4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section evaluates the project’s compatibility with existing land uses in the project area and its consistency with applicable land use policy. The methodologies used for this analysis include a site investigation to examine existing land use conditions, aerial photograph interpretation, review of applicable plans and ordinances, an Airport Approach Zone Analysis for population density provided in a July 18, 2011 letter from Dudek (Appendix G), consultation with City of Goleta Planning staff, and review of the conclusions reached for other issues addressed in this EIR that have implications for land use compatibility and policy consistency.

4.9.1 Existing Conditions

Existing Land Use

Project Site

As described in Section 2.0 Project Description, the project site consists of two parcels, legally described as Parcels A and B of Parcel Map No. 11,218. Parcel A is 1.23 acres, located at the southeast corner of the project site. It is developed with an office building and ATM kiosk, totaling 9,546 square feet (sf), together with associated paved surface parking and ornamental landscaping, including mature trees. Parcel B is 22.32 acres and is undeveloped and vegetated primarily with non-native grasses, which are periodically cleared for weed abatement. A subsurface high-pressure natural gas pipeline runs along the inside of the southern boundary of the site and an associated vault is located at the site’s southwest corner. Pole-mounted electrical transmission lines are located adjacent to the site, along the site’s east and south property lines. Existing parcel boundaries are depicted in Figure 2-2.

The project site is located in the Inland Area of the City of Goleta. The City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Land Use Map designates Parcel A as Office and Institutional (I-OI) and the parcel is zoned Industrial Research Park (M-RP). Parcel B is designated Medium-Density Residential (R-MD), which permits a minimum residential density of 15 dwelling units per acre and has a target residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre; however, Parcel B is currently zoned Mobile Home Subdivision with an Affordable Housing Overlay, permitting a residential density of up to 12.3 units per acre (MHS/AHO DR-12.3). Approximately, the southern quarter of the site is covered by a Flight Approach Overlay (F(APR)), and is partially located within one mile of Santa Barbara Airport Runway 7/25.

Surrounding Land Uses

A variety of land uses are located adjacent to and within 0.5 mile of the project site. These uses include transportation corridors, commercial development, residential uses, an electrical utility substation, office and research buildings, and light industrial uses. Adjacent land uses are summarized on Table 4.9-1 and further described in the following text. Figure 4.9-1 depicts existing land uses at the site and its immediate vicinity. Figures 4.9-2 and 4.9-3 depict the surrounding General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation and zoning designations, respectively.
Existing General Plan Land Use Designations

Source: City of Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan, November 2008.
Existing Zoning Designations

Source: City of Goleta Zoning Map, November 2006.
### Table 4.9-1

**Summary of Adjacent Existing Uses and General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction from the Project Site</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel A: Office Structure and Bank ATM Kiosk</td>
<td>Parcel A: Industrial-Office and Institutional</td>
<td>Industrial Research Park (M-RP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel B: Vacant</td>
<td>Parcel B: Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>Mobile Home Subdivision (MSH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td>UPRR and US 101 Freeway ROWs</td>
<td>Public / Quasi-public</td>
<td>Transportation Corridor (TC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td>Hollister Avenue</td>
<td>Major Arterial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Real Market Place (Retail)</td>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping Center (SC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>Glenn Annie Road</td>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Edison Electric Sub-station</td>
<td>Public/Quasi Public</td>
<td>Public Works Utilities / Private Services (PU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Glen Apartment Residential Community</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>Mobile Home Subdivision (MSH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storke/Hollister Research Center</td>
<td>Office and Institutional</td>
<td>Industrial Research Park (M-RP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>Office and Research Buildings, and Animal Hospital</td>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Industrial Research Park (M-RP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:1 City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, Chapter 2 Land Use Element, Figure 2-1 Land Use Plan Map, Updated November 2008, 2 City of Goleta Zoning Map, November 2006.

---

**General Description of Adjacent and Nearby Land Uses**

**North:** The site is bordered on the north by an east-west trending regional transportation corridor, which includes the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and its right-of-way (ROW) and US Highway 101 (US 101) and its ROW, which is immediately north of the UPRR ROW. The collective ROW ranges from approximately 350 feet to 550 feet in width along the length of the project site. North of US 101, land uses are predominantly single-family residential with some neighborhood commercial uses (convenience stores), limited vacant space, and the Dos Pueblos High School.

**South:** Hollister Avenue, a four-lane, two-way major arterial borders the southern perimeter of the project site. The Camino Real Marketplace, a regional retail center, is located on the south side of Hollister Avenue opposite the project site. The Marketplace includes 486,257 sf of retail space plus a 22,484-square foot outdoor garden center, paved surface parking, concrete hardscape, and landscaping spread over a 46-acre site. Building coverage is approximately 23 percent, hardscape and paving streets and sidewalks cover 34.90 percent of the site, and 41.90 percent of the site consists of landscape and open space. The center’s architecture is Tuscan-themed and its buildings are arranged along the site’s perimeter around a central surface parking area.
South of the Camino Real Marketplace are Girsh Park (a privately owned and managed recreation facility) and Fire Station No. 11. Immediately west of the Camino Real Marketplace, southwest of the project site, are two large office buildings and small retail shops. Further to the southwest of the project site are single-family residences.

West of the Camino Real Marketplace is the University Plaza Shopping Center, a 94,666 sf retail space with paved surface parking, concrete hardscape, and landscaping spread over a 10.66-acre site.

East: The eastern boundary of the project site is defined by Glen Annie Road, a 28-foot wide, two-lane, two-way local public street running north-south with a cul-de-sac terminus at its north end. Glen Annie Road forms a T-intersection with Hollister Avenue to the south. The east side of Glen Annie Road is occupied by three separate land uses: 1) the Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation at the north end with an approximately 50,000 square-foot facility, 2) the Pacific Glen Residential development, a 60-unit housing development which includes 81,680 square feet of development consisting of 13 attached and 47 detached, two-story residential units on a 5.78 acre site. Building coverage is 22.2 percent and open space is 33.4 percent of the site, while the balance of the site consists of paving and other hardscape, and 3) the Storke/Hollister Research Center office building a 58,015-square foot two-story development on a 2.75 acre site with frontage on the north side of Hollister Avenue. Building coverage for the Storke/Hollister Research Center is 48.5 percent. Immediately east of the Storke/Hollister Research Center is a vacant parcel that was formerly occupied by a gas station but has recently been approved for a 6,018-square foot office building/bank. Storke Road, a four-lane, two-way major arterial is east of the vacant parcel. Further east of Storke Road are light industrial and office uses.

West: Immediately west of the project site are office and research uses with frontage on Santa Felicia Drive, a north-south aligned local street that forms a T-intersection with Hollister Avenue at its south end and terminates with a cul-de-sac at the north end. The Santa Felicia Drive office buildings are predominantly single-story with the exception of a two-story office building located on the northeast side of the cul-de-sac. An animal hospital occupies the northeast corner of Santa Felicia Drive and Hollister Avenue. The office buildings on the east side of Santa Felicia Drive back-up to the west property line of the project site. A series of retaining walls, limited vegetation, and an overhead electrical distribution line border the project site’s western property line with the development along the eastern half of Santa Felicia Drive.

Further west of Santa Felicia Drive are vacant parcels. Still further west is the Jubilee Christian Church. Beyond the Church are office, industrial, and commercial uses.

**Santa Barbara Municipal Airport**
The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport (SBA) property is located approximately 3,700 feet (0.7 miles) southeast of the project site, within the City of Santa Barbara. The airport encompasses an area of approximately 948 acres and serves both private planes and commercial airliners on four runways. The nearest runway, Runway 7/25, is located approximately 4,800 feet (0.91 miles) southeast of the project site.
SBA is a public-use airfield open 24-hours a day. SBA’s first scheduled commercial flight occurs at 6:00 AM. The last scheduled commercial flight occurs at midnight. SBA also accommodates private and military aircraft. Air Traffic Control is currently open between 6:00 AM and midnight. While private and military aircraft generally prefer use SBA during daylight hours, SBA is unable to issue a restriction or curfew under their operating permit, so aircraft can use SBA at any time.

**Land Use Plans and Policy**

The future development and use of the project site is subject to the provisions and designations provided in the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and Inland Zoning Ordinance, as well as the Santa Barbara County Association of Government’s (SBCAG) Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP).

**City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan**

The City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan governs land use and physical development within the City. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan provides a unified and coherent framework and vision for the future of the community and is the basis for the City's decisions on implementing ordinances such as zoning and subdivision codes, individual development project applications, and public investments in infrastructure and services.

The City of Goleta adopted its current General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan in October 2006. Elements of the Plan have been updated since that time. Table 1 of the associated “CEQA Addendum for the Westar Mixed Use Village Project General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment” identifies the eight General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendments that have occurred since the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan was adopted. The most recent General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Map land use designation was adopted in February 2011.

The City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan divides the City into several Community Subareas. The project site is located within the central portion of the Central Subarea. This Central Subarea is bounded by Hollister Avenue on the south west of the University Plaza Shopping Center, but is bound by the southern property lines of the University Plaza Shopping Center, the Camino Real Marketplace and the Cabrillo Business Park before rebound to Hollister Avenue on the south east of the Cabrillo Business Park. The Central Subarea is bound by the UPRR/US 101 corridor to the north, and extends westerly almost to the Ellwood Elementary School area. The Northwest Residential Area is located to the north and is separated from the Central Area by the US 101/UPRR corridor. The Southwest Residential Area is located to the south of Hollister Avenue. The character of these subareas, as described in the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, is discussed below in further detail.

**Central Hollister Residential Area**

This area, which includes extensive tracts of vacant land, will be the location of much of the future growth and change within the city. For the creation of new neighborhoods in this area, the plan emphasizes well-designed housing projects that include services to support a quality residential environment, such as parks and recreation areas, along with small-scale commercial uses that would serve the needs of employees and residents in the immediate area. Regional commercial uses are limited to existing centers such as the Camino Real Marketplace, while new business park and other development is accommodated at several locations. Alternative
transportation modes such as transit, biking, and walking are emphasized in order to minimize impacts on surrounding residential areas and to manage traffic.

**Southwest Residential Community**
The plan emphasizes conservation of existing residential neighborhoods of various densities and maintenance of both ownership and rental housing. Opportunities for new residential development are limited, while the more common alteration and remodeling of existing residences is managed to ensure compatibility in terms of size, bulk, and scale with the surrounding neighborhood. The plan prevents intrusion of uses that would be detrimental to the preservation of the existing character of the neighborhoods, including nonresidential and other uses that generate substantial traffic. Scenic views of adjacent open space areas are protected.

**Northwest Residential Community**
This area includes existing residential neighborhoods that are predominately low-density. New residential development and/or substantial alterations to existing residences are required to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of size, bulk, and scale. The plan restricts intrusion of uses that would be detrimental to the preservation of the existing character of the neighborhoods, including nonresidential and other uses that generate substantial traffic. Scenic views of adjacent open spaces, the ocean, and agricultural lands are protected.

**Project Site and Surrounding Land Use Designations**
As provided above in Table 4.9-1, the project site comprises Parcels A and B. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan currently designates Parcel A as “Industrial-Office and Institutional” (I-OI), and Parcel B as “Medium Density Residential” (R-MD). General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designations at the site and in the surrounding area are described below and illustrated in Figure 4-9.3.

Applicable General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies are listed on Table 4.9-6, in the impacts discussion below.

**Project Site Parcel A and East: Industrial-Office and Institutional (I-OI)**
Parcel A and the adjacent Storke/Hollister Research Center, opposite the project site to the east are designated for Industrial-Office and Institutional uses. This designation is intended to provide areas for existing and future office-based uses. Uses allowed include moderate-density business and professional offices, medical and medical-related uses, hospitals, research and development, services oriented primarily to employees (such as day care centers, restaurants, personal and professional services), and public/quasi-public uses. Mixed-use development with residential uses on the same sites may be permitted at appropriate locations where the residential uses are compatible with adjacent uses and do not break up the continuity of the office and institutional uses.

**Project Site Parcel B and East: Medium Density Residential (R-MD)**
Parcel B and the Pacific Glen property to the east are designated for Medium Density Residential uses. This designation is intended to provide for residential units at densities of up to 20.0 units per acre. This use category permits multifamily housing and accessory uses customarily associated with such residences. Development may also include attached and detached single-family dwellings and duplex structures. Medium Density Residential uses may also function as a transition between business uses and lower-density single-family
neighborhoods. In order to achieve efficient use of a limited supply of land designated in this use category, the minimum density permitted under the Plan is 15.0 units per acre, except where site-specific constraints limit development to fewer units. Assuming an average household size of 2.0 to 3.0 persons, the range of population densities allowed in this use category is between 26.0 and 60.0 persons per acre.

**South: Regional Commercial (C-R)**

The Camino Real Marketplace site, located on the south side of Hollister Avenue and opposite the project site, is designated Regional Commercial. This designation is intended to provide for a wide range of retail commercial uses including, but not limited to, larger scale commercial uses that serve the community, the region, and the traveling public. Because these uses are typically land-intensive, the Regional Commercial designation provides for commercial uses that require large sites or attract large volumes of activity, such as “large box” retail uses, restaurants, high-volume retail businesses, and professional, personal, and financial services. In order to limit regional traffic impacts, lands designated in this category shall be limited to existing locations of “large-box” uses as of 2005, shown on the Land Use Plan map in Figure 2-1, and no additional areas shall be designated.

