

4.1 AESTHETICS

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.1.1 Environmental Setting

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed SB 743, which became effective on January 1, 2014. The purpose of SB 743 is to streamline the review under CEQA for several categories of development projects, including the development of infill projects in transit priority areas. PRC Section 21099(a)(7) defines a transit priority area as an area located within 0.5 mile of a major transit station that is “existing or planned, if the planned stop is scheduled to be completed within the planning horizon included in a Transportation Improvement Program adopted pursuant to Section 450.216 or 450.322 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations.” A major transit stop is a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

PRC Section 21099(d)(1) states that a project’s aesthetic impacts shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment if:

1. The project is in a transit priority area;
2. The project is on an infill site; and
3. The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

Further provisions of SB 743 provide that this legislation “does not affect, change, or modify the authority of a lead agency to consider aesthetic impacts pursuant to local design review ordinances or other discretionary powers provided by other laws or policies (PRC Section 21099[d][2][A]), and that aesthetic impacts do not include impacts on historical or cultural resources (Section 21099[d][2][B]).

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria because it meets the following requirements: (1) the project site is located within 0.5 mile of several local bus transit lines; (2) the project site is located on an infill site that is already developed as the Midway Village area; and (3) the proposed project would be a mixed-use residential project with a community center, recreational areas, and office space.

Because of the mixed-use residential character of the proposed project and its location within an urban transit priority area, the proposed project's aesthetic impacts are not considered significant. Nonetheless, the proposed project is evaluated under the respective Initial Study questions herein for **disclosure/informational purposes only**.

4.1.2 Previous Environmental Analyses

City of Daly City General Plan EIR Summary

Chapter 3.1 of the General Plan EIR discusses impacts related to aesthetics. The General Plan EIR determined that new development must not substantially affect scenic vistas, visual character, or light and glare conditions. The City has established zoning standards, design review practices, and General Plan policies to ensure that new development is compatible with existing development, and therefore impacts are less than significant.

The following General Plan policies are applicable to the proposed project:

Policy LU-8: Ensure that landscape and hardscape improvements made to all residential properties are environmentally sound and do not negatively impact existing neighborhood aesthetics.

Policy HE-31: Ensure that, in instances where higher density mixed-use development is permitted adjacent to existing neighborhoods, the impacts of building height are decreased to the maximum extent feasible without reducing permitted General Plan density.

Plan Bay Area EIR Summary

Section 2.10 of the Plan Bay Area EIR discusses impacts related to visual resources. As discussed in the Plan Bay Area EIR, per the requirements set forth in PRC Section 21099, visual impacts would not be considered significant in transit priority areas if projects are located on an infill site and consist of residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center. The proposed project meets the requirements of PRC Section 21099, and therefore Mitigation Measures 2.10-1, 2.10-3, 2.10-4, and 2.10-5 identified by the Plan Bay Area EIR would not be applicable.

4.1.3 Project-Specific Analysis

Impact AES-1 Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Impact Analysis

As described, the General Plan identifies San Bruno Mountain and the Coastline as natural scenic vistas within the City. As described, the General Plan identifies Guadalupe Canyon Parkway as a scenic corridor that provides scenic vistas, which is located approximately 0.25 mile from the project site. Guadalupe Canyon Parkway can provide views of the coastline and San Bruno Mountains depending on the direction of travel. Portions of the project site are visible from Guadalupe Canyon Parkway based on the topography of the area but are partially blocked by the existing topography and vegetation in the area. No other scenic corridors or vistas are located nearby. The project site is developed and characterized by the existing buildings, landscaping, as well as open space from the Bayshore Park, which provides open space and playgrounds for recreational use in the area. Mostly undeveloped hillsides are

located to the south of the project site in the midground view against the backdrop of existing urban land uses. The proposed project would construct buildings ranging from one to four stories that would be approximately 60 feet in height. The height of the proposed buildings would be comparable to the existing buildings on the project site and nearby and would not block views of scenic vistas. The proposed structures would include architectural design features that would blend with the existing design elements of the surrounding area, in accordance with applicable General Plan and City Zoning Ordinance requirements. Furthermore, pursuant to CEQA Section 21099(d), the proposed project would result in no impact on aesthetics.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

No Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No Impact.

