



The County of San Diego

Zoning Administrator Hearing Report

Date:	May 13, 2021	Case/File No.:	Spring Valley Shopping Center; PDS2019-STP-97-050W3, PDS2020-AD-20-002, PDS2020-BC-20-0026; PDS2019-ER-19-18-006
Place:	No in Person Attendance Allowed – Teleconference Only – County Conference Center 5520 Overland Avenue San Diego, CA 92123	Project:	Site Plan Modification, Administrative Permit for Shared Parking and a Boundary Adjustment
Time:	8:30 a.m.	Location:	935 Sweetwater Road, Spring Valley
Agenda Item:	#2	General Plan:	General Commercial (C-1)
Appeal Status:	Appealable to the Planning Commission	Zoning:	General Commercial (C36)
Applicant/Owner:	John Zeibarth / Jamacha Sweetwater, LLC	Community:	Spring Valley Community Plan Area
Environmental:	CEQA §15183 Exemption	APNs:	584-511-16-00, 584-511-18-00, 584-511-19-00, 584-511-20-00

A. OVERVIEW

The purpose of this staff report is to provide the Zoning Administrator with the information necessary to make a finding that the mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPU EIR) will be undertaken for a proposed Site Plan Modification, Administrative Permit and Boundary Adjustment project pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15183(e)(2).

CEQA Guidelines §15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for projects that are consistent with the uses established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified. CEQA Guidelines §15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that:

- 1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent;
- 2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action; or
- 3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

CEQA Guidelines §15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

CEQA Guidelines §15183(e)(2) further requires the lead agency to make a finding at a public hearing when significant impacts are identified that could be mitigated by undertaking mitigation measures previously identified in the EIR on the planning and zoning action.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project was evaluated to examine whether additional environmental review might be necessary for the reasons stated in §15183. As discussed in the attached Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist (15183 Findings) dated March 25, 2021, the project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review.

The approval or denial of the proposed Site Plan Modification, Administrative Permit and Boundary Adjustment will be a subsequent and separate decision made by the Director of PDS.

B. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

1. Project Description

The Spring Valley Shopping Center project (Project) is a Site Plan Modification, Administrative Permit for Shared Parking and a Boundary Adjustment. The 12.71-acre Project site (APNs: 584-511-16-00, 584-511-18-00, 584-511-19-00, 584-511-20-00) is located at 935 Sweetwater Road in the Spring Valley Community Plan area, within unincorporated San Diego County. The Project site contains an existing shopping center with the following existing components; a 94,749 square-foot building with three retail tenants, a 37,800 square-foot building with a single retail tenant, a 3,185 square-foot storage building, a 740-square foot building with a single drive-through restaurant tenant, three freestanding signs and 700 parking spaces.

For the proposed Project the 3,185 square-foot storage building will be demolished and a new 17,400 square-foot structure for a single tenant with drive-through pharmacy window will be constructed (identified as Building D on the site plan), as well as a new 4,500 square-foot structure for multiple tenants, including one drive-through restaurant tenant (identified as Building G on the site plan), and a new 4,490 square-foot structure for a single drive-through restaurant tenant (identified as Building

F on the site plan). Tenant improvements are proposed for the existing 37,800 square-foot building for a new sub-tenant within the building (the new tenant space is identified as Building E.2 on the site plan). Four new trash enclosures are also proposed along with signage for the new tenants. The Project will also widen the existing Jamacha driveway entrance to 36 feet, relocate existing utilities and easements for the construction of Building D, relocate two existing pole lights to accommodate the placement of new Buildings G and F, add two new pole lights next to proposed Building G, and provide new striping on northbound Sweetwater Road.

The Project also consists of a Boundary Adjustment and an Administrative Permit for Shared Parking. The Boundary Adjustment is necessary to adjust the legal lot boundaries of the Project site in order to accommodate the placement of proposed Building F. The Administrative Permit for Shared Parking is necessary to authorize a proposed reduction in parking spaces below what the zoning ordinance requires for the Project site for the existing structures and the addition of the proposed structures. The Spring Valley Shopping Center is classified as a Retail Sales and Services Occupancy Use which has an off-street parking requirement of 4.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA). For this Occupancy Use, total eating, drinking and entertainment uses cannot exceed 15% of a project's GFA. The existing shopping center consists of a total of 133,289 square feet of GFA, with a parking space requirement of 600 total off-street spaces. Currently, 700 off-street spaces exist onsite. The applicant proposes to add 26,390 square feet of structures to the existing shopping center, for a total of 159,679 square feet of GFA. This GFA would require 719 total off-street parking spaces per the zoning ordinance. The applicant proposes a reduction in off-street parking spaces to 4.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) with total eating, drinking and entertainment uses not exceeding 10% of the Project's GFA. This reduction will require the shopping center to provide a minimum total of 639 off-street parking spaces. The applicant proposes a total of 645 off-street parking spaces. The requested parking space reduction to 4.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet equates to 80 less spaces than the zoning ordinance requires while the Project plans indicate the actual proposed space reduction to 645 spaces equates to 74 less spaces than the zoning ordinance requires. If the Project is approved, a Shared Parking Agreement will be recorded with the Administrative Permit.

Access to the Project site will continue to be provided by existing commercial driveways connected to Sweetwater Road, Jamacha Road and Saint George Street. Water will continue to be imported from the Helix Water District and sewer services will continue to be provided by the San Diego County Sanitation District. Proposed earthwork quantities for the Project consist of 970 cubic yards of cut, 530 cubic yards of fill and the export of 340 cubic yards of material.

The Project is subject to the Village General Plan Regional Category and the General Commercial Land Use Designation. Zoning for the site is General Commercial (C36) with a "B" Special Area Designator for Community Design Review. The proposed use is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan Land Use Designation of the property established by the General Plan Update for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified by the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2011 (GPU EIR).




Figure 1: Vicinity Map




Figure 2: Aerial Map (Project Site, Existing Conditions)

C. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

1. Key Requirements for Requested Action

The Zoning Administrator should consider the requested actions and determine if the following findings can be made:

- a) The project is consistent with the existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which the GPU EIR was certified.
- b) There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site.
- c) There are no project specific impacts which the GPU EIR failed to analyze as significant effects.
- d) There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.
- e) There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

2. Project Analysis

- a. Air Quality – The Project consists of the construction of three new buildings on the site of an existing shopping center, along with the creation of one new sub-tenant space within one of the existing onsite tenant spaces onsite. The Project site is located along Jamacha Road and Sweetwater Road, which are both classified as Major Roads, and is adjacent to lands zoned for commercial and residential uses.

Criteria pollutant emissions from the Project site are generated from construction activities for the Project and during operations of the Project. An Air Quality Technical Report was prepared for the Project by Helix Environmental Planning dated March 2021. This report indicates that with the implementation of construction Best Management Practices, air pollutant emissions impacts associated with Project construction will be less than significant. Operational emissions for the Project will be associated with vehicle trips generated by the development, onsite energy consumption, and area sources such as landscaping. Based on an evaluation of air emissions, the Air Quality Technical Report states that Project emissions will be below the screening-level thresholds for all criteria pollutants and will be less than significant for air quality. The Air Quality Technical Report also states the Project will not result in any cumulatively considerable emissions of nonattainment air pollutants that will exceed the screening level thresholds, that impacts associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations will be less than significant and that an evaluation of odors from general Project construction and operation of the Project indicates that odor impacts will be less than significant.

As the proposed Project will have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project will be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it will not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- b. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – A Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report was prepared for the Project by Helix Environmental Planning dated March 2021. This report indicates that the Project will generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction and operation, and the report provides estimates of the emissions and an evaluation of their level of significance.

GHG emissions will be associated with the construction phases of the Project through use of off-road heavy equipment, haul trucks, and vehicle trips from construction worker commutes. Emissions of GHGs related to the construction of the Project will be temporary over an approximately 10-month timeframe. Total GHG emissions associated with construction of the Project, are estimated at 125 MT CO₂e. For construction emissions, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) guidance recommends that the emissions be amortized (i.e., averaged) over 30 years and added to operational emissions. Averaged over 30 years, the proposed construction activities will contribute approximately 4 MT CO₂e emissions per year.

Operational sources of GHG emissions include: (1) energy use (electricity and natural gas); (2) area sources (landscaping equipment and consumer products); (3) vehicle use; (4) solid waste generation; and (5) water conveyance and treatment. Operational emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. The model estimates emissions from vehicle and stationary sources of pollutants. CalEEMod default motor vehicle emission rates are based on the California Air

Resources Board's (CARB's) state-wide emission factors for the County region, which are incorporated into CalEEMod. The SAFE Vehicles Rule adjustment factors provided by CARB were applied to the emission factors in the model to account for anticipated increased emissions. Default vehicle speeds, trip lengths, trip purpose, and trip type percentages for the Project's proposed buildings were used. Trip generation for each land use was based on the Local Mobility Analysis prepared for the Project by Mizuta Traffic Consulting dated January 2021. As detailed in the Local Mobility Analysis, the Project will result in 1,539 new average daily trips (ADT). With implementation of the Project design features, which include water and waste reduction required for the new structures, and addition of the amortized construction emissions, the Project will result in GHG emissions estimated to be 2,049 MT CO₂e per year. Vehicular sources are modeled to be the Project's largest contributor of operational GHG emissions. The emissions estimate, however, is extremely conservative in that it assumes the Project will generate new vehicular trips that will not otherwise occur, but the Project will not necessarily generate new trips. Future customers of the Project will utilize other existing retail/service uses similar to what the Project is proposing, regardless of whether the Project gets developed or not. Rather than generating new trips, the Project is anticipated to reroute existing trips from other retail/service uses and will not create a new source of GHG emissions. Also, the Project is locally serving and is located in a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) efficient area, providing a local option for commercial retail uses in proximity to residential development. The Project's average VMT per Service Population is 29.31, which is below the average VMT threshold of 31.90. The Project is anticipated to result in an overall decrease in regional VMT and will therefore contribute to reducing regional GHG emissions in the category that accounts for a large percentage of regional GHG emissions.

Lastly, the Project is consistent with the County's General Plan land use designation for the site of General Commercial. The Project will result in an approximately 20% increase in square footage from the existing commercial development within the shopping center. Trips will be similar to those existing from the current commercial uses and will not result in a substantial increase in trips over the current baseline. Also, because the Project is proposing development consistent with the General Plan, it is correspondingly consistent with the SANDAG Regional Plan and its goals for reducing GHG emissions on a regional level.

- c. Noise – A Noise Analysis was prepared for the Project by Helix Environmental Planning dated January 11, 2021. This analysis indicates that noise sources are generated from construction activities for the Project and during operations of the Project. Construction activity will take place on three pads within the existing shopping center site and will involve demolition, grading, installation of utilities, construction of new buildings and paving. Per the analysis, construction equipment will not all operate at the same time or location and will not be in constant use during the 8-hour operating day. The combined use of an excavator, loader, and dump truck were analyzed together due to their likelihood of being used in conjunction with one another; this equipment and will generate noise levels of 71.9 dBA. These noise levels will not exceed the 75 dBA (8-hour) construction noise limits.

Operational noise generated by the Project will not exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the Project's property line. The Project site as well as surrounding parcels to the north, northeast, and west are zoned commercial, which are subject to the noise limits of 60 dBA

daytime and 55 dBA nighttime. The parcels to the south and southeast are zoned Single-Family Residential (RS), which are subject to the noise limits of 55 dBA daytime and 50 dBA nighttime. The main source of operational noise from the Project will be from the drive-thru speaker associated with Building F, which is the closest proposed new building to the residential parcels to the south and southeast of the Project site. Based on the noise analysis, the maximum sound level pressure from the proposed drive-thru speaker is 54 dBA at 32 feet. The speaker will operate at approximately 12 minutes per hour, which reduces the noise levels to 47 dBA. The nearest Noise Sensitive Land Use property line is over 95 feet away from the equipment. In addition, there is an existing wall along the southern edge of the Project site, which will provide further noise attenuation. Based on the distance separation, usage factor, and existing wall, the noise levels from the drive-thru speaker for Building F will not generate noise levels exceeding the nighttime property line noise limit of 50 dBA at the residential parcels to the south and the speaker will be in compliance with Section 36.404 of the Noise Ordinance.

The GPU EIR determined impacts to excessive noise levels as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project will have less-than-significant impacts with the incorporation of Project conditions discussed in the GPU EIR, the Project will be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it will not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- d. Traffic – The County of San Diego Transportation Study Guidelines were adopted by the County Board of Supervisors on June 24, 2020 to address Senate Bill 743. The newly established criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts is Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel associated with a Project. The Project consists of the construction of 26,390 square feet of new retail and restaurant space. In accordance with the adopted Transportation Study Guidelines the Project meets the CEQA VMT screening criteria of a locally serving commercial use that is less than 50,000 square feet. The Project site is also located in a VMT efficient area. Therefore, the Project will not result in a significant VMT impact.

A Local Mobility Analysis (LMA) is the tool utilized by the Transportation Study Guidelines to assess projects impacts to Level of Service (LOS). The Transportation Study Guidelines have adopted thresholds for determining when a project must prepare a Local Mobility Analysis based on project type and number of trips. The Project is consistent with the County General Plan and will result in more than 250 Average Daily Trips (ADT) based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation rates. In accordance with the Transportation Study Guidelines, a LMA was required for the Project. The LMA prepared for the Project by Mizuta Traffic Consultants dated January 2021 evaluated potential improvements required for the Project in accordance with the adopted Transportation Study Guidelines and County Public Road Standards. The LMA determined that, after applying reduction credits for transit and pass-by trips, the Project is forecasted to generate a total of 1,539 daily trips with 69 morning peak-hour trips and 138 evening peak-hour trips. All intersections in the study area, including the Project driveways, are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the peak-hours and will not be impacted. The Project will restripe the South Project Driveway along Sweetwater Road to include an exclusive lane for left-turning and right-turning vehicles exiting the site.

In addition, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program creates a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. The potential growth represented by this Project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. The TIF measures was identified by the GPU EIR as Tra-1.7.

The GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards. However, the Project will have a less than significant impact to County traffic and LOS standards as well as VMT with the incorporation of mitigation as detailed above. The mitigation measures were identified in the GPU EIR as Tra-1.7. In addition, the Project will not conflict with SB 743 because it is considered less than 50,000 square feet of a locally serving commercial or retail use and is below the County's adopted VMT threshold. Therefore, the Project will be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it will not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- e. Parking – Although not required for CEQA analysis, a Parking Demand Study was prepared for the Project by Mizuta Traffic Consultants dated January 6, 2021. This study conducted a parking survey at two shopping centers within 6.5 miles of the Project site which have a similar land use and tenant mix as the Project site proposes to offer. The selected shopping centers include the Rancho San Diego Town & Country Shopping Center in Rancho San Diego and the Gateway Marketplace in Chula Vista (similar sites). This study states that the peak parking ratio of the two similar sites was 2.66 parking spaces utilized per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA). The study further states that when applying a seasonal adjustment for increased parking space demand during the month of December, the peak parking ratio of the two similar sites was 3.59 parking spaces utilized per 1,000 square feet of GFA, which is less than the applicant's proposal of 4.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of GFA. The study concludes that the Project will provide a minimum of 639 parking spaces, which equates to 4.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet of GFA and which contains 66 parking spaces in excess of the amount of parking spaces needed to meet the seasonally adjusted peak parking demand for the Project site.

D. PUBLIC INPUT

During the 30-day public disclosure period from March 25, 2021 through April 24, 2021 no public comments were received.

E. SPRING VALLEY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

The Spring Valley Community Planning Group (CPG) heard the Project at three separate meetings in 2020; at the March 10, 2020 meeting, at the June 9, 2020 meeting and at the September 22, 2020 meeting. At the March 10, 2020 meeting the CPG made three separate motions. The first motion recommended to approve the site plan as presented, not including signage nor utility poles (which were separate motions). This motion passed with a vote of 12-0-0-3 (Ayes – 12, Noes – 0, Abstain – 0, Absent – 3). The second motion recommended to exempt the property from undergrounding any other electric utilities. This motion passed with a vote of 11-1-0-3 (Ayes – 11, Noes – 1, Abstain – 0, Absent – 3). The

third motion made recommendations regarding the signage proposed for Buildings D, E.2, G and F. This motion passed with a vote of 11-1-0-3 (Ayes – 11, Noes – 1, Abstain – 0, Absent – 3) and the signage recommendations were addressed by the applicant in the next submittal of the Project.

Due to proposed signage changes to Building F from what was originally presented at the CPG meeting in March, the applicant returned to the CPG at their June 9, 2020 meeting. At this meeting the CPG made a motion with recommendations regarding the proposed signage for Building F. This motion passed with a vote of 10-3-0-2 (Ayes – 10, Noes – 3, Abstain – 0, Absent – 2) and the signage recommendations were addressed by the applicant in the next submittal of the Project.

Due to signage changes to Building G from what was originally presented at the CPG meeting in March, the applicant returned to the CPG at their September 22, 2020 meeting. At this meeting the CPG made a motion to approve the signage as presented for Building G. This motion passed with a vote of 10-0-1-4 (Ayes – 10, Noes – 0, Abstain – 1, Absent – 4).

The CPG meeting minutes for all three meetings are included in Attachment D.

F. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Zoning Administrator adopt the Environmental Findings included in Attachment B, which includes a finding that the Project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to §15183 of CEQA.

Report Prepared By:

John Leavitt, Project Manager
858-495-5448


John.Leavitt@sdcounty.ca.gov

Report Approved By:

Kathleen Flannery, Acting Director
858-495-5484

Kathleen.Flannery@sdcounty.ca.gov

AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: _____



ASHLEY SMITH, CHIEF

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Planning Documentation


Attachment B – Environmental Documentation

Attachment C – Site Plan, Conceptual Landscape Plan, Preliminary Grading Plan, Administrative Permit
Plot Plan, Boundary Adjustment Plat


Attachment D – Public Documentation

Attachment A
Planning Documentation

Spring Valley
Shopping Center
PDS2019-STP-97-050W3
Vicinity Map
Spring Valley
Community Plan Area



1:3,500,000





Date: 4/12/2021
Path: P:\reg2019-STP-97-050W3_10hTry_041221vicinity.mxd




Spring Valley
Shopping Center
PDS2019-STP-97-050W3

General Plan
Spring Valley
Community Plan Area

- (2) Village Residential (VR-24)
- (3) Village Residential (VR-15)
- (4) Village Residential (VR-10.9)
- (5) Village Residential (VR-7.3)
- (6) Village Residential (VR-4.3)
- (25) General Commercial
- (28) Limited Impact Industrial
- (32) Public/Semi-Public Facilities
- (35) Medium Impact Industrial
- (36) Open Space (Recreation)
- (40) Village Residential (VR-20)



Date: 4/12/2021
Path: P:\reg2019-STP-97-050W3_10hTry_041221\plan.mxd




Spring Valley
Shopping Center
PDS2019-STP-97-050W3


Zoning


Spring Valley
Community Plan Area


- C36 - General Commercial
- C37 - Heavy Commercial
- M52 - Limited Impact Industrial
- M54 - General Impact Industrial
- RM - Multi Family Residential
- RS - Single Family Residential
- RU - Urban Residential
- RV - Variable Family Residential
- S80 - Open Space
- S94 - Transportation/Utility Corridor



Date: 4/12/2021
Path: P:\reg2019-STP-97-050W3_10hTry_041221\zoning.mxd







Attachment B
Environmental Documentation

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS

SPRING VALLEY SHOPPING CENTER

PDS2019-STP-97-050W3, PDS2020-AD-20-002, PDS2020-BC-20-0026, PDS2019-ER-19-18-006

May 13, 2021

1. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15183, find the project is exempt from further environmental review for the reasons stated in the 15183 Statement of Reasons dated March 25, 2021 because the project is consistent with the General Plan for which an environmental impact report dated August 2011 on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number 02-ZA-001 (GPU EIR) was certified, there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, there are no project impacts which the GPU EIR failed to analyze as significant effects, there are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate, there is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated in the GPU EIR, and that the application of uniformly applied development standards and policies, in addition to feasible mitigation measures included as project conditions would substantially mitigate the effects of the project.
2. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15183(e)2, the Zoning Administrator, at a duly noticed public hearing on May 13, 2021, found that feasible mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update EIR will be undertaken.
3. Find that the proposed project is consistent with the Resource Protection Ordinance (County Code, section 86.601 et seq.).
4. Find that plans and documentation have been prepared for the proposed project that demonstrate that the project complies with the Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (County Code, section 67.801 et seq.).
5. Find that the project is consistent with the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) and the County Subarea Plan and that the project site is considered to be a Tier IV habitat per the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (County Code, section 86.501 et seq.) and is entirely urban/developed and does not support native vegetation as explained in the MSCP Conformance Statement dated February 5, 2021 on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number PDS2019-ER-19-18-006.



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
(858) 505-6445 General
www.SDCPDS.org

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

March 25, 2021

Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183

Project Name: Spring Valley Shopping Center
Project Record Numbers: PDS2019-STP-97-050W3, PDS2020-AD-20-002, PDS2020-BC-20-0026
Environmental Log Number: PDS2019-ER-19-18-006
APN(s): 584-511-16-00, 584-511-18-00, 584-511-19-00, 584-511-20-00

Lead Agency Name and Address:
County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

County Staff Contact:
John Leavitt, Project Manager
(858) 495-5448
john.leavitt@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Location:
The Spring Valley Shopping Center project (Project) is located within the unincorporated Community Planning area of Spring Valley in central San Diego County. The 12.71-acre Project site is located at 935 Sweetwater Road in Spring Valley. The Project site is bordered by Sweetwater Road to the West, Jamacha Road to the North and Saint George Street to the South. Commercial use types are across the street from the Project site to the West and North and are adjacent to the Project site to the Northeast. Residential use types are across the street from the Project site to the South and adjacent to the Project site to the Southeast.

Project Applicant Name and Address:
John Zeibarth
2900 Fourth Avenue #204
San Diego, CA 92103

General Plan

Community Plan: Spring Valley

Regional Category: Village

Land Use Designation: General Commercial

Density: -

Zoning

Use Regulation: General Commercial (C36)

Minimum Lot Size: -

Special Area Regulation: Community Design Review Area (B)

Description of Project

The Project is a Site Plan Modification, Administrative Permit for Shared Parking and a Boundary Adjustment. The Project site contains two legal lots consisting of four parcels (APNs: 584-511-16-00, 584-511-18-00, 584-511-19-00, 584-511-20-00) totaling 12.71 acres and is located at 935 Sweetwater Road, Spring Valley, CA in the Spring Valley Community Plan area, within unincorporated San Diego County. The Project site is subject to the Village General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation General Commercial. Zoning for the site is General Commercial (C36). The Project is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Existing Project Site Description:

The Project site contains an existing shopping center with the following existing structures and features:

- APN 584-511-16-00 has an existing 37,800 square-foot building with a single retail tenant.
- APN 584-511-19-00 has an existing 94,749 square-foot building with three retail tenants and a 3,185 square-foot attached storage building.
- APN 584-511-18-00 has an existing 740-square foot building with a single drive-through restaurant tenant.
- One 35-foot tall Freeway-Oriented Freestanding Sign along Sweetwater Road.
- One 25-foot tall Freestanding Sign along Jamacha Road
- One 19-foot tall Freestanding Sign along Jamacha Road
- 700 Parking Spaces

The Project site currently has driveway access to Sweetwater Road, Jamacha Road and Saint George Street. Water is provided by the Helix Water District and sewer service is provided by the San Diego County Sanitation District.