**West: Business Park (I-BP)**

The properties immediately west of the project site are designed for Business Park use. The designation is intended to identify lands for attractive, well-designed business parks that provide employment opportunities to the community and surrounding area. The intensity, design, and landscaping of development is intended to be consistent with the character of existing development currently located in these areas. Uses in the Business Park designation may include a wide variety of research and development, light industrial, and office uses, as well as small-scale commercial uses that serve the needs of business park employees. In addition, these areas may include transient lodging that emphasizes extended stays where the appropriate zoning overlay has been adopted. Activities in the Business Park areas are conducted primarily indoors, while outdoor storage, processing, manufacturing, and vehicle repair uses are prohibited.

**North and East: Public/Quasi Public (P-S)**

The immediately adjacent transportation corridor to the north of the project site and the SCE substation to the east are designated as “Public/Quasi Public” (P-S). This designation is intended to identify existing and planned area for public facilities. Land within the rights-of-way for US 101 and SR 217 are also designated within this use category.

**Zoning**

A zoning ordinance regulations is a tool used to implement a jurisdiction’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. When it incorporated, the City of Goleta adopted by reference the County of Santa Barbara’s Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO) and Coastal Zoning Ordinance (CZ) to govern zoning until a new zoning ordinance regulations could be developed. The City is in the process of developing a new zoning ordinance to achieve consistency with its General Plan; however, until the new zoning ordinance is adopted, the existing zoning ordinances remain the effective governing ordinances. During the zoning ordinance development process, provisions of the new General Plan shall supersede the existing zoning ordinances where inconsistencies between zoning ordinances and the General Plan occur.
The project site is located in the Inland Area of the City of Goleta, so the IZO is the effective governing ordinance for the project site. Just as the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan shows two separate land use designations over the site, there are two separate corresponding zoning designations. Zone Districts and Zoning Overlays at the site are described below and illustrated in Figure 4-9.2 or Figure 4-9.3.

**Project Site Parcel A: Industrial Research Park (M-RP)**

The current zoning designation of Parcel A is “Industrial Research Park” (M-RP). The purpose of the M-RP zone is to provide areas exclusively for light industry, technical research, and business headquarters office uses in well-designed buildings and an attractively landscaped area.

**Project Site Parcel B: Mobile Home Subdivision (MHS) and Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO)**

The current zoning designation of Parcel B is zoned “Mobile Home Subdivision” with an “Affordable Housing Overlay” allowing densities up to 12.3 units per acre (MHS/AHO DR-12.3). The purpose of the MHS/AHO DR-12.3 zone district is to increase opportunities for affordable housing by establishing standards for the development of mobile home subdivisions. Since the density allowed under the zoning designation is not consistent with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan allowed density of 20 units per acre, the density and use permitted pursuant to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan supersedes the zoning.

**Project Site Parcel A & B (Partial): Flight Approach Overlay (F(APR))**

Approximately, the southern part of the site—approximately one fifth of the total site—is covered regulated by a “Flight Approach” Overlay (F(APR)). It is also within a and is partially located within one mile vicinity of from Runway 7/25 of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. The F(APR), as it relates to this project site, is shown in Figure 4.9-4. The F(APR) corresponding to SBA’s Runway 7/25 covers the southern 4.64 acres of the project site, including 0.52 acre within Parcel A and 4.12 acres within Parcel B. Also, 0.16 acres of the southeast portion of the project site is within one mile of Runway 7/25.

The purpose of the F(APR) is to regulate land uses within Airport Clear and Approach Zones consistent with the adopted Airport Land Use Plan for Santa Barbara County. The intent is to protect the safety of people both in the air and on the ground, to reduce and avoid noise and safety conflicts between airport operations and surrounding land uses, and to preserve navigable airspace around the County’s airports.

**ALUP, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Safety Element, and Flight Airport Approach Overlay Zone**

The ALUP was adopted in 1993 by the SBCAG. As described below, the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Safety Element and Inland Zoning Ordinance establish land use regulations to ensure compatibility with the SBA operations.

**ALUP**

The ALUP establishes an Airport Influence Area (AIA) around the SBA within which land uses could be influenced by airport-related noise and safety considerations. The AIA is concerned with a significant risk of upset potential with "unlikely" frequency of occurrence but with a "major" consequence. Most of the City of Goleta, including the entire project site, is within the AIA. The
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ALUP identifies three distinct safety zones within the AIA relative to the proximity to the airport runways: clear zone, approach zone, and one-mile zone, also referred to as Safety Areas 1, 2, and 3, respectively. As described above, the project site is partially within the boundaries of Safety Area 2 (Approach Zone). Safety is assured with building height and land use/occupancy restrictions. Sound proofing standards areas are identified to address noise issues. When a potential inconsistency with the ALUP may occur, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) reviews and makes determinations as to a project’s consistency with ALUP policies that: 1) safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants in such area, 2) assure the safety of air navigation, and 3) maintain the utility of the airport.

The ALUP provides the following land use restrictions within Safety Area 2 (Approach Zone) prohibits (in pertinent part):

Non-residential uses within one mile of the runway end which would result in large concentrations of people such as, but not limited to, shopping centers, schools, hospitals, or stadiums.

All project proposals in Safety Area 2 within one mile of the runway end, and proposals which would result in large concentrations of people in Safety Area 2 more than one mile from the runway end shall be reviewed on a case by case basis by the ALUC.

ALUP Table 4-1 Land Use Guidelines for Safety Compatibility provides, in pertinent part, that “General merchandise-retail,” “Food-retail,” “Eating and drinking,” “Other retail trade,” and “Multi-family dwelling” are considered:

Not compatible in approach zone within one mile of the runway end. Use subject to ALUC review if more than one mile from the runway end.

ALUP Table 4-1 Land Use Guidelines for Safety Compatibility provides, in pertinent part, that “Wholesale trade,” “Building materials-retail,” “Automotive,” and “Personal and business services” are considered:

Subject to ALUC review if they result in large concentrations of people underneath downwind and base legs or departure paths of frequently used airport traffic patterns. The Airport Planning Advisory Committee will provide assistance to the ALUC and its staff in this determination. Threshold for review of “large concentrations” is on the order of 25 people per acre for non-residential uses or more than four units per acre for residential use.”

ALUP Table 4-1 Land Use Guidelines for Safety Compatibility provides, in pertinent part, that “Highway and street,” “Auto parking lots,” and “Utilities” are considered compatible in the approach zone.

General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Safety Element
The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Safety Element includes Policies SE 9.1 through SE 9.8 that govern land use planning to ensure compatibility with the ALUP and minimize hazards risks and incompatibility of uses as they relate to SBA operations. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan identifies “Airport Hazard Areas” with boundaries of the AIA, Approach Zones, Clear Zones, Airport Safety Corridor, and one-mile distance from runway end boundary, consistent with the boundaries established by the ALUP. These boundaries are provided on Figure 5-3 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.
Flight Airport Approach Overlay [F(APR)] Zone

As part of the Inland Zoning Ordinance, the City has adopted a Flight Airport Approach Overlay [F(APR)] zone to regulate land uses within the ALUP’s Approach Zones, Clear Zones, and one-mile zones. Zoning regulations include height limitations on structures and appurtenances (including vegetation) and land use restrictions within these areas to maintain compatibility with airport operations from a noise and safety standpoint. The F-APR zoning requires more stringent regulations for uses within one mile of a runway.

According to Goleta Municipal Code IZO § 35-247.4.3 Land Use Regulations within Airport Clear and Approach Zones; Airport Approach Zones, the following uses are prohibited within one mile of the runway end unless found to be consistent with the ALUP by the ALUC:

b. Nonresidential development which would result in large concentrations of people (over the ALUC’s review threshold of twenty-five persons per gross acre, including, but not limited to, schools, office buildings, shopping centers, hospitals, and stadiums.

According to Goleta Municipal Code IZO § 35-247.5. Height Restrictions, the highest point of any structure or improvement (including vegetation) shall not exceed one foot in height per every 50 feet in horizontal distance from Runway 7 and 34 feet in horizontal distance from Runway 25.

Regulatory Framework

Federal

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 (as implemented by Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 77) (49 U.S.C., Section 44718), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) enforces standards that promote air safety and the efficient use of the navigable airspace. In administering Code of Federal Regulations Title 14, aeronautical studies are conducted based on information provided by development applicants on FAA Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration. Based on the information provided about a proposed development, the FAA conducts a review and determines whether the project is exempt from applicable construction regulations or complies with those regulations that govern the project and, subsequently, issues a determination letter that typically concludes one of the following:

No Objection - “The subject construction did not exceed obstruction standards and marking/lighting is not required; “

Conditional Determination - “The proposed construction/ alteration would be acceptable contingent upon implementing mitigating measures (marking and lighting, etc.); “ or

Objectionable - “The proposed construction/alteration is determined to be a hazard and is thus objectionable. The reasons for this determination are outlined to the proponent.”

A local ALUP has typically undergone FAA review, as well, and should incorporate the standards that the FAA enforces in its review of Form 7460-1 for an individual project. Therefore, a project designed to comply with the ALUP as enforced by the ALUC, would be expected to receive a “No Objection” or “Conditional Determination” letter from the FAA.
**State**

**California Government Code § 65300**

The State of California Government Code § 65300 requires that each city and county adopt a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan to govern the future development of a community. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan is designed as a “vision” for future development and establishes a set of policies that meet the community’s goals for development. As required by State law, a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan must contain at least seven elements, which include land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety.

**State Aeronautics Act** part of the California commencing with Section § 21670 (Division 9, Part 1, Chapter 4, Article 3.5 Public Utilities Code §21001, et seq. (State Aeronautics Act))

State law requires every county that has an airport with scheduled airline service or a general aviation airport to establish an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) in accordance with Public Utilities Code §§ 21670, et seq., and that each ALUC must adopt an airport land use compatibility plan for every public use airport in the county. This plan provides policies that protect airports from encroachment by incompatible uses and protects areas adjacent to airports from noise and safety hazards.

**California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics**

The California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) Division of Aeronautics maintains an Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (CalTrans, 2002) that addresses airport land use compatibility issues, including noise compatibility, aircraft accident characteristics, and safety compatibility. A primary use of this handbook is to set forth standards and guidelines for the development of local airport land use plans. The Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan was developed using this handbook and in consultation with CalTrans Division of Aeronautics.

**Local**

**General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan**

In accordance with State law, the City of Goleta has adopted a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan to establish specific guiding principles and goals, along with policies designed to achieve those goals. The City’s Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan contains Land Use, Open Space, Conservation, Safety, Visual and Historic Resources, Transportation, Public Facilities, Noise, and Housing Elements. As described above, the City’s Inland Zoning Ordinance (IZO) governs zoning within the City the project site.

**Zoning Ordinance Regulations**

Zoning divides the lands within a city into zones that specify allowable uses and development standards for real property located therein. The Zoning Ordinance zoning regulations sets forth detailed standards and regulations for development activities in a manner consistent with the policies of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

**Airport Land Use Plan**

The Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is a body of the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) created per California in accordance with Public Utilities Code § 21670 which is responsible for land use policy around airports with...
respect to airport related noise and safety. The ALUC adopted an Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) in 1993 that addresses land use compatibility with surrounding uses, aircraft noise and accident potential.

4.9.2 Thresholds of Significance

The City of Goleta’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* does not contain thresholds for land use compatibility. Most of the issues related to land use compatibility are addressed in other sections of this EIR (e.g., 4.1 Aesthetics, 4.2 Air Quality, 4.6 Hazards, and 4.9 Noise). The analysis in this section evaluates the applicable issues in aggregate in order to determine the overall effect on neighborhood compatibility. The project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Introduce land uses that overall would be incompatible with existing surrounding land uses or would result in substantial compatibility/quality of life effects on occupants of existing surrounding uses.

The following land use thresholds are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G. The project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Physically divide an established community;
- 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; or
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The project would not divide an established community, and there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the project site; therefore the project would have no impact with respect to these thresholds and they are not further discussed below.

4.9.3 Project Impacts

**Short-Term Land Use Compatibility**

**Impact LU1:** Temporary, short-term demolition and construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would potentially generate short-term compatibility/quality of life effects on occupants of existing surrounding uses.

*Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant*

The project includes demolition of 9,546 sf of existing structures and construction of 274 apartment units in 19 buildings containing a total of approximately 363,744,391 sf of gross residential building area. In addition to the 274 apartment units, the project would include 5 live/work condominiums as part of the commercial component. The commercial component includes the construction of approximately 90,054 88,704 sf of commercial building area.
Additional residential, commercial amenities, public open space and project landscaping would also be provided.

Grading is estimated to involve 49,100 cubic yards of cut and 48,800 cubic yards of compacted fill, with a potential net export of 300 cubic yards of dirt from the project site. Stormwater would be collected within the project site through a series of concrete swales, bio-swales, and bio-retention areas and ultimately directed through on-site storm drains to a 120,500 cubic-foot subsurface stormwater detention chamber or group of chambers located beneath the commercial center parking lot in the southwest quadrant of the site. Utilities would be installed on site, and a 66 kV overhead transmission line that runs along the north side of Hollister Avenue, near the southern boundary of the project site would be relocated to the northern and western property lines.

