4.2 VISUAL RESOURCES

This section describes the existing visual characteristics of the project site and evaluates the visual effects of the project. The visual impact analysis considers existing scenic resources and the potential visibility of the site from surrounding areas, including both the physical characteristics of the development and lighting and glare. The descriptions of the existing visual setting are accompanied by exhibits that provide photographs of representative views taken during a site visit in March 2007 (Exhibits 4.2-2 through 4.2-5). Photograph locations are shown in Exhibit 4.2-1. The lighting impacts described in this section are based on the lighting analyses prepared for this Draft EIR by Auerbach-Glasow Lighting Consultants in 2007. Please refer to Appendix B for the complete lighting study including exhibits and supporting information.

4.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

VISUAL CHARACTER OF THE PROJECT SITE

The project site is located in the southwestern portion of City of Manteca (City) (see Exhibit 3-1 in Chapter 3, "Project Description"), and is a fallow field. Irrigation control structures run in an east-west direction along the southern border of the site, and an irrigation well and pump are located at the site's western edge. The topography of the site is generally flat with an elevation of 25 feet above mean sea level.

The site is generally bounded by the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp to the south, residential development to the north and east, fallow agricultural land to the north, and commercial development to the west (see Exhibit 3-2 in Chapter 3, "Project Description"). The project site is an isolated tract of land located adjacent and southwest of the developing urban core of the City. Views of the site from local nearby roadways generally consist of fallow land and irrigation structures.

Fishback Road and Airport Way are local roadways that provide north-south access to the project site, while Daniels Street provides east-west access to the project site. Airport Way provides access to SR 120.

VISUAL CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA

The City is centrally located in the Central Valley near the northern end of the San Joaquin Valley, in San Joaquin County. Because the topography of Manteca is relatively flat, views of the cityscape and surrounding landscape are limited to localized views rather than broad landscape views. Similarly, views of the site from the surrounding areas within the City would be limited and localized.

SR 120 is located to the south of the site. Single-family residential development is located directly to the north and east, while a vacant parcel consisting of fallow land is located directly to the north and northwest of the site. The "Stadium Center" shopping center is to the west of the site on Daniels Street west of Airport Way. This 52-acre shopping center development consists of approximately 500,000 square feet of retail buildings, is anchored by a Costco department store, and includes six additional small to midsize box stores, three buildings for smaller shops, and seven pads for restaurants. The general character of the surrounding area is described below.

- **North:** Areas to the north of the site include a single-family residential subdivision and fallow land. A green storage building is located on the north end of the vacant parcel. Additional single-family residences are located to the north of the parcel.

- **East:** Single-family residential housing is located immediately to the east of the project site. A stormwater detention basin is also located to the east of the site, and an approximately 9-foot high wall is located along the eastern boundary of the project site.

- **South:** The SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp, a 1-lane roadway, is located immediately south and parallel to the project site. A chain link fence and several feet of road right-of-way separate the off-ramp from the site. SR 120, a 4-lane state highway, is located to the south of the off-ramp.

- **West:** Areas to the west and northwest of the project site include the "Stadium Center" shopping center and agricultural land consisting irrigated row crops, orchards, fallow land, and residences and buildings.

REPRESENTATIVE VIEWPOINTS

Views of the project site from surrounding areas are limited because of the relatively flat surrounding topography and the presence of existing development and vegetation. Distant views of the site are obstructed by surrounding residential and commercial development and vegetation.

Open views of the site are generally limited to roadways in the project area. Representative off-site areas with views of the project site can be defined by several viewpoints. These viewpoints represent areas where publicly-accessible direct views of the site were available (Exhibit 4.2-1). The analysis presented below does not attempt to document how views of the site would change from every possible viewpoint in the local area. Rather, it depicts the project from the key, representative viewpoints. The general nature of existing views of the project site from the key representative viewpoints is described below.