Proposed Project Description:

The applicant proposes the following improvements to the existing shopping center on the Project site:

- Demolish the existing 3,185-square foot storage building attached to the existing 94,749-square foot building on APN 584-511-19-00, and construct a new 17,400 square-foot structure (Identified as Building D) for a single tenant with drive-through pharmacy window and construct a new trash enclosure at the rear.
- Tenant improvement to the existing 37,800-square foot building on APN 584-511-16-00 for a new sub-tenant (Identified as Building E.2) and construct a new trash enclosure at the rear for the new sub-tenant.
- Construct a new 4,500 square-foot structure (Identified as Building G) along Sweetwater Road for multiple tenants, including one drive-through restaurant tenant, and construct a new trash enclosure in parking lot.

15183 Exemption Checklist

- Construct a new 4,490 square-foot structure (Identified as Building F) at the corner of Sweetwater Road and Saint George Street for a single drive-through restaurant tenant and construct a new trash enclosure in parking lot.
- New wall signage on new Buildings D, G and F. New wall signage for new sub-tenant (Building E.2) on the existing 37,800-square foot building.
- Replace copy of signage on the existing 35-foot tall Freeway-Oriented Freestanding Sign for new sub-tenant in Building E.2 and new tenants in Buildings D, G and F.
- Replace copy of signage on the existing 25-foot tall Freeway-Oriented Freestanding Sign for new sub-tenant in Building E.2 and new tenants in Buildings D, G and F.

The applicant also proposes to widen the existing Jamacha Driveway entrance to 36 feet, relocate existing utilities and easements for the construction of Building D, relocate two (2) existing pole lights to accommodate the placement of new Buildings G and F, add two (2) new pole lights next to proposed Building G, and provide new stripping on northbound Sweetwater Road. The Project site will continue to have driveway access to Sweetwater Road, Jamacha Road and Saint George Street. Water will continue to be provided by the Helix Water District and sewer service will continue to be provided by the San Diego County Sanitation District. Total project earthwork will consist of 970 cubic yards of cut with 530 cubic yards of fill.

The Project also consists of a Boundary Adjustment and an Administrative Permit for Shared Parking. The boundary adjustment is necessary to adjust the legal lot boundaries of the Project site in order to accommodate the placement of proposed Building F. The Administrative Permit for Shared Parking is necessary to authorize a proposed reduction in parking spaces below what the zoning ordinance requires for the Project site for the existing structures and the addition of the proposed structures. The Spring Valley Shopping Center is considered to be a Retail Sales and Services Occupancy Use which has an Off-Street Parking requirement of 4.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA). For this Occupancy Use, total eating, drinking and entertainment uses cannot exceed 15% of a project's GFA. The existing shopping center consists of a total of 133,289 square feet of GFA, with a parking space requirement of 600 total off-street spaces. 700 off-street spaces currently exist onsite. The applicant proposes to add 26,390 square feet of structures to the existing shopping center, for a total of 159,679 square feet of GFA. This GFA would require 719 total off-street parking spaces per the zoning ordinance. The applicant proposes a reduction in off-street parking spaces to 4.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) with total eating, drinking and entertainment uses not exceeding 10% of the project's GFA. This reduction would require the shopping center to provide a minimum total of 639 off-street parking spaces. The applicant proposes a total of 645 off-street parking spaces. The requested parking space reduction to 4.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet equates to 80 less spaces than the zoning ordinance requires while the Project plans indicate the actual proposed space reduction to 645 spaces equates to 74 less spaces than the zoning ordinance requires. If the Project is approved, a Shared Parking Agreement will be recorded with the Administrative Permit.

Discretionary Actions:

The Project consists of a Site Plan Modification, Administrative Permit for Shared Parking and a Boundary Adjustment.

Overview of 15183 Checklist

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not

analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The Spring Valley Shopping Center is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the Project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce Project specific impacts, and the Project implements these mitigation measures (see

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00 -
Mitigation Measures 2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the Project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the Project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

15183 Exemption Checklist

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the Project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

1. **The Project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.**

The Project would result in commercial development within an existing commercial center which is consistent with the General Commercial (C36) Use Regulation, as well as the General Commercial Land Use Designation established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

2. **There are no Project specific effects which are peculiar to the Project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.**

The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area. The Project site is located in an area developed with similar commercial development. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the Project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all Project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. Applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this Project.

3. **There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.**

The Project is consistent with the County Zoning Ordinance and General Plan land use regulations. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the Project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

4. **There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.**

As explained in the 15183 Checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

5. **The Project would undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.**

As explained in the 15183 Checklist below, the Project would undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures would be undertaken through Project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the Project's conditions of approval.

<hr/> Signature <hr/> John Leavitt Printed Name	<hr/> March 25, 2021 Date <hr/> Land Use/ Environmental Planner Title
--	--

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the Project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the Project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the Project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.

Items checked “Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates the Project would result in a Project specific significant impact (peculiar off-site or cumulative that was not identified in the GPU EIR.

Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a Project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A Project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 1(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

As described in the GPU EIR, the County contains visual resources affording opportunities for scenic vistas in every community. Resource Conservation Areas (RCAs) are identified within the GPU EIR and are the closest that the County comes to specifically designating scenic vistas. Many public roads in the County currently have views of RCAs or expanses of natural resources that would have the potential to be considered scenic vistas. Numerous public trails are also available throughout the County. New development can often have the potential to obstruct, interrupt, or detract from a scenic vista.

Project site is located at 935 Sweetwater Road in Spring Valley, within the unincorporated County of San Diego. Sweetwater Road borders the project site to the West, Jamacha Road to the North and Saint George Street to the South. The following resource conservation areas are located in close proximity to the Project site: Sweetwater Resource Conservation Area, located 0.07 miles to the south; Dictionary Hill, located 0.37 miles to the northeast of the project site; and habitat for San Diego Variegated Dudleya and San Diego Ambrosia within a quarter mile of the site. These RCA's are recognized for their biological value and are not further discussed within this response.

The development proposed on the project site would be consistent with surrounding commercial development, and would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Primary viewer groups would include vehicular and pedestrian travelers along Jamacha Road and Sweetwater Road.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on scenic vistas to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 1(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

No Scenic Highways designated by Caltrans are in proximity to the Project site. A portion of State Route (SR) 125 is designated as a Scenic Highway, and this portion is the Scenic Highway in closest proximity to the project site. This designated portion of SR 125 is located 2.5 miles to the north of the project site. Additionally, County Scenic Highway State Routes 94 and Avocado Boulevard are located approximately 2.5 miles north of the project site. No direct views to the Project site are available from the Scenic Highway portion of SR-125, SR-94, or Avocado Boulevard due to constraining intervening topography and distance.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on scenic resources to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 1(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

The Project site is within the village boundary area of the Spring Valley Community Plan. Sweetwater Road borders the project site to the West, Jamacha Road to the North and Saint George Street to the South. The existing visual character and quality of the Project surroundings are characterized by commercial use types across the road to the West and North, and adjacent to the Project site to the Northeast; and residential use types across the road to the South and adjacent to the Project site to the Southeast.

The Project is commercial development within an existing commercial center. The Project within the landscape would not detract from or contrast with existing visual character for the following reasons: the proposed use type is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and would not introduce any visually dominant features which would detract from the visual quality of the site or surrounding area, and the proposed use type is consistent with the existing use types within the surrounding area.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on visual character or quality to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 1(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would use outdoor lighting but is not located within Zone A of the County of San Diego Light Pollution Code (within twenty miles of the Mount Laguna Observatory or the Palomar Observatory). The Project is located within Zone B of the Light Pollution Code (at least twenty miles of the Mount Laguna Observatory or the Palomar Observatory) and would not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations because the Project would be required to conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 51.201-51.209). This would include the utilization of the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights. The Code was developed by the County in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, and other experts to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. Compliance with the Code would be required prior to issuance of a building permit. Thus, the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from light or glare to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Aesthetics, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources			
– Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

2(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) the Project site is classified as "Urban Built-up Land" and does not contain Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local or State Importance. A portion of the site is considered to have Prime Soils, however the site has been paved and developed by the previous commercial uses, and no new disturbance would occur. As such, the soil structure and quality has likely been compromised due to soil compaction from development and grading. Additionally, the Project site does not contain 10 acres or contiguous Prime Farmland or Statewide Importance Soils as defined by the FMMP. Therefore, no potentially significant impact or conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use would occur as a result of this Project.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from direct and indirect conversion of agricultural resources to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to agricultural resources. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 2(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project site is zoned for General Commercial (C36) which allows for commercial land use types by right. No existing agricultural use exists onsite or in the immediate proximity of the Project site. The nearest agricultural preserve is located approximately 6.3 miles northeast of the Project site. The nearest lands under Williamson Act Contract are located approximately 6.3 miles northeast of the Project site. Due to distance, no land-use interface conflicts would occur. Additionally, the Project is commercial development within an existing commercial center, which is compatible with the surrounding land use types. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from land use conflicts to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided in the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 2(c) Forestry Resources were not specifically analyzed under the GPU EIR because Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines was amended to include significance criteria for forestry resources after the release of the Notice of Preparation for the GPU EIR.

The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore Project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. The outer edge of the Cleveland National Forest is located approximately 13 miles to the west of the Project site. Thus, due to distance, the Project would have no impact on the Forest. In addition, the County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones.

As previously discussed, Forestry Resources were not specifically analyzed under the GPU EIR because Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines was amended to include significance criteria for forestry resources after the release of the NOP for the GPU EIR. However, because the project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 2(d) Forestry Resources were not specifically analyzed under the GPU EIR because Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines was amended to include significance criteria for forestry resources after the release of the Notice of Preparation for the GPU EIR. However, as indicated in response 2(c), the Project site, or any off-site improvements, are not located near any forest lands. Therefore, because the project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 2(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. No agricultural operations are currently taking place on the Project site. In addition, no impacts would occur in association with interface conflicts. Please refer to response 2(a) and 2(b) for a discussion on off-site agricultural resources and interface conflicts.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from direct and indirect conversion of agricultural resources (including forest resources) to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact to agricultural

resources. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Agricultural/Forestry Resources, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
3. Air Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

An Air Quality Technical Report was prepared for the Project by Helix Environmental Planning dated March 2021.

- 3(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The 2016 RAQS is based on projections for residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational land uses contained in the current General Plan, adopted in 2011. The General Plan designates the Project site as General Commercial. The RAQS and SIP are based on General Plans within the region and the development assumptions contained within them. The Project proposes commercial development within an existing commercial center consistent with the County

General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. Thus, the Project would not conflict with the RAQS or SIP.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on air quality plans to be less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 3(b) The GPU EIR concluded impacts to be significant and unavoidable. Construction emissions of all criteria pollutants, including PM10, PM2.5, NOX, and VOCs, would be below the daily thresholds with the incorporation of standard construction BMPs. In addition, because the project's construction emissions would be below screening-level thresholds, which were developed by SDAPCD and SCAQMD to attain the NAAQS and CAAQS, project construction would not conflict with the NAAQS or CAAQS. The NAAQS and CAAQS identify concentrations of pollutants in the ambient air below which no adverse effects on the public health and welfare are anticipated.

The Project's emissions of all criteria pollutants during operation would be below the daily thresholds. The Project would be consistent with the RAQS and would not create a CO hotspot that would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of CO. Therefore, Project operations would not create a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants. In addition, because the project's operational emissions would be below screening-level thresholds, which were developed by SDAPCD and SCAQMD to attain the NAAQS and CAAQS, project operations would not conflict with the NAAQS or CAAQS.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality violations. However, as provided in the above analysis, the Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 3(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would contribute to particulate pollution (PM10), nitrogen oxide gases (NOx), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above).

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to non-attainment criteria pollutants. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact to non-attainment criteria pollutants with the incorporation of Project conditions. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 3(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would introduce a point source of significant emissions and is not located within a quarter mile of any identified sensitive receptors. The Project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and would not place sensitive receptors near any Carbon Monoxide hotspots.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to sensitive receptors. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact to

sensitive receptors. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 3(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project could produce objectionable odors during grading, construction, and operation of the commercial components; however these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m³). Therefore, the Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts from objectionable odors. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Air Quality, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐☐☐

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐☐☐

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐☐☐

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or

☐☐☐

with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

☐☐☐

Discussion

- 4(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Biological resources on the project site were evaluated through the County's Geographical Information System (GIS). The entire site has been developed and does not contain any sensitive species. Therefore, no impacts would occur to any sensitive biological resources as a result of the Project. The site is located within the MSCP but is not designated as a Pre-approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) or a Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA).

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to special status species as significant and unavoidable. However, the Project was determined to have a less than significant impact. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impacts to be significant and unavoidable. Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS), no wetlands or jurisdictional waters were found onsite or offsite and no sensitive habitats were identified on the site. Therefore, there would be no direct or indirect impacts from the Project to sensitive natural communities identified in the RPO, NCCP, Fish and Wildlife Code, and Endangered Species Act.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities as significant and unavoidable. However, the Project was determined to have a less than significant impact. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, therefore, no impacts would occur. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to federally protected wetlands as less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Based on a GIS analysis, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified on MSCP maps nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity.

As previously stated, the GPU EIR determined impacts to wildlife movement corridors as significant and unavoidable. As the Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 4(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The project is consistent with the MSCP, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, and Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). The project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on local policies and ordinances as well as habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans as less than significant. As the Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

☐
☐
☐

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

☐
☐
☐

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

☐
☐
☐

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

☐
☐
☐

Significant
Project
Impact

Impact not
identified by
GPU EIR

Substantial
New
Information

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐☐☐

Discussion

- 5(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Based on an analysis of records by County staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that there are no historical resources present. Based on the absence of resources, mitigation is not required.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR concluded impacts on historic resources to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project determined impacts on historic resources to be less than significance with no required mitigation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 5(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by Staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that there are no impacts to archaeological resources because they do not occur within the project site. In addition, eight tribes (Barona, Campo, Jamul, Kwaaymii, Manzanita, Santa Ysabel, Sycuan, Viejas) were contacted for Native American consultation. Only one tribe (Jamul) responded requesting consultation. No tribal cultural resources were identified during consultation and Jamul agreed that since the project site is fully developed, that neither a cultural study nor monitoring would be required.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified this mitigation measures as Cul-2.5.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to archaeological resources as less than significant with mitigation. The Project determined impacts to archaeological resources as less than significant with mitigation consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measure Cul-2.5. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 5(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 5(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Proposed grading would include less than 2,500 cubic yards of excavation (project proposes 950 cubic yards of cut), as such a paleontological monitoring program is not required.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: conformance with the County's Paleontological Resource Guidelines

if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on paleontological resources as less than significant with mitigation. However, the Project determined impacts to paleontological resources as less than significant with consistency to GPU EIR mitigation measures Cul-3.1. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 5(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the Project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of cultural/paleontological resources, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Cul-2.5 and 3.1) as detailed above would be applied to the project.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

6. Energy Use – Would the Project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

☐
☐
☐

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

☐
☐
☐

Discussion

Energy use was not specifically analyzed within the GPU EIR as a separate issue area under CEQA. At the time, Energy Use was contained within Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines and since then has been moved to the issue areas within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. However, the issue of energy use in general was discussed within the GPU and the GPU EIR. For example, within the Conservation and Open Space Element of the GPU, Goal COS-15 promotes sustainable architecture and building techniques that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment. Policies, COS-15.1, COS-15.2, and COS-15.3 would support this goal by encouraging design and construction of new buildings and upgrades of existing buildings to

maximize energy efficiency and reduce GHG. Goal COS-17 promotes sustainable solid waste management Policies COS-17.1 and COS-17.5 would support this goal by reducing GHG emissions through waste reduction techniques and methane recapture. The analysis below specifically analyzes the energy use of the Project.

- 6(a) The Project would increase the demand for electricity and natural gas at the Project site, and gasoline consumption in the Project area during construction and operation relative to existing conditions. CEQA requires mitigation measures to reduce “wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary” energy usages (Public Resources Code Section 21100, subdivision [b][3]). Neither the law nor the State CEQA Guidelines establish criteria that define wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use. Compliance with the California Code of Regulations 2019 Title 24 Part 6 Building Code would result in highly energy-efficient buildings. However, compliance with building codes does not adequately address all potential energy impacts during construction and operation. It can be expected that energy consumption, outside of the building code regulations, would occur through the transport of construction materials to and from the site during the construction phase and the use of personal vehicles by residents.

Grading and Construction

During the grading and construction phases of the Project, the primary energy source utilized would be petroleum from construction equipment and vehicle trips. To a lesser extent, electricity would also be consumed for the temporary electric power for as-necessary lighting and electronic equipment. Activities including electricity would be temporary and negligible; therefore, electricity use during grading and construction would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Any natural gas that may be consumed as a result of the Project construction would be temporary and negligible and would not have an adverse effect; therefore, natural gas used during grading and construction would also not result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy.

The energy needs for the Project construction would be temporary and is not anticipated to require additional capacity or increase peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. Construction equipment use and associated energy consumptions would be typical of that associated with the construction of residential projects of this size in a semi-rural setting. Additionally, The Project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Thus, the Project’s energy consumption during the grading and construction phase would not be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Operational

Operation of the Project would be typical of commercial land uses, and project design features to reduce energy usage on-site would be implemented as detailed below in section 8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Project operation is not anticipated to result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR did not analyze Energy as a separate issue area under CEQA. Energy was analyzed under the GPU and GPU EIR and has been incorporated within General Plan Elements. The Project would not conflict with policies within the GPU related to energy use, nor would it result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, as specified within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

- 6(b) Many of the regulations regarding energy efficiency are focused on increasing the energy efficiency of buildings and renewable energy generation, as well as reducing water consumption and reliance on fossil fuels.

The Project would be required to comply with the 2019 Title 24 Energy Code; Assembly Bill 341, which requires 75 percent diversion of on-going operational waste through reuse and recycling; and the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code, which requires 50 percent diversion of on-site construction waste and reduction of potable water use and wastewater generation by 20 percent. Additionally, the Project would provide, low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool-only parking, bicycle parking, and shared parking for the multiple tenants. For outdoor water conservation and reduction, the Project would comply with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance and would demonstrate a 40 percent reduction in current Maximum Applied Water Allowance.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR did not analyze Energy as a separate issue area under CEQA. Energy was analyzed under the GPU and GPU EIR and has been incorporated within General Plan Elements. The Project would not conflict with policies within the GPU related to energy use or conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency as specified within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Energy, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

7. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, (ii) strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, (iii) liquefaction, and/or (iv) landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐☐☐

Discussion

7(a)(i) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The site is located in the tectonically active southern California area and will therefore likely experience shake effects from earthquakes. The type and severity of the seismic hazards affecting a site are to a large degree dependent upon the distance to the causative fault, the intensity of the seismic event, and the underlying soil characteristics.

The Project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, nor is it located within a known Active Fault Near-Source Zone. The County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards consider a project to have a potentially significant impact if the project proposes any building or structure to be used for human occupancy over or within 50 feet of the trace of an Alquist-Priolo fault or County Special Study Zone Fault. The Project site is located approximately 7.9 miles east from the nearest Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone and 2.4 miles east from the nearest known fault zone. Additionally, construction in accordance with the California Building Code Seismic Requirements would be required prior to the issue of a building permit. Therefore, a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

7(a)(ii) 7(a)(ii) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the Project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. In addition, a geotechnical report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved before the issuance of a building permit per California Building Code Sections 1803 and 1804. The GPU EIR identified the standard condition of a Geotechnical Report within section 2.6.3.1, Federal, State and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes, Liquefaction.

Conditions of Approval

The following list includes the Project conditions of approval:

Geotechnical Report

- A California Certified Engineering Geologist shall complete a final soils report specific to the preliminary design of the proposed development and submit the final soils report to PDS. The findings shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of the County Department of Planning and Development Services or designee.

Therefore, with implementation of the above standard County requirement for compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code, it would ensure that the Project would not result in a significant impact due to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure.

7(a)(iii) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for

Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is underlain by high shrink swell soils (expansive soils). As stated previously, the County requires a geotechnical report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. Additionally, the Project site has been previously developed and paved, and is mostly flat with minimal to no slopes on-site. Therefore, the Project is unlikely to result in any impacts from liquefaction.

- 7(a)(iv) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is identified as Generally Susceptible to potential landslides. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included withing Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. The Project site has been previously developed and paved, and is mostly flat with minimal to no slopes on-site. Therefore, the potential hazards associated with landslides are less than significant. In addition, a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved before the issuance of a building permit.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts from exposure to seismic-related hazards and soil stability. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with the incorporation of Project conditions for a geological soils report, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 7(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes (PeC), Diablo-Urban land complex, 5 to 5 percent slopes (DcD), and Las Flores loamy fine sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes (LeC), that have a soil erodibility rating of unrated (DcD) and severe (PeC and LeC). However, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the Project would be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which would ensure that the Project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns, and would not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the Project would be required to implement BMPs per the Priority Development Project Storm Water Quality Management Plan to prevent fugitive sediment. Please see Section (10) Hydrology and Water Quality for a detailed discussion.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from soil erosion and topsoil loss to be less than significant. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 7(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. As indicated in response (a)(iv), the site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards; however potential hazards associated with landslides have been determined to be less than significant due the

Project site's being primarily flat with minimal to no slopes. Lateral spreading is a principal effect from liquefaction. The site is not located within a potential liquefaction area.

Lateral spreading is a principal effect from liquefaction which was discussed in response 7(a)(iii). As discussed in response 7(a)(iii), the project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, subsidence and collapse may be caused by unstable geological structures or conditions. However, the Project would be required to prepare a Geotechnical Report as described in response 7(a)(ii) and would be required to conform to the California Building Code to ensure no impacts would occur.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from soil stability to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with the incorporation of the standard Project condition for a Geological Soils Report, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 7(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. As stated in response 7(a)(ii) and 7(a)(iii), the Project site is underlain with expansive soils, however a Geotechnical Report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved before the issuance of a building permit per California Building Code Sections 1803 and 1804 would be required as a standard condition of approval.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from expansive soils to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 7(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project site would rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. As such, the Project would not place septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems on soils incapable of adequately supporting the tanks or system.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to wastewater disposal systems to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Geology and Soils, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project:

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion

A Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report was prepared for the project by Helix Environmental dated March 2021.

Analysis

8(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation.

The Project would include the following project design features:

Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction

- The Project proposes an 11 percent reduction in parking below the County zoning standard for the entire site by reducing the parking provided from 4.5 spaces per 1,000 SF to 4 spaces per 1,000 SF.
- The Project would be located within a quarter mile of seven transit stops along Sweetwater Road, Orville Street and Jamacha Road as well as pedestrian facilities on and adjacent to the Project site.
- The Project would provide low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/vanpool vehicle parking in accordance with California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requirements. The Project would add 11 clean air vehicle spaces and 7 electric vehicle parking spaces.
- Shared parking would be included on site for the multiple tenants occupying the property. Because this is already occurring on site, the Project's proposed uses would have reduced parking for their respective uses through the shared parking provided on site.
- The Project would provide short-term bicycle parking for customers and long-term bicycle parking for employees in accordance with CALGreen requirements. The Project would provide five short-term bicycle parking spaces and five long-term parking spaces.