Project construction staging, equipment, materials storage and construction worker parking area would all occur on the project site in developed or disturbed areas in close proximity to project construction areas. The total duration for all construction phases for the project is estimated to be 15 months. It is assumed that the commercial construction duration would be 10 months and the residential construction duration would be 14 months. Both portions would be built concurrently. Potential, short-term compatibility issues on existing surrounding uses during construction are summarized below.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources: The project would introduce construction activity, including construction equipment, site grading and vegetation removal into a scenic corridor, and would temporarily affect scenic visual resources as viewed from Hollister Avenue. Construction activities would result in an adverse, but short-term impact and would be less than significant.

Air Quality: Short-term compatibility effects on surrounding land uses would occur during grading and construction of the project from dust generation and construction equipment emissions. However, the resulting air emissions would be mitigated or under the adopted thresholds and would result in a less than significant impact.

Biological Resources: The project would introduce construction activity, which if conducted during the nesting bird season would have the potential to result in the loss of vegetation that could contain active bird nest or could support ground nesting species. However, bird field surveys would render short-term construction activity impacts to be less than significant.

Cultural Impacts to cultural resources has no relevance to compatibility to adjacent uses; therefore, no short-term construction impacts would occur.

Geologic Resources: The project would involve grading consisting of 49,100 cubic yards of cut and 48,800 cubic yards of compacted fill, construction of concrete swales, bio-swales, and bio-retention areas, a 120,500 cubic-foot subsurface stormwater detention chamber or group of chambers, and installation of retaining walls. Stockpiled grading material, disturbed soils, and manufactured slopes could be subject to erosion, sedimentation and instability, resulting in potential damage to the on- and off-site structures and land uses, a potentially significant short-term impact.

Greenhouse Gas: Construction activity would result in temporary greenhouse gas emissions from construction equipment. These emissions are included in the operational emissions for the
project. Overall, the GHG impacts were found to be potentially significant. The construction period emissions alone would not exceed the thresholds and are less than significant.

*Hazards and Hazardous Materials:* The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment from routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, such as asbestos, lead, PCBs, or any hazardous materials used in or encountered during grading and construction of the project, as they would be subject to City, State, and federal regulations, reducing short-term land use compatibility impacts on surrounding land uses to a less than significant level. Construction-related safety issues from potential accidents are governed under California Occupational Safety and Health (CalOSHA) regulations, and heights of buildings and construction equipment (e.g. use of cranes) would be required to be reported to the FAA to maintain compliance with any navigational hazards. Therefore, safety hazards from the potential for accidents during construction would not create a compatibility conflict with adjacent uses.

*Hydrology and Water Quality:* Construction of proposed project would result in changes to drainage patterns and an increase in impervious surfaces on site. However, potential water quality and stormwater runoff impacts on surrounding land uses during project construction would be addressed as part of project-specific permit requirements and through implementation of construction BMPs, reducing short-term land use compatibility impacts to a less than significant level.

*Noise:* Construction activity would impact sensitive receptors within 1,600 feet of the project site, including the Pacific Glen residential development located across Glen Annie Road to the east of the project site approximately 50 feet east of the project site, the Jubilee Christian Church on Hollister Avenue 700 feet west of the project site, Girsh Park located approximately 1,300 feet south of the project site, and Dos Pueblos High School located approximately 1,600 feet northwest of the project site, resulting in a potentially significant short-term impact.

*Public Services:* There is small potential that accidents, fires, or vandalism or theft could occur during construction requiring the use of public services, such as fire protection or police personnel; however, no short-term impact compatibility impacts would occur.

*Recreation:* There would be no residents on-site requiring recreation activity during the construction period. No short-term impact to compatibility would occur.

*Traffic:* The project construction would not generate significant impacts to the study-area roadways based on the City’s capacity thresholds. Hauling of excess soil (300 cubic yards) would generate up to 25 truck-loads, which would not significantly affect roadway capacities. Construction traffic is limited to equipment staging and construction workers on a temporary basis. Further, parking for construction workers would be provided on-site, and all construction activities would be staged on-site resulting in an adverse, but less than significant impact on traffic during construction.

*Utilities & Service Systems:* Construction activities would require temporary connections to water service pipelines and electricity. However, these services are available and would be limited and short-term. Impacts would be less than significant.
In summary, potentially significant land use compatibility impacts related to Geologic Resources and Noise would result from temporary, construction-related activities occurring at the project site.

**Operational Land Use Compatibility**

The residential component of the project would be developed with approximately 274 apartment units in 19-18 buildings containing a total of approximately 383,744-391,323 sf of gross residential building area, which would include common building areas (stairs, vents, utilities, corridors) but not covered deck/patio areas, of which approximately 269,545-245,060 sf would be leasable space. In addition to the 274 apartment units, the project would include 5 live/work condominiums as part of the commercial component. The commercial component includes the construction of approximately 90,054-88,704 sf of commercial building area.

The project would require a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment, Zone Change, merger and re-subdivision of the two existing parcels lots of record into ten new parcels (see Section 2.0 Project Description for a list of all required approvals). The residential component would be developed on one 13.7-acre lot that would encompass the north two-thirds of the project site, while each of the nine commercial buildings would be located on individual lots within the southern 9.756 acres of the project site.

The residential component would be developed with a use and at a density that is consistent with the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation of R-MD; a zone change within the 13.7-acre northern portion of the site from Mobile Home Subdivision with an Affordable Housing Overlay (MHS/AHO DR-12.3) to Design Residential 20 (DR-20) would be required to achieve zoning consistency with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

The commercial component requires a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment to change the land use designation on the southern 9.765-acre portion of the site from Residential Medium Density Residential (R-MD) and Industrial-Office and Institutional (I-OI) to Community Commercial (CC). It would also require a rezoning from MHS/AHO DR-12.3 and Industrial Research Park (M-RP) to Shopping Center (SC) to achieve zoning consistency with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan as amended. The existing and proposed land use designations and zoning are shown on Figure 4.9-5.

The following assess the project’s compatibility with off-site land uses and its consistency with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies, Zoning Ordinance and the ALUP. The impacts associated with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment are discussed in the associated “CEQA Addendum for the Westar Mixed Use Village Project General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment” document.

**Impact LU 2: The project could create a compatibility conflict with surrounding land uses.**

*Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant*

While the project would result in several cumulative significant impacts per this EIR (e.g. Aesthetic: AES 1, AES 5; Air Quality: AQ 2; Cultural: CR 1; Greenhouse Gas: GHG 1; Solid Waste: SW 2), these significant impacts are not anticipated to cause compatibility impacts with surrounding structures and land uses. The following discussion considers the project’s compatibility impacts to development on each side of the project site per impact area. If an
impact area is not identified, no compatibility impact is anticipated. As noted, all project impacts related to compatibility are either less than significant or would be mitigated to less than significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures identified in other sections of this EIR. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant land use compatibility impacts with adjacent surrounding uses.

Compatibility issues related to the Zoning Ordinance-zoning regulations (Impact LU 3, LU 4 and LU 5), the SBA ALUP (Impact LU 6), General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (Impact LU 7) are addressed below in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, Zoning and ALUP policy consistency analyses, as these plans include policies that are designed to ensure land use compatibility. It is also noted that internal land use compatibility issues (i.e., compatibility between the commercial and residential uses within the project site) have been identified in the air quality and noise analyses, provided in Sections 4.2 and 4.10, respectively.

North: UPRR and the US 101 ROW
The UPRR and US 101 transportation corridors are located to the north of the project, and further north across the highway are residential uses. The project site is generally screened and buffered from these land uses due to intervening landscaping and from the transportation corridors themselves.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources: No long-term aesthetic compatibility effects on the UPRR or US 101 transportation corridor would occur during operation of the project. Southerly views of and across the project site from passenger trains travelling along the UPRR are partially obstructed, and southerly coastal views, or other views with scenic quality, are generally not available along the freeway segment adjacent to the project site due to intervening vegetation and structures. The project’s aesthetic compatibility impacts to views from passenger trains and the US Highway 101 transportation corridor would be considered less than significant.

Air Quality: No long-term air quality compatibility effects from UPRR or US 101 transportation corridor uses would occur during operation of the project. The potential health risks associated with exposure of people to diesel railroad engines’ and diesel automotive particulate emissions was evaluated, and the analysis determined that the introduction of residential units adjacent to the railroad would not be expected to result in significant health risks related to exposure to diesel particulate emissions. Long-term project emissions are primarily associated with traffic generated by the project and not the structures or uses on the project site. While the specific uses that would occur at the project site have not been identified, these stationary sources would typically require permits or would be subject to regulation by the APCD that would prevent significant air quality impacts. Therefore, the long-term air quality compatibility effects on the UPRR and US 101 transportation corridor during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: No long-term hazard compatibility effects from UPRR or US Highway 101 transportation uses would occur during operation of the project. While risks associated with the site’s proximity to the UPPR includes potential consequences of railway accidents, a risk analysis concluded that risks associated with proximity to the UPRR right-of-way would be considered less than significant. Additionally, US Highway 101 is a designated transport route for hazardous materials and waste through the County of Santa Barbara, and Hollister Avenue is used to access US Highway 101. However, the project site is not included
on a list of hazardous materials, and would not require routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Accordingly, project operations would result in less than significant compatibility impacts with land uses to the north of the site.

The proximity of the residences to the UPRR and US101 also raises potential concerns related to pedestrian safety. However, the project includes the construction of a berm and fence along the site’s border with the railway that would deter pedestrian access from the project site to the UPRR ROW.

*Noise*: During operation of the project, some residential uses within the project site would be located in close proximity to the UPRR tracks and US 101 could experience elevated exterior ambient noise levels. In addition, vibration generated along the UPRR could result in noise nuisance impacts associated with window rattling. However, the acoustic design of the project would be subject to proposed site-specific acoustical recommendations to reduce interior noise levels, ensuring land use compatibility impacts on surrounding land uses are less than significant.

*Traffic*: Operation of the project would not add enough traffic volume to the US 101 to exceed the CMP criteria; however, the operation of the project under cumulative conditions would exceed CMP thresholds at two intersections involving US 101: US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection and US 101 SB Ramp/Los Carneros Road intersection. However, the project would be subject to mitigation measures modifying the northbound right-turn lane channelization island for vehicles turning right from Storke Road onto the US 101 southbound on-ramp and would contribute fees to the GTIP fund as the US 101 SB Ramp/Los Carneros Road intersection is included in the GTIP, ensuring land use compatibility impacts on surrounding land uses are less than significant.

In summary, the project would not be considered incompatible with the UPRR/US 101 transportation corridor.

**South: Camino Real Marketplace**

The commercial component of the project would be located approximately within the southern third of the project site, opposite the Camino Real Marketplace. The Marketplace is a 46-acre shopping center designed to be a regional destination. The project’s commercial component would be less than a quarter of the size of the Marketplace and is designed as a neighborhood shopping center to serve the needs of local residents. The primary access to the commercial component of the project would be from Hollister Avenue via a newly constructed private drive with a public access easement that aligns with the existing signalized T-intersection of Hollister Avenue and Marketplace Drive, creating a standard four-leg intersection. Accordingly, turning movements in and out of the shopping center would not interfere with access to or from the Camino Real Marketplace.

Specific commercial uses for the project have not been identified, with the exception of a market and a drive-through pharmacy. Potential uses within the project’s commercial area may include markets, restaurants, retail shops, and offices. The retail uses would be similar to and complement the existing retail uses at the Marketplace. As both the Marketplace and the project commercial center would be similar uses, there would be no land use conflict between them.

*Aesthetics and Visual Resources*: No long-term aesthetic compatibility effects on the Camino Real Marketplace would occur during operation of the project. Overall, the project is expected to
have a visual appearance that is similar to the Camino Real Marketplace. Both shopping centers would have compatible Contemporary Tuscan architecture. In contrast to the Camino Real Marketplace, structures within the project’s commercial component would address the public thoroughfare frontally and, with the exception of two pads located close to the Hollister frontage, would be set back from Hollister Avenue. The project's site design provides a view corridor through the project site along that would maintain direct northerly views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection. The project’s aesthetic compatibility impacts to views from the Camino Real Marketplace would be considered less than significant.

Air Quality: No long-term air quality compatibility effects to the Camino Real Marketplace would occur during operation of the project, Long-term project emissions are primarily associated with traffic generated by the project and not the structures or uses on the project site. While the specific uses that would occur at the project site have not been identified, these stationary sources would typically require permits or would be subject to regulation by the APCD that would prevent significant air quality impacts. Therefore, the project’s air quality compatibility effects on the Camino Real Marketplace during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.

Traffic: The project would add a new connection to Hollister Avenue opposite the Marketplace Drive intersection would provide primary access to the project site resulting in a conventional four-leg intersection at Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection and continue to Glen Annie Road/Sespe Lane intersection. Hollister Avenue would be widened along the project's frontage to provide an eastbound left-turn lane and a westbound right-turn lane for traffic inbound to the site. The northbound approach from Marketplace Drive (outbound from Camino Real Marketplace) would be restriped and signals would be recalibrated. Accordingly, turning movements in and out of the project would not interfere with access to or from the Camino Real Marketplace.

