The street frontage along Bunker Hill Street currently features a non-contiguous sidewalk. The south end of the property is adjacent to an unnamed alley, and the west and east sides are adjacent to vacant parking lots. The site is topographically level at an elevation range of 18 to 20 feet above mean sea level (ASL). The nearest bus stop is on Grand Avenue 0.1 miles away, and the property is approximately 0.7 miles walking distance from the Balboa Avenue

Transit Center. The project area surrounding the site consists of urban and developed uses. The project site is served by existing public services and utilities.

III. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The 0.143-acre site is situated approximately 500 feet west of I-5 within the eastern portion of the Pacific Beach Community Plan area in the City (Figure 1, *Regional Location*). The project is requesting a CDP to construct a new, three-story, 20-unit multi-dwelling unit, totaling 13,981 SF. The project includes 19 at-rate units with one affordable unit, utilizing a density bonus request via the affordable housing regulations. The units include 10 studios, 6 1-bed/1-bath, 2 2-bed/1-bath, and 2 2-bed/2-bath. Designated parking spaces for bicycles would be provided. The project would also include various site improvements, including construction of a sidewalk, improvements to the existing sidewalk, removal of a driveway and light pole, new water and sewer services, and landscaping.

The project site is located in a TPA (i.e., Mobility Zone 2). The nearest bus stop is on Grand Avenue 0.1 miles away, and the property is approximately 0.7 miles walking distance from the Balboa Avenue Transit Center. The mobility improvements envisioned in the BASASP identify a planned Class II bicycle facility along the project frontage. The project is designed to accommodate this facility. The project would remove the existing driveway and replace it with a full height curb and gutter. To comply with the Mobility Choice Regulations, the project is required to provide at least 5 points worth of transportation amenities per the SDMC Section 143.1103(b)(1), in accordance with Land Development Manual (Appendix T). The project would provide the following VMT reduction measures which total 5 points and meet the minimum points required to comply with the Mobility Choice Regulations:

- Permanently anchored and secure lockable bicycle rack for 11 bicycles (3 more than required)
- 50% of the bicycle parking (6 spaces) shall be provided with independent power outlets for charging

Project construction would require 41.71 Cubic Yards (CY) of cut and 41.71 CY of fill, resulting in no export of material. The maximum cut would be 1.15 feet.

IV. IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following includes the project-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA. The analysis in this document evaluates the adequacy of the certified BASASP PEIR, SCH No. 2017071007 relative to the project.

Land Use

BASASP PEIR

According to Section 5.1 of the BASASP PEIR, potential land use plan consistency impacts would be less than significant because the goals, policies, and programs of the BASASP are

consistent with existing applicable local and regional land use plans, policies, and regulations contained in the City's General Plan, Climate Action Plan, Pacific Beach Community Plan, Clairemont Mesa Community Plan, Balboa Avenue Revitalization Action Program, and Land Development Code Regulations. The BASASP was also deemed consistent with the policies of the California Coastal Act and SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, in place at the time of its adoption, as demonstrated in the PEIR. Less-than-significant impacts are identified, and no mitigation is required.

The PEIR also concludes that the Specific Plan's environmental plan consistency impacts would be less than significant because planned improvements and future development would not encroach into sensitive resources in the Rose Creek Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and the portion of the MHPA where development could occur does not contain sensitive resources and will be removed from the MHPA using a Boundary Line Adjustment. Future development adjacent to the MHPA will be required to comply with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines as part of the Mitigation Framework for biological resources in the PEIR. Specifically, BIO-8 in Section 5.3 of the PEIR requires future development to address such issues as drainage, water quality, lighting, noise, barriers, invasive species, brush management and grading/development in accordance with Section 1.4.3 of the MSCP Subarea Plan. Less than significant environmental plan consistency impacts would occur upon implementation of the PEIR Mitigation Framework measures.

The BASASP enhances community connectivity by establishing an urban village and improved pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-oriented amenities. Therefore, the BASASP PEIR concludes that the plan would not physically divide an established community; impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Project

The project would construct a new, three-story, 20-unit multi-dwelling unit on a site that is zoned Community-Commercial (CC-3-9) and designated for Multiple Use in the General Plan and Community Village (0-109 DU/AC) in the BASASP and Pacific Beach Community Plan. Pursuant to the Specific Plan, projects are to be reviewed for conformance with General Plan policies, Specific Plan policies and Supplemental Development Regulations (SDRs), and all other applicable regulations including base zones and overlay zone development regulations. The project would comply with the development regulations of the CC-3-9 zone and the applicable overlay zones (i.e., Coastal Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Overlay Zone, and Transit Area Overlay Zone) in terms of setbacks, building heights, massing, floor area ratio, landscape treatments, among other requirements. The following five SDRs from the BASASP are applicable to the project: SDR-2 (Visitor Commercial Uses); and SDR-5 and SDR-6 (Mobility Improvements). The project would be expected to generate less than 1,000 average daily trips (ADT) and less than 100 peak hour trips, thus excluding several of the SDRs from being applicable. Project compliance with the applicable SDRs is described below.

The project would build a multi-family residential use on the project site consistent with the uses within the CC-3-9 zone as further restricted by SDR-2. To demonstrate compliance with SDR-5 (Balboa Avenue and Moreno Boulevard Northbound Ramps) and SDR-6 (Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive) in the BASASP, a project-level Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

was conducted (Kimley-Horn, 2026; Appendix A). Turning movement counts were collected at both SDR intersections during typical peak hour conditions to address the peak hour warrant in accordance with Council Policy 200-6. To address the remaining seven warrants at the two intersection locations, signal warrant worksheets were prepared. In addition, trip generation, distribution, and assignments were prepared to determine how project traffic would access the surrounding roadway network and to identify the number of project trips that would reach the two SDR study intersections.

The project's Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis conducted a comprehensive analysis at both SDR intersections, including all eight signal warrants, in accordance with Part 4 of the California MUTCD (refer to Attachment B of Appendix A for warrant worksheets). The analysis determined that project generated traffic would meet three of the nine signal warrants at SDR-5 (Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramps), and signal warrant 5 and 9 are not applicable to the project. The project would contribute 6 AM peak hour trips and 2 PM peak hour trips to the Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramp intersection. The analysis further determined that three of the nine signal warrants would be met at SDR-6 (Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive), and signal warrant 5 and 9 are not applicable to the project. The project would contribute 0 AM peak hour trips and 0 PM peak hour trips to the Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive intersection, based on 0.5 percent of peak trips out plus 1 percent of peak hour trips in during each peak hour.

Based on the Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis, project traffic would contribute up to 0.12 percent of the peak hour traffic utilizing the Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramp intersection and no traffic at the Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive intersection. The project would implement mobility improvements in a TPA, as envisioned in the BASASP. Payment of its fair share contribution to the cost of the Balboa Avenue/Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramp partial signal specified in SDR-5 as a condition of approval would comply with the intent of the BASASP. No land use plan or policy consistency impacts would occur.

The project site is not adjacent to the Rose Creek MHPA; therefore, the MSCP Land use Adjacency Guidelines would not be applicable to the project and less than significant environmental plan consistency impacts would occur. Mitigation Measure BIO-8 in Section 5.3 of the PEIR is not required.

The project would construct a new multi-family residential development that would enhance community connectivity through its pedestrian and bicycle amenities required by the BASASP. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community; impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Air Quality

BASASP PEIR

Air Quality is addressed in Section 5.2 of the BASASP PEIR. Because the BASASP would increase the development density and daily traffic volumes beyond what was included for the area in the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS), the PEIR concludes that impacts associated with conformance to regional air quality plans would be potentially significant and mitigated once the City provides a revised housing and employment forecast to SANDAG, as required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1. The PEIR concludes that this inconsistency with the RAQS and State Implementation Plan (SIP) results in a significant and unavoidable impact, which would be reduced to less than significant when the RAQS and SIP are updated by the City, in accordance with Mitigation Measure AQ-1.

Based on an evaluation of criteria pollutant emissions conducted in the BASASP PEIR, construction phase and operational emissions associated with new development within the Specific Plan area could exceed City significance thresholds. Thus, the PEIR determined that the increase in future emissions would result in a potentially significant air quality impact and mitigation measures are identified. Mitigation Measure AQ-2 requires an analysis of construction-phase air quality impacts at the time future development projects are proposed to determine if measures are required to reduce project-level construction emissions reduction measures identified in Mitigation Measure AQ-3 are required for future individual development projects that would exceed daily construction emissions thresholds. Mitigation Measure AQ-4 requires an evaluation of project-level operational air quality emissions and the incorporation of measures to reduce the emissions to below significance. Because there is no guarantee that all future development, including ministerial projects, would successfully implement the mitigation framework, the PEIR determined that air pollutant impacts from the construction and operation of future development could be significant and unmitigated.

