

Section 3.0

Environmental Analysis

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes those environmental issue areas as stated in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) where potentially significant impacts have the potential to occur (see Appendix A).

SECTION CONTENT AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

The EIR examines the following environmental factors outlined in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form, as follows:

- 3.1 Aesthetics
- 3.2 Air Quality
- 3.3 Biological Resources
- 3.4 Cultural Resources
- 3.5 Energy Conservation and Climate Change
- 3.6 Geology and Soils
- 3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- 3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality
- 3.9 Land Use and Planning
- 3.10 Noise
- 3.11 Public Services and Recreation
- 3.12 Transportation
- 3.13 Tribal Cultural Resources
- 3.14 Utilities and Service Systems
- 3.15 Wildfire

The following environmental issue areas are addressed in Section 4.0, Effects Not Found to Be Significant:

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing

Each potentially significant environmental issue is addressed in a separate section of the EIR (Sections 3.1 through 3.15) and is organized into the following general subsections:

- ***Environmental Setting*** describes the physical conditions that exist at this time and that may influence or affect the issue under investigation.

- **Regulatory Framework** describes the pertinent policy, standards, and codes that exist at this time and which may influence or affect the regulatory environment of the proposed project.
- **Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures** describes the thresholds that are the basis of conclusions of significance, which are primarily the criteria in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

The level of significance identifies the degree or severity of an impact with implementation of the proposed project. Project impacts are the potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions that may occur if the proposed project is implemented. Impacts are classified as potentially significant impact, less than significant impact, or no impact.

Major sources used in crafting significance criteria include the CEQA Guidelines; local, state, federal, or other standards applicable to an impact category; and officially established significance thresholds. “An ironclad definition of significant effect is not possible because the significance of any activity may vary with the setting” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064[b][1]). Principally, “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within an area affected by the project, including land, air, water, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance” constitutes a significant impact (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382).

Evidence, based on factual and scientific data, is presented to show the cause-and-effect relationship between the proposed project and the potential changes in the environment. The exact magnitude, duration, extent, frequency, range, or other parameters of a potential impact are ascertained, to the extent possible, to determine whether impacts may be significant when compared to the presented criteria. All of the potential direct and reasonably foreseeable indirect, construction-related (short-term), and operational and maintenance (long-term) effects are considered. Each section also addresses cumulative impacts (described further below) and identifies any significant and unavoidable impacts.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation measures are those project-specific measures that would be required of the proposed project to avoid a significant adverse impact; minimize a significant adverse impact; rectify a significant adverse impact by restoration; reduce or eliminate a significant adverse impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations; or compensate for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environment. Mitigation measures are included throughout

Sections 3.1 through 3.15, where necessary, to address an identified potentially significant impact.

Where significant impacts cannot be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels, they would be considered significant and unavoidable impacts. To approve a project with unavoidable significant impacts, the lead agency must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations. In adopting such a statement, the lead agency is required to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a project are found to outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered “acceptable” and the project approved (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[a]).

CUMULATIVE IMPACT EVALUATION

Cumulative impacts are defined in the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15355) as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” A cumulative impact occurs from a “change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, projects taking place over a period of time.” Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), the discussion in this EIR focuses on the identification of any significant cumulative impacts and, where present, the extent to which the proposed project would constitute a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) states the following:

The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great of detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

Cumulative Impact Methodology

To identify the projects to be analyzed in the evaluation of cumulative impacts, CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) requires that an EIR employ one of the following:

- **List Approach** – Entails listing past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside of the control of the agency; or,
- **Projection Approach** – Uses a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document that has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.

The approach and geographic scope of the cumulative impact evaluation vary depending on the environmental topic area being analyzed. The individual cumulative impacts discussion in the section addressing each environmental topic presents impacts and mitigation measures for the proposed project. Each impact begins with a summary of the approach and the geographic area relevant to that environmental topic area. For most environmental topic areas, the list approach is used. The list of potentially relevant projects, a detailed methodology, and relevant planning documents are considered in each cumulative impact discussion.

Past projects include those land uses that have been previously developed and comprise the existing environment. Present projects include those projects recently approved or under construction. Probable future projects are those that are reasonably foreseeable, such as those for which an application is on file and in process with a local planning department. The cumulative projects listed in Table 3.0-1, Cumulative Projects, have been determined to be reasonably foreseeable. The list was developed in consultation with the City's Planning Division. These projects are considered in the cumulative impact analysis as appropriate. Refer to Figure 3.0-1, Cumulative Projects Map, for the location of each project relative to the project site.