Operation of the project would also increase traffic volumes on local roadway segments (Storke Road north of Hollister Avenue) impacting capacity and local intersections impacting level of service (Hollister Avenue/Storke Road, US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road) exceeding local thresholds. While traffic impacts could slow arrival/departure to the Camino Real Marketplace, the project would be subject to mitigation measures providing an additional northbound lane along Storke Road from Hollister Avenue to the US 101 southbound on-ramp, modifying the northbound right-turn lane channelization island for vehicles turning right from Storke Road onto the US 101 southbound on-ramp and would contribute fees to the GTIP fund as the US 101 SB Ramp/Los Carneros Road intersection is included in the GTIP, ensuring land use compatibility impacts on surrounding land uses are less than significant. Accordingly, timely access to the project would not interfere with timely access to or from the Camino Real Marketplace.

Therefore, the project’s traffic compatibility effects on the Camino Real Marketplace during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.

In summary, the project would not be considered incompatible with the Camino Real Marketplace.

East: SCE Substation, Pacific Glen Residential, Storke/Hollister Research Center
The project site is situated directly across from three different types of land uses located the east side of Glen Annie Road. The project’s northernmost residential component would be
located directly across Glen Annie Road from the SCE substation (north terminus of the road) and approximately half of the Pacific Glen residential development fronting Glen Annie Road (midway along the road). The project’s commercial component, including the live/work residential units, would be located directly across from approximately the other half of the Pacific Glen residential development fronting Glen Annie Road (midway along the road) and the Stork/Hollister Research Center (southerly portion of the road).

The project’s residential component would be located across from the approximately 50,000-squarefoot SCE electrical substation located on 1.99 acres. While the substation’s appearance is industrial in nature, the facility is shielded at ground level by a combination of perimeter chain-linked fencing that contains slats and a concrete masonry wall. An ivy vine growing along the fence and wall softens their appearance. The wall also contains a metal gated entry.

The project’s residential component acreage would be almost more than double the acreage of the 5.78 acre Pacific Glen residential development and contain more than four and half times the number of residential units; however, only three residential apartment buildings would directly front six detached residential units on Glen Annie Road.

The project’s live/work quasi-residential structure component and residential publicly accessible open space separates the live/work buildings from the residential apartment buildings to the north and the Pacific Glen residences to the east. These two project components would directly front eight detached residential units on Glen Annie Road.

The project’s commercial component acreage would be more than three and a half times the acreage of the 2.75 acre Storke/Hollister Research Center development but would contain only approximately one and half times the square footage.

The primary access to the project’s commercial component from Glen Annie Road would be via one driveway 95 feet north of Hollister Avenue. The primary access to the project’s residential component from Glen Annie Road would be via a newly constructed private drive with a public access easement that aligns with the existing signalized T-intersection of Glen Annie Road and Sespe Lane creating a standard four-leg intersection at Glen Annie Road/Sespe Lane intersection that would connect to the signalized intersection at Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection to facilitate access onto Hollister Avenue. While the Glen Annie Road/Hollister Avenue T-intersection is currently controlled by a stop sign, stopping traffic before it enters east or westbound Hollister Avenue. As part of the project, a traffic signal would be installed at the Glen Annie Road/Hollister Avenue T-intersection, maintaining full access and providing a fully controlled signalized T-intersection. Two crosswalks would also be installed to allow pedestrians to safely cross Glen Annie Road and Hollister Avenue at this location. The project would eliminate southbound Glen Annie Road traffic an eastbound Hollister Avenue connection at an uncontrolled intersection, eastbound Hollister Avenue connections would be available via a signalized intersection.

As mentioned above, specific commercial uses for the project have not been identified, with the exception of a drive-through pharmacy. Potential uses within the project’s commercial area may include markets, restaurants, retail shops, and offices. The project has been designed as a mixed residential and commercial use development. As both the project uses would be similar to and complement the existing uses along Glen Annie Road, there would be no land use conflict between the project and uses.
Aesthetics and Visual Resources: No long-term aesthetic compatibility effects on the development to the east would occur during operation of the project. The qualitative visual characteristics and quantitative size, bulk and scale statistics of the project compare to the development along Glen Annie Road.

The SCE substation is screened from the project site. Additional project landscaping would further screen the SCE substation from view.

The Pacific Glen residential development is a multi-family project that contains both attached and detached residential units within the complex. Two-story detached rental units front Glen Annie Road opposite the project site while the project’s residential units along this frontage are two-story attached units. Both building types front to the street. The building setbacks from the centerline of the street would be the same on both sides of the street, including the live/work buildings. The residential apartment buildings, though they have greater mass and potentially greater apparent height, would be generally compatible visually and in terms of land use with the existing Pacific Glen residential development. The scale of the live/work building would be greater than the scale of existing residential development on Glen Annie Road; however, the building and site were designed to soften the 6-foot differential and would be generally compatible visually and in terms of land use with the existing Pacific Glen residential development.

The commercial buildings closest to Glen Annie would be located opposite the Storke/Hollister Research Center. The project’s commercial building setbacks would be greater from the centerline of the street than the existing Storke/Hollister Research Center. Furthermore, finished grade for the commercial building on the project site would be lower than the Storke/Hollister Research Center, and the site was designed to transition the differential. The project would be generally compatible visually and in terms of land use with the existing Storke/Hollister Research Center.

The analysis concludes that from an architectural and visual massing and height perspective, the project’s visual character would be compatible with the visual character of the development along Glen Annie Road.

Air Quality: As described in the above Camino Real Marketplace discussion, no long-term air quality compatibility effects to would occur during operation of the project. Long-term project emissions are primarily associated with traffic generated by the project and not the structures or uses on the project site. While the specific uses that would occur at the project site have not been identified, these stationary sources would typically require permits or would be subject to regulation by the APCD that would prevent significant air quality impacts. Therefore, the project’s air quality compatibility effects on the development along Glen Annie Road during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: No long-term hazard compatibility effects related to electromagnetic fields (EMF) from the proximity of the SCE substation and the transmission lines emanating from this station would occur during operation of the project. Accordingly, project operations would result in less than significant compatibility impacts with land uses along Glen Annie Road.

Noise: During operation of the project, some commercial uses within the project site would be located in close proximity to the residential uses along Glen Annie Road, which could
experience elevated exterior ambient noise levels (i.e. restaurant noise). However, a noise mitigation plan shall be prepared for the commercial component of the project to avoid potential noise nuisance, ensuring land use compatibility impacts with land uses along Glen Annie Road are less than significant.

**Traffic:** The project would add a new primary access to the project’s commercial component from Glen Annie Road would be via one driveway 95 feet north of Hollister Avenue. As access to the commercial center from Glen Annie Road is south of the Pacific Glen residential development it is unlikely that traffic accessing the commercial center would penetrate further than 95 feet north.

The project would also add a new connection to the project’s residential component from Glen Annie Road opposite the Pacific Glen residential development Sespe Lane intersection and would provide primary access to the project site resulting in a conventional four-leg intersection at Glen Annie Road/Sespe Lane intersection and continue to Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection. The new private road would provide through public access via a public access easement. This same private road would also provide the public with pedestrian and bicycle access to the neighborhood shopping center that would be constructed as part of the project, providing greater convenience and necessitating fewer vehicle trips for ordinary household shopping.

While the project would eliminate southbound Glen Annie Road traffic an eastbound Hollister Avenue connection at an uncontrolled intersection, eastbound Hollister Avenue connections would now be available via a signalized intersection. As part of the project, a traffic signal would be installed at the Glen Annie Road/Hollister Avenue T-intersection, maintaining full access and providing a fully controlled signalized T-intersection. Accordingly, turning movements in to and out of the project site would not interfere with access to or from the SCE substation, Pacific Glen residential development and the Stork/Hollister Research Center.

The project would enhance and increase the number of Glen Annie Road on-street parking stalls available to the public from 64 to 79 public parking stalls to provide a net addition of 15 spaces for public use. These stalls could be utilized by any members of the public and residents of the project and the Pacific Glen residential development which lacks adequate onsite parking based on current utilization.

As described in the above Camino Real Marketplace discussion, operation of the project would also increase traffic volumes on local roadway segments impacting capacity and local intersections impacting level of service exceeding local thresholds. While traffic impacts could slow arrival/departure to the land uses along Glen Annie Road, the project would be subject to mitigation measures ensuring land use compatibility impacts on surrounding land uses are less than significant. Accordingly, timely access to the project would not interfere with timely access to or from the land uses along Glen Annie Road.

Therefore, the project’s traffic compatibility effects on the land uses along Glen Annie Road during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.

**Recreation:** The project’s public open space, located south of the Glen Annie Road/Sespe Lane intersection would provide a recreational area accessible for and usable by the public.
Therefore, the project’s recreation compatibility effects on the land uses along Glen Annie Road during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.

In summary, the project would not be considered incompatible with the land uses along the east side of Glen Annie Road.

**West: Offices Along Santa Felicia Drive**

The project would construct two-story commercial and three-story residential structures parallel to the west property line at setbacks ranging from 45 feet in the commercial area to 119 feet in the residential area. Direct access is not available between the project site and Santa Felicia Drive.

Santa Felicia Drive is developed with primarily single-story office buildings. Buildings located on the east side of Santa Felicia Drive back to the project site’s west property line.

**Aesthetics and Visual Resources:** No long-term aesthetic compatibility effects on the development to the west would occur during operation of the project. The qualitative visual characteristics and quantitative size, bulk and scale statistics of the project compare to the development along Santa Felicia Drive. The analysis concludes that from an architectural and visual massing and height perspective, given the heights and massing of the commercial and residential structures in combination the grade differential, the scale of the commercial and residential buildings would be greater than the scale of existing development on Santa Felicia Drive. However, the Design Review Board shall further consider the building setbacks, architectural articulation, and landscaping which would reduce this effect. It is noted that the buildings immediately west of the site are of a smaller scale than most other buildings in the vicinity.

**Air Quality:** As described in the above Camino Real Marketplace discussion, no long-term air quality compatibility effects to would occur during operation of the project. Long-term project emissions are primarily associated with traffic generated by the project and not the structures or uses on the project site. While the specific uses that would occur at the project site have not been identified, these stationary sources would typically require permits or would be subject to regulation by the APCD that would prevent significant air quality impacts. Additionally, commercial uses are not considered sensitive receptors for odor generated by the project. Therefore, the project’s air quality compatibility effects on the development along Santa Felicia Drive during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.

**Traffic:** As described in the above Camino Real Marketplace discussion, operation of the project would also increase traffic volumes on local roadway segments impacting capacity and local intersections impacting level of service exceeding local thresholds. While traffic impacts could slow arrival/departure to the land uses along Santa Felicia Drive, the project would be subject to mitigation measures ensuring land use compatibility impacts on surrounding land uses are less than significant. Accordingly, timely access to the project would not interfere with timely access to or from the land uses along Santa Felicia Drive.

Therefore, the project’s traffic compatibility effects on the land uses along Santa Felicia Drive during operation of the project would not result in a significant impact.
In summary, the project would not be considered incompatible with the land uses along the east side of Santa Felicia Drive.

**Consistency with Zoning Ordinance Regulations**

As described in Section 2.0, the project would require a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Development Agreement, Ordinance–Municipal Code Amendment, Minor–two Major Conditional Use Permits, Major Conditional Use Permit and a Vesting Tentative Map.

**Impact LU 3:** The project would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance with approval of requested permits and associated modifications.

*Significance Before Mitigation: No Impact*

As described below, while the related physical development and operational component of the project would result in environmental effects as described in Section 4.1–4.14, none of these requested permit types and associated modifications would conflict with any applicable section of the IZO for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

**Zone Change**

As described above, the project includes a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment to change the land use designation on the southern 9.85-acre portion of the site from Residential Medium Density Residential (R-MD) and Industrial-Office and Institutional (I-OI) to Community Commercial (CC). To be consistent with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan CC land use designation, the project includes a rezoning from MHS/AHO DR-12.3 and Industrial Research Park (M-RP) to Shopping Center (SC) per Section 35-325.4. To be consistent with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan R-MD land use designation and density, the project includes a rezoning for the northern 13.7-acre portion of the site from MHS/AHO DR-12.3 to Design Residential 20 (DR-20) per IZO § Section 35-325.4 (as adopted by the GMC). These rezones would be required to achieve zoning consistency with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment as requested and if supported would not result in an impact related to consistency with the City’s zoning ordinance regulations.

**Zone District Standards (not including adequacy of parking supply)**

The project residential density of 20 units per acre is within the 20 units per acre density allowed by the DR-20 zoning. In addition the project residential open space and landscaping of 42.65% would exceed the minimum 40 percent open space and landscaping required by the DR-20 zoning. However, the project would meet the five feet of distance required between buildings on the same building site requirements of the DR-20 zone district 35-222.9, for Buildings 3, 4, 5 and 6, for Buildings 8 and 11, for Buildings 15, 18 and 19, and Buildings 13, 15 and 17. DR-20 Section requires a minimum distance between buildings designed or used for human habitation on the same building site to be fifty feet.” It would not be feasible for the project to meet these requirements. As such, the applicant is requesting a modification from Section 35-221.7 per Section 35-317.8.1. This modification would allow the residential component of the project to maintain the current densities as well as efficiently use the land.

The DR zone district allows for the provision of project specific density, height limits, parking (see below for the parking discussion), setbacks, open space and landscaping in accordance with the IZO and General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The proposed rezone is generally...
consistent with the requested General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation for the site and if supported would not result in an impact related to consistency with the City’s zoning ordinance regulations.