Views from the SR 120 Airport Way Off-Ramp (Viewpoint 1)

The SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp is located at the southeast corner of the site. A sound wall between SR 120 and the residential development to the east of the project site extends to the eastern boundary of the project site from the east. Views of the project site are available to motorists traveling west along SR 120 and the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp west of the sound wall. From this viewpoint, the entire western portion of the project site is clearly visible in the middleground, and residential housing, agricultural buildings, and the Stadium Center shopping center are visible in the background (Exhibit 4.2-2, Viewpoint 1).

Views from SR 120 (Viewpoints 2 and 3)

SR 120 is located south of the project site and south of the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp. Partially obstructed views of the project site are available through trees from the highway overcrossing on Airport Way. Motorists and pedestrians traveling north along Airport Way have views of the eastern and western portions of the project site. Foreground views of the site are obstructed by trees located north of SR 120, while the eastern portion of the project site and the approximately 9-foot tall sound wall are clearly visible in the middleground. Residential development north of the project site along Daniels Street and east of the site are visible in the background (Exhibit 4.2-2, Viewpoint 2). The western portion of the project site north of the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp is visible in the middleground, while residential development and the fallow agricultural parcel west of Fishback Road are visible in the background (Exhibit 4.2.-3, Viewpoint 3).

Views from Airport Way (Viewpoints 4 and 5)

Airport Way runs in a north-south direction and is adjacent and parallel to the western boundary of the project site. From Airport Way, the entire length of the project site to the 9-foot tall sound wall along the eastern boundary of the site is clearly visible. The project site is visible in the middleground, and residential development north and east of the site is visible in the background (Exhibit 4.2-3, Viewpoint 4). Foreground and middleground views of the site are dominated by the project site, and residential development is visible in the background (Exhibit 4.2-4, Viewpoint 5).

Views from Airport Way North of Daniels Street (Viewpoint 6)

Airport Way runs in a north-south direction and is adjacent and parallel to the western boundary of the project site, while Daniels Street runs in an east-west direction and is adjacent to and parallel to the northern boundary of the project site. Fallow agricultural land is visible in the foreground. The eastern portion of the project site south of Daniels Street is visible in the middleground, while SR 120 and residential development is visible in the background. (Exhibit 4.2-4, Viewpoint 6).

Views from Fishback Road (Viewpoint 7)

Fishback Road is north of Daniels Street, runs in a north-south direction, and is perpendicular to the northern boundary of the project site. The central portion of the project site is visible in the middleground, while SR 120 and residential development dominates the background (Exhibit 4.2-5, Viewpoint 7). Views of the eastern portion of the project site are obstructed by residences along Daniels Street.

Views from Daniels Street (Viewpoint 8)

Daniels Street runs in an east-west direction and is adjacent and parallel to the northern boundary of the project site. Unobstructed views of the project site are available from Daniels Street (Exhibit 4.2-5, Viewpoint 8). Foreground views are dominated by the project site, while the Stadium Center shopping center is visible in the background.

LIGHT AND GLARE

Currently, no lighting exists on the project site. Existing nighttime lighting sources near the site consist of street lighting along Daniels Street, Airport Way, and Laurel Park Circle. In general, dominant nighttime lighting sources in the project area originate from SR 120, street lighting along Daniels Street, and commercial development west of Airport Way.

4.2.2 REGULATORY BACKGROUND

Federal Plans, Policies, Regulations, and Laws

No federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws are applicable to the proposed project.

State Plans, Policies, Regulations, and Laws

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the California Scenic Highway Program. The goal of this program is to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from changes that would affect the aesthetic value of the land adjacent to highways.

There are no state-designated highways or eligible routes or roadways in the project area. The nearest state-designated highway segment is I-5 from SR 152 to SR 205, approximately 15 miles southwest of the project area (Caltrans 1999). Views of the project area from this segment of I-5 are not available because of the extended distance to the site and intervening topography. Neither SR 99, located in the eastern part of the project area, nor SR 120, located south of the project site, are state-designated scenic highways.