Water and Waste Reduction

- A Construction and Demolition Debris Management Plan will be developed to divert debris from construction and demolition away from landfills. In accordance with County Ordinance Sections 68.508 through 68.518, 90 percent of inerts and 70 percent of all other materials from the Project will be recycled.
- The Project would implement reuse and recycling programs to divert at least 75 percent of

operational waste from landfills in accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 341.

- The Project would provide areas for storage and collection of recyclables and yard waste in accordance with CALGreen Standards in place during time of construction.
- The Project would provide a 20 percent reduction in potable water use associated with plumbing fixtures for the proposed improvements as compared to the baseline water use for the same types of fixtures in accordance with CALGreen.
- The Project would comply with the County's Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance requirements for all landscaping associated with the proposed Project and would demonstrate a 40 percent reduction in current Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) for outdoor water use.

GHG emissions would be associated with the construction phases of the Project through use of off-road heavy equipment, haul trucks, and vehicle trips from construction worker commutes. A detailed discussion of construction assumptions and modeling inputs can be found in the Project's Air Quality Technical Report. Emissions of GHGs related to the construction of the Project would be temporary over a 10-month timeframe. Estimated Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions, total GHG emissions associated with construction of the Project are estimated at 125 MT CO₂e. For construction emissions, SCAQMD guidance recommends that the emissions be amortized (i.e., averaged) over 30 years and added to operational emissions. Averaged over 30 years, the proposed construction activities would contribute approximately 4 MT CO₂e emissions per year.

Operational sources of GHG emissions include: (1) energy use (electricity and natural gas); (2) area sources (landscaping equipment and consumer products); (3) vehicle use; (4) solid waste generation; and (5) water conveyance and treatment. Operational emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. The model estimates emissions from vehicle and stationary sources of pollutants. CalEEMod default motor vehicle emission rates are based on the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) state-wide emission factors for the County region which are incorporated into CalEEMod. The SAFE Vehicles Rule adjustment factors provided by CARB were applied to the emission factors in the model to account for anticipated increased emissions. Default vehicle speeds, trip lengths, trip purpose, and trip type percentages for the drive-thru restaurant, coffee shop, and drug store were used. Trip generation for each land use was based on the Local Mobility Analysis prepared for the Project. As detailed in the Local Mobility Analysis, the Project would result in 1,539 net new average daily trips (ADT).

With implementation of the Project design features and addition of the amortized construction emissions, the Project would result in GHG emissions estimated to be 2,049 MT CO₂e per year. Vehicular sources are modeled to be the Project's largest contributor of operational GHG emissions. The emissions estimate, however, is extremely conservative in that it assumes the Project would generate new vehicular trips that would not otherwise occur when the Project would not necessarily generate new trips. Future customers of the Project would utilize other existing retail/service uses similar to what the Project is proposing regardless if the Project gets developed or not. Rather than generating new trips, the Project is anticipated to reroute existing trips from other retail/service uses and would not create a new source of GHG emissions.

In addition, the Project is consistent with the County's General Plan land use designation for the site of General Commercial. The Project would result in an approximately 20% increase in square footage from the existing commercial development within the commercial center. Trips would be similar to those existing from the current commercial uses and would not result in a substantial increase in trips over the current baseline.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to be less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact with the incorporation of Project Design Features, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 8(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. There are numerous State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The principal overall State plan and policy is AB 32 and SB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The quantitative goal of AB 32 was to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 32 requires further reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. These statewide plans and regulations are being implemented at the statewide level, and compliance on a project-specific level is not addressed.

The primary regional plan for the County aimed at reducing GHG emissions by reducing transportation source emissions is SANDAG's Regional Plan. The growth projections included in the Regional Plan, which were used in developing regional sustainability goals to reduce GHG emissions, are based on land use plans developed by cities and by the County. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with their respective general plan land use designations would be consistent with the growth projections in the Regional Plan. The General Plan designates the Project site as General Commercial. The Project, which is constructing a new drug store, fast food restaurant, and coffee shop within an existing commercial property, would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation. Therefore, because the Project is proposing development consistent with the General Plan, it is correspondingly consistent with the Regional Plan and its goals for reducing GHG emissions on a regional level.

Further, the Project would be located in a VMT efficient area providing a local option for commercial retail uses in proximity to residential development. The Project's average VMT per Service Population is 29.31, which is below the average VMT threshold of 31.90. The Project is anticipated to result in an overall decrease in regional VMT and would therefore contribute to reducing regional GHG emissions in the category that accounts for a large percentage of regional GHG emissions. The Project's other, non-mobile source emissions would be reduced through compliance with various State plans and regulations, such as Title 24 energy efficiency standards, the Renewables Portfolio Standard Program, CALGreen, and AB 341. The Project would also be consistent with the County's General Plan, which includes goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to applicable regulation compliance to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐☐☐

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

☐☐☐

Discussion

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the proposed Project by Salem Engineering Group, Inc. dated April 15, 2020.

- 9(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

One Historical Recognized Environmental Condition was identified on-site and is detailed below:

K-Mart Automobile Service Center

- According to San Diego County Department of Environmental Health (SDCDEH) records, one 1,000-gallon waste oil underground storage tank (UST) was removed in March 1990 from the exterior of the former K-Mart automobile service center adjoining to the north of the building located at 935 Sweetwater Road. The waste oil UST was removed under the regulatory agency supervision of the SDCDEH. Reportedly, the waste oil UST appeared to be in good condition showing no evidence of holes or leaks at the time of removal. Three soil samples were collected from the waste oil UST excavation and analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes (BTEX). Analytical results of the soil samples indicated no detectable concentrations of constituents of concern in the soil samples analyzed. Following the results of the soil sample analysis, the SDCDEH issued a "no further action" (NFA) designation. The SDCDEH granted regulatory agency "closure" for the waste oil UST on April 24, 1990.

Additionally, one storage building on the Project site would be demolished as part of the proposed Project. This building was built prior to the ban on the use of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing materials in construction. Prior to the demolition of this building, surveys would be required to determine the location, presence, and quantity of hazardous building materials. The Project would be required to comply with Project conditions and applicable regulations to ensure that impacts related to the disposal of hazardous materials from the removal of structures is less than significant.

Conditions of Approval

The following includes the Project conditions of approval:

Structure and Debris Removal

- Structures and debris identified on the approved plan set for the Project as requiring remodeling or demolition would be remodeled or demolished

Lead Survey

- A facility survey would be performed to determine the presence or absence of lead based paint (LBP) and lead containing materials (LCM) in the structures identified for demolition on the approved plan set for the Project. All LBP and LCM would be managed in accordance with applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Division 4.5), the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1), and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8).

Asbestos Survey

- A facility survey would be performed to determine the presence or absence of Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) in the structures identified for demolition on the approved plan set for the Project by a person certified by Cal/OSHA pursuant to regulations implementing subdivision (b) of Section 9021.5 of the Labor Code and who has passed an EPA-approved Building Inspector Course.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials and accidental release of hazardous materials to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Thus, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a school.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from hazards to schools to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. Based on a comprehensive review of regulatory databases, the Project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the Project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from existing hazardous materials sites to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan, Airport Safety Zone, Avigation Easement, Overflight area, within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface Area or within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on public airports to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

- 9(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN:
The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.

- 9(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT:
The Project is not located along the coastal zone.

- 9(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN:

The Project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.

- 9f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN:

The Project site is not located within an identified dam inundation zone. Additionally, the development would not constitute a "Unique Institution" such as a hospital, school, or retirement home pursuant to the Office of Emergency Services included within the County Guidelines for Determining Significance, Emergency Response Plans.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from emergency response and evacuation plans to be less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR

- 9(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact as significant and unavoidable. The Project site is located within an urban unzoned fire hazard severity zone in the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE)'s designated Local Responsibility Area (CALFIRE 2020). The Project is in the service area of the San Miguel Fire Protection District (SMFPD) and would be required to comply with the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code.

Additionally, the Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County General Plan's Safety Element is 5 minutes. The closest SMFPD station to the Project site is located at 2850 Via Orange Way, approximately 2.6 miles northeast of the site, which has capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from wildland fires to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 9(h) The GPU EIR concluded this impact as less than significant. The Project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the Project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. There are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the Project would not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined less than significant impacts with mitigation from vectors. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
10. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? ☐ ☐ ☐
- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? ☐ ☐ ☐
- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion

Technical studies were prepared for the Project related to hydrology and water quality:

- (1) PDP SWQMP dated March 11, 2021 prepared by BWE, Inc. One each for Buildings D and G.
PDP SWQMP dated March 10, 2021 prepared by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates for Building F.

- (2) A Preliminary Drainage Study dated March 2021 prepared by BWE, Inc. One each for Buildings D and G.
A Preliminary Drainage Study dated February 2021 prepared by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates for Building F.

- 10(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Development Projects have the potential to generate pollutants during both the construction and operational phases. For the Project to avoid potential violations of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, storm water management plans are prepared for both phases of the development Project.

During the construction phase, the Project would prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would implement typical erosion control BMPs such as hydraulic stabilization and hydroseeding on disturbed slopes, silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel and sandbags, storm drain inlet protection and engineered desilting basin for sediment control. The SWPPP would be prepared in accordance with Order No. 2009-009-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) order CAS000002 Construction General Permit (CGP) adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on September 2, 2009.

In the post-construction phase, as outlined in the SWQMP, the Project would implement site design and source control BMPs to prevent potential pollutants from entering storm water runoff. The SWQMP has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego BMP Design Manual and SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (2013), as adopted by the RWQCB on May 8, 2013.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to water quality standards with the implementation of Project conditions as detailed above. The conditions are consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project lies in the La Nacion (909.12) hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed (San Diego Bay Shoreline; San Diego Bay; Paradise Creek; Sweetwater River) is impaired. The full list of constituents of concern for the Sweetwater watershed is available from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Project would contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the Project would comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5) to water quality standards and requirements. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances would ensure that Project impacts are less than significant.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determine significant and unavoidable impacts to water quality standards and requirements and groundwater supplies and recharge. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to water quality standards and requirements, and groundwater supplies and recharge (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5). Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would obtain its water supply from the Helix Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The Project would not use any groundwater and would not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to groundwater recharge for the reasons stated above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project site is developed and consists of an existing asphalt parking lot and commercial buildings. The site topography is relatively flat and generally flows east to west to Sweetwater Road. The runoff originating from the site drains to an existing storm drain system situated within Sweetwater road via a catch basin and storm drainpipe.

The onsite drainage patterns would be slightly altered by the proposed Project for Building D, however runoff would continue to flow in the same general direction as existing conditions. The 100-year peak flow rates at the two discharge points analyzed by the Drainage study for Building D would be maintained in the proposed condition. Therefore, negative downstream drainage impacts are not anticipated to occur. Stormwater runoff from the site is collected and conveyed by a system of downspouts, concrete gutter,

planters, trench drains and storm drainpipes. The proposed Project for Building D would implement best management practices as outlined in the PDP SWQMP to reduce stormwater quantity impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Four biofiltration basins are proposed for Building D for this purpose. Runoff from the northerly and westerly drainage basin is discharged offsite via an existing curb outlet situated near Sweetwater road. An overflow spillway is proposed for each biofiltration basin to bypass the excess 100-year peak flow rate.

Building F will not adversely impact existing drainage facilities or downstream neighbors. The existing site area for Building F is mostly impervious with approximately 7,800 square feet of landscaping. The landscape area of the Building F portion of the project will increase to approximately 12,900 square feet and will incorporate biofiltration basins. Building F also proposes underground storm vaults to detain a volume of storm water for water quality and hydromodification purposes. The combination of the proposed features will reduce the storm water discharge for the site and will drain to existing points of discharge. The proposed Project for Building F would implement best management practices as outlined in the PDP SWQMP to reduce stormwater quantity impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Two biofiltration basins are proposed for Building D for this purpose.

The onsite drainage patterns would be slightly altered by the proposed Project for Building G, however runoff would continue to flow in the same general direction as existing conditions. The 100-year peak flow rates at the two discharge points analyzed by the Drainage study for Building G would be reduced in the proposed condition. Therefore, negative downstream drainage impacts are not anticipated to occur. Stormwater runoff from the site is collected and conveyed by a system of downspouts, concrete gutter, planters, trench drains and storm drainpipes. The proposed Project would implement best management practices as outlined in the PDP SWQMP to reduce stormwater quantity impacts to the maximum extent practicable. One biofiltration basin is proposed for Building G for this purpose.

In addition, the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site because as previously stated in response 10(a), storm water management plans are prepared for both the construction and post-construction phases of the development Project. The SWPPP and SWQMP specify and describe the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream receiving waters. The Department of Public Works would ensure that these Plans are implemented as proposed. Although on-site drainage patterns would be altered, the proposed improvements would ensure the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to erosion or siltation and less than significant impacts. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact to erosion or siltation (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5). Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. As discussed above in response 10(e) the Preliminary Drainage Studies prepared for the Project by BWE, Inc. for Buildings D and G and by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates for

Building F determined that the proposed Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to flooding as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to flooding with the incorporation of design features and improvements. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. Pursuant to the Preliminary Drainage Studies prepared for the Project by BWE, Inc. for Buildings D and G and by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates for Building F, the Project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Because the Project would reduce the 100-year peak flows, the Project would not contribute runoff to exceed the capacity of the existing drainage system.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to exceed capacity of stormwater systems as less than significant with mitigation. With mitigation, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with regards to exceeding the capacity of stormwater systems with mitigation (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5). Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(h) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures and source control BMPs as indicated in response 10(a) would be employed such that potential pollutants would be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determine impacts to water quality standards and requirements as significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact to water quality standards with the implementation of Project conditions listed in 10(a). The conditions are consistent with the GPU EIR mitigation measures Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(i) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. No FEMA or County-mapped floodplains were identified on the Project site or off-site improvement locations. In addition, the Preliminary Drainage Studies prepared for the Project by BWE, Inc. for Buildings D and G and by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates for Building F also concluded that the Project site does not contain any 100-year flood hazard areas per FEMA. Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a County or federal floodplain or flood way.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(j) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. As indicated in 10(i), no FEMA or County-mapped floodplains were identified on the Project site or off-

site improvement locations. Therefore, the Project structures would not impede or redirect flood flows.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from impeding or redirecting flood flows as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(k) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area and the Project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from housing within a 100-year flood hazard areas and emergency response and evacuations plans as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(l) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The County Office of Emergency Services maintains Dam Evacuation Plans for each dam operational area. These plans contain information concerning the physical situation, affected jurisdictions, evacuation routes, unique institutions, and event responses. If a “unique institution” is proposed, such as a hospital, school, or retirement home, within dam inundation area, an amendment to the Dam Evacuation Plan would be required. As previously discussed in response 10(k), the Project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from dam inundation and flood hazards and emergency response and evacuation plans as less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 10(m) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation.

- 10(m)(i) SEICHE: The Project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.

- 10(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The Project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.

- 10(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 7(a)(iv).

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from seiche, tsunami and mudflow hazards to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Hydrology and Water Quality, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Hyd-1.2 through Hyd-1.5) would be applied to the Project. The mitigation measures, as detailed above, requires the Project applicant to comply with Watershed Protection Ordinance, Stormwater Standards Manual, Guidelines for Determining Significance for Hydrology and Water Quality.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

11. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

☐☐☐

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

☐☐☐

Discussion

- 11(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Additionally, the site is consistent with surrounding commercial use types. Moreover, build-out of the site was anticipated in the GPU EIR. Therefore, the proposed Project would not physically divide an established community.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from physically dividing an established community as less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 11(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. As previously discussed in response 11(a), the Project aligns with the County General plan and Zoning Ordinance as it would implement a land use consistent with the C36 Use Regulation and General Commercial land use designation for the Project site.

The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Land Use and Planning, the following findings can be made:

15183 Exemption Checklist

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
12. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 12(a) The GPU EIR determined that impacts to mineral resources would be significant and unavoidable. The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) required classification of land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs). The Project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the Project site is surrounded by commercial use types across the road to the West and North, and adjacent to the Project site to the Northeast; and residential use types across the road to the South and adjacent to the Project site to the Southeast, which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the Project site. A future mining operation at the Project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to mineral resources to be significant and unavoidable. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 12(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25). The Project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands nor is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Additionally, the Project site is surrounded by commercial and residential land uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the Project site. A future mining operation at the site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to mineral resources to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Mineral Resources, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. The GPU EIR concluded significant and unavoidable impacts to mineral resources, however, the Project would have less than significant impacts for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

13. Noise – Would the Project:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐☐☐

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐☐☐

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐☐☐

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐☐☐**Discussion**

A Noise Report was prepared for the Project by Helix Environmental dated January 11, 2021.

- 13(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The area surrounding the project site consists of mainly residences uses. The project will not expose

people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element: Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires projects to comply with a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). The project consists of commercial uses and is not subject to the 60 dB CNEL exterior noise levels. In addition, the Noise Report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning dated January 11, 2021, demonstrated that the project would not expose on or off-site sensitive land uses to noise levels that exceed the required noise limits for exterior and interior use area. The exterior noise impacts at the project site are primarily the result of the drive-thru speaker. A site visit conducted by Helix's Noise Consultant, found that the existing noise levels within the area is 66.2 dBA. The project would not result in exposing existing and future noise sensitive receptors to noise levels that exceed the County's Standard. The increase in ADT from this project would not result in an increase of 3 dBA CNEL on any impacted roadways, therefore, would not expose on- or off-site, existing, and foreseeable future noise sensitive land uses to noise levels that exceed the noise standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line. The project site as well as surrounding parcels to the north, northeast, and west are zoned commercial, which are subject to the noise limits of 60 dBA daytime and 55 dBA nighttime. The parcels to the south and southeast are zoned Single-Family Residential (RS), which are subject to the arithmetic mean noise levels limit of 55 dBA daytime and 50 dBA nighttime. The main source of operational noise from this project would be from the drive-thru speaker. Based on the noise report, the maximum sound level pressure from the drive-thru speaker is 54 dBA at 32 feet. The speaker will operate at approximately 12 minutes per hour, which reduces the noise levels to 47 dBA. The nearest Noise Sensitive Land Use property line is at least 95 feet away for the equipment. In addition, there is an existing wall along the southern edge of the project site, which will provide further noise attenuation. Based on the distance separation, usage factor, and existing wall, the noise levels from the speaker will be in compliance with the Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404. The project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410: The project will not generate construction noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM. Based on the Noise Report, the combined use of an excavator, loader, and dump truck would generate noise levels of 71.9 dBA LEQ. Blasting and/or rock crushing is not proposed. The project will implement best management practices, which will ensure that the noise levels from these activities do not exceed the County's Noise Standards.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to excessive noise levels as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impacts with the incorporation of Project conditions discussed in the GPU EIR, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

13(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area. In addition, the project will not propose any equipment such as pile driving or blasting that would result in vibration or ground borne noises.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise on a project or cumulative level.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to excessive groundborne vibration as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

13(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. The project would not result in more than 3 dBA increase on any roadways. Therefore, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from permanent increase in ambient noise levels to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less than significant impact with the incorporation of Project conditions listed in response 13(a). Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

13(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the Noise Ordinance. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, the project will not operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24 hour period.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from temporary increase in ambient noise levels to be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with Project conditions of approval listed in response 13(a). Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

13(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

13(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Noise, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant by adhering to the Project standard conditions of approval, which are consistent with the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

14. Population and Housing – Would the Project:

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

☐☐☐

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

☐☐☐

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐☐☐

Discussion

14(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project site is designated in the General Plan as General Commercial. The Project is consistent with the General Plan and would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area as development of the site was accounted for within the GPU. In addition, the Project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in the area.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from population growth to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

14(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project does not propose the demolition of any residential structures and thus would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing. As such, replacement housing would not be required elsewhere.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from displacement of housing to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

14(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project does not propose the demolition of any residential structures and thus would not displace a substantial number of people. As such, replacement housing would not be required elsewhere.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from displacement of people to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Population and Housing, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

15. Public Services – Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

☐☐☐**Discussion**

15(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation for the exception of school services, which remained significant and unavoidable. The Project is for the development of commercial land use types within an existing commercial center. The Project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the Project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the Project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

The Project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impact to fire protection services, police protection services and other public services as significant with mitigation while school services remained significant and unavoidable. However, as the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons stated above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Public Services, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
16. Recreation – Would the Project:			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 16(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. No impact to parks or recreation facilities would occur as a result of the Project.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts related to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 16(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities such as parks.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts related to construction of new recreational facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Recreation, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant.

17. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

☐☐☐

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐☐☐

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐☐☐

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☐☐☐

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐☐☐

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐☐☐

Discussion

A Local Mobility Analysis was prepared for the Project by Mizuta Traffic Consultants dated January 2021.

- 17(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The County of San Diego Transportation Study Guidelines have been adopted by the County Board of Supervisors on June 24, 2020 to address Senate Bill 743 (SB 743). SB 743 changed the way that public agencies evaluate transportation impacts under CEQA. A key element of this law is the elimination of using auto delay, Level of Service (LOS), and other similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion as a basis for determining significant transportation impacts under CEQA. The new established criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts is Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and is further addressed below. Although no longer utilized as the standard for evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA, the County's General Plan identified LOS as being a required analysis per Policy M-2.1 and is therefore also addressed.

Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines details new regulations, effective statewide July 1, 2020, based on SB 743 that sets forth specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. As previously discussed, the new established criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts is Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project.

In addition, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program creates a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. The TIF measures was identified by the GPU EIR as Tra-1.7.

A Local Mobility Analysis (LMA) is the tool utilized by the Transportation Study Guidelines to assess projects impacts to LOS. However, the Transportation Study Guidelines have also adopted thresholds for determining when a project must prepare a Local Mobility Analysis based on project type and number of trips. The project is consistent with the County General plan and would result in more than 250 ADT based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation rates. In accordance with the Transportation Study Guidelines, an LMA was required for the project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy related to local mobility.

The LMA prepared for the Project by Mizuta Traffic Consultants dated January 2021 evaluated potential improvements required for the Project in accordance with the adopted Transportation Study Guidelines and County Public Road Standards. The LMA determined that the project would generate a total of 2,112 daily trips with 86 trips (52 inbound, 34 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 212 trips (106 inbound, 106 outbound) in the PM peak hour. The additional 95,144 sf of commercial uses already approved on the existing site was added to the existing traffic volumes. The approved commercial uses are forecasted to generate a total of 7,612 daily trips with 306 trips (184 inbound, 122 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 762 trips (381 inbound, 381 outbound) in the PM peak-hour. All intersections in the study area, including the Project driveways, are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the peak-hours. Additionally, the Project will restripe the South Project Driveway along Sweetwater Road to include an exclusive lane for left-turning and right-turning vehicles exiting the site.