The project commercial building coverage of 21 percent is within the 30 percent allowed for by the SC zoning. However, due to the proposed tract-vesting tentative map and zero or close to zero-lot line development the project would not meet the “Setbacks for Buildings and Structures” requirements of the SC zone district for every commercial lot as follows:

- **Lot 1**: A modification to the 10-foot side yard setback. A modification to allow parking within the front and side yard setbacks.
- **Lot 2**: A modification to the 10-foot side yard setbacks.
- **Lot 3**: A modification to the 20-foot front yard setback.
- **Lot 4**: A modification to the 20-foot front yard setback and a modification to the 10-foot side yard setback. A modification to allow parking within the side yard setback.
- **Lot 5**: A modification to the 10-foot side yard setback. A modification to allow parking within the front yard setback.
- **Lot 6**: A modification to the 10-foot side yard setback. A modification to allow parking within the front yard setback.
- **Lot 7**: A modification to allow parking within the front and side yard setbacks.
- **Lot 8**: A modification to allow parking within the front and side yard setbacks.
- **Lot 9**: A modification to allow parking within the front and side yard setbacks.

SC-IZO Section § 35-231.8 requires a front yard setback of 20 feet from the right-of-way line of any street bordering the shopping center and a side and rear yard setback of 20 feet except a 20 foot setback when a Convenience Shopping Center abuts a residential district. It would not be feasible for the project to meet these requirements. Accordingly, the applicant is requesting a modification from IZO Section § 35-231.8 per Section IZO § 35-317.8(1). This modification would allow the commercial component of the project to achieve a site plan that appears to be one collective shopping center on one lot and would be superior to an alternative site plan that meets all of the development standards but separates the commercial buildings from one another.

The SC zone district allows for the provision of project specific height limits, parking (see below for the parking discussion), setbacks, building coverage, and landscaping/screening in accordance with the IZO and General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The proposed rezone is generally consistent with the requested General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation for the site and if supported would not result in an impact related to consistency with the City’s zoning ordinance.

**Ordinance Amendment**

Additionally, the project includes an Ordinance Amendment to amend the SC Uses Permitted with a Minor CUP to allow “a residential use that is secondary to the permitted commercial use.” The City’s Zoning Ordinance does zoning regulations do not include a zoning category for live/work units. Accordingly, the project includes an Ordinance Amendment to amend the Goleta Municipal Code zoning regulations to add a “Live/Work” definition to IZO §35-209, to add a “Live/Work” use permitted with a Major Conditional Use Permit in Convenience and Community Shopping Centers within the Shopping Center Zone District IZO § 35-231.6, and to
add a “Live/Work” use permitted with a Minor Conditional Use Permit in the Retail commercial Zone District IZO § 35-225.5. The Ordinance Amendment’s full “Live/Work” definition text is as follows:

“LIVE/WORK: A dwelling unit of which a maximum of forty-nine (49) percent of the gross square footage of the total building area is used for non-residential uses. Permitted non-residential live/work uses are restricted to permitted uses within the zone in which it is located. Live/Work uses must comply with all of the following:

A. Live/Work units must be internally accessible between the residential area and the non-residential area. The non-residential area must be directly accessible to a non-resident from the ground level via an entry/exit separated from a residential entry/exit;

B. An employee of the non-residential use must reside in the dwelling unit. However, the non-residential use may have employees that do not reside within the dwelling unit;

C. Live/Work uses must observe similar operational and delivery hours and walk-in/client visits as other permitted uses within the zone in which it is located.

D. Outdoor storage is not permitted;

E. Live/Work uses cannot store or generate hazardous materials or employ hazardous processes;

F. Noise, vibration, dust, odors, fumes, smoke, heat, electrical interference or other similar nuisances from Live/Work activities cannot be perceived beyond the individual unit; and

G. Live/Work activities cannot increase pedestrian or vehicle traffic beyond that ordinarily associated with the zone in which it is located nor can it reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces available for use.”

The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan allows for residential uses to be located within the Community Commercial (C-C) and the Old Town Commercial (C-OT) Land Use Designations. This Ordinance Amendment would allow for residential live/work units to be located within the commercial zone districts that are found within C-C and the C-OT Land Use Designations. This amendment is supported as it is generally consistent with the requested General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation for the site and if supported would not result in an impact related to consistency with the City’s zoning ordinance.

Development Agreement

The project also includes a Development Agreement, but the Development Agreement does not require or obligate the permittee or City to pursue any physical changes to the environment and, therefore, has no potential to cause environmental impacts.

Other Discretionary Permits

The project also includes two Conditional Use Permits and one Vesting Tentative Tract Map.

Minor-Major Conditional Use Permit (10-040-CUP) to permit development of the 5 live/work units, consistent with the Ordinance Amendment to amend permit a “Live/Work” use permitted with a Major Conditional Use Permit in a Convenience Shopping Centers within the Shopping Center Zone District the SC Uses Permitted with a Minor CUP to allow a “a residential use that is secondary to the permitted commercial use. Live/Work” use. This conditional use is supported as the non-residential square footage of each unit is less than 49% of the gross square footage.
of the total building area, as the live/work units are internally accessible and as the non-residential area is directly accessible to a non-resident from the ground level via a separate entry/exit from the residential area, and as the anticipated uses are anticipated to operate as other permitted uses within the zone in which it is located. Additionally, the Major Conditional Use Permit it is generally consistent with the requested General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation for the site and if supported would not result in an impact related to consistency with the City's zoning ordinance.

Major Conditional Use Permit (10-041-CUP) to permit a pharmacy drive-through facility. This conditional use is supported as it is generally consistent with the requested General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation for the site and if supported would not result in an impact related to consistency with the City's zoning ordinance.

A Vesting Tentative Tract Map to merge and re-subdivided the two existing lots of record (APN 073-030-020, 024 Parcels A and B) to create 12 new parcels. This map is supported as it is generally consistent with the requested General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation for the site and if supported would not result in an impact related to consistency with the City's subdivision regulations.

Adequacy of Parking Supply

The following parking analyses review the Inland Zoning Ordinance parking requirements for the project's residential and commercial land uses and the project's peak parking demands based on empirical data.

Impact LU 4: The project would generate demand for parking that would be met by the on-site parking supply.

Significance Before Mitigation: Less Than Significant

The project would provide 945-921 parking spaces on the site, with 360 spaces provided in surface lots for the commercial uses, 545 551 spaces provided for the apartment units (214 205 garage spaces + 66 80 carport spaces + 259-257 uncovered spaces + 9 ADA accessible spaces), and 10 spaces for the 5 live-work units (10 garage spaces).

In order to evaluate its adequacy, the parking supply (945-921 spaces) was compared to IZO requirements, parking demand rates at the nearby Willow Springs residential development, and empirical parking data for similar apartment-type land uses contained in the ITE Parking Generation\(^1\) and the ULI Shared Parking\(^2\) reports. As described below, the number of parking spaces exceeds the anticipated demand based on all of the above methods used to estimate parking demand. Therefore, the project would result in no impact related to parking supply.

Inland Zoning Ordinance Parking Requirements

Pursuant to the IZO, the calculation for the retail-commercial uses is based on the gross building size, and the calculation for the restaurant uses are based on the number of square feet devoted to patrons plus the number of employees. Parking requirements for the project per the City’s Inland Zoning Ordinance are summarized in Table 4.9-2.
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### 4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

**Westar Mixed-Use Village**

**Final EIR**

4.9-31

July 2012

---

#### Table 4.9-2

Zoning Ordinance Parking Requirements of Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Parking Rate</th>
<th>Spaces Required</th>
<th>Spaces Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/General Commercial</td>
<td>73,054 SF</td>
<td>1 space per 500 SF</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron Area Employees</td>
<td>17,000 SF</td>
<td>1 space per 300 SF</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 space per 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apartment Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>96.98</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>96.98</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>426.125</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
<td>252.250</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>52.51</td>
<td>2.5 spaces per unit</td>
<td>130.125</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Parking</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1 space per 5 units</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apartment Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>533.531</td>
<td>545.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Live-Work Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spaces Required</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>764 762</td>
<td>945 921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Pursuant to the zoning regulations, parking requirements are based on the number of square feet devoted to patrons + 2 spaces per employee.

Based on the number of parking spaces required for the types of land uses proposed, the IZO parking requirement for the project would be 764 762 spaces. The 360 spaces provided for the commercial uses would exceed the IZO requirement of 221 spaces and provide a buffer for peak parking periods. The 545 551 parking spaces provided for the apartments would exceed the IZO requirement of 533 531 spaces and the 10 garage spaces provided for the live-work units would meet the Inland IZO requirement of 10 spaces.

**Parking Demand Analysis**

The parking demands associated with any project may be different than the IZO requirement. ATE researched empirical parking data for shopping centers, apartments, and condominiums in order to forecast the peak parking demands for the project. Rates were derived from the ITF parking report as well as ULI reports. The peak parking demand for the commercial component of the project is based on rates derived from the ULI Parking Requirements for Shopping Centers. While the ITE Parking Generation publication includes rates for shopping centers, it does not stratify the data by the size or type of center. The ULI Parking Requirements for Shopping Centers includes rates for various center sizes and types. The rates for "Neighborhood" center were selected for the analysis since the project shopping center fits the ULI definition as square footage for this type of center is about 30,000 to 100,000 sf or more, and usually includes a supermarket and/or drug stores. Table 4.9-3 presents the project’s peak parking demand forecasts, utilizing the ITE methodology for peak parking demand rates for low/mid-rise apartments, and live/work condominiums and ULI parking requirements for “Neighborhood” shopping centers.

---
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Table 4.9-3
Peak Parking Demand - ITE Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Peak Demand Rate</th>
<th>Peak Parking Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>90,054 sf</td>
<td>3.3 Spaces/1,000 sf</td>
<td>297 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.94 Spaces/Unit</td>
<td>532 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live/Work Condos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52 Spaces/Unit</td>
<td>8 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>837 Spaces</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] Demand based on neighborhood shopping center rate derived from ULI Parking Requirements for Shopping Centers.

\[b\] Demand based on 85th percentile rate derived from ITE Parking Generation.

Based on the ITE methodology, as shown in Table 4.9-4, peak parking demands forecast for the project is 297 spaces for the retail-commercial uses and 540 spaces for the residential uses. Therefore, when using the ITE empirical data rates, the 360 spaces proposed for the retail-commercial uses would accommodate the peak demand with a reserve of 63 spaces. The 555 spaces proposed for the residential uses would accommodate the peak demand with a reserve of 45-19 spaces. The 10 spaces proposed for the live/work uses would accommodate the peak demand with a reserve of 2 spaces. The analysis shows that peak parking demands would be accommodated within the site and not spillover onto adjacent streets.

**Willow Springs I Parking Demand Rates**

Peak parking demand rates for the existing Willow Springs I site, located in the City of Goleta, were also used to forecast the project’s peak demands for the apartments. Table 4.9-4 presents the parking demand for the project based on the rates developed from the parking survey conducted at the Willow Spring I site.

Table 4.9-4
Project Peak Parking Demand Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-Use</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Peak Demand Rate</th>
<th>Peak Parking Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.74 Spaces/Unit</td>
<td>477 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] Demand based on rate derived from Willow Springs Parking Study.

Table 4.9-5 shows peak parking demand of 477 spaces for the apartments based on the local study, which would be met by the 551 spaces that are proposed.

**Impact LU 5: The project would create additional off-site public parking supply on Glen Annie Road.**

*Significance Before Mitigation: Beneficial*

Off-street parking requirements are not provided in the Zoning Ordinance zoning regulations. However, the project would modify Glen Annie Road to provide a net addition of 15 spaces for public use. On-street parallel parking is currently available along Glen Annie Road. Based on the standard of 23 feet for each parallel parking space, there are approximately 27 spaces along the east side of the road, 30 spaces along the west side of the road, and 7 spaces within the existing cul-de-sac at the end of the road (64 total spaces).
The project would widen Glen Annie Road to provide additional parking along the west side of the road as well as widen the cul-de-sac to increase those spaces. A total of 79 spaces would be available with the modifications. There would be 18 ninety-degree spaces, 13 angled spaces, and 11 parallel spaces along the west side of the Glen Annie Road. The widened cul-de-sac would provide 10 parking spaces. It is noted that the Glen Annie Road width has been designed so that vehicles pulling out of the angled parking stalls do not back out past the centerline and interfere with northbound traffic flows.

Table 4.9-5 summarizes the existing and proposed parking supply on Glen Annie Road. The additional on-street parking spaces proposed by the applicant would increase the public parking supply for the residential and commercial uses in the area by 15 spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>East Side</th>
<th>West Side</th>
<th>Cul-De-Sac</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is a common occurrence for all available public parking spaces along Glen Annie Road to be in use each evening. Residents of Pacific Glen residential development across Glen Annie Road to the east have publicly stated at Design Review Board meetings that they use Glen Annie Road as overflow parking. Per Pacific Glen approval documents (94-DP-005) 133 parking spaces were required and 142 were constructed; however, per current parking regulations, a total of 158 parking spaces would be required:

- 146 parking spaces for residents
  - 9 2-bedroom units: 18 parking spaces
  - 51 3- and 4-bedroom units: 128 parking spaces
- 12 for visitors

While it is not the responsibility of this project to offset a parking deficit for an adjacent development, there is nonetheless a real demand to use off-site parking to satisfy the Pacific Glen residential development’s parking deficit. This project would meet the required parking and is not anticipated to create demand on off-site parking. While the additional on-street parking spaces could be used by any member of the public, the additional 15 spaces would ease the overburdened parking demand and create better land use compatibility. This is seen as a Beneficial impact.