Regional and Local Plans, Policies, Regulations, and Ordinances

The *City of Manteca General Plan 2023* (City General Plan) outlines goals and policies associated with aesthetic resources. The following policies from the Community Design Element are relevant to the project:

- **Policy CD-P-14:** Establish design guidelines for non-residential uses within 200 feet of SR 99 and SR 120. The guidelines should address the following concepts.

    - New office and commercial land use shall provide attractive landscaping, lighting, and signage adjacent to all buildings oriented to SR 99 and SR 120.

    - Encourage buildings that include attractive focal elements, such as a tower or articulated roofline in each non-residential development adjacent to SR 99 or SR 120 to serve as visual landmarks.

    - New non-residential buildings oriented to SR 99 and SR 120 shall provide an attractive façade similar in articulation, and using the same materials and colors, as the primary façade of the building.

    - Truck loading and refuse collection areas and adjacent to SR 99 and SR 120 shall be screened from view.

    - The landscape along SR 120 and SR 99 will reflect the natural character of the region in the selection of trees and groundcover.

- **Policy CD-P-35:** Architectural elements that contribute to a building's character, aid in climate control, and enhance pedestrian scale are encouraged. Examples include canopies, roof overhangs, projections or recessions of stories, balconies, reveals, and awnings.

- **Policy CD-P-36:** Encourage the creation of an urban forest comprised of street trees, residential lot trees, and trees in non-residential parking lots and other public open space.

- **Policy CD-P-37:** Commercial centers should provide for convenient, attractive pedestrian access from street fronts and from adjacent commercial, office, and residential land uses.

- **Policy CD-P-38:** Commercial centers should provide for convenient, attractive pedestrian access within the center with dedicated pedestrian ways between all buildings and pedestrian spaces such as plazas, courtyards, and terraces at natural gathering areas within the site.

- **Policy CD-P-44:** Provide minimal levels of street, parking, building, site, and public area lighting to meet safety standards and provide direction.

- **Policy CD-P-45:** Provide directional shielding for all exterior lighting to minimize the annoyance of direct or indirect glare.

- **Policy CD-P-47:** The City shall adopt light and glare standards that minimize the creation of new light source and the annoyance of direct and indirect glare.

The City of Manteca Zoning Ordinance addresses exterior lighting and glare in Section 17.13.040.D and Section 17.15.090.G of the City's Municipal Code:

> **17.13.040.D. Glare.**
> 1. No direct glare shall be permitted with the exception that parking areas and walkways may be illuminated by luminaries so hooded or shielded that the maximum angle of the cone of direct illumination shall be sixty degrees if the luminary is not less than six feet above the ground. Such luminaries shall be placed not more than twenty feet above ground level and shall not be in excess of ten foot candles.
> 2. Indirect glare shall not exceed that value which is produced by an illumination of the reflecting surface, not to exceed:

a) 10 foot-candle (maximum).

b) 4 foot-candle (average).

c) 1 foot-candle (minimum).

d) Any light or combination of lights shall not cast light on residential property and shall not exceed 0.0 foot-candles as measured from said property.

17.15.090.G. Lighting.
1. Public parking areas designed to accommodate ten or more vehicles in other than vehicle sales areas shall provide a minimum lighting level of one foot candle of maintained illumination on the parking surface during the hours of use between one-half hour before dusk and one-half hour after dawn.
2. Any parking area illumination, including security lighting, shall be so arranged as to reflect away from adjoining properties and rights-of-way.

4.2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

This visual impact analysis is based on a field survey and review of existing representative viewpoints of the site in relation to the surrounding vicinity. The elements of the project were compared to existing views of the site to determine how the project would change foreground, middleground, and background views where appropriate. The project was also reviewed for its overall visual impacts using the standards of quality, consistency, and symmetry typically used for a visual assessment.