Local-serving commercial uses, typically those under 50,000 square feet in size, and infill retail developments tend to shift where vehicle trips occur rather than generate wholly new trips (and corresponding vehicle miles traveled). Because the proposed project is less than 50,000 square feet and would be expected to shift where people shop for retail/fast-food rather than increase the amount of new trips on the roadway in the region, it is reasonable to presume that total regional VMT would not increase as a result of the project. The presence of other retail and fast-food establishments in the community also support the conclusion that the project would indeed function as local-serving retail with most customers likely traveling from nearby areas of Spring Valley, with little potential to draw longer trips from the wider region.

A five percent transit reduction credit can be applied to projects if the site has transit access and/or near transit stops within 0.25 miles. There are multiple transit stops that are located along Jamacha Road and Sweetwater Road that meet this criteria. Additionally, pass-by trips are trips that are already on the road network and “passing by” the project site. A pass-by trip credit of 30 percent was used during the PM peak-hour and 22 percent for the AM peak-hour and daily trip forecasts to calculate net trip rates for the Proposed project.

The project is forecasted to generate a total of 2,112 daily trips with 86 AM peak hour trips and 212 PM peak-hour trips. After applying the transit trip credit, the project is forecasted to generate a total of 2,006 daily trips with 83 AM peak-hour trips and 200 PM peak-hour trips at the project driveways. After applying the pass-by trip credit, the project is forecasted to generate a net total of 1,539 daily trips with 69 AM peak-hour trips and 138 PM peak-hour trips.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined significant and unavoidable impacts to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards. However, the project would have a less than significant impact to County traffic and LOS standards as well as VMT with the incorporation of mitigation as detailed above. The mitigation measures were identified in the GPU EIR as Tra-1.7, Tra-4.4 and Tra-6.9 which require payment into the County TIF program as well as implementation of the County Subdivision Ordinance and the Community Trails Master Plan. In addition, the project would not conflict with SB 743 because it is considered less than 50,000 square feet of a locally serving commercial use or retail and is below the County’s adopted VMT threshold. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 17(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The designated congestion management agency for the County is the San Diego Association of governments (SANDAG). In October 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region’s continued compliance with the federal congestion management process.

As previously stated, Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines details new regulations, effective statewide July 1, 2020 that sets forth specific considerations for evaluating a project’s transportation impacts. As discussed in 17(a), the project would not result in an impact to VMT due to the project consisting of a locally serving commercial use that is less than 50,000 square feet. Additionally, as discussed in 17(a), the Project will restripe the South Project Driveway along Sweetwater Road to include an exclusive lane for left-

turning and right-turning vehicles exiting the site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on significant and unavoidable impacts to unincorporated County traffic and LOS standards. However, the project would have a less than significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area, Airport Safety Zone, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Area, Avigation Easement, or Overflight Area. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact to air traffic patterns. The Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project would not substantially alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on rural road safety to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no mitigation required for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The Project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code. In addition, consistent with GPU EIR mitigation measure Tra-4.2, the Project would implement the Building and Fire codes to ensure emergency vehicle accessibility.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on emergency access as less than significant with mitigation. As the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above and is consistent with GPU EIR Mitigation Measure Tra 4.2, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

17(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the Project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on alternative transportation and rural safety as less than significant with mitigation. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Transportation and Traffic, the following findings can be made

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Tra-1.7, Tra-4.2, Tra-4.4 and Tra-6.9) would be applied to the project. The mitigation measures, as detailed above, would require payment into the County TIF Program as well as consistency with the Building Code, Fire Code, County Public Road Standards, Subdivision Ordinance and Community Trails Master Plan.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
18. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:			
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 18(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The project would be served by the San Diego County Sanitation District (SDCSD) which has adequate capacity to serve the Project.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on wastewater treatment requirements to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 18(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project involves new water and wastewater pipeline extensions. However, these extensions would be on-site, and would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis. Water service would be provided by the Helix Water District and sewer service would be provided by the SDCSD.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on wastewater treatment requirements to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 18(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project proposes new storm water drainage facilities. However, these extensions would not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts on sufficient stormwater drainage facilities to be less than significant. As the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 18(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would be served water by the Helix Water District which has adequate water capacity to serve the Project.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to adequate water supplies be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 18(e) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant with mitigation. The Project would be served by the San Diego County Sanitation District (SDCSD) which has adequate capacity to serve the Project.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts to adequate wastewater facilities be less than significant with mitigation. However, the proposed Project would

have a less-than-significant impact with no required mitigation for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 18(f) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the Project. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.
- 18(g) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be less than significant. The Project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Utilities and Service Systems, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. No mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR would be required because Project specific impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
19. Wildfire – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:			
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts in the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risk, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

Wildfire was analyzed within the GPU EIR within Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The guidelines for determining significance stated: the proposed General Plan Update would have a significant impact if it would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. In 2019, the issue of Wildfire was separated into its own section within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines to incorporate the four issue questions above. The GPU EIR did address these issues within the analysis; however, they were not called out as separate issue areas. Within the GPU EIR, the issue of Wildland Fires was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

- 19(a) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project site is located within an urban unzoned fire hazard severity zone in the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE)'s designated Local Responsibility Area (CALFIRE 2020). The Project is in the service area of the San Miguel Fire Protection District (SMFPD) and would be required to comply with the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code.

Additionally, the Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County General Plan's Safety Element is 5 minutes. The closest SMFPD station to the Project site is located at 2850 Via Orange Way, approximately 2.6 miles northeast of the site, which has capacity to serve the Project.

As previously stated, Wildfire was analyzed within the GPU EIR within Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and was determined to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 19(b) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project is not within a fire hazard severity zone but is within the Urban-Wildlife Interface Zone. The Project would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the building permit process and is consistent with GPU mitigation measures Haz-4.2 and Haz-4.3. In addition, the Project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and the County of San Diego General Plan. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the Project would not be expected to experience exacerbated wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing, winds or other factors.

As previously stated, Wildfire was analyzed within the GPU EIR within Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and was determined to be significant and unavoidable. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis provided within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 19(c) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. The Project would require the minor renovation and expansion of a private driveway. All infrastructure associated with the Project has been incorporated within this analysis. Therefore, no additional temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment related to associated infrastructure would occur that have not been analyzed in other sections of this environmental document.

As previously discussed, the GPU EIR determined impacts from Wildfire to be significant and unavoidable. However, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR.

- 19(d) The GPU EIR concluded this impact to be significant and unavoidable. As previously stated in 19(b), the Project would comply with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Fire Code and Consolidated Fire Code. The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards and is identified as Generally Susceptible to potential landslides. Based on review of the Project by County Staff Hydrogeologist and the topography of the site, potential hazards associated with landslides are less than significant. In addition, a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendation would be required to be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the project site would not expose people or structures to significant risk, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes.

The GPU EIR concluded significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Wildfire under Section 2.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. However, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact with for the reasons detailed above. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the analysis within the GPU EIR because it would not increase impacts identified within the GPU EIR

Conclusion

With regards to the issue area of Wildfire, the following findings can be made:

1. No peculiar impacts to the Project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR (Haz-4.2 and Haz-4.3) would be applied to the Project. These mitigation measures, as detailed above, requires the Project applicant to implement brush management and comply with the building and fire codes.

Appendices

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

Appendix A

The following is the list of Project specific technical studies used to support the Project's environmental analysis. All technical studies are available on the website here https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/Current_Projects.html#par_title or hard copies are available at the County of San Diego Zoning Counter, 5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110, San Diego, 92123:

BWE, Inc., (March 2021), Preliminary Drainage Study, one each for Buildings D and G

Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates, (February 26, 2021), Preliminary Drainage Study for Building F

BWE, Inc., (March 11, 2021), Stormwater Quality Management Plan for Priority Development Projects, one each for Buildings D and G

Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates, (March 10, 2021), Stormwater Quality Management Plan for Priority Development Projects for Building F

Helix Environmental Planning, (March 2021), Air Quality Technical Report

Helix Environmental Planning, (March 2021), Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report

Mizuta, Mark; Mizuta Traffic Consulting, (January 2021), Parking Demand Study

Mizuta, Mark; Mizuta Traffic Consulting, (January 2021), Spring Valley Shopping Center Local Mobility Analysis

Salem Engineering Group, Inc., (April 15, 2020), Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment

Terry, Charles and Runyan, Jason; Helix Environmental Planning, (January 11, 2021), Noise Analysis

References

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00 -
References_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf)

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf

**MULTIPLE SPECIES CONSERVATION PROGRAM
CONFORMANCE STATEMENT**

Spring Valley Shopping Center

**PDS2019-STP-97-050W3, PDS2020-AD-20-002, PDS2020-BC-20-0026
APNs 584-511-16-00, 584-511-18-00, 584-511-19-00, 584-511-20-00**

February 5, 2021

Summary

The project proposes the construction of three new structures with associated signage and trash enclosures on the site of an existing shopping center and parking lot. One existing storage structure will be removed to accommodate the placement of one of the new proposed structures, and one other existing onsite structure will have tenant improvements to allow for a new sub-tenant with a new trash enclosure. The project site is located within the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul segment of the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan. The project is therefore required to conform to the MSCP and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance.

Statement of Fact

There are no sensitive habitats or species within the proposed project area. The site is entirely urban/ developed and does not support native vegetation. As a Tier IV habitat, no on-site preservation is required and impacts to urban/ developed habitat do not require mitigation under the Biological Mitigation Ordinance. No impacts to wildlife corridors or linkages will occur as the project site does not support geological, topographic or habitat features that would function in a corridor capacity. Furthermore, the site is not classified as a Biological Resource Core Area as it is not within the Pre-Approved Mitigation Area, is not within or adjacent to a large block of undisturbed habitat, is not mapped as having high habitat value and does not support sensitive species. Given the current site conditions and the surrounding land uses, development of this project will not hinder the formation of a future preserve system.

Conclusion

After consideration of the above facts, the proposed project is found to be in conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance.

REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF
Spring Valley Shopping Center
PDS2019-STP-97-050W3, PDS2020-AD-20-002, PDS2020-BC-20-0026

March 25, 2021

I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE – Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

YES
☐

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
☒

Discussion:

The proposed project and any off-site improvements are located within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.

II. MSCP/BMO - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

YES
☒

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
☐

Discussion:

The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. The project conforms with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance as discussed in the MSCP Findings dated February 5, 2021.

III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

YES
☐

NO
☐

NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
☒

Discussion:

The proposed project will obtain its water supply from the Helix Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources.

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The <u>Steep Slope</u> section (Section 86.604(e))?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT <input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

Steep Slopes:

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(e) of the RPO.

Sensitive Habitats:

Sensitive habitat lands include unique vegetation communities and/or habitat that is either necessary to support a viable population of sensitive species, is critical to the proper functioning of a balanced natural ecosystem, or which serves as a functioning wildlife corridor. No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the RPO.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. As such, the project complies with the RPO.

V. STORMWATER ORDINANCE (WPO) - Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

YES

☒

NO

☐

NOT APPLICABLE

☐**Discussion:**

A Priority Development Project Stormwater Quality Management Plan (PDP SWQMP) was prepared for each of the proposed Buildings D, F and G for the project. BWE, Inc prepared the PDP SWQMP for Building D, dated March 11, 2021. Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates, Inc. prepared the PDP SWQMP for Building F, dated March 10, 2021. BWE, Inc prepared the PDP SWQMP for Building G, dated March 11, 2021. The three PDP SWQMPs have been reviewed and found to be complete and in compliance with the WPO.

VI. NOISE ORDINANCE – Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan and the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance?

YES

☒

NO

☐

NOT APPLICABLE

☐**Discussion:**

Even though the proposal could generate potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the County General Plan or Noise Ordinance), the following noise mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the noise impacts to applicable limits:

Staff has reviewed the plot plan and noise report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning dated January 11, 2021. Staff determined that the information provided is accepted. The project site as well as surrounding parcels to the north, northeast, and west are zoned commercial, which are subject to the noise limits of 60 dBA daytime and 55 dBA nighttime. The parcels to the south and southeast are zoned Single-Family Residential (RS), which are subject to the arithmetic mean noise levels limit of 55 dBA daytime and 50 dBA nighttime. The main source of operational noise from this project would be from the drive-thru intercom. Based on the noise report, the maximum sound level pressure from the drive-thru speaker is 54 dBA at 32 feet. The speaker will operate at approximately 12 minutes per hour, which reduces the noise levels to 47 dBA. The nearest Noise Sensitive Land Use property line is at least 95 feet away from the equipment. In addition, there is an existing wall along the southern edge of the project site, which will provide further noise attenuation. Based on the distance separation, usage

factor, and existing wall, the noise levels from the speaker will be in compliance with the Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404.

Additionally, the project is also subject to the County Noise Ordinance that regulates the temporary noise limits. Temporary construction noise is subject to Section 36.408, 409, and 410. Noise from construction activities is one of the main noise producing sources from this project. Construction work would be limited to Monday through Saturday between 7a.m. to 7p.m. Based on the Noise Report, the combined use of an excavator, loader, and dump truck would generate noise levels of 71.9 dBA LEQ. Blasting and/or rock crushing is not proposed. The project demonstrates Noise Ordinance compliance and conformance to the County Noise Element. Temporary noise from construction and grading is not expected to exceed the 75 dBA. The project has been conditioned to ensure compliance with the Noise Ordinance.

Attachment C
Site Plan, Conceptual Landscape Plan,
Preliminary Grading Plan, Administrative Permit
Plot Plan, Boundary Adjustment Plat

$$1'' = 40' = 0'''$$
[illegible]

A map of the Los Angeles area showing the study site location. The map includes major roads like I-5, I-10, and I-405, and landmarks like the Los Angeles Convention Center and the Los Angeles International Airport. A black dot indicates the study site location near the intersection of I-10 and I-405.

AN EASEMENT FOR POLES, WIRES AND ANCHORS AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, RECORDED APRIL 22, 1965 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 71451 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, IN FAVOR OF: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

15, IN FAVOR OF: HELIX INNOVATION DISTRICT
AFFECTS: AS DESCRIBED THEREIN (AFFECTS PARCELS C AND D)


AN EASEMENT SHOWN ON DEDICATED ON THE MAP FILED OR
RECORDED FEBRUARY 21, 1973 AS MAP NO. 7556 OF TRACT
FOR: SEWER AND DRAINAGE AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES.
(AFFECTS PARCELS C AND D)

1101 N. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER
SUNNYVALE, CA


THE TERMS, PROVISIONS AND EASEMENT(S) CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "GRANT OF EASEMENT" RECORDED MAY 16 2016 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2016--0235754 OF OFFICIAL RECORD (AFFECTS PARCELS C AND D)

RING VALLEY



deg. 10/20/2020 11:15:42 AM, DWG To PDF.pc3



FRONT ELEVATION (WEST) - EXISTING
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"




REAR ELEVATION (EAST) - EXISTING
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"



SIDE ELEVATION (SOUTH) - EXISTING
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

2 - 89


SIDE ELEVATION (NORTH) - EXISTING
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"




SIDE ELEVATION (NORTH) - EXISTING
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

PHOTOS OF THE EXISTING KIWART GARDEN CENTER TO BE REMOVED

SIDE PERSPECTIVE (SOUTH) - EXISTING STRUCTURE
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"



FRONT VIEW
TENANT SPACE 'B' FENCED ENCLOSURE (EXISTING)
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



SIDE VIEW
TENANT SPACE 'A' FENCED ENCLOSURE (EXISTING)
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:
180 SWEETWATER ROAD
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94576
PROJECT NO.: 1801
ZONING: CN

DATE: 03/20/20
DESIGNER: ZAP
DRAWN BY: ZAP
CHECKED BY: ZAP
APPROVED BY: ZAP

PROJECT NAME:
SHOPPING CENTER -
SPRING VALLEY
SHEET TITLE:
EXISTING BUILDING ELEVATIONS

PROJECT ADDRESS:
180 SWEETWATER ROAD
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94576
PROJECT NO.: 1801
ZONING: CN

DATE: 03/20/20
DESIGNER: ZAP
DRAWN BY: ZAP
CHECKED BY: ZAP
APPROVED BY: ZAP

PROJECT NAME:
SHOPPING CENTER -
SPRING VALLEY
SHEET TITLE:
EXISTING BUILDING ELEVATIONS

SPRING VALLEY COLORED ELEVATIONS AND SIGN PACKAGE

11'X17 COLORED EXHIBITS SHEET INDEX:

- COLORED ARCHITECTURE ELEVATIONS WITH MATERIALS	
-ED1.0	PROPOSED BUILDING D ELEVATIONS
-ED2.0	PROPOSED BUILDING D TRASH ENCLOSURE
-EE1.0	EXISTING BUILDING E ELEVATIONS
-EE2.0	PROPOSED BUILDING E ELEVATIONS
-EE3.0	PROPOSED BUILDING E TRASH ENCLOSURE
-EF1.0	PROPOSED BUILDING F ELEVATIONS
-EF2.0	PROPOSED BUILDING F TRASH ENCLOSURE
-EG1.0	PROPOSED BUILDING G ELEVATION
-EG2.0	PROPOSED BUILDING G TRASH ENCLOSURE
- SIGN DEVELOPMENT PACKAGE	
-SA-1	EXISTING TENANT A SIGN ELEVATIONS
-SA-2	EXISTING TENANT B SIGN ELEVATIONS
-SA-3	EXISTING TENANT C SIGN ELEVATIONS
-CVS-1	PROPOSED BUILDING D (CVS) SIGN PLAN
-CVS-2	PROPOSED BUILDING D (CVS) SIGN ELEVATIONS
-SF-1	EXISTING BUILDING E (SMART AND FINAL) SIGN ELEVATIONS
-SF-2	PROPOSED BUILDING E (SMART AND FINAL) SIGN ELEVATIONS
-SF-3	PROPOSED BUILDING (SMART AND FINAL) SIGN INFO
-CFA-1	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN PLAN
-CFA-2	NOT USED
-CFA-3	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN ELEVATIONS
-CFA-4	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN ELEVATIONS
-CFA-5	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN INFO
-CFA-6	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN INFO
-CFA-7	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN INFO
-CFA-8	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN INFO
-CFA-10	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN INFO
-CFA-11	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN INFO
-CFA-12	PROPOSED BUILDING F (CHICK-FIL-A) SIGN INFO
- SIGN DEVELOPMENT PACKAGE continued	
-SBMT 01	PROPOSED BUILDING G SIGN (STARBUCKS) PLAN
-SBMT 02	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN ELEVATIONS
-SBMT 03	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 04	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 05	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 06	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 07	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 08	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 09	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 10	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 11	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 12	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 13	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 14	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 15	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 16	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 17	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 18	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-SBMT 19	PROPOSED BUILDING G (STARBUCKS) SIGN INFO
-M-1	EXISTING MONUMENT SIGN 25'
-M-2	EXISTING MONUMENT SIGN 35'
-M-3	EXISTING MONUMENT SIGN 18'
-LI-1	POLE LIGHT ELEVATIONS

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:

DATE : 04 20 2020

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350


PREPARED BY:

SHEET NUMBER


ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

TS-1






NORTH ELEVATION (JAMACHA RD) PROPOSED



EAST ELEVATION PROPOSED



WEST ELEVATION (SWEETWATER RD.) PROPOSED

Material	Material Description
EX1	PAVING/PLASTER/CONCRETE
EX2	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX3	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX4	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX5	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX6	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX7	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX8	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX9	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX10	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX11	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX12	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX13	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX14	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX15	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX16	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX17	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX18	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX19	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX20	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX21	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX22	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX23	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX24	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX25	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX26	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX27	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX28	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX29	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX30	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX31	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX32	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX33	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX34	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX35	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX36	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX37	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX38	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX39	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX40	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX41	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX42	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX43	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX44	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX45	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX46	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX47	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX48	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX49	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX50	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX51	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX52	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX53	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX54	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX55	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX56	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX57	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX58	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX59	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX60	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX61	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX62	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX63	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX64	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX65	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX66	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX67	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX68	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX69	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX70	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX71	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX72	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX73	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX74	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX75	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX76	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX77	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX78	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX79	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX80	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX81	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX82	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX83	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX84	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX85	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX86	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX87	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX88	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX89	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX90	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX91	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX92	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX93	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX94	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX95	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX96	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX97	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX98	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH
EX99	PLASTER/EIFS FINISH
EX100	COLOR RDP - TL HATCH

NOTE: COLOR ELEVATIONS
DUE TO LIMITATIONS OF THE PRINTING PROCESS, SURFACE TEXTURE OF MATERIALS, ETC., THE COLORS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING WILL VARY. COLORS AND MATERIALS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE TAKEN FROM SITE PHOTOS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS.

PROJECT ADDRESS: 835 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 10-23-2019

SHEET NUMBER: ED1.0


BLDG D

PROPOSED

elevations

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



INTERACTIVE CREAM SW6113

GRIZZLE GRAY SW 7068

PROJECT ADDRESS:

835 SWEETWATER ROAD

Spring Valley, CA 91977

PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 01-12-2021

PREPARED BY:

ZAAP, INC.

2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204

SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

ED2.0

BLDG D

PROPOSED


TRASH

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY


S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.

SPRING VALLEY, CA 91977

1/14/2021 12:58:08 PM, DWG To PDF.pc3



EAST EXISTING ELEVATION



NORTH - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION



WEST - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION




EXISTING ELEVATIONS

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:	835 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350	DATE : 10-23-2019	SHEET NUMBER
PREPARED BY:	ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ		EE1.0 BLDGE EXISTING ELEVATIONS



EAST - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION




NORTH - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION WITH NEW O'REILLY SIGNAGE

PROPOSED: 73.87 SF
PER COUNTY CODE = 51x1.5 = 76.5 SF MAX SIGN AREA



WEST - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION WITH NEW O'REILLY SIGNAGE

PER COUNTY CODE = 143x1.5 = 214.5 SF MAX SIGN AREA (PROPOSED 186.37SF)
PER COUNTY CODE = 49x1.5 = 73.5 SF MAX (PROPOSED 69.28SF)



EXTERIOR COLORS

EXISTING
1) Dunn Edwards DE6178 Boutique Beige

EXISTING
2) Dunn Edwards DE6222 Weather Board

EXISTING
3) Dunn Edwards DEA164 Autumn Bark

EXISTING
4) Cultured Stone - Natural LedgeStone



S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.

SPRING VALLEY, CA




PREPARED BY:
Gregory J. Cary
gjcary@oreillyauto.com
Tel: 916.399.7415
La Graciosa, CA 95214
PROJECT ADDRESS:
835 SWEETWATER ROAD
SPRING VALLEY, CA 95777
PROJECT NAME:
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD
& SWEETWATER


REVISION #	DATE	BY/DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	03/19/2020	gjcary	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

SHEET TITLE: Only Color Exterior Elevations
EE2.0


BLDG E PROPOSED ELEVATIONS



1D EAST ELEVATION PROPOSED FOR BUILDING F
N.T.S.



1C WEST ELEVATION PROPOSED FOR BUILDING F
N.T.S.



3B NORTH ELEVATION PROPOSED FOR BUILDING F
N.T.S.

1B SOUTH ELEVATION PROPOSED FOR BUILDING F
N.T.S.