Consistency with Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Land Use Plan

**Impact LU 6: The project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.**

**Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant**

As described above, the project site is located within the (AIA) around the SBA-Santa Barbara Municipal Airport within which land uses could be influenced by airport-related noise and safety considerations. Specifically, the southern 4.64 acres of the project site are covered by the
F(APR) Approach Zone and 0.16 acres are located within one mile from Runway 7/25. Runway 7/25 is 6,500 feet long and is considered a “Large Air Carrier Runway.” The project site is located approximately 4,800 feet from the end of the runway, and the project is located approximately 1,000 feet perpendicular to the centerline of the runway. Based upon a typical depiction of the Large Air Carrier Runway and the related safety zones depicted and described within Figure 9L of the CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (CalTrans Handbook), the project is located within the Santa Barbara Airport’s Safety Compatibility Zone #3 (Inner Turning Zone). As shown in Figure 4.9-6, the Inner Turning Zone would overlay both residential and commercial development on the project site.

Safety and noise are the two general areas of concern relative to the project site’s location within the Approach Zone and the corresponding one-mile distance from Runway 7/25 as identified with the ALUP. Below, each of these areas of concern is assessed.

**Safety**

Safety near the airport is assured increased with building height and land use/occupancy restrictions.

**Building Height**

Buildings A & H are completely within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone and would have a maximum height of approximately 24 feet with architectural features potentially extending several feet higher. Additionally, Buildings B & I are partially within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone and their roof heights would vary widely ranging from 19 feet to 32 feet; architectural decorative features would extend up to four feet above the roof-line. All building heights would be below the Inland-Zoning-Ordinance IZO SC zone district maximum height limit of 35 feet and the Approach Zone height restriction of 96 feet. Therefore, all of the buildings would be within the airport overlay height restrictions.

**Land Use/Occupancy Restrictions**

The ALUP identifies land uses that are not compatible and should not be built within one mile of a runway, but their use is subject to ALUC review if they are more than one mile from the runway end. These uses include “General merchandise-retail,” “Food-retail,” “Eating and drinking establishments,” “Other retail,” and “Multi-family dwelling.” The one-mile area includes approximately 0.16 acres of the project site and contains an existing office building and ATM kiosk. The project would demolish the existing structures within the one-mile area of Runway 7/25 and would not construct any structures within one mile of Runway 7/25; however, parking and landscaping would be provided within one mile of Runway 7/25. Building H, which is intended to be an eating and drinking establishment, would be constructed just west of the one-mile marker of Runway 7/25. Per the ALUP, construction of an eating and drinking establishment just outside the one-mile marker of Runway 7/25 required would result in a potential in ALUC consistency determination with the ALUP, pending ALUC review.

---

4 City Goleta Zoning Ordinance, Section IZO §35-247.5 Height Restrictions. Runway 7: one vertical foot per 50 horizontal feet in distance from runway end. Runway 25: one vertical foot per 34 horizontal feet in distance from runway end. Runway 7/25 is located approximately 4,800 feet southeast. Runway 7: 4,800/50 = 96 feet; Runway 25 4,800/34 = 141 feet.
Large Air Carrier Runway Safety Compatibility Zones

Source: Dakek, July 2011.
The ALUP also states that the commercial uses identified above and “Wholesale trade,” “Building materials-retail,” “Automotive,” and “Personal and business services” are subject to ALUC review if within the Approach Zone. Further, the ALUP also states that uses that would result in large concentrations of people in the Approach Zone (e.g., shopping centers, schools, hospitals and stadiums) are potentially incompatible. Such uses must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the ALUC. The threshold for review of “large concentrations” is on the order of 25 people per acre for non-residential uses or more than four units per acre for residential use. Final consistency with the ALUP will be determined by the ALUC. This aspect of the project required a ALUC consistency determination with the ALUP.

The ALUP states that “Highway and street,” “Auto parking lots,” and “Utilities” are considered compatible in the approach zone.

Population Density Calculations

A total 4.64 acres of the southern portion of the site would be within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone. The project would construct four commercial buildings within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone: Buildings A, B, H and I as shown in Figure 4.9-2, for a total building area of approximately 50,000 square feet, of which 33,000 square feet would be for retail use and 17,000 square feet would be for eating and drinking establishments. There would also be approximately 234 parking spaces within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone.

In order to assess the concentration of people per acre within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone, two approaches are considered. The first is an estimate based on parking spaces and the second is based on building occupancies as per California Building Code (2010), as adopted by the Goleta Municipal Code.

The Initial Study prepared for this EIR presented an analysis based on the number of parking spaces and vehicle occupancy. According to this analysis, population densities for land uses can be derived for “normal” and “peak” use periods by multiplying the number of required parking spaces for each land use by the average vehicle occupancy (AVO) derived from studies of similar land uses. Peak use population is determined when 100 percent of all parking spaces are occupied, and the normal use population is determined when 75 percent of all parking spaces are occupied. As it is unlikely that all land uses within a project site would be fully occupied simultaneously, the density should be regarded as worst case estimates. An AVO of 1.83 was used for retail land uses and 1.52 for restaurant land uses. The parking based analysis may underestimate the population density in that the project is designed as a mixed-use project that would provide for pedestrian and other non-vehicular access to the site.

City Staff Parking Calculated Population Density for Entire Retail Component

Per the Zoning Ordinance [ZO], the entire retail use would require 147\(^5\) parking spaces and the restaurant use would require 57\(^6\) parking spaces for a total of 204 parking spaces. Utilizing the AVOs within the Camino Real Marketplace Environmental Impact Report (Camino Real Project Environmental Impact Report, Santa Barbara County, January 1997) and the Zoning:

\[\frac{73,054 \text{ square feet}}{500 \text{ square feet}} = 147 \text{ parking spaces}\]

\[\frac{17,000 \text{ square feet}}{300 \text{ square feet}} = 57 \text{ parking spaces}\]
Ordinance’s IZO’s required parking, the peak Westar commercial population density would be 34 persons per acre7 and the normal use population density would be 26 persons per acre.

Moreover, the applicant’s parking demand analysis determined that peak parking demand for the entire shopping center would be 297 parking spaces. Overall population densities would be higher if the parking demand for the entire shopping center was to be used instead of the Zoning Ordinance’s IZO’s required parking (297 parking spaces versus 204 parking spaces).

City Staff Parking Calculated Population Density for F(APR) Retail Component

Per the Zoning Ordinance zoning regulations, the retail use limited to he F(APR) would require 668 parking spaces and the restaurant use limited to the F(APR) would require 579 parking spaces for a total of 123 parking spaces. Utilizing the AVOs within the Camino Real Marketplace Environmental Impact Report (CRM EIR) (Camino Real Project Environmental Impact Report, Santa Barbara County, January 1997) and the Zoning Ordinance’s IZO’s required parking, the peak Westar commercial population density would be 45 persons per acre10 and the normal use population density would be 34 persons per acre.

Another approach to estimate population density is to consider maximum building occupancy according to the California Building Code (CBC, 2010) while factoring in a density reduction rate of 50 percent per the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook based on surveys of actual occupancy levels which indicate that retail uses are generally occupied by no more than 50 percent of their maximum occupancy levels11. According to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, surveys of actual occupancy levels conducted by various agencies, even with the 50 percent adjustment, the CBC-based methodology typically produces occupancy intensities at the high end of the likely range.

City Staff Maximum Occupancy Calculated Population Density for Entire Retail Component

The seven retail structures would total 73,054 sf, and they would have a corresponding maximum occupancy of approximately 2,432 persons12 according to the CBC maximum occupancy rate for retail structures (California Building Code, 2010). The two restaurant structures would total 17,000 sf, and they would have a corresponding maximum occupancy of approximately 1,134 persons.13 The combined maximum occupancy would be approximately 3,566 persons. This amounts to a maximum of approximately 362 persons per acre. With the 50 percent reduction, the occupancy would be approximately 1,783, or 181 persons per acre.

---

7 Retail: \((147 \text{ parking spaces})(1.83 \text{ people per parking space}) + (57 \text{ parking spaces})(1.52 \text{ people per parking space}) = 326 \text{ people.}\) (326 people)/(9.85 acres) = 34 persons per acre.
8 \((33,000 \text{ square feet})/(1 \text{ parking space per 500 square feet of gross floor area}) = 66 \text{ parking spaces}\)
9 \((17,000 \text{ square feet})/(1 \text{ parking space per 300 square feet of space devoted to patrons and } 1 \text{ space per 2 employees -- as neither floor plans nor employee count is known, a conservative estimate is based on gross square footage}) = 57 \text{ parking spaces}\)
10 Retail: \((66 \text{ parking spaces})(1.83 \text{ people per parking space}) + (57 \text{ parking spaces})(1.52 \text{ people per parking space}) = 208 \text{ people.}\) (208 people)/(4.64 acres) = 45 persons per acre.
12 (73,054 square feet)(2010 California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2: Stores, Stores-Retail Sales Rooms = one person per 30 sf) = 2,432 persons
13 (17,000 square feet) (2010 California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2: Dining Rooms/Drinking Establishments = one person per 15 sf) = 1,134
City Staff Maximum Occupancy Calculated Population Density for F(APR) Retail Component

The two retail structures would total 33,000 sf, and they would have a corresponding maximum occupancy of approximately 1,100 persons (33,000 square feet) (2010 California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2: Stores, Stores-Retail Sales Rooms = one person per 30 sf) = 1,100 persons. The two restaurant structures would total up to 17,000 sf, and they would have a corresponding maximum occupancy of approximately 1,134 persons (17,000 square feet) (2010 California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2: Dining Rooms/Drinking Establishments = one person per 15 sf) = 1,134 persons. This amounts to a maximum of approximately 481 persons per acre. With the 50 percent reduction, the occupancy would be approximately 1,117, or 241 persons per acre.

Applicant Calculated Population Density

The applicant submitted population density calculations based upon the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (January 2002), Safety Compatibility Guidelines Criteria analyzing the southeastern portion of the project site located within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport’s Safety Compatibility Zone #3. The average non-residential density for Zone #3 is identified as 80-100 people per gross acre, with a maximum of 200 people per single acre (unless special risk reduction building design measures are employed). With implementation of the project, the peak commercial population on the project site would be approximately 527 persons or 53.36 persons per acre, and the average commercial population on the project site would be approximately 48.66 persons per acre.

The applicant also makes note of the Camino Real Marketplace ALUC determination, an approved project located directly south of the project site, that may have relevance in determining which was also found to be consistent with the ALUP.

Camino Real Marketplace

The ALUC determined that the Camino Real Project, including 500,000 square feet of retail, restaurant, movie theater, 2,509 parking spaces on 46.78 acres in a location bisecting Runway 7/25 centerline and the Airport Safety Corridor, was consistent with the ALUP in February 1997. The site is subject to frequent over-flights. The population density of the commercial/retail uses on the site ranged from 68-90 persons per acre by land use and densities were within the density guidelines in the 1993 Caltrans Handbook of 60 to 100 people in the Outer Safety Zone area and prior decisions of the ALUC. And the population density of the proposed restaurants on the site ranged from 64-85 persons per acre by land use and densities were within the density guidelines in the 1993 Caltrans Handbook of up to 150 people per acre for the Traffic Pattern Zone.

The project concentration or population density would exceed the 25 people per acre threshold in each of the above scenarios. In addition, while the project would not result in any incompatible uses within one mile of Runway 7/25, the project would result in “General merchandise-retail,” “Food-retail,” “Eating and drinking,” and “Other retail trade” located within the F(APR) just outside the one mile marker from the end of Runway 7/25 and is subject to ALUC review. As such, the commercial uses within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone would result in a potential ALUP inconsistency, pending review by the ALUC.

---

14 (33,000 square feet) (2010 California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2: Stores, Stores-Retail Sales Rooms = one person per 30 sf) = 1,100 persons
15 (17,000 square feet) (2010 California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2: Dining Rooms/Drinking Establishments = one person per 15 sf) = 1,134
Aircraft Accidents: Location, Frequency and Severity

The CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (CalTrans, January 2002) has studied the locations of aircraft accidents relative to runway used, incorporating data from airports nationwide, indicating that single-engine propeller aircraft, off-airport landing and takeoff accident locations tend to be clustered close to the runway ends or relatively near the extended runway centerline. There is a lower potential for accidents involving business-jet and air carrier aircraft, since these aircraft are generally able to fly with the loss of an engine to the nearest airport for a normal landing. The majority of landing accidents for twin-engine and other multi-engine airplanes, including general aviation jets, occur within 500 feet of the extended runway centerline. Takeoff accidents are widely scattered because of the diversity of departure directions. The accident sites are spread about evenly between 5,000 to 10,000 feet from the start of the takeoff roll. Poor visibility conditions contribute to the occurrence of crashes farther from the airport runway, and farther off-center from the runway alignment. A greater percentage of accidents occur over 4,000 feet from the runway end under instrument flight rule (IFR) conditions when compared to accidents occurring under visual flight rule (VFR) conditions. Under both IFR and VFR conditions, accidents occurring over 4,000 feet from the runway are dispersed over a greater distance from the runway centerline than those occurring closer from the runway end. Airplane accident locations associated with longer runways such as the 6,500-foot long Runway 7/25 are dispersed over a greater distance from the runway end. Although most accidents locations are clustered around the end of the runway, accidents occurring over 5,000 feet from the runway tend to be more dispersed relative to the center of the runway, and are spread up to 2,500 feet from the runway centerline. There is less potential for a helicopter accident at the project site resulting from helicopter arrivals and departures since they use Runway 7/25 only during IFR conditions.