In addition, this analysis is based on a quantitative lighting study prepared for the project site (see Appendix B). Lighting levels, light trespass, and high-angle glare were assessed for the project site and adjacent areas using site layout, landscaping, fixture layouts, and photometric information provided by the project applicant. Calculations were performed to assess horizontal and vertical light levels, glare, and light trespass. Results were compared to lighting recommendations published by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA), the California Energy Commission (CEC), and the International Dark Sky Association (IDA), and were not compared to Section 17.13.040.D and Section 17.15.090.G of the City's Municipal Code as there are some technical conflicts with the lighting standards established by the City, making them hard if not impossible to implement. Therefore, this lighting analysis is based on the published lighting recommendations listed above, which are commonly used lighting standards within the industry.

The IESNA handbook contains lighting recommendations for parking lots. Table 4.2-1 presents lighting recommendations from Section 22 of the IESNA Handbook. For glare, the IDA recommends that the maximum intensity in one's field of view shall not exceed 10 times that of the average lighting level.

The visual impacts were compared against the thresholds of significance discussed below.

Table 4.2-1
Recommended Maintained Illuminance for Parking Lots [a]

Criteria	Recommended Value
Recommended Average Horizontal Illuminance at pavement[1]	1.0 fc
Minimum Horizontal Illuminance at pavement[2]	0.2 fc
Horizontal Uniformity Ratio, Maximum-to-Minimum[3]	20:1
Minimum Vertical Illuminance at 5' above pavement[4]	0.1 fc

fc = foot candle

[a] Illuminance is the total amount of visible light illuminating (incident upon) a point on a surface from all directions above the surface. This "surface" can be a physical surface or an imaginary plane. Therefore, illuminance is equivalent to irradiance weighted with the response curve of the human eye.

[1] Average Horizontal Illuminance at pavement: The mean average illuminance within a given area, as measured at ground level, parallel to the ground.

[2] Minimum Horizontal Illuminance at pavement: The lowest measured illuminance within a given area, as measured at ground level, parallel to the ground.

[3] Horizontal Uniformity Ratio, Maximum-to-Minimum: The brightest measured illuminance in a given area divided by the lowest measured illuminance. The more even the lighting is across the area, the lower the ratio will be.

[4] Minimum Vertical Illuminance at 5' above pavement: The lowest measured illuminance within a given area, as measured 5' above ground level and perpendicular to the ground.

Source: IESNA Handbook, 2000, 9th Edition, Section 22 (see Appendix B)

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The project would cause a significant impact related to aesthetic resources if it would:

- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings including resources adjacent to a State Scenic Highway; or
- create a new source of substantial light or glare that would exceed IESNA lighting standards for commercial and parking lot facilities.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

IMPACT 4.2-1 Visual Resources — Impacts on a Scenic Vista. *No views on or near the project site would be considered a scenic vista. Therefore, development of the project would not alter or obscure views of a scenic vista. This would be a* ***less-than-significant*** *impact.*

A scenic vista is generally considered a view of an area that has remarkable scenery or a resource that is indigenous to the area. The project site itself does not provide any aesthetic resources that would be considered a scenic vista because it primarily consists of agricultural lands that are relatively common in other areas of the City and are not unique to the surrounding visual setting. Further, because on-site agricultural production activities have altered the natural landscape, the project site does not provide views of the indigenous natural landscape. Although the current land uses provide views of an agricultural landscape that is representative of the project region, the project site does not contain resources that are exemplary of the agricultural history of the area (i.e., historic structures or landmarks) (see Section 4.12, "Cultural Resources"). Views of the project site are not unique in the region.

The project site is generally flat and many views of the site are screened by surrounding residential and commercial development. Although some views of the distant Diablo Range are available from the project site, no areas that would qualify as a scenic vista are located near the project site. Therefore, there is little opportunity for project activities to obscure views of scenic vistas that may be located outside the project site. Because the project would not have a substantial adverse affect on a scenic vista, this would be a **less-than-significant** impact.