NOTES:
1. BUILDING SIGN ON SOUTH ELEVATION TO BE NON-ILLUMINATED.
2. SHOULD ROOFTOP UNITS BE VISIBLE FROM THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY THEN THEY SHALL BE SCREENED

EXTERIOR FINISHES			
EC-1	PREFINISHED METAL COPING COLOR: DARK BRONZE	STC-1	STUCCO SYSTEM COLOR: SERENE THOUGHTS FINISH: SAND MEDIUM
PT-9	EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR: DARK BRONZE FINISH: SEMI-GLOSS	BR-3	BRICK VENEER COLOR: SPANISH MOSS SIZE: MODULAR MORTAR: ARGOS SAN TAN
ST-1	STOREFRONT COLOR: DARK BRONZE		

FINISH	DESCRIPTION	MANUFACTURER	MODEL NAME	MODEL NUMBER	COLOR	NOTE
BR-3	BRICK VENEER	H.C. MUDGON BRICK	MODULAR			SPANISH MOSS MORTAR: ARGOS SAN TAN
BR-4	BRICK VENEER (PRIMARY)	MODULAR				PT-9
BR-5	BRICK VENEER (ACCENT)	MODULAR				"SEE APPROVED BRICK ALTERNATES"
CP-1	PARAPET WALL COPING	MODULAR				"SEE APPROVED BRICK ALTERNATES"
EC-1	EXTERIOR PAINT	MODULAR				TEXTURE: FPD
PT-9	EXTERIOR PAINT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-1	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-2	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-3	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-4	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-5	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-6	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-7	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-8	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-9	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-10	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-11	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-12	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-13	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-14	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-15	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-16	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-17	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-18	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-19	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-20	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-21	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-22	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-23	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-24	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-25	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-26	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-27	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-28	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-29	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-30	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-31	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-32	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-33	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-34	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-35	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-36	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-37	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-38	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-39	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-40	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-41	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-42	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-43	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-44	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-45	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-46	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-47	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-48	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-49	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-50	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-51	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-52	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-53	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-54	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-55	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-56	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-57	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-58	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-59	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-60	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-61	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-62	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-63	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-64	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-65	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-66	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-67	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-68	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-69	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-70	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-71	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-72	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-73	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-74	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-75	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-76	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-77	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-78	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-79	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-80	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-81	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-82	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-83	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-84	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-85	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-86	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-87	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-88	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-89	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-90	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-91	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-92	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-93	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-94	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-95	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-96	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-97	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-98	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-99	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS
ST-100	STOREFRONT	MODULAR				SMOOTH WHITE, HIGH GLOSS

PROJECT ADDRESS: 835 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 05-11-2020

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ




SHEET NUMBER: EF 1.0
BLDG F
ELEV.



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.

SPRING VALLEY FIRESTEIN KMART SPRING VALLEY/02 - Design Development\PHASE_2\CAD\Tenant Buildings\Click Fil A\Spring Valley CFA TRASH ELV Colored.dwg, 10/21/2019 10:45:03 AM, DWG To PDF.pc3



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
HSPRING/2044616360 Feuerstein KMar Spring Valley\02 - Design Development\PHASE_2\CAD\Tenant Buildings\Starbucks\16350_ Starbucks-Thru Building Elevations.dwg, 8/27/2020 3:48:44 PM, DWG To PDF.pc3

PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE: 05-18-2020

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER: EG1.0
BLDG G
PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

NOTES:
1. IF ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT CAN BE SEEN FROM PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY THEN IT WILL BE SCREENED**

LEGEND:
TATAMI TAN SW 6116
GRIZZLE GRAY SW 7068
EXTRA WHITE SW 7066
INTERACTIVE CREAM SW 6113
TENANT LIGHT GREY **TBD**
WOOD SIDING TBD

SPRING VALLEY SIGN PACKAGE

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:		DATE :	12/09/2019
935 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350			
PREPARED BY:		SHEET NUMBER	
ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ		TS-2	



EXISTING TENANT A, B, AND C
SIGN ELEVATIONS

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE :


12/09/2019

PREPARED BY:


ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

TS-3



220'-0" LEASE LINE TO LEASE LINE



APPROVED
MAY 22 2019



PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES


PREVIOUSLY APPROVED
EXISTING TENANT 'A'



2 - 102



250 SQ FT TOTAL WALL SIGN ALLOWED
250 SQ FT TOTAL WALL SIGN USED



www.zaap.biz

SHEET

SA-1

EXISTING

SPRING VALLEY SHOPPING CENTER

JANUARY 2019

- LANDLORD TO PROVIDE:**
- ADEQUATE ACCESS BEHIND LOGO LETTERS FOR INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE, PER ARTICLE 600 OF THE N.E.C.
 - ONE (1) 20 AMP 120V ISOLATED SIGN CIRCUIT AND JUNCTION BOX TO AREA BEHIND SIGN LETTERS CONNECTED TO THE ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
 - AT LEAST 1/2" THICK PLYWOOD BACKING BEHIND ALL E.I.F.S. WALL SYSTEMS FOR SIGN AND BANNER SUPPORT

SIGN FASCIA TO BE FREE OF JOINTS & REVEALS, AND OF A LIGHT COLOR (MINIMUM 80% L.R.V.) TO PROVIDE HIGH CONTRAST AND VISIBILITY FOR THE SIGN.

ALL COLORS ARE SUBJECT TO ROSS STORES, INC. REVIEW AND APPROVAL. COLOR APPEARANCE MAY BE ALTERED BY PRINTING, SEE APPROVED FINAL CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS FOR COLOR SPECIFICATIONS.

IF ANY SIGNAGE PROPOSED IN THIS EXHIBIT IS ALTERED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES, ROSS STORES INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO, AT NO COST, ADJUST ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES TO BEST ACCOMMODATE THE ALTERED SIGNAGE.

- (A) 68"H INDIVIDUAL "ROSS" PAN CHANNEL
LETTER-LOG LOGO LETTERS:
FACES: TUF-GLAS-SS 21210-E4 MATTE BLUE
RETURNS: 8"D ALUM. W/ WHITE FINISH
TRIM CAP: 2" WHITE JEWELITE
LETTER BACKS: ALUMINUM
LEDS: INSEM SS-KD12CL-RW 9000K WHITE
MOUNTING: 1/4"-20 GALV. THRU BOLTS
PEG OFF: 1/2" SPACERS

- 28"H INDIVIDUAL "DFL" LOGO LETTERS:
ALL CALLOUTS SAME AS "ROSS" EXCEPT:
RETURNS: 5"D ALUM. W/ WHITE FINISH
TRIM CAP: 1" WHITE JEWELITE


- C** 23"H X 46"W X 10"D DOUBLE-FACE
INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED UNDER-CANOPY
SIGN, SEE SHEET UC FOR DETAILS.

APPROVED

MAY 22 2019

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PREVIOUSLY APPROVED
EXISTING TENANT B



CODE COMPLIANT :

SIGN AREA ALLOWED : ±195 SF
 SIGN AREA USED : ±192.82 SF

15 SF 18.6 SF
DRESS 24 SF
FOR LESS

UC SIGN: 1.9 X 3.8' = 7.22 SF

SSC21

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

#2136 SPRING VALLEY
Un-named Shopping Center
SEC Sweetwater Rd. & Jamacha Rd.
Spring Valley, CA

ROSS
DRESS FOR LESS

MEMBER

CSA

California State Association

ISA

1057 solano ave.
p.o. box 6153
albany, ca 94706-0153
510/526-0296 fax 526-6092
www.billmoore.com

RB-H

SHEET

11/09/18	12/12/18
11/09/18	12/12/18

SB-1

EXISTING

APPROVED
MAY 22 2019
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES

PREVIOUSLY APPROVED
EXISTING TENANT C

• I AND/OR TO PROVIDE:

- ADEQUATE ACCESS BEHIND LOGO LETTERS AND CABINET FOR INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE, PER ARTICLE 600 OF THE N.E.C.
- ONE (1) 20 AMP 120V ISOLATED SIGN CIRCUIT AND JUNCTION BOXES TO AREA BEHIND SIGN LETTERS CONNECTED TO THE ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
- AT LEAST 1/2" THICK PLYWOOD BACKING BEHIND ALL E.I.F.s, WALL SYSTEM FOR SIGN AND BANNER SUPPORT

SIGN FASCIA TO BE FREE OF JOINTS & REVEALS, AND OF A LIGHT COLOR (MINIMUM 75% L.R.V.) TO PROVIDE HIGH CONTRAST AND VISIBILITY FOR THE SIGN.

ALL COLORS ARE SUBJECT TO ROSS STORES, INC. REVIEW AND APPROVAL. COLOR APPEARANCE MAY BE ALTERED BY PRINTING, SEE APPROVED FINAL CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS FOR COLOR SPECIFICATIONS.

IF ANY SIGNAGE PROPOSED IN THIS EXHIBIT IS ALTERED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES, ROSS STORES INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO, AT NO COST, ADJUST ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES TO BEST ACCOMMODATE THE ALTERED SIGNAGE.

A 60" H INDIVIDUAL "DD'S" PAN CHANNEL
LOGO LETTERS.

LOGO LETTERS:
FACES: 7328 5G WHITE ACRYLIC SHEET W/ VINYL
OVERLAY 3M 3630-118 INTENSE MAGENTA
(3M 3630-236 FOR TURQUOISE APOSTROPHE)
RETURNS: 8"D ALUM. W/ WHITE FINISH
TRIM CAP: 2" WHITE JEWELITE
LETTER BACKS: ALUMINUM
LED: PRINCIPAL 9000K COOL WHITE
MOUNTING: 1/4"-20 GALVANIZED THRU BOLTS
PEG OFF: 1/2" SPACERS

(B) 30" INDIVIDUAL "DISCOUNTS" PAN CHANNEL
LOGO LETTERS:
FACES: 7328 .5G WHITE ACRYLIC SHEET W. VINYL
OVERLAY 3M 3630-236 TURQUOISE
RETURNING: 8"D ALUM. W/ WHITE FINISH
TRIM CAP: 2" WHITE JEWELITE
LETTER BACKS: ALUMINUM
LED: PRINCIPAL 5000K NATURAL WHITE
MOUNTING: 1/4"-20 GALVANIZED THRU BOLTS
PENG OFF: 1/2" SPACERS

C 20"H X 21-3"W X 5"D SINGLE-FACE INTERNALLY-ILLUMINATED CABINET SIGN.

ILLUMINATED CABINET SIGN:
2" RETAINERS PAINTED TO MATCH MAGENTA,
RETURNS: 8"ID ALUMINUM PAINTED
MAGENTA TO MATCH PMS #2415C
MATTHEWS #MPO0875 GLOSSY
FACE: TRANSLUCENT SG WHITE SOLAR GRADE
ACRYLIC WITH 3M 3630-118 INTENSE MAGENTA VINYL
OVERLAY AND 1"MM COPY WEDED AWAY.
LED: PRINCIPAL 9000K COOL WHITE
MOUNTING: 1/4"-20 GALVANIZED THRU BOLTS

D 12"H X 48"W X 10"D DOUBLE-FACE INTERNALLY-ILLUMINATED UNDERCANOPY SIGN, U.I.
SEE SHEET UC FOR DETAILS.

1 STOREFRONT • WEST • SWEETWATER ROAD • ELEVATION

150 SF ALLOWED

54.5 SF

DISCOUNTS 53.125 SF 35.27 SF

UNDER-CANOPY SIGN -4 SF

146.89 SF USED

bill moore & associates
1057 solano ave.
p.o. box 6153
albany, ca 94706-0153
510/526-0296 fax 526-6092
www.billmoore.com

#5383 SPRING VALLEY
 Unnamed Shopping Center
 935 Sweetwater Road
 Spring Valley, CA 91977



SHEET
SHEET
SC-1

EXISTING

SPRING VALLEY
SIGN PACKAGE
BLDG D
"CVS"


SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:		DATE : 10-23-2019
935 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350		
PREPARED BY:		SHEET NUMBER
ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ		TS-4





Proposed Signage



Sign Placement - Sign Key

North Elevation			
B1	CVS pharmacy	39 1/2"H x 371 11/16"W	101.96 SqFt
B2	drive-thru pharmacy	18 3/4"H x 238 5/8"W	31.07 SqFt
B3	drive-thru pharmacy clearance xx'-xx"	12"H x 72"W	6.0 SqFt
B3	drive-thru pharmacy	12"H x 121"W	10.0 SqFt
Total Proposed			149.03 SqFt

West Elevation			
B1	CVS pharmacy	39 1/2"H x 371 11/16"W	101.96 SqFt
B2	drive-thru pharmacy	18 3/4"H x 238 5/8"W	31.07 SqFt
B13		18 9/16"H x 14 1/2"W	1.87 SqFt
Total Proposed			134.9 SqFt

East Elevation			
B14	receiving entrance	18"H x 24"W	3.0 SqFt
Total Proposed			3.0 SqFt

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA




PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY: SHEET NUMBER

ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

CVS 01



Material	Material Description
EX1	PAVING/PAVING
EX2	PLASTER/PLASTER
EX3	PLASTER/PLASTER
EX4	PLASTER/PLASTER
EX5	PLASTER/PLASTER
EX6	PLASTER/PLASTER
EX7	PLASTER/PLASTER
EX8	PLASTER/PLASTER

NOTE: COLOR ELEVATIONS
DUE TO LIMITATIONS OF THE PRINTING PROCESS, SURFACE TEXTURE OF MATERIALS, ETC. THE COLORS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING WILL VARY. COLORS AND MATERIALS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE TAKEN FROM SITE PHOTOS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS.

PROJECT ADDRESS: 835 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE: 3/10/2021

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER: CVS 02



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

SPRING VALLEY
SIGN PACKAGE
BLDG E
"SMART AND FINAL "
"O'REILLY"

PROJECT ADDRESS:		DATE : 10-23-2019
935 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350		
PREPARED BY:		SHEET NUMBER
ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ		TS-6

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA





NORTH - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION



WEST - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION




EXISTING ELEVATIONS

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:	DATE : 10-23-2019	
	835 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350	
PREPARED BY:	ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ	SHEET NUMBER SF1.0



EAST - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION



NORTH - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION WITH NEW O'REILLY SIGNAGE

PROPOSED: 73.87 SF
PER COUNTY CODE = 51x1.5 = 76.5 SF MAX SIGN AREA



PER COUNTY CODE = 143x1.5 = 214.5 SF MAX SIGN AREA (PROPOSED 186.37SF)
PER COUNTY CODE = 49x1.5 = 73.5 SF MAX (PROPOSED 69.28SF)

WEST - EXISTING EXTERIOR ELEVATION WITH NEW O'REILLY SIGNAGE



EXTERIOR COLORS

EXISTING
1) Dunn Edwards DE6178 Boutique Beige

EXISTING
2) Dunn Edwards DE6222 Weather Board

EXISTING
3) Dunn Edwards DEA164 Autumn Bark

EXISTING
4) Cultured Stone - Natural LedgeStone



S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.

SPRING VALLEY, CA




PREPARED BY:
Catty Architects
800 SWEETWATER ROAD
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94707
PROJECT ADDRESS:
800 SWEETWATER ROAD
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94707
PROJECT NAME:
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD
& SWEETWATER

REVISION #	DATE	BY	DATE
1	03/10/2020	CA	
2		CA	
3		CA	
4		CA	
5		CA	
6		CA	
7		CA	
8		CA	
9		CA	
10		CA	
11		CA	
12		CA	
13		CA	
14		CA	
15		CA	
16		CA	
17		CA	
18		CA	
19		CA	
20		CA	
21		CA	
22		CA	
23		CA	
24		CA	
25		CA	
26		CA	
27		CA	
28		CA	
29		CA	
30		CA	
31		CA	
32		CA	
33		CA	
34		CA	
35		CA	
36		CA	
37		CA	
38		CA	
39		CA	
40		CA	
41		CA	
42		CA	
43		CA	
44		CA	
45		CA	
46		CA	
47		CA	
48		CA	
49		CA	
50		CA	
51		CA	
52		CA	
53		CA	
54		CA	
55		CA	
56		CA	
57		CA	
58		CA	
59		CA	
60		CA	
61		CA	
62		CA	
63		CA	
64		CA	
65		CA	
66		CA	
67		CA	
68		CA	
69		CA	
70		CA	
71		CA	
72		CA	
73		CA	
74		CA	
75		CA	
76		CA	
77		CA	
78		CA	
79		CA	
80		CA	
81		CA	
82		CA	
83		CA	
84		CA	
85		CA	
86		CA	
87		CA	
88		CA	
89		CA	
90		CA	
91		CA	
92		CA	
93		CA	
94		CA	
95		CA	
96		CA	
97		CA	
98		CA	
99		CA	
100		CA	

SHEET TITLE: Only Color Exterior Elevations
SF2.0

EXISTING SIGN




EXISTING SIGN



EXISTING SIGN



EXISTING SIGN



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY: SHEET NUMBER

SF3.0

ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SPRING VALLEY
SIGN PACKAGE
BLDG F
"CHICK-FIL-A"

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:	DATE : 10-23-2019
835 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350	
PREPARED BY:	SHEET NUMBER
ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ	TS-7






Scope of Work

- A** NEW 6'-0" ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" CHANNEL LETTERS SIGN
- B** NEW 6'-0" NON-ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" FCO LETTERS SIGN
- D** NEW 7'-0" ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" ICON LOGO CABINET
- E** NEW 6'-0" ILLUM. DIRECTIONAL SIGN

Install Only Manufacturing By Others

- 1** DRIVE-THRU MENU BOARD
- 2** DRIVE-THRU CLEARANCE ARM
- 3** DRIVE-THRU CLEARANCE ARM
- 5** FLAG POLE

BMP LEGEND	
FOR 001	SHOW LOT
FOR 002	DIRT
FOR 003	DIRT
FOR 004	DIRT
FOR 005	DIRT
FOR 006	DIRT
FOR 007	DIRT
FOR 008	DIRT
FOR 009	DIRT
FOR 010	DIRT
FOR 011	DIRT
FOR 012	DIRT
FOR 013	DIRT
FOR 014	DIRT
FOR 015	DIRT
FOR 016	DIRT
FOR 017	DIRT
FOR 018	DIRT
FOR 019	DIRT
FOR 020	DIRT
FOR 021	DIRT
FOR 022	DIRT
FOR 023	DIRT
FOR 024	DIRT
FOR 025	DIRT
FOR 026	DIRT
FOR 027	DIRT
FOR 028	DIRT
FOR 029	DIRT
FOR 030	DIRT
FOR 031	DIRT
FOR 032	DIRT
FOR 033	DIRT
FOR 034	DIRT
FOR 035	DIRT
FOR 036	DIRT
FOR 037	DIRT
FOR 038	DIRT
FOR 039	DIRT
FOR 040	DIRT
FOR 041	DIRT
FOR 042	DIRT
FOR 043	DIRT
FOR 044	DIRT
FOR 045	DIRT
FOR 046	DIRT
FOR 047	DIRT
FOR 048	DIRT
FOR 049	DIRT
FOR 050	DIRT
FOR 051	DIRT
FOR 052	DIRT
FOR 053	DIRT
FOR 054	DIRT
FOR 055	DIRT
FOR 056	DIRT
FOR 057	DIRT
FOR 058	DIRT
FOR 059	DIRT
FOR 060	DIRT
FOR 061	DIRT
FOR 062	DIRT
FOR 063	DIRT
FOR 064	DIRT
FOR 065	DIRT
FOR 066	DIRT
FOR 067	DIRT
FOR 068	DIRT
FOR 069	DIRT
FOR 070	DIRT
FOR 071	DIRT
FOR 072	DIRT
FOR 073	DIRT
FOR 074	DIRT
FOR 075	DIRT
FOR 076	DIRT
FOR 077	DIRT
FOR 078	DIRT
FOR 079	DIRT
FOR 080	DIRT
FOR 081	DIRT
FOR 082	DIRT
FOR 083	DIRT
FOR 084	DIRT
FOR 085	DIRT
FOR 086	DIRT
FOR 087	DIRT
FOR 088	DIRT
FOR 089	DIRT
FOR 090	DIRT
FOR 091	DIRT
FOR 092	DIRT
FOR 093	DIRT
FOR 094	DIRT
FOR 095	DIRT
FOR 096	DIRT
FOR 097	DIRT
FOR 098	DIRT
FOR 099	DIRT
FOR 100	DIRT



CHICK-FIL-A - Spring Valley, CA. - Site Plan

SCALE: 1" = 40'-0"

SIGN ID LETTER	FACE A	FACE B
A	Chick-fil-A	N/A
B	Chick-fil-A	N/A
D	Chick-fil-A	N/A
E	Drive Thru	Drive Thru
G	Thank You	Do Not Enter
1	2	N/A
3		N/A
4		N/A
5		N/A



PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE: 10-23-2019

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER: CFA_01

THIS IS AN ORIGINAL UNPUBLISHED DRAWING CREATED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH A PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY ZAAP. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN OUTSIDE YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY AN OFFICER OF ZAAP.

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROPOSED WALL SIGN "A": 50.6 SF
PER COUNTY CODE: 42X1.5=63 SF
PER SVC PG: 42X1.25=52.5 SF

A NEW 6'-0" ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" CHANNEL LETTERS SIGN

North Elevation

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

THIS SIGN IS NON-ILLUMINATED



PROPOSED WALL SIGN "B": 50.6 SF
PER COUNTY CODE: 42X1.5=63 SF
PER SVC PG: 42X1.25=52.5 SF

B NEW 6'-0" NON-ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" FCO LETTERS SIGN

South Elevation

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 10-23-2019

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.


2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER
CFA_03
SIGN ELEV

THIS IS AN ORIGINAL UNPUBLISHED DRAWING CREATED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH A PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY ZAAP. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN OUTSIDE YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY AN OFFICER OF ZAAP.

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROPOSED WALL SIGN "D": 49.0 SF
PER COUNTY CODE: 121X1.5=181.5 SF
PER SVCPG: 121X1.25=166.25 SF

- C NEW 6'-0" ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" CHANNEL LETTERS SIGN
- I NEW SINTRA ADDRESS NUMERALS

West Elevation

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED WALL SIGN "C": 50.6 SF
PER COUNTY CODE: 121X1.5=181.5 SF
PER SVCPG: 121X1.25=166.25 SF

- D NEW 7'-0" ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" ICON LOGO CABINET
- N NEW WINDOW VINYL

East Elevation

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

THIS IS AN ORIGINAL UNPUBLISHED DRAWING CREATED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH A PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY ZAP. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN OUTSIDE YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY AN OFFICER OF ZAP.

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY


S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:
935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91777
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 10-23-2019

PREPARED BY:
ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER
CFA_04
SIGN ELEV



AREA: 50.61 SQ. FT.
8 STRAIGHT LINES


MOUNTING AND ELECTRICAL PENETRATIONS

A C NEW 6'-0" ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" CHANNEL LETTERS SIGN

note: per SVCPG the south elevation sign will not be illuminated.