With regard to cumulative air emissions, future development within the BASASP planning area would result in ozone precursor (i.e., volatile organic compounds) emissions which could contribute to existing violations of the state and federal ozone standards. Particulate (i.e. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) emissions produced by future development could also contribute to existing violations of their respective standards. Thus, the PEIR determines that Specific Plan impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact to air quality in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) because the ability of future development to implement the mitigation framework could not be guaranteed.

With regard to the exposure of sensitive receptors to carbon monoxide (CO) and toxic air contaminants (TACs), the PEIR analysis indicates there would be no potential for CO hot spots or exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial, project-generated, local CO emissions. It also concludes that the implementation of future development under the BASASP would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial construction-related TAC concentrations. Thus, the PEIR concludes that air quality impacts to sensitive receptors from construction and operation of future development would be less than significant.

Although the BASASP area is adjacent to industrial operations, there are no known sources of long-term odors in the area. In addition, there are no agricultural operations in the BASASP area which would generate odors. Similarly, future development under the BASASP would not produce objectionable odors, and less-than-significant impacts are identified in the PEIR.

Project

The project would implement the CC-3-9 zoning and Community Village land use designation in the BASASP and Pacific Beach Community Plan. The project would contribute to the significant and unavoidable impact associated with the RAQS consistency identified in the BASASP PEIR. The mitigation framework in the EIR requires the City to submit a revised land use plan to SANDAG for updating growth projections contained in the RAQS. In 2022, the RAQS were updated by the SDAPCD, including the growth associated with the implementation of the BASASP. Therefore, the project's impact would be less than significant.

Implementation of the project would produce temporary air emissions during construction as a result of demolition, soil grading, heavy equipment operations, worker trips, deliveries/material hauling trips, and temporary power production. An Air Quality Study was conducted on the project in accordance with Mitigation Measure AQ-2 and AQ-4 from the BASASP PEIR to address project-level construction and operational emissions (Ldn, 2026; Appendix B). Based on that analysis, the project's daily and annual emissions of criteria pollutants from construction activities would be well below the City's significance thresholds. As such, construction impacts would be less than significant, and the project would not be required to implement BASASP PEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-3 requiring construction-phase emissions reduction measures.

Sources of operational emissions associated with the project include traffic generated by the project, and area source emissions. Operational emissions modeling was conducted for the project in the Air Quality Study, which was prepared to comply with Mitigation Measure AQ-4 from the BASASP PEIR. The analysis determined that the net daily and annual project operational emissions would not exceed the City's project-level significance thresholds. In addition, the project would implement improvements that would result in the installation of transportation infrastructure and amenities that would support a decrease in vehicular mode share traffic, as anticipated in the BASASP PEIR.

The project site is located approximately 0.25 miles from the intersection of Garnet Avenue and Mission Bay Drive, which was evaluated for localized air pollution effect by conducting a Carbon Monoxide (CO) hot spot analysis in the BASASP PEIR. The analysis determined that the intersection would not result in significant impacts associated with CO hotspots. The incremental increase in cancer risks and chronic health risks to sensitive receivers associated with build-out of the BASASP and associated discretionary actions would be less than significant upon implementation of projects in the BASASP. As the proposed project is consistent with the Specific Plan, impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the project would also be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Construction of the project at the site would involve the use of diesel-powered construction equipment. Diesel exhaust odors may be noticeable temporarily at adjacent properties during the construction period; however, construction activities would be temporary and are not considered significant. The proposed development of the site would not include industrial or agricultural uses that are typically associated with objectionable odors. Therefore, project impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Biological Resources

BASASP PEIR

The majority of the Specific Plan area contains developed and/or disturbed habitat and eucalyptus woodland which are not considered sensitive vegetation communities. A small amount of area contains sensitive vegetation which can also support sensitive wildlife and plant species. Potentially significant impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife species directly through the loss of habitat or indirectly by placing development adjacent sensitive habitats were identified in Section 5.3 of the BASASP PEIR. Impacts would be mitigated in accordance with the City's Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations, Biology Guidelines and provisions of the MSCP Subarea Plan, in accordance with the Mitigation Framework in the BASASP PEIR. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires a survey for sensitive vegetation and plants for undeveloped lands within the Specific Plan area and adherence to the requirements of the City's Biology Guidelines and MSCP Subarea Plan. With regard to sensitive bird species adjacent to Rose Creek, Mitigation Measures BIO-2 and BIO-3 require evaluations of the adjacent habitats for the suitability to support Ridgway's rail and least Bell's vireo and implementation of project-specific mitigation in accordance with City regulations. To reduce impacts to nesting birds within the BASASP area, project would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-4 which requires compliance with the City's MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines which restrict construction noise and require pre-construction surveys and nesting season avoidance, if species are present. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 requires site-specific biologic surveys to determine if any other sensitive or MSCP Covered species are present on the project site and the implementation of habitat-based mitigation and/or compliance with the MSCP Subarea Plan conditions of coverage, as applicable. Although future development has the potential for significant impacts to sensitive species, implementation of the PEIR Mitigation Framework would ensure that impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Potential impacts to sensitive habitats, such as Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland communities, would be significant according to Section 5.3 of the BASASP PEIR and require mitigation. Impacts to eucalyptus woodland, non-native vegetation, disturbed habitat, and developed land, are not significant and do not require mitigation. Impacts to sensitive upland vegetation and wetland habitats from future discretionary development would be mitigated in accordance with the City's Biology Guidelines, as outlined in the

Mitigation Framework of the BASASP PEIR. Mitigation Measure BIO-6 requires preservation, restoration and/or creation of sensitive habitats for impacts to sensitive uplands in accordance with the City Biology Guidelines. Mitigation Measure BIO-7 requires avoidance of wetland habitats, and if infeasible, mitigation to ensure no net loss in accordance with the City Biology Guidelines. Implementation of these mitigation measures, combined with compliance with the MSCP Subarea Plan, would reduce impacts to less than significant.

With regard to potential impacts to jurisdictional areas, the PEIR concludes that no direct impacts to wetlands are anticipated because the BASASP does not include development in areas containing potential jurisdictional features. Indirect effects to wetlands, which are regulated by Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, and City Biology Guidelines are not anticipated. If impacts to jurisdictional areas were to occur, the PEIR concludes that they would be significant. Implementation of the PEIR Mitigation Framework would reduce them to less than significance. Specifically, Mitigation Measure BIO-7 would ensure avoidance and require mitigation to ensure no net loss, while Mitigation Measure BIO-8 requires projects to obtain permits from the regulatory agencies to ensure mitigation is acceptable to permitting agencies.

Because no development is proposed within Rose Creek, no impacts to wildlife movement within the wildlife corridor are anticipated in the BASASP PEIR. No mitigation is required.

In terms of potential conflicts with the provisions of the MSCP Subarea Plan and MHPA edge effects, future development within the BASASP planning area would generally avoid the MHPA and be consistent with the MSCP Subarea Plan. Future development proposed adjacent to MHPA would be required to comply with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines which address requirements for grading and land development, drainage, toxic substances in runoff, lighting, barriers, invasive plant species, brush management, and noise. Adherence to these guidelines would avoid any future significant indirect impacts to resources protected by the MSCP Subarea Plan and no mitigation is required.

Future development within the BASASP would be required to comply with the City's ESL Regulations to avoid impacts to MHPA, wetlands, vernal pools, MSCP Covered Species and MSCP Narrow Endemic species. The PEIR states that a significant conflict with the ESL Regulations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Future development projects within or adjacent to the MHPA or adjacent Rose Creek have the potential to introduce invasive species through the use of exotic/invasive plant species in landscaping, which would be considered a significant impact. The introduction of invasive species would be addressed through project compliance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. No mitigation is required.