The CalTrans Handbook found that “there are numerous factors that distinguish the risks associated with runways predominantly used by air carrier aircraft from those of runways that have a significant number of general aviation operations, such as:

- Nearly all aircraft are flown by professional pilots;
- Nearly all pilots are instrument rated;
- Pilots are more experienced and fly more frequently;
- Typically, there are at least two pilots in the cockpit;
- Many flights are conducted under restrictive requirements;
- The majority of flights are conducted under instrument flight plans, even when weather does not require it;
- The vast majority of aircraft have multiple engines and can remain airborne following the loss of one engine;
- Aircraft maintenance programs are monitored by the FAA;
- Aircraft are much newer on average than small aircraft in the general aviation fleet; and
- Essentially all of these airports have electronic landing aids.

All of these factors support the very low frequency of commercial aviation accidents; however, the consequences of an off-airport air carrier accident are potentially devastating (9-46).”

The CalTrans Handbook studied the very low-frequency of aircraft accidents and found that approximately two-thirds of aircraft accidents take place on an airport, a small percentage of aircraft accidents are en route accidents occurring more than 5 miles from an airport, and “29 percent of general aviation and 26 percent of commercial aviation accidents which can be classified as airport-vicinity accidents, potentially including some en route accidents which
happened to take place within 5 miles of an airport (page 8-8).” Approximately 87 percent of air carrier accidents occur within 2 miles of an airport (including accidents that occur on the airport), and approximately 55 percent of air carrier accidents that occur within 2 miles of an airport result in a fatal or serious injury.

Additionally, the CalTrans Handbook found that approximately 5 percent of air carrier takeoffs and 7 percent of air carrier landings accidents occur along the centerline of runways between 4,921 and 6,562 feet long, and approximately 5 percent of air carrier takeoffs and 7 percent of air carrier landings accidents occur between 984 and 1,148 feet perpendicular to the centerline of the runway. Accidents involving collisions with residences or other buildings are relatively rare. The CalTrans Handbook found that 0.3 percent of all accidents involved residential buildings and 0.4 percent of all accidents involved other buildings, and injuries to people on the ground (non-occupants) as a result of aircraft accidents occur even less frequently than collisions with buildings.

As indicated in the above statistics, the project site is located within an area that could potentially be the site of an aircraft accident. The potential impact resulting from an airplane accident in the project site location is significant (at a minimum an unlikely frequency of occurrence, but major consequence should it occur) and unmitigable.

**Noise**

As described in Section 4.10 Noise, the project site is located north of the 60 dBA CNEL contour of Runway 7/25 as shown in the ALUP, and the City of Goleta Noise Element Figure 9-2. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan projects a very small reduction in future noise levels from the airport, so the future 60 dBA CNEL noise contour is expected to be further from the project site than depicted. Aircraft noise, both in terms of average and peak levels, does not measurably change the projected noise level or noise contour distances described above and is not considered to be a constraint to residential development as proposed at the Westar site. Consequently, therefore, the project would not be subject to unacceptable levels or conflict with ALUP noise policies.

**Conclusion**

The project would be referred to the Airport Land Use Commission for a determination of the project’s consistency with the ALUP. The ALUC could make additional recommendations regarding the appropriateness of the uses as they related to airport operations and safety. Until a final determination on this matter is made by the ALUC, project impacts relative to hazards and risks associated with airport operation would be potentially significant.

During the Draft EIR public review period, the ALUC reviewed the project for consistency with the ALUP, including a review of the commercial uses within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone. Acting as the ALUC for the County of Santa Barbara, the SBCAG determined that the project is consistent with the ALUP. A letter dated November 18, 2011 from SBCAG to Steve Chase, City of Goleta, was provided verifying this consistency determination. The letter is provided in Appendix G. The property is within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport’s Airport Influence Area, and it is subject to potential hazards from low-altitude aircraft overflights. Consequently, it requires the property owner to grant an avigation easement to the City of Santa Barbara, the owner and operator of the airport.
Consistency with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies

Impact LU 7: The project could result in consistency impacts with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies

Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

The project would amend the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and Inland Zoning Ordinance to accommodate the development uses such that consistency with land use and zoning designations would be achieved.

Table 4.9-6 identifies applicable General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies that are related to the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. For each policy, discussion of the project and its environmental impacts as they relate to the resources protected by that policy are summarized with references to the relevant EIR analysis. The purpose of this discussion is to identify whether or not the project would conflict with policy and thereby result in an environmental impact or prevent the avoidance or mitigation of environmental effects intended by the policy. This discussion is provided for CEQA analysis; it is not intended to serve as the City’s final determination of the project’s consistency with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan goals and policies as related to required findings for the requested approvals. The City’s final determination of the project’s consistency with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan is to be made by the Planning Commission and City Council. As indicated in Table 4.9-6, the project would be consistent with all applicable General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

The project is not expected to result in additional significant environmental impacts as a result of inconsistency with these policies beyond those identified in other sections of this EIR.

Table 4.9-6
Preliminary Consistency Analysis with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU 1: LAND USE PLAN MAP AND GENERAL POLICIES</td>
<td>Objective: To maintain a land use pattern that provides continuity with the past and present use and development of the city and locates the various uses in a manner that is consistent with the fundamental goals and principles of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.2 Residential Character. The Land Use Plan map shall ensure that Goleta’s land use pattern remains predominately residential and open, with the majority of nonresidential development concentrated along the primary transportation corridor—east and west along Hollister Avenue and US-101. The intent of the Land Use Plan is to protect and preserve residential neighborhoods by preventing intrusion of nonresidential uses that would be detrimental to the preservation of the existing character of the neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project is a mixed-use residential and commercial development located between Hollister Avenue and US-101. The project has been designed to connect an existing residential neighborhood to a new residential neighborhood, preserving the existing character, and to transition the residential uses to existing and new commercial uses along the Hollister Avenue corridor. The project includes a GPA to change 9.85 acres from R-MD and I-OI to C-C creating a 9.85-acre nonresidential area along the Hollister Avenue corridor. The majority of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY | DISCUSSION
--- | ---

**LU 1.4 Employment Centers.** Existing developed office and industrial areas shall be preserved and protected to continue their role of providing employment opportunities for the community. A mix of industries and economic activities is encouraged in order to provide a wide range of employment opportunities and wage levels and to avoid over reliance on any one economic sector.

**Consistent.** The project site currently contains an office building, which houses a television studio company and a smaller building containing an ATM kiosk with two drive-through ATMs, for a combined total of 9,546 sf of structures.

The project includes a GPA to change 9.85 acres from R-MD and I-OI designations to C-C creating a 9.85-acre C-C area along the Hollister Avenue corridor containing a shopping center. Per the IZO SC zone district standards, up to 18,040 sf of the shopping center could be used as professional and commercial office, nearly double the existing office space located on-site. The very nature of a retail/office development at this location would support a need for a mix of industries and economic activities that, in combination with other industries in the City, would contribute to a wide range of local employment opportunities and wage levels to avoid over reliance on any one economic sector.

The shopping center could support an estimated 262 employees. Additionally, a varying number of construction workers are expected to be employed during the construction of the project. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

---

### POLICY

#### LU 1.6 Retail and Other Commercial Centers

The priority for commercial uses, including large regional commercial centers, shall be for the types that will meet local needs and those that provide goods and services not now available in the City. Goleta’s retail areas shall be designed to serve as community focal points and shall include appropriate outdoor gathering places. Retail and other commercial centers shall provide high levels of maintenance and upkeep to assure their quality appearance.

#### LU 1.7 New Development and Protection of Environmental Resources

Approvals of all new development shall require adherence to high environmental standards and the preservation and protection of environmental resources, such as environmentally sensitive habitats, consistent with the standards set forth in the Conservation Element and the City’s Zoning Code.

#### LU 1.8: New Development and Neighborhood Compatibility

Approvals of all new development shall require compatibility with the character of existing development in the immediate area, including size, bulk, scale, and height. New development shall not substantially impair or block important viewsheds and scenic vistas, as set forth in the Visual and Historical Resources Element.

### DISCUSSION

#### Consistent with mitigation. The project would result in a 90,054 sf shopping center intended to meet both the everyday needs of the surrounding residential neighborhoods and to provide opportunities for residents to obtain goods and services not now available in the City, especially in the shopping center’s smaller suites and live/work units. The shopping center has been designed to serve as a community focal point creating a link with the Camino Real Marketplace and includes numerous outdoor gathering spaces. The shopping center is to be professionally managed and has been conditioned to provide high levels of maintenance and upkeep through maintenance agreements (MM AES 3-2, MM AES 3-8, and MM WQ 2-3). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.


#### Consistent with Mitigation. Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the project would result in direct impacts to ESHAs. While impacts would occur to ESHAs, the standards set forth in the Conservation Element include measures to offset impacts and ESHAs, and the project has been conditioned in accordance with these feasible standards to enhance ESHAs. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

#### Consistent with mitigation. The project site is surrounded by development with varying visual character, including a commercial center with relatively large retail structures placed around a large central parking area, two-story multi-family units, and office buildings with a scale more typical of single-family homes. The character of development along Hollister beyond the immediately surrounding properties also reflects a mix of uses. The development would introduce structures with a visual character that is similar to some of the elements in the surrounding area. The project design is sensitive to the adjacency of the structures to surrounding uses, particularly along its eastern border. Although the structures may
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be at a different scale than some existing structures to the west of the site, the development would be generally compatible with the overall character of the Hollister Avenue corridor. The project has been conditioned to further integrate the project with the surrounding land developments, to preserve and protect the ridgeline views and limit degradation of the character and visual quality of the site to the maximum extent feasible while still allowing development onsite. Conditions include receiving Final approval from the Design Review Board (MM AES 1-1), verifying height of structural development (MM AES 1-2), screening utilities (MM AES 3-3), undergrounding distribution lines (MM AES 3-4), preparing a composite utility plan (MM AES 3-5), provision of trash/recycling enclosures (MM AES 3-6), landscaping requirements (MM AES 3-7), Hollister Avenue landscaping restrictions (MM AES 5-1), exterior lighting requirements (MM AES 9-1). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.2, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 2.1, VH 2.2, VH 2.3 and VH 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LU 1.9 Quality Design in the Built Environment.** The City shall encourage quality site, architectural, and landscape design in all new development proposals. Development proposals shall include coordinated site planning, circulation, and design. Public and/or common open spaces with quality visual environments shall be included to create attractive community gathering areas with a sense of place and scale.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project site is located within an urban area containing a mix of development including retail, light industrial, commercial, offices, and residential housing.

The project’s design has been presented before the Design Review Board on four-five separate occasions, spanning November 2009 to November 2011. At each appearance the board members complimented the project on the quality of the site, architectural and landscape design. Additional appearances before the Design Review Board would further study the architectural (including materials and colors), landscaping, lighting, utility screening, and other design components of the project.

The project design is sensitive to the adjacency of the structures to surrounding uses, and has been designed to achieve the advantages of coordinated site planning, creating a connection to an existing residential neighborhood, and a transitioning to/from the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>residential uses to existing and new commercial uses along the Hollister Avenue corridor. The project design would improve circulation by connecting Sespe Lane to Hollister Avenue at a signalized intersection, per MM TR 2-1 and MM TR 6-1 increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road, per MM TR 3-1 and MM TR 7-1 vastly improve the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection LOS and provide safe bicycle passage through the modified intersection, per MM TR 7-2 maintain the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection LOS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project has been designed to provide an open space area, accessible to the general public, between the main drive and the live/work units on the project’s Glen Annie Road frontage. This public facility The open space area would not include active recreation amenities, but would include landscaped open play and paved gathering areas. A pedestrian walking/jogging trail, surfaced with decomposed granite, would be provided around the perimeter of the residential area. The project has also been designed to provide common open spaces and gathering areas in the residential and commercial components of the project providing areas to take in a sense of place and varying scales. In addition to providing open space and recreation amenities onsite, the project would be conditioned to contribute to—must pay Quimby fees to the City per the Goleta Municipal Code for acquisition and maintenance of other public park and recreation facilities. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy. |

See additional discussion of consistency with Open Space policy OS 7.8.

**LU 1.10 Multifamily Residential Development.** The Medium- and High-Density Multifamily designations shall provide appropriate locations for multifamily dwellings as well as allow development standards that enable creativity and diversity in design while protecting health and safety. The use categories differ in terms of maximum permitted densities allowed, but each designation shall permit a range of housing types, including detached units, attached townhouses, and garden apartments. All multifamily developments shall be required to provide or ensure:

- Adequate open space and recreational Consistent with mitigation. The project is a mixed-use residential and commercial development appropriately located to connect an existing residential neighborhood to a new residential neighborhood and to transition the residential uses to existing and new commercial uses along the Hollister Avenue corridor.

