

Miramar Ranch North project issues include:

1. Project Scope is unclear. Community and stakeholders were presented a different Project Scope with no condominiums. The Scripps Mesa Project, as described by the San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) Board of Education and certified in the CA Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), defined the total land size of 305,000 sq. ft to be utilized as follows:

300,000 sq. ft. (297,500) for rental apartment; but current plan includes 8 condominiums,  
4,000 sq. ft. for District/community center; but current plan lacks community center,  
2,000 sq. ft. for commercial space,  
1,500 sq. ft. for community garden; but current plan lacks community garden and recreational area approved by State Board of Education.

2. FIVE community advisory groups VOTED TO OPPOSE the project.

Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee (unanimous NO vote),  
Scripps Ranch Planning Group (unanimous NO vote),  
Scripps Ranch Schools Committee (unanimous NO vote),  
Scripps Ranch Recreation Council (unanimous NO vote),  
Scripps Ranch Civic Association (voted NO, 15-0-1).

3. Request new Environmental Impact Report (EIR) because Monarch Development volunteered to undergo new City of San Diego discretionary review and because the SDUSD Final EIR is significantly inadequate.

(A) INACCURATE GREENHOUSE GAS STUDIES. Baseline issues: FEIR mistakenly deducts instead of adds GHG emissions from current uses to arbitrarily reduce project emissions (calculates GHG emissions as difference between current and proposed uses). Necessity of Transportation Demand Management Program conclusions are unsupported because numbers of employees in commercial portion of project, leasing office, and makerspace are not quantified. The document acknowledges that the City of San Diego CEQA significance thresholds apply. FEIR failures to articulate and analyze the project against City of San Diego thresholds and utilizes inappropriate baseline when calculating GHG emissions.

(B) INAPPROPRIATE USE OF OF MINISTERIAL, "BY-RIGHT" PROCESS REVIEW. FEIR acknowledges that the non-educational portions of the project are subject to City local plans,

policies, and ordinances; however, the FEIR states the project and the non-educational building entitlements must obtain only ministerial (Process One) approval from the City in the form of a building permit. Since EIR was required in this instance, that suggests something other than Process One was warranted.

(C) FAILURE TO NAME CITY OF SAN DIEGO AS A RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. FEIR fails to identify the City as a responsible agency (“all public agencies other than the lead agency which have discretionary approval power over the project,” Guidelines section 15381). Analysis of certain impacts (adequacy of parkland, fire services) are deferred on the basis of future City review; however, if such review is ministerial, the so-called review will have no impact and such analysis should instead be included in the FEIR. No comment letter was submitted by City Staff which would support the FEIR’s conclusions that only ministerial approvals are involved. Determinations of whether discretionary approvals are involved appears to be one for the City of San Diego to make and having failed to include evidence concerning this matter in the FEIR, the many CEQA determinations are unsupported or erroneous.

(D) FAILURE TO INCLUDE THE RELOCATION OF THE INNOVATIONS ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL. Innovations Academy is currently providing education on the school land with a lease agreement that expires on June 30, 2019. \$20 million dollars in Prop Z taxpayer’s money was allocated for new Innovations Academy property and school facilities but new property is still in permitting process and it’s unclear if the current school lease will be extended to June 30, 2020.

(E) SIGNIFICANT AESTHETIC CONCLUSIONS ARE UNSUPPORTED due to failure to provide visual simulations or analysis of impact on all affected areas and populations. Inconsistencies with local community plan guidelines, such as building height limits, are not analyzed, avoided, or mitigated.

(F) TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION ISSUES NOT ADDRESSED. Caltrans submitted a comment letter indicating the EIR’s traffic analysis was incomplete for failing to consider the project’s impacts on I-15 on ramps and for failing to consider cumulative impacts with the Watermark Project. The consideration of the impacts from Caltrans were ignored.

(G) FAILURE TO CONSIDER A REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES OR ALTERNATIVES that reduce project impacts; conclusions regarding rejected alternatives, such as maintaining the property for education use and leases to charter schools, are unsupported.

(H) USED OUTDATED GEOLOGICAL STUDIES, thus significant conclusions are unsupported; for example, there is no consideration of the large water pipeline built under the project site since the utilized geological studies.

(I) DEFERRAL OF REVIEW BY SD FIRE DEPARTMENT AND SD POLICE DEPARTMENT. Input from these agencies should be part of the FEIR, not deferred until after the project is approved.

4. Violations of MRN Community Plan (CP) guidelines for building height, bulk, and blocks.

**Section 6.3 of MRN CP states:** *“In building and site design, all commercial development should be compatible with surrounding land uses in height and bulk.”*

The project is two to four times the height of adjacent commercial and retail structures; its bulk significantly exceeds that of any nearby structure.

**Section 11.1 of MRN CP states:** *“residential building height should be limited to three stories.”*

The project has four stories.

**Section 11.4 of MRN CP states:** *“Long, narrow structures and tall building blocks are inappropriate to the canyon setting.”* The canyon setting refers to the land area along Scripps Poway Parkway. The proposed project is located at the corner of Scripps Poway Parkway and Spring Canyon Road. The project consists of a large and tall building block that is inappropriate to the setting.

5. Lack of transit/mobility in Scripps Ranch. The MTS transit bus stop, at east end of Mira Mesa Blvd and Scripps Ranch Blvd, is **2 miles** from the project site at 10380 Spring Canyon Road. Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) as defined by the California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) requires homes be built within a 1/2-mile radius of a qualifying rail or ferry station or bus stop with frequent service. The apartment units added with the 35% bonus density plus two incentives (ground floor restriction, building setbacks) are unqualified for this non-transit-oriented mixed-use development.

6. Miramar Ranch North Maintenance Assessment District (MAD) fee impacts are not addressed, nor is the impact to the MAD due to the project. Property needs to be changed to reflect the residential use on the school property. Current property fee for the MAD is a business use. City needs to reassess the property MAD zone to reflect the 264 residential units that will utilize the MAD facilities.

7. Project circumvents the CA School Safe Zone laws and jeopardizes the safety of children, putting them in close proximity to guns, alcohol, weapons, and photography from apartment units that will be within 150 feet of a park corridor through which children walk to school.

8. The CA Ed Code for joint occupancy projects recommends a lack of disruption of the surrounding neighborhood and a community benefit that is supported by the community. The proposed mixed-use 4-story apartment project disrupts the surrounding neighborhoods, disregards the public interest, and provides no community benefit – the community is overwhelmingly against the project.

CA Ed Code violation (Ch 4; Article 1.5 - #17387) – *“It is the intent of the Legislature that leases entered into pursuant to this chapter (Chapter 4) provide for community involvement by attendance*

*area at the district level. This community involvement should facilitate making the best possible judgments about the use of excess school facilities in each individual situation. It is the intent of the Legislature to have the community involved before decisions are made about school closure or the use of surplus space, thus avoiding community conflict and assuring building use that is compatible with the community's needs and desires."*