Project

The project site is fully developed and does not contain any biological resources or ESL. The project would not result in impacts to sensitive species, sensitive habitat, wetlands, wildlife corridors, wildlife nursery sites, or conflicts with the City's MSCP. It is consistent with the BASASP PEIR. No impact to biological resources would occur; no mitigation is required.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Energy Conservation

BASASP PEIR

Build out of the BASASP would require construction-related energy consumption and long-term operational energy consumption as described in Section 5.4 of the BASASP PEIR. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or other forms of energy during the construction of future projects under the project as there are no known conditions in the BASASP area that would require non-standard equipment or construction practices that would increase fuel-energy consumption above typical rates. Thus, the PEIR concludes that short-term energy impacts would be less than significant.

Energy conservation measures required by applicable energy conservation regulations (e.g., CALGreen) and energy conservation policies included in the BASASP would avoid excessive energy consumption from VMT during the operation of future development in the BASASP area would avoid excessive encourage a reduction in energy consumption related to transportation. Thus, the PEIR concludes that long-term operational energy impacts would be less than significant.

Project

The project would be required to comply with California Building Code (CBC) Energy Efficiency Requirements and applicable CALGreen building standards. Compliance with existing regulatory standards would ensure that the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy and would be compliant with State plans. Impacts would be less than significant consistent with the BASASP EIR.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Geology and Soils

BASASP PEIR

As stated in Section 5.5 of the BASASP PEIR, future development proposed under the BASASP would be required, at the project level, to conform to applicable City General Plan and other plans, as well as other pertinent regulatory/industry and code requirements related to geologic and safety concerns (e.g., the CBC and emergency response plans). Potential impacts related to geologic hazards would be avoided, reduced to an acceptable level of risk, or reduced below a level of significance through mandatory conformance with

applicable regulatory/industry standard and codes. No mitigation is required to address geologic hazards such as ground shaking, fault rupture, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards.

With regard to erosion and sedimentation, the PEIR concludes that potential impacts related to erosion and sedimentation from implementation of the BASASP would be avoided or reduced below a level of significance through mandatory conformance with applicable regulatory/industry standard and codes, including applicable requirements under the City Storm Water Program and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). No mitigation is required.

Section 5.5 of the BASASP PEIR addresses potential impacts from structures being located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable and potentially result in onsite or off-site subsidence, expansive soil, or collapse. Future development activities would be subject to appropriate site-specific geotechnical review per applicable regulatory/industry standards. Therefore, the PEIR concludes that geologic instability would be avoided or reduced below a level of significance through mandatory conformance with applicable regulatory/industry standard and codes, including the International Building Code, CBC and pertinent City criteria. No mitigation is required.

Project

The project site is located within seismically active Southern California, and the area is prone to ground shaking. A project-specific geotechnical study was prepared for the project (NOVA, 2026; Appendix C) to address geologic conditions of the site. Subsequent input from another geotechnical engineering contractor was also provided on the project design (Verdantas, 2025; Appendix D) The site is not underlain by active, potentially active, or inactive faults. The Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon (NIRC) Fault Zone is located in the project area, approximately 350 feet northeast of the project site. The potential for ground rupture at the project site is considered low due to the absence of active faults at the project site.

According to the City's Seismic Safety Study, the site is situated in Geologic Hazard Categories 31 (Liquefaction). The project site is underlain by Quaternary alluvium and Quaternary old paralic deposits. Alluvial deposits were encountered during geologic excavations to depths ranging from 16 to 26 feet below the ground surface (bgs). Old paralic deposits were encountered to the maximum-explored depth of about 41.5 feet bgs. Given the relatively wet, loose/soft nature of the materials beneath the site, the presence of shallow groundwater, and proximity to active faulting, the potential for liquefaction and dynamic settlement to occur is considered high. Foundation and structural recommendations, including remedial grading, are provided in the project's geotechnical reports for addressing these hazards (Appendix C and D).

No evidence of landsliding or slope instability was observed across the relatively flat, developed site. Published geologic mapping indicates landslides are not present on or adjacent to the site. As discussed in the BASASP PEIR, future development projects, such as the project, would be required to comply with the CBC and SDMC. Compliance with the CBC, the SDMC, and the site-specific geotechnical recommendations related to ground improvements and foundations contained in the geotechnical report (Verdantas, 2025;

Appendix D) would be implemented as conditions of approval to ensure the project design would reduce potentially significant impacts associated with ground shaking and seismic hazards to a less-than-significant level.

The project would implement an erosion control plan that conforms to the City-mandated grading requirements and standards in the Land Development Manual, which would ensure that proposed grading and construction operations would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. Soil disturbance would be required during construction, and compliance with the project-specific erosion control plan and local state regulations related to erosion control would ensure there would not be a substantial loss of topsoil or erosion.

The project geotechnical report indicates that the project would not result in seismically induced settlement assuming site-specific geotechnical recommendations are incorporated into the design. Thus, less than significant impacts associated with geological instability would occur.

The soil encountered on site has very low expansion potential. The deposits on site are not considered suitable to support the project; however, they may be removed during construction, depending on the finished grade elevation of the subterranean garage. The project geotechnical report contains site-specific recommendations to be implemented during project design development, grading, and construction (refer to Appendix D). The project would comply with the SDMC, CBC, and site-specific geotechnical recommendations, which would be project conditions of approvals, to reduce potentially significant impacts associated with expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.6 of the BASASP PEIR addresses whether plan implementation would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The projected GHG emissions to be generated from build out of the BASASP were estimated for construction and operational sources. For the purposes of determining if the increase in GHG emissions would have an impact, GHG emissions attributable to the BASASP at full buildout were compared to GHG emissions associated with buildout under the adopted Community Plans. While the BASASP would increase aggregated GHG emissions over those of the adopted Community Plans at buildout (Year 2035), this increase in GHG is a direct result of the implementation of Climate Action Plan (CAP) Strategies and the General Plan's City of Villages Strategy. Increasing residential and commercial density in transit corridors and Community Villages within a TPA would support the City in achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets of the CAP. The PEIR concludes that BASASP GHG emissions impacts would be less than significant.

The BASASP allows for the development of compact, walkable communities close to transit connections consistent with smart growth principles. The BASASP supports the multi-modal strategy of the SANDAG Regional Plan through improvements to increase bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access to the Balboa Avenue Trolley Station. Policies contained within the BASASP Land Use and Mobility Elements would serve to promote bus transit use as well as other forms of mobility, including walking and bicycling. The BASASP incorporates goals and policies intended to support the General Plan and CAP policies. Therefore, the PEIR concludes that the BASASP would be consistent with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and impacts would be less than significant.

Project

The project is consistent with the existing General Plan, BASASP and Pacific Beach Community Plan land use designations and zoning for the site. The project encourages the development of affordable and senior housing units at different income levels and the inclusion of on-site affordable housing units in residential developments by providing affordable housing and market-rate units on the premises at different income levels. The project promotes active residential street frontages by designing ground-floor units with living space that fronts the street and provides direct access from the Street in areas not identified as active commercial frontage. The subject property is designated as Community Village and is not identified for Active Commercial Frontage, per Figure 2-1 of the Balboa Station Area Specific Plan. In addition, the project is exempt from Mobility Choices, where multi-family residential development provides transportation amenities as required by SDMC 142.0528.

The project would also be consistent with the strategies and actions of the CAP and its implementing regulations to reduce citywide GHG by incorporating energy and water efficient building features, electric vehicle charging, bicycle parking, and street tree plantings. These project features would be assured as conditions of project approval. Thus, the project would be consistent with the GHG reduction strategies in the CAP, and less-than-significant impacts would occur. No mitigation is required.

The project's contribution of GHGs to cumulative Statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable based on the project's consistency with the City's CAP and the General Plan. Therefore, the project's GHG emissions would have a less-than-significant impact on the environment. No mitigation is required.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.7 of the BASASP PEIR analyzes the potential impacts on historical, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources resulting from implementation of the BASASP. Implementation of future development within the BASASP planning area could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan or current zoning. Impacts to historic resources would be significant and require compliance with the Mitigation Framework in the PEIR. Mitigation Measure HIST-1 requires projects proposing development of a building or structure in excess of 45 years of age address whether or not the affected building or structure is historically significant in accordance with the Historic Resources Guidelines. If the project-specific determination is that the resource is historically significant, mitigation outlined in Mitigation Measure HIST-1 would be required as specified in the Historic Resources Regulations and Historic Resources Guidelines. Even with implementation of the PEIR Mitigation Framework, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project. Therefore, potential impacts to historic buildings, structures, objects, or sites, would remain significant and unavoidable.