IMPACT 4.2-2 Visual Resources — Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway. *No state scenic highways are located within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in damage to scenic resources along a state scenic highway. This would be a* ***less-than-significant*** *impact.*

A scenic resource is generally a resource, landmark, or area that has been noted for its outstanding scenic qualities and is thereby protected because of those qualities. A scenic resource within a state scenic highway is a resource that is noted for its outstanding scenic qualities and is visible from a state-designated scenic highway. There are no scenic state-designated highways or eligible routes, or scenic roadways designated by the City of Manteca or San Joaquin County, in the immediate project area. The nearest state-designated scenic highway is a segment of I-5 approximately 15 miles southwest of the project area; the designation is from the San Joaquin County line north to SR 205. Because of the large distance between this state-designated scenic highway segment and the project area, the project site is not visible from this scenic highway segment. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on scenic resources adjacent to a state-designated highway.

IMPACT 4.2-3 Visual Resources — Degradation of Visual Character. *Implementation of the project would substantially alter the visual character of the project site through conversion of agricultural land to developed urban uses. This would be considered a* ***significant*** *impact.*

The 16-acre project site consists primarily of fallow agricultural land. Implementation of the project would result in conversion of this land use to commercial development and supporting land uses (e.g., parking lots). The project is proposed to be an aesthetically and architecturally pleasing development that would complement the existing "Stadium Center" shopping center to the west of the project site. The project includes extensive design guidelines that identify the specific landscaping, lighting, and signage that would be implemented at the site consistent with the City's design policies of the general plan (policies CD-P-14, CD-P-35, and CD-P-36). Specifically, the project includes extensive landscaping throughout parking and building areas, would orient buildings to provide for pedestrian access within the center (policy CD-P-38), would provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to off-site areas (policy CD-P-37), and would meet safety requirements for parking (see Section 4.11, "Transportation and Circulation") (policy CD-P-44).

The area surrounding the project site is generally undergoing a transition from rural and agricultural open space uses to an urban environment. While over time the area would be fully developed with urban land uses, the project area is currently in a transitional state and provides representative views of typical agricultural and urban environments. As such, even with implementation of measures to enhance the aesthetic appeal of the development, the change from agricultural to urban uses can be perceived by some as a substantial alteration of the visual character of the project site.

The visual impacts from surrounding representative viewpoints are described below. The project site would be visible from nearby residences and motorists traveling along SR 120, the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp, Airport Way, Daniels Street, and Fishback Road.

Views from SR 120

From SR 120, existing views of the project site consist of a common agricultural viewshed found in many locations in San Joaquin County. With implementation of the project, the rural agricultural setting of the project site would change to a commercial development surrounded by single-family residential housing to the north and

east, commercial development to the west, and fallow agriculture land to the north and west of the site. For motorists traveling eastbound, views of the western half of the site would be screened by vegetation adjacent to SR 120. For motorists traveling in either direction, landscaping proposed along the southern boundary of the site would screen most foreground and middleground views of the commercial development. The southern project site boundary would be lined with southern live oak, austrailian willow, and chinese pistache spaced at 25-foot intervals, which would eventually create an urban forest visual environment typical of other commercial development in the area. Initially, young trees would be short and tree branches and foliage would allow some views of project structures. However, once fully mature, the trees would create an urban forest environment, and the taller trees would block some views of project structures. In general, background views of the development would be unobstructed from SR 120. Most views of residential development located north and east of the project site would be blocked by the project. The project includes several design, architectural, and development guidelines to preserve and maintain the general visual quality of the development and to ensure that the character of development would be consistent with viewer expectations for similar urban environments. It is anticipated that views of the project would be similar to views of established commercial settings found elsewhere in the project vicinity.