Specifications:

- BODY:** SIF CUSTOM FABRICATED ALUMINUM CHANNEL LETTERS CONSTRUCTED OF .050" WITH .063 ALUMINUM BACKS. ALUMINUM RETURNS MECHANICALLY FASTENED TO BACKS. INTERIOR OF SIGN TO BE PAINTED MATTE WHITE.
- FACES:** 3/16" #2793 RED ACRYLIC OR EQUIVALENT.
- TRIM CAP:** 1" X 125 TRUE RED JEWELITE TRIM CAP (ADHERED VIA WELD ON RETURNS)
- RETURNS:** 5" DEEP RETURNS PAINTED TO MATCH MOUNTING SURFACE COLOR
- STAND OFF:** 3/8" SLEEVE ANCHORS WITH 1/2" ALUMINUM SPACERS.
- REGISTERED:** 3/16" ACRYLIC DISK WITH RETURNS PAINTED TO MATCH MOUNTING SURFACE. 3M 3632-53 CARDINAL RED AND WHITE VINYL @ APPLIED FIRST SURFACE.
- DISCONNECT:** ELECTRICAL TOGGLE DISCONNECT SWITCH WITH WATERPROOF BOOT
- ILLUMINATION:** RED LED LIGHTING WITH REMOTE TRANSFORMERS. ALL WIRING & COMPONENTS TO MEET U.L. STANDARDS



PERSPECTIVE VIEW

CHICK-FIL-A SIF LED ILLUMINATED CHANNEL LETTERS

SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"

PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977

DATE : 10-23-2019

PROJECT NO: 16350

SHEET NUMBER

CFA_05

SIGN INFO





PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

THIS IS AN ORIGINAL UNPUBLISHED DRAWING CREATED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH A PROJECT PLANNED FOR YOU BY NIS INC. IT IS NOT TO BE SHOWN OUTSIDE YOUR ORGANIZATION NOR USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION.

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY


S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA





DISCONNECT SWITCH

ARLON CAST FLEX
SUBSTRATE





D NEW 7'-0" ILLUM. "CHICK-FIL-A" ICON LOGO CABINET

Specifications:

CABINET: SIGNCOMP #2025 SINGLE FACE BODY PAINTED MATTHEWS RED MP 10252.
FACES: WHITE BLEED 3M PANOGRAPHIC III FLEX FACE WITH CARDINAL RED #3632-53
TRANSLUCENT VINYL FIRST SURFACE OVERLAY WITH WHITE SHOW THRU.
RETAINER: SIGNCOMP #2095 BLEED TENSION FRAME COVER PAINTED MATTHEWS RED MP 10252.
RETURNS: 9 3/4" DEEP ALUMINUM RETURN PAINTED MATTHEWS RED MP 10252.
ILLUMINATION: WHITE 6500K LED.
DISCONNECT: ELECTRICAL TOGGLE DISCONNECT SWITCH WITH BOOT

ALL WIRING & COMPONENTS TO MEET U.L. STANDARDS



NEW S/F ILLUMINATED ICON LOGO CABINET

SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"

PROJECT ADDRESS: 835 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE: 10-23-2019

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.

2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

CFA_06

SIGN INFO

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

3M RED 3632-53
MATTHEWS MP 74155 SV SATIN DARK BRONZE
WHITE / #7328 ACRYLIC



ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA


1 2 DRIVE-THRU MENU BOARD

SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

CFA_08
SIGN INFO




DATE : 10-23-2019

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



FOOTINGS BY OTHERS, FINAL SETTING BY NSMC



Flag

FOUNDATION SIZES

HEIGHT	A	B	C	FLAG SIZE
20'	3'-6"	30"	24"	6'-10'
25'	3'-6"	30"	24"	6'-10'
30'	3'-6"	30"	24"	6'-10'
35'	4'-0"	36"	30"	6'-10'
40'	4'-6"	42"	36"	12'-18'
45'	5'-0"	48"	42"	12'-18'
50'	5'-6"	48"	42"	12'-18'

Size Chart


Ground sleeve and concrete installed by the general contractor

Pole installed on pre-installed ground sleeve by sign contractor



FLAG POLE

SCALE: NTS



Flag Pole Elevation

PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 10-23-2019

SHEET NUMBER: CFA_12
SIGN

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

CFA-00108 - CFA FPL E

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

SPRING VALLEY
SIGN PACKAGE
BLDG G
" Starbucks "
MULTI TENANT

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY


S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROJECT ADDRESS:	DATE : 10-23-2019
935 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350	
PREPARED BY:	SHEET NUMBER
ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ	TS-8

KEY LEGEND

- A 60" LOGO
- B 48" DT WALL SIGN
- C 20" CHANNEL LETTER
- D D/T DIRECTIONAL
- E EXIT DIRECTIONAL
- F CLEARANCE BAR
- G PRE MENU SCREEN
- H ORDER SCREEN W/ CANOPY
- I 5 PANEL MENU BOARD
- J REFACE MONUMENT



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

03/10/2021

SHEET NUMBER

SP.1

PREPARED BY:


ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

(N) GAS LOCATION PER
SDGE. BUILD PER SDGE
STANDARDS.

(E) PUBLIC
SIDEWALK

(E) FIRE
HYDRANT NEW LIGHT
TO THIS LOCATION

2 - 124




FRONT ELEVATION (EAST)

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"




STREET ELEVATION (WEST)

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



SIDE ELEVATION (SOUTH)

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



SIDE ELEVATION (NORTH)

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"



NOTES:
1. IF ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT CAN BE SEEN FROM PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY THEN IT WILL BE SCREENED**

PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 05-18-2020


PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER: SBMT
02

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.

PHASE 2 CAD Tenant Buildings Starbucks 16350_ Starbucks-Thru Building Elevations.dwg, 8/27/2020 3:48:44 PM, DWG To PDF.pc3



Scale: $1/2'' = 1'$

A 60" Illuminated Logo Disc - Wall Mounted ~ Qty (2)

SPECIFICATIONS:

- A** 60 (1524mm) Single faced internally illuminated wall mount logo disk. Cabinet to be 3' (762mm) deep, fabricated aluminum slotted and back. Paint cabinet black polyurethane. Faces to be 3/16" (5mm) Acrylic 015-2GP 1" (25mm) black trimcap with square head screws retainer edging.
- B** Graphics of logo to be 1st surface 3M Translucent Scotchcal vinyl- Holly Green # 3630-76. Siren to show thru White.
- C** Internally illuminated logo disk with Sloan Prism Enlighture white 6500K. laid out at 1.5 modules per foot, 6" on center. installed to back of disk with self-contained power supply with U.L approved enclosure.

D Flushed mounted to wood fascia with #14 Screws.

Sign must be approved by the National Electrical Code, Underwriters Laboratory, CUL, and all applicable local codes. Disconnect switch in primary to be within sight of sign (sign includes power supply enclosure) REF: NEC 110-3(B) 600-2, 600-4. Primary electrical source 1/2"(13mm) conduit minimum REF: NEC 600-6, 600-21 (provided by installer).

Disk 60in S/F Illuminated wall mount EVOLVED			
Size	Sq.Ft.	Sq.M.	Volts
60" (1524mm)	19.62	1.82	120



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:

DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY:

ZAAP, INC.


2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

SBMT

03




2 Left View

1 Front View

3 Right View

B 48" Illuminated Drive-Thru w/ Right Arrow - Wall Mounted ~ Qty (2)

Scale: 3/4" = 1'



Vertical Cross-Section View

NTS

Service Position View

NTS

Attachment Detail

NTS

Sign Specifications:

- Cabinet:
 - Fabricated 125" (3mm) aluminum housing painted black to match RAL 7021M with 3M #480-10 white vinyl end cap as shown.
 - Areas using black paint to match RAL 7021M shall have a max 20% gloss level, match sample.
 - Back to be 125" (3mm) aluminum backed up with 125" (3mm) white solar grade polycarbonate matching R&H #7328. All polycarbonate face elements to be mechanically retained.
 - Interior aluminum surfaces of sign cabinet to be painted white with Lacry Statone.
 - Sign cabinet shall be constructed with no visible fasteners. Fasteners retaining the hinged face will be located on the bottom such that they are not visible. All fasteners used in the assembly of internal components shall be coated to prevent corrosion.
 - Internal structure of cabinet shall be per approved shop drawings.
 - Internally illuminated logo disc with Sloan Prism Enlighten white 6500K, laid out at 1.5 modules per foot, 7" on center. Installed to back of disk with self-contained power supply with U.L. approved enclosure.

- Regulatory:
 - Sign must meet all regulations in the National Electric Code as well as any local or state electrical codes.
 - As per NEC 600.6, sign is equipped with a service disconnect switch.
 - Sign must be listed as an Electric Sign per Underwriters Laboratories (UL) and must bear the appropriate U.L. CUL or CSM relevant certification marks.
 - Primary power by electrical contractor per NEC.



These Drawings and Specifications are confidential and shall remain the sole property of Starbucks Corporation, which is the owner of the copyright in this work. They shall not be reproduced (in whole or in part) without the prior written consent of Starbucks Corporation.

This drawing is a Design Development Document. Site specific information and details shall be provided by the design architect and/or Engineer of Record and will be required prior to using this document for Bidding, Permitting, or Construction.

Size	Sq. Ft.	Sq. Ft.	Volts	Amps
21" (533mm)	4.52	6.96	120	0.85

1: Fitted as illustrated center part
2: Fitted as completed signage

PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

SHEET NUMBER
SBMT
04



PREPARED BY:
ZAAP INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



Design # 14198




STARBUCKS SPECIFICATION:

- Internally illuminated channel letters to be fabricated from 0.040 / 3003 aluminum with pre painted White interiors and painted Black polycarbonate exteriors, 3"-7mm deep. Letters backs to be .063 Black & White aluminum pop-riveted to sidewalls and sealed.
- Faces to be 3/16" white acrylic faces with black trim cap retainer edging.
- Internally illuminated with Sloan Prism Enlighten white 6500K, laid out 1.5 modules per foot, 6" on center installed to back of letter with Sloan power supply with U.L. approved closure.
- Fasten letters flush to wall with required fasteners.
Sign must be approved by the National Electrical Code, Underwriters Laboratory, CUL, and all applicable local codes.
Disconnect switch in primary to be within sight of sign (sign includes power supply enclosure) REF: NEC 110-3(B) 600-2, 600-4.
Primary electrical source (1/2"(13mm) conduit minimum) REF: NEC 600-6, 600-21 (provided by installer)



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY: SHEET NUMBER

SBMT

05

ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ


16'4"

20"

C2 18" DAY/NITE CHANNEL LETTERS ~ Qty (1)

SCALE: 3/8" = 1'



C2 18" DAY/NITE CHANNEL LETTERS ~ Qty (1)



LED Detail
Scale 3/8" = 1'-0"




STARBUCKS SPECIFICATION:

- A** Internally illuminated channel letters to be fabricated from 0.040" / 3003 aluminum with painted white interiors and painted black polyurethane exteriors, 3" (76mm) deep. Letter backs to be .063" Black & White aluminum riveted to sidewalls and sealed.
 - B** Faces to be 3/16" white acrylic faces with 3W day/night perforated vinyl applied to faces and black trim cap retainer girding.
 - C** Internally illuminated with Sloan Prism Enlighten white 6500K, laid out 15 modules per foot, 6" on center installed to back of letter with Sloan power supply with U.L. approved closure.
 - D** Fasten letters flush with wall with required fasteners.
- Sign must be approved by the National Electrical Code, Underwriters Laboratory, CUL and all applicable local codes.
Disconnect switch in primary to be within sight of sign (sign includes power supply enclosure) REF: NEC 110-3(b)(1) 600-204, 600-21
110-3(b)(2) 110-3(b)(3) conduit must remain 6mm REF: NEC 600-6, 600-21
(provided by installer)
- 
UL
LISTED
ELECTRICAL
EQUIPMENT
- 
UL
CLASS
0
EAS



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



Letter Section View

Scale: NTS

PROJECT ADDRESS: _____

DATE : 10-23-2019

DATE : 10-23-2019


935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY: _____ SHEET NUMBER _____

SBMT

06





- GENERAL NOTES
- DESIGN CODE: CBC 2019/IBC 2018
 - WIND LOADS: ASCE 7-16
 - WIND VELOCITY 117 MPH, RISK CATEGORY II, EXPOSURE C
 - CONCRETE MIN. 2500 PSI @ 28 DAYS
 - BOLTS AND HARDWARE SHALL BE HOT DIP GALVANIZED PER ASTM A153
 - STRUCTURAL STEEL BARS, PLATES AND ROLLED SHAPES ASTM A36
 - SOIL PASSIVE PRESSURE PER CBC CLASS 5 (100 PCF)
 - STEEL REINFORCEMENT IN CONCRETE ASTM A615 GRADE 60
 - PROVIDE MIN. 3" CLEAR COVER ON ALL STEEL EMBEDDED IN CONCRETE
 - SCOPE OF WORK IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN OF SIGN SUPPORT COLUMN(S) AND FOOTING. SCOPE OF WORK EXCLUDES PERFORMING CAPACITY CHECKS OF SIGN FRAMING AND ATTACHMENTS TO COLUMNS. ALL OF WHICH ARE BY OTHERS
 - ALL FABRICATING TO BE PERFORMED IN AN APPROVED SHOP
 - STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION PER SEC. 1704.6 IS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT
 - ANCHOR BOLT STEEL ASTM F1554 GRADE 36
 - CONTACT YUNGMAN ENGINEERING IMMEDIATELY IF GROUNDWATER IS DISCOVERED DURING FOOTING EXCAVATION
 - STRUCTURAL STEEL WELDS SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ANSI/AWS D1.1 AND AISC SPECIFICATIONS CHAPTER J. WELDERS SHALL BE CERTIFIED AS REQUIRED BY GOVERNING CODE AUTHORITY. WELDING SHALL BE PERFORMED BY ELECTRIC ARC PROCESS USING LOW-HYDROGEN ELECTRODES WITH $F_{ex} \geq 70$ KSI MIN

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

YUNGMAN
ENGINEERING

2172 FELSPAR ST. UNIT B
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109
(619) 706-8577
info@yungmanengineering.com


PREPARED FOR:
SIGN INDUSTRIES

STARBUCKS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS,
CALIFORNIA

PROJECT NUMBER:
1835C

DATE: 12-23-2019
SCALE: NO SCALE
DRAWN BY: MTY
DESIGNED BY: MTY

REVISIONS:
NO. DATE
1
2
3



PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

SHEET NUMBER
SBMT
08

PREPARED BY:
ZAAP INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

Starbucks
Design ID# 14191

- Cabinet:**
- Fabricated .090" (2mm) aluminum housing painted black to match RAL 7021M with white end caps as shown.
 - Directional copy backed up with .125" (3mm) #7328 white polycarbonate. All polycarbonate face elements to be attached to aluminum face panel with weld studs.
 - Interior aluminum surfaces of sign cabinet to be painted white with Lacyl Starbrite.
 - Welded aluminum construction with no visible fasteners. Fasteners retaining the hinged face will be located on the bottom such that they are not visible. All fasteners used in the assembly of internal components shall be coated to prevent corrosion.
 - Internal structure of cabinet shall be per approved shop drawings.
 - Internally illuminated logo disc with Sloan Prism Enlighten white 6500K, laid out at 1.5 modules per foot, 7" on center with self-contained power supply with UL approved enclosure.

Support:

- Supporting structure will be all welded aluminum tube and channel construction painted black to match RAL 7021M as per approved shop drawings and shall be integral to the sign cabinet.
- Base tube will be constructed so that it can be retro-fittable to existing sign foundations. All foundations, existing and new must be constructed for stability and must meet all local city or state codes regulations.

Regulatory:

- Sign must meet all regulations in the National Electric Code as well as any local or state electrical codes.
- As per NEC 600.6, sign is equipped with a service disconnect switch.
- Sign must be listed as an Electric Sign per Underwriters Laboratories UL48 and/or CSA and bear the appropriate UL, CUL or CSA relevant certification marks.
- Primary power by electrical contractor per NEC.



These Drawings and Specifications are confidential and shall remain the sole property of Starbucks Corporation, which is the owner of the copyright in this work. They shall not be reproduced (in whole or in part), shared with third parties or used in any manner on other projects or extensions to this project without the prior written consent of Starbucks Corporation.

This drawing is a Design Development Document. Site specific modifications made under the responsible charge of the Architect and/or Engineer-of-Record will be required prior to using this document for Bidding, Permitting, or Construction.

Size	Sq. Ft. ¹	Sq. Ft. ²	Volts	Amps
48" (1168mm)	0.94	7.99	120	0.85

1: Figure as illuminated center part
2: Figure as complete signage


PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

SHEET NUMBER
SBMT
09


PREPARED BY:

ZAAP INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ



E D/F EXIT DIRECTIONAL SIGNS ~ Qty (1)

Scale: 1"= 1'



Vertical Cross-Section View, Typ.

Service Position View

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

GENERAL NOTES

1. DESIGN CODE: CBC 2019/IBC 2018
2. DESIGN LOADS: ASCE 7-16
3. WIND VELOCITY: 117 MPH, RISK CATEGORY II, EXPOSURE C
4. CONCRETE MIN. 2500 PSI @ 28 DAYS
5. BOLTS AND HARDWARE SHALL BE HOT DIP GALVANIZED PER ASTM A153
6. STRUCTURAL STEEL BARS, PLATES AND ROLLED SHAPES ASTM A36
7. SOIL PASSIVE PRESSURE PER CBC CLASS 5 (100 PCF)
8. STEEL REINFORCEMENT IN CONCRETE ASTM A615 GRADE 60
9. PROVIDE MIN. 3" CLEAR COVER ON ALL STEEL EMBEDDED IN CONCRETE
10. SCOPE OF WORK IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN OF SIGN SUPPORT COLUMN(S) AND FOOTING. SCOPE OF WORK EXCLUDES PERFORMING CAPACITY CHECKS OF SIGN FRAMING AND ATTACHMENTS TO COLUMNS, ALL OF WHICH ARE BY OTHERS
11. ALL FABRICATING TO BE PERFORMED IN AN APPROVED SHOP
12. STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION PER SEC. 1704-6 IS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT
13. ANCHOR BOLT STEEL ASTM F1554 GRADE 36
14. CONTACT YUNGMAN ENGINEERING IMMEDIATELY IF GROUNDWATER IS DISCOVERED DURING FOOTING EXCAVATION
15. STRUCTURAL STEEL WELDS SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ANSII/AISC D1.1 AND AISC SPECIFICATIONS CHAPTER J. WELDERS SHALL BE CERTIFIED AS REQUIRED BY GOVERNING CODE AUTHORITY. WELDING SHALL BE PERFORMED BY ELECTRIC ARC PROCESS USING LOW-HYDROGEN ELECTRODES WITH Fxexw70 K5M1IN

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



2172 FELSPAR ST., UNIT B
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109
(858) 705-0557
michael@yungmanengineering.com

PREPARED FOR:
SIGN INDUSTRIES

STARBUCKS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS,
CALIFORNIA

PROJECT NUMBER:
1835C


DATE: 12-23-2019

SCALE: NO SCALE

DRAWN BY: MTY

DESIGNED BY: MTY

REVISIONS: NO. DATE



PROJECT ADDRESS:

DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY:

SHEET NUMBER

ZAAP, INC.

SBMT

SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

10



Design ID#14106

SPECIFICATIONS:

- Scrapers Bar
- 2"x5" 5/16" steel tube painted to match PMS 369 green.
- Flush steel end caps painted to match PMS 369 green.
- Copy and chevrons to be 1st surface computer cut 3M #680-10 white Scotchlite reflective vinyl film.
- Bottom striping to be 1st surface computer cut 3M #680-10 white Scotchlite reflective vinyl film. Striping extends 3/8" [10mm] onto front face.
- Suspend from support with SS cable & hardware. Cable provided requires field adjustment for proper clearance height.



Support:

- Supporting structure will be all welded steel tube construction painted black to match RAL 7021M as per approved shop drawings.
- Base tube will be constructed so that it can be retro-fitted to existing sign foundations. All foundations, existing and new must be analyzed for suitability and must meet all local city or state codes regulations.

These Drawings and Specifications are confidential and shall remain the sole property of Starbucks Corporation, which is the owner of the copyright in this work. They shall not be reproduced (in whole or in part), shared with third parties or used in any manner on other projects or extensions to this project without the prior written consent of Starbucks Corporation.


This drawing is a Design Development Document. Site specific modifications made under the responsible charge of the Architect and/or Engineer/Architect shall be required prior to using this document for Bidding, Permitting, or Construction.