Archaeological resources have been recorded within the 1-mile search of the BASASP planning area. Specifically, the entire BASASP area west of 1-5 is within the recorded site boundaries of P-37-005017 (CA-SDI-5017; SDM-W-150/152), the ethnohistoric village of La Rinconada de Jama (or Rinconada). This is a large and significant archaeological site that has been subject to vast disturbance over many years of ranching, road construction, and residential and commercial development. Additionally, there is potential for subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological resources to be encountered on the east side of 1-5. Though in an area predominately developed and disturbed, future development under the BASASP has the potential to result in significant impacts to prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, sacred sites, and human remains, including, but not limited to, areas within and/or in proximity to the village of La Rinconada de Jamo.

The PEIR Mitigation Framework includes Mitigation Measure HIST-2 which requires a determination by City staff as to the potential for prehistoric or historic archaeological resources based on Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps and the completion of an archaeological resources evaluation in accordance with the City Guidelines, if there is the potential for prehistoric or historic archaeological resources on a project site. Measures to reduce project impacts to such resources would be defined in the project-specific evaluation. This mitigation, combined with the policies of the General Plan and the adopted community plan policies promoting the identification, protection, and preservation of archaeological resources, in addition to compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation early in the development review process, and the City's Historic Resources Regulations, which requires review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps, would reduce the program-level impact related to prehistoric or historical archaeological resources. However, even with application of the existing regulatory framework and mitigation framework which would avoid future project-level impacts, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures could not be determined at a program level of analysis. Thus, the PEIR concludes that potential impacts to prehistoric and historic

archaeological resources, sacred sites, and human remains would be minimized but would remain significant and unavoidable.

Given the presence of known and potential tribal cultural resources within and immediately adjacent to the BASASP, future development implemented in accordance with the BASASP would potentially result in impacts to significant tribal cultural resources and, therefore, would be required to implement Mitigation Measure HIST-2, which addresses measures to minimize impacts to archaeological and tribal cultural resources. This mitigation, combined with the policies of the General Plan and the adopted community plan policies promoting the identification, protection, and preservation of archaeological resources, in addition to compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation early in the development review process, and the City's Historic Resources Regulations (SDMC Section 143.0212), which requires review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps, would reduce the program-level impact related to prehistoric or historical archaeological resources. However, even with application of the existing regulatory framework and mitigation framework which would avoid future project-level impacts, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures cannot be determined at this program level of analysis. Thus, the PEIR concludes that potential impacts to tribal cultural resources, would be minimized but would remain significant and unavoidable.

Project

The entire BASASP area west of 1-5 where the project site is situated is within the mapped area of P-37-005017 (CA-SDI-5017; SDM-W-150/152). As noted in the PEIR, the recorded site is a large and significant archaeological site that has been subject to vast disturbance over many years of ranching, road construction, and residential and commercial development. In accordance with Mitigation Measure HIST-2, City staff evaluated the sensitivity of the project site using the CHRIS database search and determined that it has a high potential for impacts to a known prehistoric resource. However, no impacts to sacred sites and human remains are expected based on the Sacred Lands Search conducted by the City for the BASAP PEIR and the level of site disturbance. Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification letters were sent November 5, 2025, to the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, Jamul Indian Village, and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. No requests for consultation were received. A Cultural Resource Survey was conducted (BFSA, 2025; Appendix E) to evaluate potential impacts from project implementation. No prehistoric or historic resources were identified. Furthermore, the closest studies to the current project did not identify any intact cultural deposits. However, based on the proximity of the project to P-37-005017 and the lack of visibility of the natural ground surface due to the site consisting of a graded, asphalt-covered parking lot, archaeological and Native American monitoring is required for all project-related ground disturbance.

Based upon the above information, archaeological monitoring would be required in accordance with Mitigation Measure HIST 2 from the BASASP PEIR, as noted in Section VII of this document. Implementation of the measure would minimize impacts to archaeological and tribal cultural resources. However, consistent with the BASASP PEIR potential impacts to archaeological resources would be significant and unavoidable.

Human Health / Public Safety / Hazardous Materials

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.8 of the BASASP PEIR states that potential impacts related to hazardous materials and associated health hazards from implementation of the BASASP would be avoided through mandatory conformance with applicable regulatory/industry standard and codes, including approval from the County Department of Environmental Health (DEH)/Hazardous Materials Division (HMD) and other pertinent requirements as outlined in the PEIR. Impacts would be less than significant, and therefore, no mitigation is required.

Potential impacts related to flood hazards from implementation of the BASASP would be less than significant, because no development within the BASASP area would occur within the 100-year floodplain and would be located outside of potential tsunami/seiche and dam inundation areas. The BASASP would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding related to mapped 100-year floodplains or failure of a dam or levee, as well as flooding/inundation from a tsunami or seiche, and less-than-significant impacts would occur. No mitigation is required.

Based on the nature of the future development and the required compliance with associated criteria under the applicable guidelines pertaining to emergency preparedness and emergency response services, Section 5.8 of the PEIR concludes that implementation of the Specific Plan would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

The BASASP planning area is urbanized with low potential for wildfire hazards with the exception of some of the northeastern corner of the BASASP area, which is identified as within the very high fire hazard severity zone. Potential impacts related to exposing people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires from implementation of the BASASP would be less than significant, based on the fact that future developments would be required to comply with applicable state and City standards associated with wildfire hazards and fire prevention. No mitigation is required.

Project

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites identified by the California DTSC or the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The site is in proximity to two closed Underground Storage Tank (UST) Cleanup sites, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Case Number 9UT1515 at 4433 Mission Bay Drive, and Case Number 9UT2672 at 4409 Mission Bay Drive, San Diego, CA. A Department of Environmental Health & Quality, Site Assessment & Mitigation Program (SAM) Consultation record was opened on March 11, 2024. SAM staff reviewed a technical report prepared by Weis Environmental, LLC titled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Southeast Corner of Mission Bay Drive and Bunker Hill Street, San Diego, California 92109" and dated October 1, 2022. The Phase I report prepared by Weis Environmental, LLC concluded that the environmental assessment conducted at the project site revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions, historical recognized environmental conditions, or controlled

recognized environmental conditions. Weis Environmental, LLC recommended that additional environmental assessment of the Site is not considered to be warranted at this time. SAM concurred with the conclusions and recommendation. As such, the project would not result in impacts associated with hazardous materials sites as anticipated in the BASASP PEIR.

Implementation of the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the project would involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuel, solvents, chemicals, and oils associated with operating construction equipment. Although small amounts of fuel, solvents, chemicals, and oils would be transported, used, and disposed of during the construction phase, these materials are typically used in construction projects and would not represent the transport, use, and disposal of actively hazardous materials. In addition, the transport of the aforementioned materials would comply with all applicable regulations and requirements and therefore, would not create a significant hazard to public health.

There are no schools located within 0.25 miles of the project site. The project consists of a commercial use which would not generate hazardous emissions, or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Thus, the project would not result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of a school.

Pertinent information regarding emergency response in the project area vicinity is provided in the County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP) and related documents. The plan is a comprehensive resource document that serves many purposes such as enhancing public awareness, creating a decision tool for management, promoting compliance with state and federal program requirements, enhancing local policies for hazard mitigation capability, and providing inter-jurisdictional coordination. Developed with input from a number of County organizations, local cities and other entities, the Board of Supervisors for the County adopted the revised 2023 MJHMP on February 7, 2023 (County of San Diego 2023). The County General Plan includes information on emergency evacuation in the Mobility and Safety elements, with reference to the Office of Emergency Services Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan (County of San Diego 2022). Specifically, Annex Q (Evacuation) of the plan notes that: "Primary evacuation routes consist of major interstates, highways and prime arterials within San Diego County ... " with 1-5 identified in the project vicinity. The County plan also notes that "Local jurisdictions will work with ... applicable agencies/departments to identify evacuation points and transportation routes." The project is located on a developed parcel in a community that is largely built out with existing major roads that provide a means for emergency evacuation. The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, and adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; therefore, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

This project is in an urbanized area, surrounded by development, and has no interface with wildlands. According to the City of San Diego Official Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), the project site is not located within a VHFHSZ (City of San Diego, 2025). As part of

standard development procedures, the project plans would be submitted to the City for review and approval to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided to and from the project site. The project would be constructed to comply with the California Fire Code and SDMC requirements, and as such, would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfire hazards.