Table 3.0-1: Cumulative Projects

| Map No. | HEU Site No. (if applicable) | Project Name | Location | Development Proposed | Status |
|---------|------------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------|
| - | Portion = Site 2 | Cannon Property (Piraeus) - Proposed Project | Piraeus Street and Plato Place | 149 | Under Review |
| 1 | -- | Encinitas Beach Resort (Alila Marea Resort) | Highway 101/La Costa Avenue | 130 room hotel with 5,827 SF restaurant/bar | Constructed / Operational |
| 2 | -- | Surfer's Point Hotel | NE Corner of Highway 101/La Costa Avenue | 24 unit timeshare hotel resort | Under Review |

Table 3.0-1, continued

| Map No. | HEU Site No. (if applicable) | Project Name | Location | Development Proposed | Status |
|---------|------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------|
| 3 | -- | 516 La Costa Development | 516 La Costa Avenue | 17 room hotel / 3,089 SF restaurant | Under Review |
| 4 | -- | Skyloft | Skyloft Road between Piraeus Street and Burgundy Road | 17 single family residential units | Under Review |
| 5 | -- | Weston Subdivision | 510 La Costa Avenue | 46 single family residential units | Under Construction |
| 6 | 9 | Echter Property (Fox Point Farms) | 1150 Quail Gardens Drive | 250 | Under Construction |
| 7 | AD2a, AD2b, and AD2c | Quail Meadows Apartments | Mays Hollow Lane, 225 Quail Gardens Drive | 483 ² | In Review |
| 8 | Portion = Site 7 | Marea Village (Jackel Properties) | 1950 Highway 101 | 94 for-lease apartments/34-room boutique hotel/18,261 SF mixed-use development | Approved |
| 9 | 8a | Rancho Santa Fe Parcels (Gaffey/Goodsen) | 2220, 2230, and 2228 Encinitas Boulevard | 283 ¹ | Approved |
| 10 | AD8 | Vulcan & La Costa Avenue | 1967 N Vulcan Avenue | 68 ² | In Review |
| 11 | 12 | Sunshine Gardens | 630 Encinitas Boulevard | 140 ¹ | Under Construction |
| 12 | -- | Moonlight Mixed Use | 154, 184, & 196 N Coast Highway 101 | 50,408 Commercial Area proposed with 45 residential units | In Review |
| 13 | -- | NINE7ZERO PCH Leucadia | 978 N. Coast Highway | Mixed Use with 9 residential units | In Review |
| 14 | 5 | Moonlight Station | 550-590, 696 Encinitas Blvd. | 202 | In Review |
| 15 | AD31 | Clark Avenue Apartments | 662, 672 & 682 Clark Avenue and 556 Union Street | 199 | Approved |

Table 3.0-1, continued

| Map No. | HEU Site No. (if applicable) | Project Name | Location | Development Proposed | Status |
|---------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|----------------------|-----------|
| 16 | -- | Bella Vista Subdivision | Bella Vista Drive (APN: 216-122-17-00) | 17 residential units | In Review |

Notes:

SF = square feet; HEU = (General Plan) Housing Element Update

¹ Denotes the number of DUs that would theoretically be constructed with application of the density bonus allowance and/or as previously approved by the City.² Denotes the number of DUs proposed with the application as currently being processed through the City.

Source: City of Encinitas 2013 - 2021 General Plan Housing Element Update; Table C-2: Net Acreage and Unit Yield Per Site; Correspondence with City of Encinitas, Planning Division, September 2022; Local Transportation Assessment (Intersecting Metrics 2022; available under separate cover).

While they had not done so at the time the NOP was filed for the proposed project, it is reasonably foreseeable the remaining General Plan Housing Element Update (HEU) sites will also file an application; therefore, to be conservative, all of the 2013-2021 Housing Element Update sites have been included in the cumulative impact analysis to the extent that they may contribute to certain issue-specific cumulative effects (i.e., public services such as school services; recreation; sewer capacity; transportation, etc.). Thus, the cumulative analysis in this EIR is based on a “worst-case” assumption that all of the HEU sites are developed. The remaining HEU sites (not including the proposed project and those listed in Table 3.0-1) are identified in Table 3.0-2, Housing Element Update Sites, and are shown with the estimated potential number of dwelling units that may be allowed with application of the density bonus allowance.

Table 3.0-2: Housing Element Update Sites¹

| Map No. | HEU Site No. | Project Name | Location | Allocated DUs in HEU |
|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 17 | 1 | Greek Church Parcel | 3459 Manchester Avenue | 50 |
| 18 | 6a | Armstrong Parcels | N. El Camino Real | 55 |
| 19 | AD1 | Sage Canyon | Sage Canyon Drive | 60 |
| 20 | AD9 | Seacoast Church | 1050 Regal Road | 35 |
| 21 | A11 | Manchester Avenue West Sites | 2951 Manchester Avenue | 41 |
| 22 | AD14 | Harrison Sites | 364 and 371 2 nd Street | 21 |
| Total | | | | 262 |

Notes:

DU = dwelling units; HEU = (General Plan) Housing Element Update

¹ Housing Element Update sites not included in Table 3.0-1, above.

Source: City of Encinitas 2013-2021 Housing Element Update, Table C-2: Net Acreage and Unit Yield Per Site; Correspondence with City of Encinitas, Planning Division, September 2022.



This page intentionally left blank.