Impact AES-2 Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

Impact Analysis

There are three eligible state scenic highways within the City; however, none are officially designated. These highways include State Route (SR) 35, SR 1, and Interstate 280 (I-280). Scenic potential along these corridors is related to the views of the coastline and San Bruno Mountain. The project site is located approximately 4.5 miles from SR 35, 2 miles from SR 1, and 2 miles from I-280. No portions of the project site or the surrounding project area are visible from these highways. The General Plan also identifies Guadalupe Canyon Parkway as a scenic corridor; however, the designated portions of this roadway are not directly adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no impact would occur. Furthermore, pursuant to CEQA Section 21099(d) the proposed project would result in no impact on aesthetics.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

No Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No Impact.

Impact AES-3 In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Impact Analysis

The project site is in an urbanized area, and therefore, this analysis focuses on whether the proposed project would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

As addressed in Section 2.0, Project Description, and Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning, following recommendation by the Planning Commission and subsequent approval by the City Council, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning ordinances related to architectural finishes. The project site is designated as High Density Residential (R-HD) and Public Park (PP). The designation applies to areas where the City intends to provide, through the Zoning Ordinance, regulatory incentives and/or requirements for developers to construct buildings that contain a vertical mix of uses. The introduction of the R-HD designation is intended to allow for residential intensification in the project area, both of which are well-served by public transportation, so that they may be transformed into more vibrant urban streets as identified during the Envision Daly City process and reduce economic blight. Using the development policies and building design requirements for R-HD as set forth by Title 24 and the City's Code, the proposed project has been designed as a combination of a variety of land uses, structures, and amenities that would also be aesthetically compatible with the surrounding area. Bayshore Park would be relocated to a different section of the project site. The proposed project includes different land use designations (R-HD and PP) and would include a transfer of these two land use designation from one portion of the project site to another, within the entirety of the site. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality, and impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, pursuant to CEQA Section 21099(d) the proposed project would result in no impact on aesthetics.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

No Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No Impact.

Impact AES-4 Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Impact Analysis

The existing Midway Village currently contains lighting. The proposed project would expand lighting as part of the redevelopment, with the addition of new buildings, residents, landscaping, and lighting changes to Bayshore Park. Accordingly, exterior security lighting would be re-installed and expanded throughout the project site including on buildings, along pedestrian paths, in parking areas, and in the Bayshore Park area. This lighting would primarily be required for security and safety purposes, although it is anticipated that the proposed project would also include decorative and accent lighting for aesthetic and design reasons. Regardless of the intended purpose, the use of exterior lighting must comply with the City Code, which requires exterior lighting to be designed and installed in such a manner that the light source is shielded from view off the site unless required for necessary safety reasons. Further, the proposed project would be required to comply with the design review process outlined in the City Code, which requires that general architectural considerations, such as exterior lighting, are compatible with design and character of adjacent or neighboring properties and the minimization of light from lights and buildings.

As a result, any exterior lighting used on the project site would be shielded and located as to direct light away from adjacent uses and to avoid light spillover onto these uses. All exterior lighting used as part of the proposed project would comply with the provisions contained in both the City Code and the General Plan. Further, no podium lighting (such as lighting for stadiums or ball fields) would be required for the Bayshore Park area.

Additionally, proposed project construction would be subject to the requirements of the most recent California Building Code (CBC; California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 24), including Title 24, Part 6 CCR. Compliance with the Title 24 lighting and energy requirements would ensure that light from the proposed project would not spill over to adjacent uses. Proposed project construction would be subject to the requirements of the CBC (CCR Title 24). Section 132 of Title 24, Part 6 of CCR regulates lighting characteristics such as maximum power and brightness, shielding, and sensor controls to turn lighting on and off. The standards require that outdoor lighting be automatically controlled so that it is turned off during daytime hours and during other times when it is not needed. Luminaires with lamps larger than a specified wattage must be classified as cut-off so that the majority of the light is directed toward the ground. Therefore, with adherence to the above-referenced standards and requirements, proposed project impacts associated with light would be less than significant. Furthermore, pursuant to CEQA Section 21099(d) the proposed project would result in no impact on aesthetics.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

No Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No Impact.

This page left intentionally blank.