The project site is not located in a 100-year floodplain or hazard zone. There would be no potential impacts related to flood hazards from implementation of the project. The project site is not located in an AIA for local airports and would not present a hazard to air navigation; no impacts would occur.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage

BASASP PEIR

The BASASP area is highly developed with impervious surfaces; therefore, the rate and/or volume of runoff is not likely to be increased by new development. Future development within the BASASP area would be subject to grading and drainage regulations in the SDMC and would be required to adhere to the City's Drainage Design Manual and Storm Water Standards Manual. Therefore, with future development, the volume and rate of overall surface runoff within the BASASP area would be reduced when compared to the existing condition. Thus, Section 5.9 of the BASASP PEIR concludes that impacts related to surface runoff from implementation of the plan would be less than significant. No mitigation was required.

Future development would be subject to grading and drainage regulations in the SDMC and would be required to adhere to the City's Drainage Design Manual and Storm Water Standards Manual. Therefore, with future development, the volume and rate of overall surface runoff within the planning area would be reduced when compared to the existing condition. Thus, the PEIR concludes that impacts to runoff related to development within the BASASP area would be less than significant. No mitigation was required.

Future developments adherence to storm water quality regulations, such as the City's Drainage Design Manual and Storm Water Standards Manual, would ensure that impacts related to water quality would be less than significant. No mitigation was required.

Project

The project site is fully developed and is currently used as a parking lot. It is completely paved with asphalt concrete. The perimeter surrounding Bunker Hill Street is fully developed with sidewalks and existing curbs and gutters. A project-specific Drainage Study was prepared to address site-specific drainage conditions (J&B, 2026; Appendix F). No surface waters are present on the project site or nearby. Surface runoff was subdivided into three

drainage areas with most of the area outflowing towards Bunker Hill Street & the remainder outflowing towards the alley.

The project would comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be utilized and provided for on-site. Implementation of these BMPs would preclude any violations of existing standards and discharge regulations. This will be addressed through the project's Conditions of Approval,

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Noise

BASASP PEIR

According to PEIR Section 5.10, implementation of the BASASP could potentially expose new development to exterior or interior noise levels in excess of the Land Use - Noise Compatibility Guidelines established in the City's Noise Element, which would result in an inconsistency with City standards and a potentially significant noise impact. The PEIR Mitigation Framework includes Mitigation Measure NOI-1 which requires new development to conduct a site-specific acoustical analysis if the project consists of noise sensitive residential receptors which would be exposed to exterior noise levels in excess of the standards contained in the City's Land Use-Noise Compatibility Guidelines. The acoustical analyses would identify site-specific noise reduction measures to ensure that design features are incorporated into the projects to reduce exterior and interior noise levels to acceptable levels. Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure NOI-1, along with compliance with state and local noise control laws, including Section 1207.4 of Title 24, would ensure that impacts related to noise levels which exceed standards would be less than significant for future development.

With regard to permanent increases to existing ambient noise levels, the PEIR concludes that traffic produced during BASASP implementation would increase ambient noise levels by more than 3 CNEL along one roadway segment of Santa Fe Street between Damon Avenue and Balboa Avenue. The future noise environment, however, would be dominated by highway traffic noise, which would overshadow any increased traffic noise on local streets in close proximity to the freeways. Because exterior noise levels along the impacted segment would remain below 65 CN EL, exclusive of freeway noise, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels on this roadway or any other analyzed local roadway. Therefore, the PEIR concluded that traffic noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation was required.

In terms of ground-borne vibration impacts, future development proposed within the screening distances (i.e., 120 to 600 feet) of the tracks along the rail line through the BASASP area and development proposing vibratory construction equipment would require further analysis to determine whether potentially significant impacts to vibration sensitive land uses

would occur. Impacts due to ground-borne vibration could be potentially significant and the PEIR Mitigation Framework includes Mitigation Measures NOI-2 and NOI-3 to reduce vibration-related impacts to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 requires a site-specific vibration study if development is proposed within the Federal Transportation Association (FTA) screening distances related to train activity. Mitigation Measure NOI-3 requires a site-specific vibration study for proposed development that has the potential for construction-related vibration impacts within 200 to 600 feet of vibration-sensitive uses. In both cases, proposed development affected by vibration or producing construction-related vibration would be required to incorporate the measures from the vibration studies into their design or construction operations to reduce vibration impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Section 5.10 of the BASASP PEIR addresses temporary construction noise impacts of future development within the BASASP planning area. Because construction noise attributed to future projects in the BASASP area would be regulated by the SDMC, construction noise impacts due to the implementation of the BASASP would be determined by those projects' conformance to the Noise Ordinance. However, construction activities related to implementation of the BASASP would potentially generate short-term noise levels in excess of 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA) LEQ (12 hour) at adjacent properties. The ability for future projects to conform to the Noise Ordinance cannot be determined at the programmatic level. Noise impacts from construction activity within the BASASP planning area were considered potentially significant. The PEIR Mitigation Framework includes Mitigation Measure NOI-4, which requires future development projects in close proximity to noise sensitive land uses to implement noise reduction measures to minimize short-term noise levels caused by construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant. However, the PEIR concludes that construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable given that ministerial projects would not be required to comply with the PEIR Mitigation Framework.

Project

Sources of ambient noise in the project area consist of vehicle traffic associated with I-5 and Mission Bay Drive and stationary sources associated with nearby commercial uses. Vehicular traffic along I-5 is the dominant source affecting ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. According to noise contours presented in Figure 5.10-2 of the BASASP PEIR, the project site is currently exposed to noise levels of up to 65 CNEL primarily from vehicular travel along Mission Bay Drive. According to noise contours contained in Figure 5.10-3 in the BASASP PEIR, ambient noise along Mission Bay Drive near the project site is not expected to substantially increase by 2035. Table 5.10-5 of the PEIR shows that future noise would increase ambient noise by 0.9 CNEL in the project vicinity. Thus, projected noise levels would remain about 65 CNEL in the future and changes in ambient noise in the project vicinity would not be perceptible (i.e., less than 3 decibels). The changes in ambient noise would not result in significant noise exposure to existing and future noise-sensitive land uses (NSLUs). Therefore, the project would not expose NSLUs in the project area to ambient noise that exceeds the City's noise standards, and impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 from the BASASP would not be required.

The project site is not located within areas identified by the BASASP PEIR as having incompatible noise levels (i.e., greater than 75 CNEL). The primary source of future noise would continue to be 1-5 with its projected noise contours not affecting the project site. The project site is over 640 feet from the western travel lanes of 1-5. Based on this distance, the exterior of the proposed hotel building would be exposed to noise levels between 60 and 65 CNEL due to future vehicular traffic in the project area. Therefore, the construction of the new multi-family residential building would be compatible with residential use with the future noise environment described in the BASASP PEIR and less-than-significant impacts would occur.

As stated above, the project's traffic would contribute to future noise levels but would not be a significant source of vehicular noise due to the low volume of traffic it would produce (i.e., net new 120 ADT; Kimley Horn, 2026, Appendix A) relative to the existing and future traffic volumes anticipated in the project area. The existing regulatory framework and review process for new development in areas exposed to high levels of vehicle traffic noise, in combination with compliance with policies in the General Plan, would ensure that the project would not be exposed to incompatible exterior noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project features a residential use that would produce new stationary noise sources, such as heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC) units in the project area. City policies and regulations would control these noise sources and reduce potential impacts between the project and the nearby land uses. The project would comply with the existing regulatory framework and the City's development review process, which would ensure compliance with applicable noise standards and protect NSLUs in the project area from noise in excess of the required standards.

Construction associated with the project would include demolition of the existing asphalt and concrete; site preparation work; excavation of soil; foundation work; and building construction. These activities would generate temporary construction noises associated with construction equipment and activities. SDMC Section 59.5.0404 contains standards related to hours and days of operation which would prohibit noise levels greater than 75 dBA LEQ (12-hour) at any residential property line. The project site is surrounded by commercial properties and no NSLUs occur in the project area; less than significant construction noise impacts would occur during construction. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-4 from the BASASP PEIR would not be required.