Views from the SR 120 Airport Way Off-ramp, Airport Way, Daniels Street, and Fishback Road

With implementation of the project, the rural agricultural setting of the project site would change to a commercial development. Views of the site from the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp, Airport Way, Daniels Street, and Fishback Road would be close-range and would include sidewalks, parking lots, trees and landscaping, direct and indirect views of commercial buildings, and views of access roadways to the site. Similar to views from SR 120, the project would substantially change views of the local area through conversion of agricultural land uses to urban land uses. Further, views of the site from surrounding single-family residences would substantially change and in some locations (especially along Daniels Street) the project would be a prominent feature in foreground views. Similar to the discussion above, implementation of design, architectural, development, and maintenance standards and guidelines to preserve and maintain the general visual quality of the development would ensure that the character of development would be consistent with viewer expectations for similar urban environments. However, because the project would result in substantial foreground changes in the visual environment for drivers along SR 120, local roadways, and surrounding residences, this would be a **significant** visual impact.

IMPACT 4.2-4 Visual Resources — Impacts from Lighting. *The project would require lighting of parking lots, sidewalks, and commercial buildings that could inadvertently cause light and glare for motorists on adjacent roadways and residents on Daniels Street and Laurel Park Circle. The proposed site lighting plan would create a new source of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area. Because calculated site lighting levels would exceed the IESNA lighting recommendations for parking lots for three criteria, would not meet IESNA lighting recommendations for one criterion, and would exceed the recommended IDA maximum to average ratios for indirect glare, lighting and glare levels associated with operation of the proposed project would be a* ***significant*** *impact.*

Currently, no lighting exists on the project site. Existing nighttime lighting sources near the site consist of street lighting along Daniels Street, Laurel Park Circle, and Airport Way. In general, dominant nighttime lighting sources in the project area originate from SR 120, street lighting along Daniels Street, and commercial development west of Airport Way. Development of the project would require lighting of roadways, parking lots, buildings, and other facilities. A substantial increase in the amount of nighttime light and glare compared to existing conditions would result from implementation of the project, potentially obscuring views of stars, constellations, and other features of the night sky. In addition, nighttime lighting in commercial areas or the presence of reflective surfaces on buildings in these areas (e.g., reflective window glazing), may result in light and glare shining onto motorists on SR 120, the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp, Airport Way, and Daniels Street.

The project applicant prepared a proposed site lighting plan for the project site. The purpose of the lighting plan is to balance the safety of patrons that would visit the site with the value of darkness in surrounding areas based on

Lowe's standard lighting criteria for its facilities. The lighting plan consists of the site layout, landscaping plan, lighting fixture layout, and site photometric plan. Project site and adjacent area lighting levels, light trespass, and high-angle glare associated with the lighting plan were assessed (see Appendix B) and compared to lighting recommendations published by the IESNA, the CEC, and the IDA.

Lighting levels were calculated for the project site (utilizing site lighting plan information) and were found to exceed the IESNA lighting recommendations for parking lots for three criteria. For minimum horizontal illuminance at pavement, the calculated lighting level is less than the recommended level (see table 4.2-2). Because calculated site lighting levels are inconsistent with recommended values and could result in the substantial casting of light and glare to offsite areas and under illuminated areas on the project site, this would be considered a **significant** lighting impact.

Table 4.2-2
Recommended and Calculated Maintained Illuminance for Parking Lots

Criteria	Recommended Value	Calculated Value
Recommended Average Horizontal Illuminance at pavement	1.0 fc	2.9 fc
Minimum Horizontal Illuminance at pavement	0.2 fc	0.1 fc
Horizontal Uniformity Ratio, Maximum-to-Minimum	20:1	92:1
Minimum Vertical Illuminance at 5' above pavement	0.1 fc	0.3 fc

fc = foot candle
Source: IESNA Handbook 2000, 9th Edition, Section 22, Auerbach Glasow 2007 (as included in Appendix B)

To assess light trespass, lighting levels were calculated at the project site boundary and across the street from the project site. The amount of light trespass from the project site was found to be reasonable. Indirect glare was analyzed at walls where type WL and WL-250 fixtures would be located. Maximum to average ratios at the walls were found to be 35:1 on average, exceeding the IDA recommendations of 10 times the average lighting level (see table 4.2-3). This would be considered a **significant** impact.