Size	Sq. Ft.
10'-3" (3124mm)	2.29




F FREESTANDING -DT CLEARANCE BAR ARROW SERIES-Qty (1)

Scale: 1/2"= 1'



Front View @ Placard - Graphic Details

Bottom View @ Placard - Graphic Details



Base Plate Cover Detail

Base Plate Detail

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE: 10-23-2019

SHEET NUMBER

SBMT

11

PREPARED BY: ZAAP INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

YUNGMAN
ENGINEERING

2172 FELSPAR ST., UNIT B
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109
(858) 705-0857
michael@yungmanengineering.com

PREPARED FOR:
SIGN INDUSTRIES

STARBUCKS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS,
CALIFORNIA

PROJECT NUMBER:
1835B

DATE: 12-23-2019

SCALE: NO SCALE

DRAWN BY: MTY

DESIGNED BY: MTY

REVISIONS:
NO. DATE

1

2

3



DATE : 10-23-2019

PROJECT ADDRESS:

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350


PREPARED BY:

ZAAP INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

SBMT

12



GENERAL NOTES

1. DESIGN CODE: CBC 2019/IBC 2018
2. DESIGN LOADS: ASCE 7-16
3. WIND VELOCITY 117 MPH, RISK CATEGORY II, EXPOSURE C
4. CONCRETE MIN. 2500 PSI @ 28 DAYS
5. CABLE STEEL ASTM A475
6. HSS RECT TUBE STEEL ASTM A500 GRADE B, 46 KSI
7. BOLTS AND HARDWARE SHALL BE HOT DIP GALVANIZED PER ASTM A153
8. STRUCTURAL STEEL BARS, PLATES AND ROLLED SHAPES ASTM A36
9. SOIL PASSIVE PRESSURE PER CBC CLASS 5 (100 PCF)
10. STEEL REINFORCEMENT IN CONCRETE ASTM A615 GRADE 60
11. PROVIDE MIN. 3" CLEAR COVER ON ALL STEEL EMBEDDED IN CONCRETE
12. SCOPE OF WORK IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN OF SIGN SUPPORT COLUMN(S) AND FOOTING. SCOPE OF WORK EXCLUDES PERFORMING CAPACITY CHECKS OF SIGN FRAMING AND ATTACHMENT'S TO COLUMNS. ALL OF WHICH ARE BY OTHERS
13. ALL FABRICATING TO BE PERFORMED IN AN APPROVED SHOP
14. STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION PER SEC. 1704.6 IS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT
15. ANCHOR BOLT STEEL ASTM F1554 GRADE 36
16. CONTACT YUNGMAN ENGINEERING IMMEDIATELY IF GROUNDWATER IS DISCOVERED DURING FOOTING EXCAVATION
17. STRUCTURAL STEEL WELDS SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ANSI/AWS D1.1 AND AISC SPECIFICATIONS CHAPTER J. WELDERS SHALL BE CERTIFIED AS REQUIRED BY GOVERNING CODE AUTHORITY. WELDING SHALL BE PERFORMED BY ELECTRIC ARC PROCESS USING LOW-HYDROGEN ELECTRODES WITH $F_{ex} \geq 70$ KSI MIN


SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

DT PRE ORDER FREESTANDING		11036584
<p>ALL CREDIT OPERATIVE AND PROCESS DATA PERTAINING TO THIS ORDER IS THE PROPERTY OF DSA PHOTOTECH 19961 Central Avenue, Carson, CA 90746 (310) 337-5000 (310) 337-0600 Fax DSA phubell@dsaphototech.com</p> 		
DRIVE THRU PRE ORDER w/ STAND		
PAY DATE	COSBDET/PRELED	SCALE 1/16 S
PAH 02/13/14		

13

YUNGMAN
ENGINEERING

2172 FELSPAR ST. UNIT B
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109
(619) 705-0657
michael@yungmanengineering.com

PREPARED FOR:
SIGN INDUSTRIES

STARBUCKS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS,
CALIFORNIA

PROJECT NUMBER:
1835K

DATE: 12-23-2019

SCALE: NO SCALE

DRAWN BY: MTY

DESIGNED BY: MTY

REVISIONS:
NO. DATE

1

2

3



PROJECT ADDRESS:

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350


PREPARED BY:

ZAAP INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

SBMT

14




GENERAL NOTES


- DESIGN CODE: CBC 2019/IBC 2018
- DESIGN LOADS: ASCE 7-16
- WIND VELOCITY 117 MPH, RISK CATEGORY II, EXPOSURE C
- CONCRETE MIN. 2500 PSI @ 28 DAYS
- BOLTS AND HARDWARE SHALL BE HOT DIP GALVANIZED PER ASTM A153
- STRUCTURAL STEEL BARS, PLATES AND ROLLED SHAPES ASTM A36
- SOIL PASSIVE PRESSURE PER CBC CLASS 5 (100 PCF)
- STEEL REINFORCEMENT IN CONCRETE ASTM A615 GRADE 60
- PROVIDE MIN. 3" CLEAR COVER ON ALL STEEL EMBEDDED IN CONCRETE
- SCOPE OF WORK IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN OF SIGN SUPPORT COLUMN(S) AND FOOTING. SCOPE OF WORK EXCLUDES PERFORMING CAPACITY CHECKS OF SIGN FRAMING AND ATTACHMENTS TO COLUMNS. ALL OF WHICH ARE BY OTHERS
- ALL FABRICATING TO BE PERFORMED IN AN APPROVED SHOP
- STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION PER SEC. 1704.6 IS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT
- ANCHOR BOLT STEEL ASTM F1554 GRADE 36
- CONTACT YUNGMAN ENGINEERING IMMEDIATELY IF GROUNDWATER IS DISCOVERED DURING FOOTING EXCAVATION
- STRUCTURAL STEEL WELDS SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ANSIAWS D1.1 AND AISC SPECIFICATIONS CHAPTER J. WELDERS SHALL BE CERTIFIED AS REQUIRED BY GOVERNING CODE AUTHORITY. WELDING SHALL BE PERFORMED BY ELECTRIC ARC PROCESS USING LOW-HYDROGEN ELECTRODES WITH $F_{exx} \geq 70$ KSI MIN

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| DT ORDER POINT CANOPY FREESTANDING | 14163 |
| OPC, NO MONITOR OR ORDER BOARD | |



NT

PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

DATE : 10-23-2019

SHEET NUMBER: SBMT 15

RAL7021 BLACK GREY, 10% SHEEN, EXT

H1 DRIVE THRU CANOPY WITH DIGITAL ORDER SCREEN ~ Qty (1)
INSTALLATION ONLY

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROJECT ADDRESS:
935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350


DATE : 10-23-2019

SHEET NUMBER
SBMT
16

PREPARED BY:
ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ



Design ID#14116



H2 DRIVE THRU DIGITAL ORDER SCREEN~ Qty (1)

INSTALLATION ONLY ON H1

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

NTS

YUNGMAN
ENGINEERING

2172 FELSPAR ST., UNIT B
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109
(619) 705-0657
michael@yungmanengineering.com

PREPARED FOR:
SIGN INDUSTRIES

STARBUCKS
VARIOUS LOCATIONS,
CALIFORNIA

PROJECT NUMBER:
1835H

DATE: 12-23-2019

SCALE: NO SCALE

DRAWN BY: MTY


DESIGNED BY: MTY

REVISIONS: DATE

1

2

3



PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350


PREPARED BY:

ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

SBMT

17






SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



Design ID#14119



I DRIVE THRU 5-PANEL MENU SIGN ~ Qty (1)
INSTALLATION ONLY

Sian Specifications:

- #1 - 3/4" [19mm] STEEL BASE PLATE w/ 18deg HOLES
- #2 - COX10.5 (6"x2"x3/8") STEEL POST (2x)
- #3 - 5/32"x1/4" STEEL SUPPORT ANGLES (2x)
- #4 - EXTRUDED ALUMINUM MENU BOARDS (3x)
- #5 - ONE FULL AND TWO SPLIT PANEL LIGHTBOXES
- #6 - 25 1/4"x38" AND FOUR 25 1/4"x18" GRAPHICS
- #7 - ALL GRAPHIC ASSEMBLIES SHIFTED 1/4" TO RIGHT
- #8 - STANDARD LED TUBE LIGHTING, SIDE LOCKS

- #5 - WELDED ALUMINUM BASE COVER
- #6 - WATER-TIGHT BOX w/SWITCH & SENSOR, RIGID CONDUIT RUN TO SECOND EXT BOX BELOW BASE COVER, 120 WATT, 0.90Aac
- #7 - 8 BASE WASHERS, 1/4" THICK
- #8 - TWO SIDE MOUNT LOCKS per MENUBOARD RETAIN EXISTING KEY #E3Z-26-819-15

Scale: 1" = 3/4"

RAL7021 BLACK GREY, 10% SHEEN, EXT		DT 5 PANEL FREESTANDING		14119	11036585
<p>ALL DISPLAYS OPERATING AND MEETING DSA SPECIFICATIONS</p> <p>ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS THE PROPERTY OF DSA. IT IS TO BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE SPECIFIC PROJECT ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM DSA. PERMISSION IS GRANTED TO THE USER TO MAKE COPIES OF THIS INFORMATION FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. PERMISSION IS GRANTED TO THE USER TO MAKE COPIES OF THIS INFORMATION FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.</p>		<p>DISA/PHOTO/DTCH</p> <p>16981 Central Avenue, Casselle, CA 90046</p> <p>(310) 537-0000 (310) 537-9660 Fax</p> <p>phub@disa.com</p>			
RAL7021 BLACK GREY, 10% SHEEN, EXT		DRIVE THRU 5 PANEL W/ STAND		14119	11036585
<p>ALL DISPLAYS OPERATING AND MEETING DSA SPECIFICATIONS</p> <p>ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS THE PROPERTY OF DSA. IT IS TO BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE SPECIFIC PROJECT ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM DSA. PERMISSION IS GRANTED TO THE USER TO MAKE COPIES OF THIS INFORMATION FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. PERMISSION IS GRANTED TO THE USER TO MAKE COPIES OF THIS INFORMATION FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.</p>		<p>DISA/PHOTO/DTCH</p> <p>16981 Central Avenue, Casselle, CA 90046</p> <p>(310) 537-0000 (310) 537-9660 Fax</p> <p>phub@disa.com</p>			
DATE	02/06/2014	COSBRO/DTCH	ED	DRIVE THRU 5 PANEL W/ STAND	14119
DATE	02/06/2014	COSBRO/DTCH	ED	DRIVE THRU 5 PANEL W/ STAND	14119

APPROVED
2/06/14

PROJECT ADDRESS:
935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91777
PROJECT NO: 16350


PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ



S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

SPRING VALLEY
SIGN PACKAGE

"EXISTING MONUMENT SIGNS WITH NEW TENANTS"

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROJECT ADDRESS: DATE : 10-23-2019

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

SHEET NUMBER

TS-9


PREPARED BY:
ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

FIELD SURVEY REQUIRED JAMACHA ROAD SIGN



NEW D/F ILLUMINATED PYLON SIGN TENANT PANEL

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



WHITE ACRYLIC FACE WITH
TRANSLUCENT VINYL APPLIED
FIRST SURFACE

EXISTING MONUMENT SIGN WITH NEW
PROPOSED TENANTS

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PROJECT ADDRESS:

935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE : 03 24 2020

PREPARED BY:

ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHEET NUMBER

M-1
25' MONUMENT SIGN
EXISTING





FIELD SURVEY REQUIRED SWEETWATER ROAD SIGN



P NEW S/F ILLUM. PYLON SIGN
TENANT PANEL

CHICK-FIL-A - NEW S/F ILLUMINATED PYLON SIGN TENANT PANEL

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

EXISTING MONUMENT SIGN WITH NEW
PROPOSED TENANTS

PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

DATE: 03/24/2020

SHEET NUMBER: M-2

35' MONUMENT SIGN
EXISTING

PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY


S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA




EXISTING "RALLY'S" MONUMENT SIGN
NTS

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA




PROJECT ADDRESS: 935 SWEETWATER ROAD Spring Valley, CA 91977 PROJECT NO: 16350	DATE : 04 01 2020
PREPARED BY: ZAAP, INC. 2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ	SHEET NUMBER M-3 18" MONUMENT SIGN EXISTING



KEY NOTES


- ① ROUTE FIXTURE CIRCUIT TO LIGHTING CONTROL PANEL FOR SHUTOFF PHOTOCELL "ON", TIMECLOCK "OFF".
- ② PROVIDE 24" DIAMETER CONCRETE BASE 5' DEEP.
- ③ INTERNAL LIGHT SHIELD TO BE PROVIDED WITH FIXTURE HEAD UNIT.

A & A2 PROPOSED 25'TALL POLE LIGHTS




EXISTING 25'TALL POLE LIGHTS

AR-2



EXISTING 35'TALL POLE LIGHTS

AS-2



EXISTING 4 HEAD 35'TALL POLE LIGHTS

A4

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY

S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



PROJECT ADDRESS: **DATE : 12/29/2020**

835 SWEETWATER ROAD
Spring Valley, CA 91977
PROJECT NO: 16350

PREPARED BY: **SHEET NUMBER**

ZAAP, INC.
2900 FOURTH AVENUE #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
619-233-6450 WWW.ZAAP.BIZ

LL_1
POLE LIGHT
ELEVATIONS

[illegible]

GENERAL:

- REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN IS FOR BUILDING
- IN THE EVENT OF A CONFLICT BETWEEN LANDSCAPE PLANS AND ARCHITECTURAL PLANS, LANDSCAPE PLANS SHALL PREVAIL
- ALL LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION SHALL CONFORM TO THE STANDARDS OF THE COUNTY-WIDE LANDSCAPE
- LANDSCAPE DEVELOPMENT MANUAL LANDSCAPE STANDARDS AND ALL OTHER LANDSCAPE RELATED COUNTY AND REGIONAL STANDARDS


PLANTING:

- A MINIMUM OF 3" OF TOP DRESS MULCH WILL BE APPLIED TO ALL EXPOSED SOIL SURFACE INCLUDING TREE AREAS
- SPACING OF SLOPE SHRUBS AND GRASSES SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
- PLANTING MATERIALS SHOULD BE LEGEND REINFORCED SYRINX
- NATIVITIES WILL BE INSTALLED ON ALL SLOPES 3:1 OR STEEPER
- ALL EXISTING TREES SHOWN ON PLAN ARE OFF-SITE


OBSERVATION REQUIREMENTS:

1. THE LANDSCAPE PROJECT WILL REQUIRE THE FOLLOWING SUBMITTALS BE PROVIDED TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW: A. ALL PRODUCT SUBMITTALS FOR CONFORMANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS.
2. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL BE CONTACTED TO DETERMINE THE IRRIGATION MAIN LINE PRESSURE TEST.
3. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL BE CONTACTED TO OBSERVE THE IRRIGATION COVERAGE TEST.
4. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL BE CONTACTED TO OBSERVE THE PLANT MATERIAL INSPECTION ON-SITE DELIVERY, AND VERIFY PLANT LOCATIONS IN FIELD.
5. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL BE CONTACTED TO OBSERVE THE INSTALLATION IS IN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE WITH THE APPROVED PLANS.
6. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL BE CONTACTED TO PROVIDE THE OWNER A COPY OF THE MAINTENANCE AND DEFECTS CONTROL. VALVES BY DIMENSIONS FROM MAINTENANCE

LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL FOLLOW APPROVED PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION. ANY DEVIATIONS FROM APPROVED PLANS SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT OF RECORD FOR REVIEW AND APPROVED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.



SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA



DUNKIN
CHICK-FIL-A
CVS
TOTAL AREA

$$1'' = 40' - 0''$$
[illegible]

OWNER:
BRETT FEUERSTEIN
MIRA MESA SHOPPING CENTER
8244 MIRA MESA BLVD.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92126
858-271-4682

COMPOSTING
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
JPEL, INC.
4408 MANCHESTER AVE, STE 2
ENCINITAS, CA 92024
760-479-0644

ARCHITECT:
ZAAP, INC.
2400 FOURTH ST., #204
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109
619-233-6450

ENGINEER:
BWE
9449 BALBOA AVENUE,
San Diego, CA 92129
619-291-5550

TITLE SHEET
CONCEPTUAL PLANTING PLAN "DUNKIN"
CONCEPTUAL WATER CALCULATION PLAN

2 - 148

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: OF NORTH CAROLINA
 I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT OF THE
 ABOVE PROJECT IS THE SAME AS THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
 CHARGED WITH THE DESIGN OF THE PROJECT AS DEFINED IN
 THE PERMIT APPLICATION. THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION
 OF THE PROJECT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE
 REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS.


DATE: 8/20/20
 MY EXPIRATION DATE: 8/20/22
 MY REGISTRATION NUMBER: 20589
 4108 MANCHESTER AVE. SUITE 201
 RICHMOND, VA 23224
 TEL: 804-781-7044

I AM FAMILIAR WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR LANDSCAPE AND
 IRRIGATION PLANS CONTAINED IN THE COUNTY LANDSCAPE
 AND IRRIGATION PLANS MANUAL. I HAVE READ THE
 CHAPTERS OF THE LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION
 MANUALS THAT APPLY TO THIS PROJECT. I HAVE
 PREPARED THIS PLAN IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL
 APPLICABLE REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS. I HAVE
 REVIEWED THE PROJECT AND I HAVE DETERMINED THAT THE
 RESULTS WILL PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT USE OF WATER
 AND IRRIGATION.

JAMES P. BENEDETTI, R.L.A. #3058
MY REGISTRATION EXPIRES 04/30/22
4403 MANCHESTER AVE. SUITE 201
ENCINITAS, CA 92024

760-474-0644
1. JAMES P. BENEDICT, CERTIFY THAT THE LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION PLAN AS SHOWN HEREON PER THIS GRADING PLAN IS AS STATED PER SECTION 87.01 PLANTINGS AND SECTION 87.08 (IRRIGATION), AM FAMILIAR WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADING DESIGN PLANS CONTAINED IN THE COUNTY LANDSCAPE WATER CONSERVATION REGULATIONS IN TITLE 8, DIVISION 6, CHAPTER 7 OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CODE OF REGULATORY ORDINANCES. I CERTIFY THAT THE LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION PLAN CONFORMS TO THE REGULATIONS. I CERTIFY THAT THE PLAN COMPLIES WITH THE REGULATIONS TO PROVIDE EFFICIENT USE OF WATER.


DATE	9/30/22
JAMES P. BENEDETTI, R.L.A. #056	
MY REGISTRATION EXPIRES 09/30/22	
4403 MANCHESTER AVE. SUITE 201	
ENCINITAS, CA 92024	
760-478-0644	



[illegible]

4500 SF. PAD BUILDING SWEETWATER & JAMACHA RD. SPRING VALLEY, CA 92114		JPBLA JAMES P. BENEDITI LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT 4403 MANCHESTER AVE., SUITE 201 CARLSBAD, CA 92008 760-479-0644 FAX 760-479-0645	Date: 9/12/17	Sheet No.: 2020 - 27	LC-3
			Revisions: 1ST SUBMITTAL 10/6/20 2ND SUBMITTAL	Project No.: 2020 - 27 Project Name: SWEETWATER & JAMACHA RD. Project Location: SPRING VALLEY, CA 92114	

[illegible]



PLANT LEGEND

SYMBOL	COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	REMARKS
	AGAVESTROMA INDOCA	24" BOX	25	M STANDARD
	ALOUCA ADAPADO	24" BOX	5	M STANDARD
	MANOLIA GRANDIFLORA	24" BOX	5	M STANDARD
	ST. MARY			
	EXIST. TREES TO REMAIN - 6			
	EXIST. TREES TO BE REMOVED - 11			
	SHRUBS/GRASSES			
	ALOE BLUE EUP	1 GAL	370	L 2'-0" OC.
	CALLISTEMON LITTLE JOHN	1/2 GAL	114	L 3'-0" OC.
	CAREX PANSA	440 SF	L	1'-0" OC.
	CLONORPITALUM	1/2 GAL	145	L 3'-6" OC.
	DIANELIA REICULTA	5 GAL	39	L 1'-6" OC.
	DIANELIA X CLARITY	5 GAL	47	M 2'-6" OC.
	LEUCODENDRON	5 GAL	58	L 3'-6" OC.
	LETIUS COMPENSATILIS	5 GAL	68	L 3'-0" OC.
	LOMANSA LONGIFOLIA	5 GAL	154	L 3'-0" OC.
	BREEZE	5 GAL	126	L 3'-0" OC.
	MULBERRERIA CAPILLARIS	5 GAL	126	L 3'-0" OC.
	SEMPERIO SERPENS	1 GAL	1265 SF	L 2'-0" OC.
	BICHASIA PLANTING			
	BASIN BOTTOM SIDES - 1 GAL CONTAINER AT 7' OC. -			
	LOW BUSH BLUE			
	LOW BUSH			
	SISTIRICHUAN BELLUM			
	BLUE FETTER GRASS			

LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS	
1 GAL. LANDSCAPE AREA	12000 SF
1 GAL. LANDSCAPE AREA	12000 SF
TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA	24000 SF

PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING	
1 GAL. LANDSCAPE AREA	67
1 GAL. LANDSCAPE AREA	67
TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA	134 SF

PLANTING NOTES

1. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
2. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
3. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
4. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
5. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
6. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
7. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
8. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
9. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
10. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
11. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.
12. ALL PLANTING SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANTING GUIDE.

GRAPHIC SCALE

1 inch = 30 feet

1 inch = 30 feet

BVE

10000 S. JAMACHA RD. SUITE 100
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94576
TEL: (925) 271-1200
FAX: (925) 271-1201
WWW.BVE.COM

HOUSTON ASSOCIATES

10000 S. JAMACHA RD. SUITE 100
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94576
TEL: (925) 271-1200
FAX: (925) 271-1201
WWW.HOUSTONASSOCIATES.COM

ZAP

10000 S. JAMACHA RD. SUITE 100
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94576
TEL: (925) 271-1200
FAX: (925) 271-1201
WWW.ZAP.COM

PROJECT ADDRESS:
10000 S. JAMACHA RD. SUITE 100
SPRING VALLEY, CA 94576
PROJECT NO.: 10000

DATE: 10/20/20
DRAWN BY: J. BVE
CHECKED BY: J. BVE
APPROVED BY: J. BVE


PROJECT NAME:
SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
SHEET TITLE: LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN

ALL LIVING AREAS SHALL BE IRRIGATED ACCORDING TO PLANT TYPE AND ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIRE. ALL IRRIGATED AREAS SHALL RECEIVE UNIFORM COVERAGE BY MEANS OF AN AUTOMATICALLY CONTROLLED ELECTRICALLY OPERATED IRRIGATION SYSTEM. THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM SHALL BE DESIGNED TO MAINTAIN MOISTURE LEVELS IN THE SOIL AT A LEVEL SUFFICIENT TO MAINTAIN MASTER WATER AND SOIL SATURITY CAPABILITIES, A REDUCED RISK OF SOIL CRUSTING AND TO MINIMIZE DROUGHT. STATE OF THE AUTOMATIC CONTROLLER WITH A MINIMUM OF 1000 PRESET IRRIGATION TIMES PER YEAR AND 1000 PRESET DURATION STANDARDS. RELATIVE CONTROL VALUES SHALL BE USED WITH LOW PRESCRIPTION HEADS FOR REDUCED WATER CONSUMPTION. PRESSURE REGULATING DEVICES SHALL BE USED TO MAINTAIN PRESSURES NOT EXCEEDING 100 PSI. ALL PRESCRIBED MAINS AND LATERAL LINES SHALL BE INSTALLED BELOW GRADE PER LOCAL AND REGIONAL STANDARDS. AN AUTOMATIC MAINTENANCE LOG SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE USER. ALL MAINTENANCE LOGS SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE USER.

Underground Service Alert
Call: TOLL FREE
1-800
227-2600

NO TAPPING AND TIEING

TWO WORKING DAYS BEFORE YOU DIG
 "CAUTION": Remember this! Digging without proper notice can cause serious damage to underground utilities. Only those utilities belonging to the utility companies belong to the utility companies. There could be other utilities buried at the same location. The call will inform you of whom they will notify.



HYDROZONE PLAN

LEGEND

1  HYDROZONE ONE: DBP (LOW WATER USE)
(1,237 SF, 65.0% OF TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA)

2  HYDROZONE TWO: BUBBLERS (MEDIUM WATER-USE)
(225 SF, 7.7% OF TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA)

TOTAL AREA 1,522 SF

0 10 20 30
SCALE: 1"=20'-0"

N






[illegible]

THE LOCATION OF THE EASEMENT CANNOT BE DETERMINED FROM RECORD INFORMATION.