Construction activities associated with the project would have the potential to generate construction vibration, particularly associated with demolition and excavation. The project would not require pile driving to construct the proposed building, nor are there any NSLUs adjacent to the project site; therefore, impacts from construction vibration would be less than significant. In addition, the project does not include components that would generate vibration during long-term operation. Impacts associated with vibration would be less than significant. The project would not be required to implement Mitigation Measures NOI-2 and NOI-3 from the BASASP PEIR.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Paleontological Resources

BASASP PEIR

According to Section 5.11 of the BASASP PEIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources from future ministerial projects within the BASASP planning area would be potentially significant, based on the presence of underlying formational units exhibiting moderate to high potential for the occurrence of sensitive paleontological resources. The PEIR Mitigation Framework includes Mitigation Measure PALEO-1 which requires the implementation of paleontological review and monitoring during construction activities at a project-level and mitigation for the loss of important fossil remains. All future discretionary projects that would occur as a result of the project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, which would reduce project-level paleontological resources impacts associated with future discretionary development to below a level of significance. However, because the Mitigation Framework would not be applied to ministerial projects, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Project

The project site is underlain with alluvium, and old paralic deposits (NOVA, 2023; Appendix C). Alluvium is considered to have a low paleontological sensitivity according to the City's significance thresholds. Old paralic deposits have a high paleontological sensitivity (City of San Diego 2022). The project proposes 41.71 CY of excavation, to a maximum depth of 1.15 FT. Based on the geotechnical report, this excavation would be entirely within the alluvium deposits. The Geotechnical Report indicates that further excavation may be required to address liquefaction risk. The project will be required to comply with Municipal Code Section 142.0151: Paleontological Resources Requirements for Grading Activities for any additional grading.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Population and Housing

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.12 of the BASASP PEIR address potential impacts to population and housing. The displacement of residents related to future development under the BASASP would be temporary in nature, as the overall number of dwelling units in the BASASP area would increase over time and no existing residential areas would be re-designated to non-residential uses. Therefore, the PEIR concludes that impacts related to the displacement of residents would be less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.

In terms of growth inducement, the PEIR indicates that no new or major expansion of infrastructure serving the area is anticipated to occur as a result of implementation of the BASASP. The Specific Plan includes planning, design, and implementation strategies intended to accommodate projected growth within the BASASP planning area, such as housing provision and non-vehicular transportation options. Outside the BASASP area, project-related growth is not expected due to the areas being largely built out. As a result, the PEIR concludes that impacts related to growth inducement would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Project

The project entails the development of a new, 3-story, multi-dwelling unit with 20 units on an existing vacant parking lot. The project would not displace any residential housing units or residential population. The project would not require new or major expansion of infrastructure servicing the area. The project would increase density, housing options, and population within the BASASP area, however, these changes would occur in conjunction with the overall planning goals and policies of the City. The project would bring population directly into an area adjacent to primary transportation and recreational infrastructure in the City, and would be expected to relieve pressure on some City areas without these amenities.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Public Services

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.13 of the BASASP PEIR addresses whether plan growth patterns would result in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered public facilities (including fire protection, police protection, parks or other recreational facilities, schools, or libraries), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. According to the PEIR, there is adequate fire protection available to meet the needs of future development. Thus, no new fire facilities would need to be constructed which could result in physical impacts on the environment. Likewise, no new construction of police facilities which could result in physical changes to the environment would occur as a result of BASASP implementation. The provision of additional parkland to serve the BASASP community could result in a physical impact on the environment which could be significant. However, there are no specific park improvement plans at the time the BASASP was proposed. Also, the construction of new park facilities would be subject to separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. With regard to school facilities, Government Code Section 65995 and Education Code Section 53080 authorize school districts to impose facility mitigation fees on new development to address any increased enrollment that may result. Future development proposals under the BASASP would be required to pay applicable school impact fees prior to

the issuance of building permits. No libraries were proposed in the BASASP; thus, no new construction of library facilities could result in physical changes to the environment were anticipated. Therefore, the PEIR concludes that impacts related to the provision or expansion of public facilities and services would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Project

The project site is in an area served by the Northern Division of the San Diego Police Department. The proposed project would increase demand for police services through the intensification of onsite uses but would implement the planned land use for the property, consistent with the General Plan, BASASP and Pacific Beach Community Plan. As discussed in the PEIR, buildout of the BASASP would not require new construction of police facilities which could result in physical changes to the environment. The project would be subject to applicable Development Impact Fees (DIF) for public facilities financing in accordance with SDMC Section 142.0640 to offset demands.

The project site is in an area served by San Diego Fire-Rescue Department. The project would result in an incremental demand for fire protection and emergency response services. According to the PEIR, no new fire facilities would need to be constructed during buildout of the BASASP which could result in physical impacts on the environment. The project would be subject to payment of DIF to offset demand for new fire protection facilities identified in the community.

The project would increase demand for park facilities through the intensification of onsite uses. Implementation of the BASASP provides policy support for increasing the amount of parkland in the area but does not propose construction of new facilities in an area that is deficient in public park space. New development would be subject to payment of DIF to offset demands for any new parks proposed in the community.

The project could result in incremental demand for school facilities. The project is consistent with the planned land uses for the project site, the development of which was included in population and growth projections analyzed in the BASASP PEIR, and would be required to pay mitigation fees to the applicable school district, consistent with the requirements of Senate Bill 50.

The project could result in incremental demand for library facilities. The project is consistent with the planned land uses for the project site, the development of which was included in population and growth projections analyzed in the BASASP PEIR. As discussed in the PEIR, construction of additional library facilities to meet library service requirements of the Pacific Beach community is not required. New development would be subject to payment of DIF to offset demands for any new library facilities proposed in the community.

In all cases, should new public service facilities be proposed in the project area in the future, their construction would be subject to environmental review pursuant to CEQA at the time of facility design and approval. Less than significant public service impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Public Utilities

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.14 of the BASASP PEIR addresses whether implementation of the plan would result in impacts to public utilities. Based on the findings of the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared for the BASASP, the PEIR concludes that there would be sufficient water supply to serve existing and projected demands of the Specific Plan in normal and dry year forecasts during a 20-year projection. Therefore, impacts water supply would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

With regard to water distribution, wastewater collection, treatment and disposal, stormwater conveyance and communications, systematic improvements to water, wastewater, and storm water facilities throughout the BASASP planning area are expected to be provided as gradual replacement of aging and substandard infrastructure is needed. Upgrades in infrastructure, such as increasing the sizing and replacement of existing water, sewer, and storm water pipelines and mains are an ongoing process, which is administered by the Public Utilities Department (PUD) on a project-by-project basis. Any upgrades to and maintenance of public storm water facilities (or facilities granted and accepted via easement) are administered by the Transportation and Storm Water Department (T&SW) but implemented by private development applicants in accordance with City Council Policy 800-04. The PEIR concludes that impacts associated with modifications to water, sewer, and storm water utilities that could result in physical changes to the environment would be addressed on project-level environmental review. Therefore, impacts associated with infrastructure upgrades would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Future development projects under the BASASP must comply with City ordinances related to solid waste. Discretionary projects resulting in the construction, demolition, and/or renovation of 40,000 SF or more of building space have the potential to generate 60 tons or more of solid waste on a daily basis and would be required to prepare a project-specific Waste Management Plan (WMP). The WMP would address how the project could achieve the 75 percent waste reduction goal and its implementation would be made a condition of approval. Therefore, the PEIR concludes that impacts to solid waste management facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Future development under the BASASP would not result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or other forms of energy during the construction or operation. Energy conservation measures required by applicable energy conservation regulations (e.g., CALGreen) and energy conservation policies included in the BASASP would avoid excessive energy consumption from operations. Short-term and long-term energy impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Project

Water service is provided to the project site by the City's PUD. The project would be serviced by the existing public water supply using new connections. The project would construct a new 3-story, 13,394-square-foot, multi-dwelling unit development with a total of 20 units, consistent with the Community Village land use designation applied to the site in the BASASP and Pacific Beach Community Plan, utilizing a density bonus request via the affordable housing regulations. A project-specific Water Study (Dexter Wilson Engineering 2025: Appendix G) was prepared, and concluded that there would be sufficient water supply to serve existing and projected demands. Furthermore, as discussed above, the WSA for the BASASP determined that there would be sufficient water supply to serve existing and projected demands of the planning area, and future water demands within the PUD's service area in normal and dry year forecasts during a 20-year projection. Although the new residential units would increase demand for water as compared to the existing parking lot, building code regulations would serve to ensure water-efficient fixtures are installed with the project and its demand for water is minimized. Therefore, the project would not use excessive amounts of water beyond available supplies. Impacts would be less than significant consistent with the BASASP PEIR.