Table 4.2-3
Indirect Glare at Project Wall Surfaces

Building Surface	Maximum (fc)	Average (fc)	Max. to Min. Ratio
Wall 1	69.8	4.50	15.5
Wall 2	241	6.28	38.4
Wall 3	270	8.28	32.6
Wall 4	168	4.34	38.7
Wall 5	108	2.11	51.2

fc = foot candle
Source: Auerbach Glasow 2007, Table 5 (as included in Appendix B)

In summary, the proposed project lighting plan would create a new source of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area. Because calculated site lighting levels were found to exceed the IESNA lighting recommendations for parking lots for three criteria, not meet IESNA lighting recommendations for one criterion, and exceed the recommended IDA maximum to average ratios for indirect glare (Auerbach Glasow 2007), site lighting and glare levels associated with operation of the proposed project would be a **significant** impact.

4.2.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are necessary for the following less-than-significant impacts:

4.2-1: Impacts on a Scenic Vista.

4.2-2: Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway.

Mitigation is recommended for the following potentially significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-3: Visual Resources — Degradation of Visual Character. Because the project would comply with the City's design and lighting standards, no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce the project's visual impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-4: Visual Resources — Impacts from Lighting.

To address elevated site lighting levels throughout most of the site and lower than standard lighting levels in the northeast corner of the site, the applicant shall implement the following measures:

1. Reduce lamp wattages on all pole mounted lighting fixtures from 400W to 250W.
2. Reduce lamp wattages on all wall mounted lighting fixtures to 150W.
3. Include glare shields with all type WL and WL-250 fixtures to reduce back splash.
4. Add one to two fixtures at the northeast corner of the site.

4.2.5 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The project's scenic resources impacts would be less-than-significant and no mitigation is required. Because of the scale and location of the proposed project, there is no feasible mitigation available to address aesthetic resource impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural land to commercial development. Although design, architectural, development, and maintenance standards are included in the project to ensure that commercial development at the project site remains within the City's aesthetic guidelines, there is no mechanism to allow implementation of the project while avoiding the conversion of the local viewshed from agricultural to commercial development. However, conversion of the agricultural viewshed at the project site to commercial development is identified as a significant impact, and no feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project's impact to the local visual character of the project site (Impact 4.2-3) would be a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

By reducing lamp wattages on all pole and wall mounted lighting fixtures, installing glare shields with all type WL and WL-250 fixtures, and adding fixtures at the northeast corner of the site, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-4 would adjust lighting and glare levels to levels consistent with IESNA standards, As a result, impacts associated with site lighting and glare would be reduced to a **less-than-significant** level. Implementation of this mitigation measure would also make the project consistent with the City's general plan policies related to lighting (including policies CD-P-44, CD-P-45, and CD-P-47).

Source: Adapted by EDAW in 2007

Representative Viewpoint Locations **Exhibit 4.2-1**

Viewpoint 1 – View of the project site looking northwest from the SR 120 Airport Way off-ramp. The western half of the site is shown.

Viewpoint 2 – View of the project site looking northeast from the SR 120 highway overpass on Airport Way. View of the eastern half of the site is shown.

Representative Photographs **Exhibit 4.2-2**

Viewpoint 3 – View of the project site looking north from the SR 120 highway overpass on Airport Way. View of the western half of the site is shown.

Viewpoint 4 – View of the project site looking northeast from Airport Way and SR 120 off-ramp intersection. View of the eastern half of the project site is shown.

Representative Photographs **Exhibit 4.2-3**

Viewpoint 5 – View of the project site looking east from Airport Way. View of the entire project site is shown.

Viewpoint 6 – View of the project site looking southeast from Airport Way north of Daniels Street. View of the eastern half of the project site is shown.

Representative Photographs **Exhibit 4.2-4**

Viewpoint 7 – View of the project site looking south from Fishback Road. View of the middle portion of the project site is shown.

Viewpoint 8 – View of the project site looking west from Daniels Street. View of the western half of the project site is shown.

Representative Photographs **Exhibit 4.2-5**