ZAP

PROJECT ADDRESS 200 FOURTH AVENUE #204 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 (619) 594-1000 FAX 619-523-5440 FAX WWW.ZAMP.BIZ		PROJECT NAME SPRING VALLEY CENTER - SPRING VALLEY	CDD	NEW MASTER PLAN
PROJECT ADDRESS 10000 LINDSEY ROAD SPRING VALLEY, CA 91777 PROJECT NO. 10350		DATE 08/02/09 REVISION # REVISION DATE		









Chick-Fil-A
5200 Sweetwater Road
Atlanta, Georgia
30348-2988



JOSEPH C. TRUITT
Professional Engineer
No. 10000
State of Georgia
1111 S. SHAWNEE RD.
SUITE 100
DUBLIN, GA 30128
(770) 476-1000



CHICK-FIL-A
HWY 125 & JAMACHA RD, FSU
931 Sweetwater Rd., Spring Valley, CA 91777

FSR# 04466

REVISION SCHEDULE

PROJECT NO. 04466
SHEET NO. 2 OF 2
DATE 01/11/17
PROJECT NAME
SHEET NUMBER

C4.0

DATE	REVISION	BY	DATE
01/11/17	1	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	2	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	3	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	4	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	5	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	6	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	7	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	8	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	9	JS	01/11/17
01/11/17	10	JS	01/11/17



BVE
BUREAU OF VERIFICATION & ENGINEERING
1000 S. JAMACHA RD.
SUITE 100
SPRING VALLEY, CA 91777
(951) 244-1000

PREPARED BY: BVE
CHECKED BY: BVE
DESIGNED BY: BVE
DATE: 01/11/17

PROJECT NO. 04466
SHEET NO. 2 OF 2
DATE 01/11/17
PROJECT NAME
SHEET NUMBER

C4.0

CHICK-FIL-A
HWY 125 & JAMACHA RD, FSU
931 Sweetwater Rd., Spring Valley, CA 91777

FSR# 04466

REVISION SCHEDULE

PROJECT NO. 04466
SHEET NO. 2 OF 2
DATE 01/11/17
PROJECT NAME
SHEET NUMBER

C4.0

CHICK-FIL-A
HWY 125 & JAMACHA RD, FSU
931 Sweetwater Rd., Spring Valley, CA 91777

FSR# 04466

REVISION SCHEDULE

PROJECT NO. 04466
SHEET NO. 2 OF 2
DATE 01/11/17
PROJECT NAME
SHEET NUMBER

C4.0

CHICK-FIL-A
HWY 125 & JAMACHA RD, FSU
931 Sweetwater Rd., Spring Valley, CA 91777

FSR# 04466

REVISION SCHEDULE

PROJECT NO. 04466
SHEET NO. 2 OF 2
DATE 01/11/17
PROJECT NAME
SHEET NUMBER

C4.0

CHICK-FIL-A
HWY 125 & JAMACHA RD, FSU
931 Sweetwater Rd., Spring Valley, CA 91777

FSR# 04466

REVISION SCHEDULE

PROJECT NO. 04466
SHEET NO. 2 OF 2
DATE 01/11/17
PROJECT NAME
SHEET NUMBER

C4.0


CHICK-FIL-A
HWY 125 & JAMACHA RD, FSU
931 Sweetwater Rd., Spring Valley, CA 91777

FSR# 04466

REVISION SCHEDULE

PROJECT NO. 04466
SHEET NO. 2 OF 2
DATE 01/11/17
PROJECT NAME
SHEET NUMBER

C4.0



THIS PLAN IS:
PRELIMINARY
(NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION)

NOT TO SCALE



LEGEND


- 1. TOP OF EXISTING WALL
- 2. TOP OF WALL
- 3. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 4. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 5. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 6. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 7. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 8. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 9. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 10. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 11. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 12. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 13. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 14. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 15. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 16. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 17. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 18. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 19. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 20. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 21. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 22. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 23. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 24. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 25. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 26. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 27. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 28. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 29. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 30. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 31. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 32. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 33. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 34. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 35. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 36. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 37. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 38. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 39. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 40. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 41. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 42. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 43. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 44. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 45. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 46. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 47. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 48. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 49. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 50. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 51. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 52. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 53. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 54. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 55. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 56. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 57. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 58. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 59. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 60. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 61. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 62. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 63. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 64. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 65. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 66. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 67. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 68. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 69. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 70. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 71. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 72. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 73. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 74. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 75. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 76. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 77. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 78. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 79. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 80. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 81. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 82. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 83. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 84. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 85. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 86. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 87. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 88. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 89. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 90. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 91. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 92. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 93. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 94. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 95. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 96. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 97. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 98. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 99. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF
- 100. TOP OF EXISTING ROOF

* EASEMENT NOTE:
REQUIREMENT EASEMENT SHALL BE REQUIRED UPON THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW ACCESS EASEMENT AT THE PROPOSED DRIVEWAY ALONG SAINT GEORGE ST. AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAN.

SHOPPING CENTER - SPRING VALLEY
S.E.C. JAMACHA RD. & SWEETWATER RD.
SPRING VALLEY, CA

PLAT

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123



DATE FILED: 10/21/20
REC'D BY: J. Roberts

PRELIMINARY ACTION DATE: _____
SIGNED BY: _____

FINAL ACTION DATE: _____
SIGNED BY: _____

<p>HEALTH DEPARTMENT CERTIFICATION</p> <p>NOTE: Proposed Boundary: Existing Boundary: Different Zones:</p> <p>CHECKLIST Vicinity Map/Engr. Scale Legal Description (abbr.) Label "Parcel A", etc. Assessors Parcel No. Label Existing Line Label Proposed Line All Owners must sign Sign as Trustee if Trust Parcel(s) net area only Parcel(s) dimensions Existing Structures Structure Setback* (if less than 100') Structure(s) Use Street name and width Dedicated Open Space No Utility Easements No bearings/curve data</p>	<p>OPTIONAL USE AREA:</p> <p>JAMACHA RD. SWEETWATER RD. SITE ST. GEORGE ST.</p> <p>VICINITY MAP (NOT TO SCALE)</p>
---	--

PARCEL A: OWNER(S) Jamacha Sweetwater Llc
ADDRESS 8294 Mira Mesa Blvd,
CITY San Diego **ZIP** 92126 **PHONE** 619-211-5161

PARCEL B: OWNER(S) Jamacha Sweetwater Llc
ADDRESS 8294 Mira Mesa Blvd,
CITY San Diego **ZIP** 92126 **PHONE** _____

THIS PLAT WAS PREPARED WITH MY/ (SIGN) Brett Feurstein
OUR KNOWLEDGE AND CONSENT: (PRINT NAME HERE)

PARCEL C: OWNER(S) N/A
(OR APPLICANT) _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ **ZIP** _____ **PHONE** _____

PRELIMINARY
MAP PREPARED BY: ADAM E. EISENBERG, PLS **L.S. NO.** 9096
ADDRESS 9449 Balboa Avenue
CITY SAN DIEGO **ZIP** 92123 **PHONE** (619) 299-5550

PLAT NO. 10-0042

Attachment D
Public Documentation

**County of San Diego
Spring Valley Community Planning Group
P.O. Box 1637, Spring Valley, CA 91979**

**Regular Meeting Minutes
March 10, 2020; 7:00 p.m.**

**Meeting Location: Otay Water District Headquarters
2554 Sweetwater Spring Boulevard, Spring Valley, CA 91978**

E-mail: svpgchair@gmail.com; Facebook: [Spring Valley Planning Group](#)

A. Members Present

seat	Name	absent	seat	Name	absent
1	Elizabeth "Liz" Lavertu (Chair)		9	Clifton Cunningham	X
2	Lora Lowes		10	Chris Pearson	
3	Jesse Robles		11	James "Jim" Custeau (Secretary)	
4	Mark Kalsho	X	12	Adrian Caminos	
5	Marilyn Wilkinson		13	Edward Woodruff	
6	John Eugenio		14	Robert "Bob" Eble	
7	Scott Harris (Vice-Chair)	X	15	Tim Snyder	
8	Scott Shaffer				

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Public Communications: No speakers

C. Presentations:

1. Census 2020, Information Only. Mr. Alejandro Aguilar, employed by the U.S. Census Bureau showed an informational video, followed by a PowerPoint to provide additional information. Article 1, section 2 in the Constitution says we must have a census once every 10 years. Based on the results of the Census, states will either gain or lose representatives in Congress. There will be 4 ways to complete the process: internet, phone, paper form, in-person. The information will be available in many languages. All supplied information is protected by title 13 expressly prohibiting questions dealing with, citizenship status, immigration status, social security number, etc. There will be no contact except by mail. Each counted person represents approximately \$2000 in Federal Aid to the community.

2. Miller Paving, 9222-9236 Olive Drive. Input on new metal building to replace hut. Information only. Stacy Miller was not in attendance. This presentation is tabled.

D. Action Items:

- 1. PDS2019-STP-97-050W3 and PDS2020-AD-20-002**, Target Shopping Ctr-Sweetwater Rd. @ Jamacha Rd. Applicant requests two waivers. First is to waive the requirement for 40' width for truck aisle. Second is to modify the parking requirement from 4.5/1,000 sf with 15% food uses to 4/ 1,000 sf if the food uses

are restricted to 10% instead of 15%. A Design Exception Review is requested to allow the driveway width to be increased from 30' to 36'. Request to add a drug store of approximately 15,000 sf and two pad buildings of approximately 4,500 sf each along Sweetwater Road, in addition update the facade of Smart and Final to allow a subtenant as well as a trash enclosure in the rear of Smart and Final. The pad buildings would accommodate a drive-thru food use at each location. The northerly pad building is anticipated to be multi-tenant, while the southerly pad building is anticipated to be single tenant. The uses are all conforming to the Zoning Ordinance. The monument signs will remain the same as approved and the approved criteria used for existing tenants will be applied to the new tenants. Presenter: Lowes Proponent: Ziebarth.

Member Lowes presented the project with a detailed Power Point which identified the reason for the widened roadway, trash enclosures, issues surrounding power pole supports, overall plot plan showing placement of three new buildings (CVS Pharmacy – northeast side of project, multi-tenant food building centered along Sweetwater Rd, single tenant restaurant on southwest corner of lot). New retail space to be partitioned on north end of Smart n Final business (likely O'Reilly Auto Parts). Signage for all new tenants. The group generally agreed after a short discussion that the site plan was fine (buildings, roadway entrance widening, narrowing of truck lane, trash enclosures, parking to square footage ratio). Most of the remainder of the discussion surrounded size and placement of signage on the buildings. Ultimately three motions on the project were presented as follows.

Motion 1: Approve site plan as presented, not including signage nor utility poles (see separate motions)

M/S: (Lowes/Pearson)

Vote: Aye (12); No (0); Abstain (0); Absent (3); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

Motion 2: Exempt property from undergrounding any other electric utilities.

M/S: (Lowes/Camino)

Vote: Aye (11); No (1, Robles); Abstain (0); Absent (3); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

Motion 3: 1. Approve sign for secondary tenant at Smart & Final except individual letter are to be on building - background to be colored same as the rest of building; 2. Building G (multi use) signage to be from 1-1.25 x frontage. Signage for all 4 sides. (developer to return to Group for final sign approval). 3. Chick Fil-A signage allowed at 1.25 x frontage. No sign on south exposure (St. George St.), signs allowed on 3 sides (east, north, west); no white background (color band to be same or a shade of other wall color). 4. CVS signage approved as submitted, except "drive through" sign on north elevation (Jamacha Rd) to be same size as on west elevation.

M/S: (Lowes/Robles)

Vote: Aye (11); No (1, Lowes); Abstain (0); Absent (3); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

E. Approval of Minutes of February 11, 2020 meeting.

Motion: Approve Minutes as presented.

M/S: (Wilkinson/Snyder)

Vote: Aye (12); No (0); Abstain (0); Absent (3); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

F. GROUP BUSINESS

1. Announcements: Chair Lavertu will be attending the PDS Quarterly Chair's meeting on 03/14. She will be meeting with Supervisor Jacob next Tuesday for ongoing homeless population discussion.

2. Reports: none

3. Committees: none

4. New projects: to be assigned

5. Next meeting: March 24, 2020

G. ADJOURNMENT: 9:25 PM

County of San Diego
Spring Valley Community Planning Group
P.O. Box 1637, Spring Valley, CA 91979

Regular Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2020; 7:00 p.m.

E-mail: svpgchair@gmail.com; Facebook: [Spring Valley Planning Group](#)

Due to ongoing COVID emergency, the meeting will be held virtually - Access Meeting Online:

<https://meetingsamer12.webex.com/meetingsamer12/j.php?MTID=m52cfd39013a33f95c796536f93f6549f>

Access Meeting by Phone
Dial **+1-408-418-9388**
Meeting number (access code): **622 146 627**
Meeting password: **SVcpg**
Meeting password from phones: **78274**

A. Members

seat	Name	absent	seat	Name	absent
1	Elizabeth "Liz" Lavertu (Chair)	X	9	Clifton Cunningham	X
2	Lora Lowes		10	Chris Pearson	
3	Jesse Robles		11	James "Jim" Custeau (Secretary)	
4	Mark Kalsho		12	Adrian Caminos	
5	Marilyn Wilkinson		13	Edward Woodruff	
6	John Eugenio		14	Robert "Bob" Eble	
7	Scott Harris (Vice-Chair)		15	Tim Snyder	
8	Scott Shaffer				

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Public Communications: There was no public comment

C. Action Items:

1. Chic-Fil-A Signage, New signage at proposed Chic-Fil-A at Target Center, 935 Sweetwater Road.

Presenter: Lowes; Proponent: Ziebarth. There was considerable discussion about the sign on the south side of the building. Three members (Shaffer, Lowes, Robles) were concerned about having a sign on the south side of the building, with Robles feeling it will be a visual blight to residents adjacent to the shopping center. Shaffer expressed concern about the sign facing a residential area due to Chic-Fil-A's connection with the advocacy of anti-LGBTQ values. All the other members were okay with an unlighted sign. Pearson voiced concern about the odor from the cooking and Robles was concerned about increased traffic entering and exiting the establishment, especially off Saint George, which he feels will

impact nearby residents. The group has concerns with cooking odors emitted by exhaust fans and increased traffic off St. George. The group asks that those concerns be mitigated.

Motion: Recommend approve of the building signs' square footage at 1.25 times the dimension of linear frontage; Sign on south wall at the intersection of Sweetwater Rd. and St. George St. to not be lighted.

M/S: Lowes/Caminos

Vote: Aye (10); No (3 - Robles, Shaffer, Pearson); Abstain (0); Absent (2); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

2. Paradise Valley Gas Station and Mart; PDS 2019-ZAP-19-003, Request for Guy Wire for Power pole to remain. Presenter: Lowes; Proponent: ?

This item is postponed

3.

Motion: Discretionary Permit Application, PDS 2020-11-004TE; Time extension until June 23, parcel number 504-28-00; address: 3364 Helix St, Owner: Helix St LLC. Presenter: Harris; Proponent: ?

This item is postponed

D. Approval of Minutes of May 12, 2020 Meeting.

Motion: Approve minutes of May 12, 2020 meeting as amended.

M/S: Custeau/Robles

Vote: Aye (10); No (0); Abstain (3, Lowes, Kalsho, Pearson); Absent (2); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

E. GROUP BUSINESS

1. Announcements: none

2. Reports:

Traffic Advisory Committee: Custeau advised the group that another 18-month closure renewal request (as required by law) of the temporary road closure at the north end of Whitestone Rd will be on the TAC meeting agenda on June 12, 2020. The planning group approved the road closure in 2018. He also reported speaking with Ernie Bartley in traffic engineering on June 8th. Bartley said signs are on order banning overnight parking of all vehicles on the north side (freeway side) of Campo Rd – east of Sweetwater Springs to east end of road. He also reported that residents and property owners on the south side of the road still need to be contacted for their approval of similar parking restrictions on the south side of the street.

Harris reports that the American Society of Landscape Architects has \$5,000 of grant money available on a competitive basis. Applications are due in August. Scott Harris will call them to get additional information.

Scott Shaffer commented about the illegal marijuana shop on the east end of Campo Rd. – illegal signage as well as bright lights on throughout the night.

3. New projects: none.

4. Next meeting: June 23, 2020

F. ADJOURNMENT: 8:03 PM

**County of San Diego
Spring Valley Community Planning Group
P.O. Box 1637, Spring Valley, CA 91979**

**TUESDAY, September 22, 2020 7:00 P.M.
Chairperson svpgchair@gmail.com or 619-807-6947**

**Access Meeting Online
<https://elizabethlavertu.my.webex.com/elizabethlavertu.my/j.php?MTID=me7b01814bfe079c91d172af3f1d34439>**

**Access Meeting by Phone
Dial **+1-415-655-0001**
Meeting number (access code): 126 314 7618
Meeting password: SVCPG
Meeting password from phones: 78274**

A. Members

seat	Name	absent	seat	Name	absent
1	Elizabeth "Liz" Lavertu (Chair)		9	Clifton Cunningham	
2	Lora Lowes	X	10	Chris Pearson	
3	Jesse Robles		11	James "Jim" Custeau (Secretary)	
4	Mark Kalsho	X	12	Adrian Caminos	
5	Marilyn Wilkinson		13	Edward Woodruff	X
6	John Eugenio	7:05	14	Robert "Bob" Eble	
7	Scott Harris (Vice-Chair)		15	Tim Snyder	
8	Scott Shaffer	X			

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Public Communications: No public comments

Presentation: County Homeless Storage, Presenter: Omar Passons, director of integrative services for county health and human services. Mr. Passons provided general information about help for homeless individuals. There is an increase in help for homeless to address behavioral, addiction and health issues in addition to being homeless. Additionally, homeless have a lot of stuff and no where to put it. Unfortunately, this creates challenges getting homeless individuals to leave their stuff long enough to get other services to help them get off the streets. The distance the homeless need to go to get to their stuff can dissuade them from participating in meetings and other intake services in order to help get them off the street. They will be proposing a storage site in Goodland Acres Park to provide temporary, secure, protected storage. Amaris Sanchez also provide input from the county. She said they are basing the design of this storage site along the lines of what has worked in other areas. They have also discussed this project with Parks and Recreation department as well. Michelle, homeowner in the area, said they are experiencing a lot of problems with the homeless across the street. She acknowledged the proactive work that that county is doing. She's concerned about the excess hoarding behavior that she sees some of the homeless engaging in. Would this storage area help with this problem? Passons, says, their hope is to reduce this issue with this storage plan. Sheriff's office addresses the encroachment problem on the sidewalks. Sanchez, says homeless could voluntarily store legal items. The Sheriff department could use

this storage when taking individuals into custody or transferring to medical services. The county is modeling storage funded by the San Diego housing commission in the city. Rusty Trinidad, resident on Orville Street, personal belongings are a big problem. Passons, says this is a complex problem, involving multiple county agencies – this storage is just one of the many possible solutions to the homeless problem. Wilkinson says she is shocked that this storage is proposed for a park! She would like to know what other sites in the county have signed on for this – we’ve been a dumping ground. She is concerned that this will be an attraction to homeless. Passons says this is more than just storage, it includes services as well. They are also working with Lakeside. Caminos asked what services would be offered? What kind of security in the area to keep homeless from bringing stuff and leaving it around the storage area? Passons says, they are still working on what the security would look like. Sanchez says, 24/7 security would be part of the project. She also says services for storage, plus specialized staff to help with social services. The city storage sites seem to be working well. Caminos also asked about looking at other locations. Sanchez says 100’s of sites have been looked at. Charles from P&R was originally skeptical, but now, after looking at the RFP, especially the 24-hour security requirement, feels this storage area will help with illegal activities at the Goodland Acres Park. With the available housing and this storage option, the sheriff’s office will be much more willing to enforce removal of illegal campers on our sidewalks and parkland. Snyder says that we need a bridge shelter like what the Alpha Project as done downtown. Pearson and Robles asked that commercial properties be looked at for this storage. For further information contact Omar.Passons@sdcounty.ca.gov; Amaris.Sanchez@sdcounty.ca.gov

C.

D. Action Items:

1. **County of San Diego Clean Mobility Options Program Grant;** We are currently a finalist for a state-funded voucher-based grant under the Clean Mobility Options Program. This grant funds capacity building and community engagement to help understand the transportation needs of historically underserved communities. Additionally, analysis will be performed to determine if zero-emission carpooling/vanpooling, bike-sharing/scooter-sharing, innovative transit services, and ride-on-demand services can address the identified transportation needs. Presenter: Farmer. After the presentation he will be asking for support for the grant application. The grant will be used to support clean transportation through the cap and trade program. The county is a finalist for a grant to establish a pilot project that will help identify long-term transportation needs. Questions to be answered, include travel patterns and mode of transportation. Current costs and time considerations for the local community. Also, the modes of transportation. Impediments to purchasing clean transportation (electric cars, etc.) two sites that have been identified are low income housing in La Presa area. Spring Valley residents will be surveyed to assess understanding of current transportation needs and services that are available. After the survey a summary report will be written. Eugenio asked if electric golf carts would be part of the solution. Farmer says that the specifics would be determined after the need’s analysis.
Motion: Send a letter of support for the County of San Diego Clean Mobility Options Program.
M/S: Wilkinson/Pearson)
Vote: Aye (10); No (1, Eugenio); Abstain (0); Absent (4); Vacant (0)
Motion: Passes

2. **Site Time Extension Request, PDS2020-TM-5604TE, Major Subdivision, Residential, PDS2020LDGRMJ-30263/PDS2020LDMJUP-500812059, Raintree Terrace located**

Sweetwater Road Tentative Map. Presenter: Eble Proponent: Rivero/Benhoff. This project has a long history beginning in Oct of 2014. Ultimately the project after several changes was approved by the planning group and by PDS. Since that time a new developer has purchased the property leading to delays in getting this project going.

Motion: approve the time extension

M/S: (Eble/Snyder)

Vote: Aye (11); No (0); Abstain (0); Absent (4); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

3. **New Signage Starbucks, APN 584-520-28-00, Southeast Corner of Jamacha Road and Sweetwater in the Target Shopping Center.** Presenter: Lavertu, Proponent: Feuerstein. Robles recused himself due to how close he lives to the project. He asked for clarification

Motion: Approve the sign project as presented.

M/S: Custeau/Caminos)

Vote: Aye (10); No (0); Abstain (1-Robles-recused himself due to living close to project); Absent (4); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

4. **Request for D2 Waiver, APN-503-261-12-00, 8682 Lamar Street.** Request for D2 waiver flood plain, preliminary work for future construction. Presenter: Lowes Proponent: Barron. No motion, the proponent and presenter were both absent – this item is postponed until a later date.

E. Approval of Minutes: September 8, 2020 meeting.

Motion: approve minutes as presented

M/S: (Pearson/Eugenio)

Vote: Aye (10); No (0); Abstain (1, Cunningham); Absent (4); Vacant (0)

Motion: Passes

F. GROUP BUSINESS

1. Announcement

County of San Diego Business Revitalization and Assistance Grant Program. A new program to offer businesses up to \$8,000 to enhance the frontage of their building. Chair asks that each of us consider letting local businesses know of this opportunity. There is a short window to apply for the grant.

Public Comment Opportunities for Proposed Light Pollution Chapter Amendment. Does not affect us. It's for the back-country areas of Julian and Ramona.

San Diego County Local Agency Formation Commission, Notice of Public Hearing. Information sent out in email.

2. Reports:

Traffic Advisory Committee.

CSA 128. Wilkinson reports that Calavo Park site is not in our CSA. The park will be built with county general fund money. Bringing this area into our CSA is not an easy thing to do, requiring a 2/3 vote of homeowners to approve. Tina Carlson informed our group that Mt. Miguel high school came to the CSA to ask for funding for their score boards. They agreed with our planning group's position that this project be funded by the county general fund or Supervisor's office dollars.

DPW Annual Resurfacing Plan Update, Michelle from the community asked that Brucker Avenue and Julia asked that Rosedale Drive be added to the resurfacing plan.

3. Assign projects:

Revert lots to acreage – APN's 580-220-01-00 to 580-220-06-00 (part of old Pointe project on the

south side of Jamacha Blvd); assigned to Wilkinson and Robles.

4. Next meeting: October 13, 2020

G. ADJOURNMENT: 8:54 PM