Regarding water and wastewater infrastructure, the project site is located in an urbanized area where existing water and wastewater service is provided. Based on the project's Water Study, new water service connections to an existing public water main in Bunker Hill Street would be constructed on site for domestic water and irrigation water (Dexter Wilson Engineering 2025: Appendix G). The necessary infrastructure improvements to wastewater and water infrastructure are required as part of the project approval process and would occur within developed areas with no potential for significant environmental impacts associated with the construction of utility infrastructure. The project would maintain or improve the existing system in adherence with sewer and water regulations and conformance with the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant consistent with the BASASP PEIR.

Given the developed nature of the project site and surrounding area and the number of private communication systems providers available to serve the project area, there is capacity to provide communications systems services to the project site. The project would not require new or expanded off-site facilities that would result in potentially significant environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant consistent with the BASASP PEIR.

The project would not significantly alter the drainage pattern of the project site or area (refer to the Hydrology discussion). The project would connect with the existing storm drain system, with runoff following the same flow directions as the existing condition. Surface runoff is divided into three drainage areas with most of the area outflowing towards bunker hill street & the remainder outflowing towards the alley. The post developed condition is very similar to the existing condition. Downstream adjacent properties will not be affected by this development. The project would be conditioned to comply with the City's Storm Water Regulations during and after construction. The project would not require new or expanded off-site facilities. Impacts would be less than significant consistent with the BASASP PEIR.

The project would connect to existing communication systems in the project area and would not require new or expanded off-site facilities that would result in potentially significant environmental impacts. Project impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the BASASP PEIR.

The project does not involve the construction, demolition, and/or renovation of 40,000 SF or more of building space. Pursuant to the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, the project is not likely to generate approximately 60 tons of waste or more during construction and/or operation. The project would also comply with the City's ordinances related to the storage, diversion and recycling of waste and would not affect the City's ability to achieve its waste reduction goals and help preserve solid waste capacity. Direct and cumulative project impacts on solid waste management would be less than significant consistent with the BASASP PEIR.

As discussed in the BASASP PEIR, future development pursuant to the Specific Plan would not result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or other forms of energy during the construction. Similarly, energy conservation measures required by applicable energy conservation regulations (e.g., CALGreen) and energy conservation policies included in the BASASP would avoid excessive energy consumption from operations associated with future development, including the project. Less-than-significant impacts would occur.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Transportation / Circulation

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.15 of the BASASP PEIR addresses potential impacts to alternative transportation modes and conflicts with plans and policies supporting alternative transportation modes and systems. All recommended pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-related improvements contained in the BASASP would improve alternative transportation connectivity and accessibility within the Specific Plan Area. Facilities planned as part of the BASASP would increase, rather than decrease, the percent of alternative mode trips in the City's transportation system. Project effects on pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, and rail and bus facilities, therefore, would be beneficial to and increase trips on alternative transportation systems. The PEIR concludes that less-than-significant impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

All recommended transit improvements would create new/enhanced alternative transportation opportunities within the BASASP. All recommendations also would improve alternative transportation connectivity and accessibility which would be beneficial and implement the policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation modes rather than conflicting with them. BASASP implementation would not substantially adversely impact planned alternative transportation mode systems and would not result in adverse

impacts to policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation modes. No mitigation is required.

With regard to vehicular traffic circulation, traffic generated by the implementation of the BASASP would result in cumulatively significant level of service impacts to eleven roadway segments, five intersections, four freeway segments and two metered freeway ramp locations in the study area. Impact reduction would occur through the identification of necessary roadway, intersection, and freeway improvements to be carried out at a project level. The PEIR Mitigation Framework identifies the required improvement to address these impacts. While Mitigation Measures TRANS 5.15-1 through TRANS 5.15-4, which require the widening of the impacted roadway segments, were identified in the PEIR to reduce potentially significant impacts to roadway segments; none of the measures were incorporated into the BASASP. With regard to intersections, Mitigation Measures TRANS 5.15-5, TRANS 5.15-6, TRANS 5.15-7, and -TRANS 5.15-9 identify various traffic signal and intersection improvements to mitigate the intersection impacts to a less than significant level and have therefore been incorporated into the Specific Plan as SDRs. No mitigation measures are identified for BASASP impacts to freeways because freeway improvements are not within the authority of the City. However, freeway mainline improvements identified in SANDAG's Regional Plan are contained in Mitigation Measure TRANS 5.15-10 in the PEIR Mitigation Framework. The PEIR Mitigation Framework also includes Mitigation Measure TRANS 5.15-11 to address ramp capacity at the impacted on-ramp locations, which includes the construction of additional lanes, interchange reconfigurations and other capacity improvements.

Because none of the roadway segment measures were considered feasible due to the impact on the adjacent development and cost of right-of-way acquisition, the PEIR concludes that roadway segment impacts along Garnet Avenue, Balboa Avenue, Mission Bay Drive, and Clairemont Drive of the BASASP would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of recommended improvements in the BASASP EIR were incorporated into the Specific Plan and would reduce impacts at the intersections of Mission Bay Drive/Damon Avenue, Mission Bay Drive/Garnet Avenue, Balboa Avenue/Garnet Avenue East of 1-5, Mission Bay Drive/Grand Avenue, Balboa Avenue/Morena Boulevard, and Morena Boulevard/Jutland Drive to less-than-significant levels except at the intersection of Balboa Avenue at Clairemont Drive, which would remain significant and unavoidable upon implementation of the BASASP due to the infeasibility of the recommended improvements.

Project

At the time the BASASP PEIR was certified, which became effective in September 2019 (outside the Coastal Zone) and in December 2021 within the Coastal Zone, CEQA required a transportation analysis to evaluate impacts based on traffic load and capacity of the street system using a level of service (LOS) standard. Subsequently, CEQA was revised and updated to prohibit use of LOS as the measure of the significance for transportation/circulation impacts. CEQA now requires the evaluation of transportation/circulation impacts using the metric of VMT, with the intent to better align CEQA practices with statewide sustainability goals related to efficient land use, greater multimodal choices, and GHG reductions, which updated how transportation impacts are evaluated under CEQA. Currently, the City's CEQA Guidelines require examination of whether a project would result in VMT exceeding

thresholds identified in the City's Transportation Study Manual (TSM; City of San Diego current version dated 2022). The project would be expected to generate approximately 120 average daily trips (ADT) with 10 AM (2 in, 8 out) peak-hour weekday trips and 11 PM (8 in, 3 out) peak-hour weekday trips. This is at a rate of 6 trips/ dwelling unit for Multiple Dwelling Units (Over 20 dwelling units/acre) for the 20 dwelling units per the City of San Diego Trip Generation Manual (May 2003). Since the project's expected ADT is under 1,000 ADT, and is consistent with the Community Plan/Zoning Designation, the project is screened out of preparing a Local Mobility Analysis per the City's Transportation Study Manual.

Pursuant to the Specific Plan, projects are to be reviewed for conformance with General Plan policies, Specific Plan policies and Supplemental Development Regulations (SDRs), and all other applicable regulations including base zones and overlay zone development regulations. To demonstrate compliance with SDR-5 (Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramps) and SDR-6 (Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive) in the BASASP, a project-level Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis was conducted (Kimley-Horn, 2026; Appendix A). Turning movement counts were collected at both SDR intersections during typical peak hour conditions to address the peak hour warrant in accordance with Council Policy 200-6. To address the remaining seven warrants at the two intersection locations, signal warrant worksheets were prepared. In addition, trip generation, distribution, and assignments were prepared to determine how project traffic would access the surrounding roadway network and to identify the number of project trips that would reach the two SDR study intersections.

The project's Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis conducted a comprehensive analysis at both SDR intersections, including all eight signal warrants, in accordance with Part 4 of the California MUTCD (refer to Attachment B of Appendix A for warrant worksheets). The analysis determined that project generated traffic would meet three of the nine signal warrants at SDR-5 (Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramps), and signal warrant 5 and 9 are not applicable to the project. The project would contribute 6 AM peak hour trips and 2 PM peak hour trips to the Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramp intersection. The analysis further determined that three of the nine signal warrants would be met at SDR-6 (Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive), and signal warrant 5 and 9 are not applicable to the project. The project would contribute 0 AM peak hour trips and 0 PM peak hour trips to the Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive intersection, based on 0.5 percent of peak trips out plus 1 percent of peak hour trips in during each peak hour.

Based on the Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis, project traffic would contribute up to 0.12 percent of the peak hour traffic utilizing the Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramp intersection and no traffic at the Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive intersection. The project would implement mobility improvements in a TPA, as envisioned in the BASASP. Payment of its fair share contribution to the cost of the Balboa Avenue/Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramp partial signal specified in SDR-5 as a condition of approval would comply with the intent of the BASASP. No land use plan or policy consistency impacts would occur.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major

change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

BASASP PEIR

Section 5.16 of the BASASP PEIR addresses potential impacts to public views, neighborhood character, and natural landforms. With regard to impacts to public views, no designated scenic roadways are located within the BASASP nor is the planning area within the viewshed of a scenic roadway outside the BASASP area. Similarly, no scenic sites are identified in either the Pacific Beach Community Plan/LCP or the Clairemont Mesa Community Plan. The BASASP modified the land use designations and zoning within the Pacific Beach community and established urban design policies and supplemental development regulations for lands designated Community Village. The only public viewing area adjacent to and within the BASASP area that contains a public resource is the Rose Creek open space, which has urban development fully built up to its edge. Although proximate to Mission Bay Park, park use areas are separated from the BASASP area by intervening uses, and accompanying views are focused southwesterly toward the bay (rather than toward the BASASP area to the north and east). The PEIR concludes that the implementation of the BASASP would not substantially alter or block public views from public viewing areas within the BASASP area. Therefore, impact levels would range from no impact to less than significant; no mitigation is required.

With regard to neighborhood character, the land use plan, policies, and recommended mobility enhancements of the BASASP, along with implementation of the LDC, would provide for a more unified visual character than currently exists, while not affecting the more consistent neighborhoods to the north, west, east or south. Proposed gateways in the BASASP would provide additional visual landmarks to enhance the overall visual quality and perception of the BASASP planning area. Although development intensity would increase, the project's land use and urban design policies would ensure that implementation of the BASASP would not negatively and substantially alter the character of the neighborhood. The PEIR concludes that less-than-significant impacts to neighborhood character would occur and no mitigation is required.

Potential landform alteration impacts would be less than significant because future development would mostly occur within the generally level portion of the BASASP area that is already developed, and such future development activities would not substantially alter existing natural landforms. Impacts related to landform alteration would be less than significant; no mitigation is required.

Project

The project would construct a new, three-story, 20-unit multi-dwelling unit on a site that is zoned Community-Commercial (CC-3-9) and designated for Multiple Use in the General Plan and Community Village (0-109 DU/AC) in the BASASP and Pacific Beach Community Plan. Pursuant to the Specific Plan, projects are to be reviewed for conformance with General Plan policies, Specific Plan policies and Supplemental Development Regulations (SDRs), and all other applicable regulations including base zones and overlay zone development

regulations. The project would comply with the development regulations of the CC-3-9 zone and the applicable overlay zones (i.e., Coastal Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Overlay Zone, and Transit Area Overlay Zone) in terms of setbacks, building heights, massing, floor area ratio, landscape treatments, among other requirements. The project would not have any impacts on designated view corridors nor substantially alter or block public views from public viewing areas within the BASASP area.

The project would comply with all applicable regulations and policies pertaining to visual character contained within the LDC and BASASP. The Urban Design policies of the BASASP encourage buildings to front directly onto and orient toward the public street, avoiding blank walls and encouraging active frontage elements to enliven the streetscape. The policies encourage enhanced building materials, textures and detailing at the ground level and into the building features using plane changes, entries and corners. Downward facing shielded pedestrian lighting along building frontages is also encouraged. Building massing and articulation policies, as well as structured parking placement below structures, are contained in the BASASP in order to produce development that has visual interest and pedestrian-oriented development along the public realm.

The project would front directly onto and orient towards a public street, and would promote active residential street frontages by designing ground-floor units with living space that fronts the street and provides direct access from the street in an area not identified as active commercial frontage. The project meets the intent of the building design policies in the Balboa Specific Plan. The project's building design includes a variation of recessed areas that incorporate balconies, additional setbacks, and terraces that front the public street. The ground floor is incorporated into the design, where access is fronted toward the public right-of-way. The project design integrates the policy intent of the Urban Design policies of the BASASP. Therefore, the project would not negatively and substantially alter the character of the neighborhood.

The project's landform alteration impacts would be less than significant given the developed nature and the generally level topography of the existing site. No natural landforms would be modified by the project.

Overall, based on the foregoing analysis and information, the project is within the scope of the analysis of the PEIR, and there is no evidence that the project would require a major change to the PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant impact, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of impacts from that described in the PEIR.

VII. SIGNIFICANT UNMITIGATED IMPACTS

The BASASP PEIR identifies significant impacts that would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Noise, and Paleontological Resources. The PEIR identifies significant and unmitigated impacts related to Air Quality, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources, Noise (vibration and construction), Paleontological Resources (ministerial development), and Transportation/Circulation (roadway and freeways). The PEIR identifies also significant unmitigated cumulative impacts related to Air Quality,

Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Transportation/Circulation. The Direct (D) and Cumulative (C) impacts are noted below:

- Significant but Mitigated Impacts:
 - Air Quality: Sensitive Receptors (D/C)
 - Air Quality: Odors (D/C)
 - Biological Resources: Sensitive Species (D)
 - Biological Resources: Sensitive Habitats (D)
 - Noise: Compatibility with Noise Guidelines (D)
 - Paleontological Resources: Discretionary Projects (D)
- Significant and Unavoidable Impacts:
 - Air Quality: Regional Air Quality Plan (D/C)
 - Air Quality: Air Quality Standards (D/C)
 - Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources: Historic Structures, and Objects (D/C)
 - Historical Resources: Archaeological, Sacred Sites, Human Remains (D/C)
 - Historical Resources: Tribal Cultural Resources (D/C)
 - Noise: Vibration-Construction (D)
 - Noise: Construction (D)
 - Paleontological Resources: Ministerial Projects (D/C)
 - Transportation/Circulation: Roadway Segments (D/C)
 - Transportation/Circulation: Intersections (D/C)
 - Transportation/Circulation: Freeway Segments (D/C)
 - Transportation/Circulation: Ramp Meters (D/C)

REFERENCES

- BFS Environmental Services. 2025. *Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for the Bunker Hill APNs 424-321-03 and -04 Project*. October 23, 2025.
- City of San Diego. 2025. *Official Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone*. Accessed April 24, 2025. <https://www.sandiego.gov/fire/community-risk-reduction/fire-hazard-severity-zones>.
- City of San Diego. 2021. *Balboa Avenue Station Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report No. 586601, SCH No. 2017071007*. May.
- City of San Diego. 2022a. *Transportation Study Manual*. September 19.
- City of San Diego. 2022b. *California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds*. September.
- County of San Diego. 2023. *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan*. February.
- County of San Diego. 2022. *Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan*.
- Dexter Wilson Engineering. 2025. *Water Service Analysis for the Bunker Hill Revere Phase 2 Project in the City of San Diego*. July 9, 2025.
- J&B Engineers, Surveyors. 2026. *Hydrology Study for Bunker Hill 3-Story Building*. July 7, 2026.
- Kimley-Horn & Associates. 2026. *Bunker Hill Apartments (Site 2) Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis for Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard Northbound Ramp, Morena Boulevard and Jutland Drive (PRJ-1132845)*. April 13, 2026.
- Ldn Consulting, Inc. 2026. *Bunker Hill Lofts Mixed-Use Residential Development (APNs 424-321-03 and 424-321-04) Air Quality Screening Letter – City of San Diego, California*. June 1, 2026.
- NOVA Services. 2023. *Geotechnical Investigation Bunker Hill Multi-Dwelling Units APNs 424-321-03 and 424-321-04 Bunker Hill Street San Diego, CA 92109*. July 7, 2023.
- San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. 2022. *2022 Regional Air Quality Strategy*.
- Verdantas. 2025. *Assumption of Geotechnical Engineer of Record and Geotechnical Update Bunker Hill Multi-Dwelling Units*. September 3, 2025.
- Weis Environmental, LLC. 2022. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Southeast Corner of Mission Bay Drive and Bunker Hill Street, San Diego, California 92109*. October 1, 2022.