The residential component of the project consists of garden apartments and has been designed to be consistent with the R-
### 4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>facilities, such as parks, open spaces, or bike paths as an integral part of the development; community garden areas are encouraged.</td>
<td>MD development standards while protecting health and safety. The residential component does not exceed the recommended maximum density of the project site at 20 units per acre, the recommended maximum (average) structure height of 35 feet, or the maximum lot coverage of 0.30 as identified in Table 2-1. In addition, the residential component exceeds the minimum open space and landscaping of 0.40 and onsite parking requirements of the IZO DR zone district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Appropriate amounts of outdoor space for the exclusive use of individual residential units.</td>
<td>The residential component provides private facilities accessible to residents of the project, Recreational amenities including items such as a central recreation facility containing a clubhouse, swimming pool and spa, and additional amenities throughout the entire development including items such as a tot-lot, half-court basketball court, bocce ball court, bench seating, shade structures, BBQ areas, lawns for open play, and a community car wash. A pedestrian walking/jogging trail, surfaced with decomposed granite, would be provided around the perimeter of the residential area. In addition, a park along Glen Annie Road would be available for public use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Appropriate pedestrian and bicyclist access to commercial or other activity centers and appropriate facilities to encourage use of public transit.</td>
<td>The project has been designed with features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking. Internal pedestrian walkways and bicycle access is provided within the site and to adjacent commercial and other developments. The project also includes a fully improved bus stop to encourage use of public transit. Collectively, these features facilitate alternative modes of transportation to jobs, shopping, and other activity centers as well as for recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Adequate services and facilities (such as sewer, water, and roadway capacity) concurrent with development.</td>
<td>Adequate services and facilities such as sewer and water would be provided. The project design would improve circulation by connecting Sespe Lane to Hollister Avenue at a signalized intersection, per MM TR 2-1 and MM TR 6-1 increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road, per MM TR 3-1 and MM TR 7-1 vastly improve the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection LOS and provide safe bicycle passage through the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Adequate off-street parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Appropriate access by emergency vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modified intersection, per MM TR 7-2 maintain the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection LOS.</td>
<td>The project would provide appropriate access to emergency vehicles per the Fire Department’s Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District’s (Fire Department) preliminary review. Final review and approval of construction plans by the Fire Department and Community Services would ensure adequate circulation design and roadway improvements to accommodate safe ingress/egress/residential roadway compatibility, emergency vehicle access, and adequate roadway capacity to serve the project. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LU 1.11: Multiple-Use Development.

New larger developments, including multifamily, commercial, retail, office, and industrial uses, shall be designed to incorporate features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking. Mixed-use development, where certain commercial and residential uses are provided in a single integrated development project, shall be allowed in appropriate areas, including, but not limited to, the Hollister corridor in Old Town.

**Consistent.**

See discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.10,

#### LU 1.13: Adequate Infrastructure and Services.

For health, safety, and general welfare reasons, approvals of new development shall be subject to a finding that adequate infrastructure and services will be available to serve the proposed development in accordance with the Public Facilities and Transportation Elements.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project includes the development of all necessary infrastructures to serve the project.

Adequate water and sewer service from the Goleta Water District and Goleta West Sanitary District is available to serve the project. The landscaping will be watered with reclaimed water. Adequate electricity and natural gas from Edison and Sempra is also available to serve the project.

New drainage improvements including swales, bio-retention areas and a 120,500 cubic-foot subsurface stormwater detention chamber would be constructed to ensure that stormwater runoff from the project is adequately treated and discharged into the stormwater system.
4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project design would improve circulation the following ways: 1) connecting Sespe Lane to Hollister Avenue at a signalized intersection, 2) per MM TR 2-1 and MM TR 6-1 increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road, 3) per MM TR 3-1 and MM TR 7-1 vastly improve the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection LOS and provide safe bicycle passage through the modified intersection, and 4) per MM TR 7-2 maintain the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection LOS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.


LU 2: RESIDENTIAL LAND USE

Objective: To provide appropriate land areas for the residential needs of existing and future city residents consistent with the existing character of the city's neighborhoods.

LU 2.2 Residential Use Densities. All proposed residential projects shall be consistent with the recommended standards for density and building intensity set forth in this plan. The recommended densities described in the policies for the residential use categories and in Table 2-1 are maximum permitted densities but are not guaranteed. Density of development allowed on any site shall reflect site constraints, including:

a. Environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA).

b. Areas prone to flooding and geologic, slope instability, or other natural hazards.

c. Areas with stormwater drainage problems.

d. Presence of other significant hazards or hazardous materials.

e. Protection of significant public and private views.

f. Exposure to exterior noise levels that exceed a Community Noise Exposure Level (CNEL) of 60 dBA (see related NE 1.2).

g. Areas with archaeological or cultural resources.

h. Deficiencies in the type or level of services necessary for urban development, such as transportation facilities (roadway and pedestrian), sewer and water service, and emergency service response time.

Consistent with mitigation. The residential component of the project consists of garden apartments and has been designed to be consistent with the R-MD development standards. The residential component does not exceed the recommended maximum density of the project site at 20 units per acre, the recommended maximum (average) structure height of 35 feet, or the maximum lot coverage of 0.30 as identified in Table 2-1. In addition, the residential component exceeds the minimum open space and landscaping of 0.40 and onsite parking requirements of the IZO DR zone district.

The project would result in direct impacts to environmentally sensitive habitats, but the project has been conditioned in accordance with these standards to enhance the environmental resources. Accordingly, the density of the development allowed does not reflect ESHA site constraints.

The project site is not prone to flooding, geologic, slope instability or other natural hazards that would interfere with the density of the development. Stormwater drainage problems would not interfere with density of the development as the project would include...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Prevailing densities of adjacent developed residential areas.</td>
<td>construction of a 120,500 cubic-foot subsurface stormwater detention chamber. The project was conditioned to preserve and protect the ridgeline views and limit degradation of the character and visual quality of the site to the maximum extent feasible while still allowing development onsite without limiting the density of the development. While some of the northernmost residential units would be exposed to noise from existing sources, the project has been conditioned to submit an acoustical study to reduce interior noise to 45 dB CNEL (MM N 4-1) and outdoor living spaces to 60 dBA CNEL (MM N 5-1). Incorporation of the acoustical study recommendations would not interfere with density of the development. The project site is considered sensitive for archaeological resources. However, no archaeological resources were discovered onsite. A railroad cut representing the former site of the Southern Pacific Railroad is located onsite and would be demolished by the project. The absence of either resource would not interfere with density of the development. The project design would improve circulation by connecting Sespe Lane to Hollister Avenue at a signalized intersection, increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road, vastly improve the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection LOS, and maintain the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection. The project would have adequate water, sewer, electricity and natural gas to serve the project, and emergency service response time. The project design is sensitive to the adjacency of the structures to surrounding uses, particularly along its eastern border. Although the structures may be at a different scale than some existing structures to the west of the site, the development would be generally compatible with the overall character of the Hollister Avenue corridor. The project is conditioned to further integrate the project with the surrounding land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Acceptable Capacity for Storke Road is currently 34,000 Average Daily Trips (ADT) based on its current design to accommodate traffic at an acceptable level of service (LOS C). Acceptable Capacity and levels of service are discussed in more detail in Section 4.13 Transportation and Traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developments. Accordingly, the prevailing densities of adjacent developed areas would not interfere with density of the development. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.2, LU 1.7, LU 1.8, LU 1.13 Conservation Element policies CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.3, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 1.9, CE 3.3, CE 3.5, CE 3.6, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, CE 8.4 CE 9.1, CE 9.2, CE 9.4 and CE 9.5, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 2.1, VH 2.2, VH 2.3, VH 2.6, VH 5.4 and VH 5.6, Transportation policy TE 4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4 and TE 13.5, Public Facility policy PF 4.1, PF 4.2, and PF 9.7, and Noise Element policies NE 1.1, NE 1.2, and NE 1.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LU 2.3: Residential Development Standards.** The following standards or criteria shall be applicable to residential development proposals:

- **a.** The privacy of existing residential uses in the immediate area shall be protected in the design of new or expanded structures.
- **a.b.** Solar access of residential uses shall be protected in the design of new or expanded structures.
- **a.c.** Proposals for construction of new or expanded homes shall be required to have a size, bulk, scale, and height that are compatible with the character of the immediate existing neighborhood.

**Consistent.** The only residential uses in the immediate vicinity of the project is the Pacific Glen residential development, a multi-family project that contains both attached and detached residential units opposite the project site fronting Glen Annie Road. The building setbacks from the centerline of the street would be the same on both sides of the street, including the live/work buildings. Although the residential apartment and live/work buildings have potentially greater apparent height than the existing Pacific Glen residential development, the project is unlikely to alter private views from residential units east of the site. Neither would the project introduce new sources of shade and potentially limit solar access.

As discussed in LU 1.8, the project would be compatible with the character of existing development in the immediate area, including size, bulk, scale, and height.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.8.

**LU 2.6 Medium-Density Residential (R-MD).** This use category permits multifamily housing and accessory uses customarily associated with residences. Development may also include attached and detached single-family dwellings and duplex structures. Medium-density areas may also function

**Consistent.** The project is not located within the Central Hollister Housing Opportunity Sites.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.2, LU 1.8, LU 1.10.
as a transition between business uses and single-family residential neighborhoods. This designation is intended to provide for development of residential units at densities of up to 20.0 units per acre. In order to achieve efficient use of a limited supply of land designated in this use category, the minimum density permitted shall be 15.0 units per acre, except where site-specific constraints are determined to limit development to fewer units. Central Hollister Housing Opportunity Sites as identified in Housing Element Subpolicy HE 11.6 shall provide for development of residential units at densities ranging from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 25 units per acre in support of the achievement of affordable housing goals. Assuming an average household size of 2.0 to 3.0 persons, the range of population densities allowed in this use category is between 26.0 persons per acre and 60.0 persons per acre. (See related Policy LU 8 and Subpolicy HE 11.6)

**Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses**

**Objective:** To provide lands in locations that are suitable, functional, attractive, and convenient for an appropriate mix and scale of residential- and business-serving commercial uses, including business and professional offices, retail trade, business services, and residential mixed uses.

**LU 3.1 Commercial Land Use Categories.** Table 2-2 shows the permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity in each of the commercial land use designations. The commercial use categories are intended to provide appropriate locations for business uses that serve neighborhoods, the community, the region, and the traveling public while seeking to minimize traffic congestion, visual, and other impacts on surrounding residential areas. The intent of each use category is further described in the following sections.

**Consistent.** The project is a mixed-use residential and commercial development located between Hollister Avenue and US-101. The project has been designed to connect an existing residential neighborhood to a new residential neighborhood, preserving the existing character, and to transition the residential uses to existing and new commercial uses along the Hollister Avenue corridor.

The project includes a GPA to change 9.85 acres from R-MD and I-OI to C-C creating a 9.85 acre nonresidential area along the Hollister Avenue corridor. The C-C project site has been designed to be consistent with the C-C development standards. The commercial component does not exceed the recommended maximum (average) structure height of 35 feet, nor does the live/work component exceed the maximum residential density of 12 units per acre as identified in Table 2-2. In addition, the commercial component does not exceed the maximum building coverage of 0.30 but exceeds the minimum open space and landscaping of 0.05 and onsite parking requirements of the IZO SC zone district. The project would require setback modifications from the requirements of the SC zone district for every commercial
lot to achieve a site plan that appears to be one collective shopping center on one lot and would be superior to an alternative site plan that meets all of the development standards but separates the commercial buildings from one another. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.6 and LU 3.3.

Consistent with mitigation. The project would result in an 90,054 88,704 sf shopping center intended to meet both the everyday needs of the surrounding residential neighborhoods and to provide opportunities for residents to obtain goods and services not now available in the City, especially in the shopping center’s smaller suites and live/work units. While the shopping center has not been designed to attract significant traffic volumes from outside Goleta Valley, unlike the Regional Commercial Camino Real Marketplace, the shopping center has been designed to link with the Camino Real Marketplace and may experience some pass-by trips from the Camino Real Marketplace.

The live/work component does not exceed the maximum residential density of 12 units per acre, would not break up the continuity of commercial use at the sidewalk level, nor are they within the airport Approach Zone.

The project has been designed with internal pedestrian walkways and bicycle access within the site and to adjacent commercial and other developments.

The project has been conditioned to provide a noise mitigation plan (N 3-1) to avoid any potential conflict with adjacent residential uses.

The project design would improve circulation by connecting Sespe Lane to Hollister Avenue at a signalized intersection, increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road, vastly improve the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection LOS, and maintain the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection. The project would have adequate water, sewer, electricity and natural gas to serve the project, and emergency service response time.
Policy LU 11: Growth Management

**Objective:** To develop a well-maintained, interconnected system of multi-functional parks, recreation facilities and public open spaces that will meet the needs of existing and future residents and employees and that are attractive, safe, and accessible to all segments of the city’s population, and supportive of established neighborhoods.

---

**OPEN SPACE ELEMENT**

**Objective:** To designate, preserve, and expand a public trail system that will provide recreation opportunities for multiple types of users in diverse and attractive environmental settings and that will connect various parks and neighborhoods with the regional trail network and to Los Padres National Forest.

---

**Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map**

**Objective:** To designate, preserve, and protect significant open space resources including agricultural, ecological, recreational, and scenic lands in Goleta and surrounding areas for current and future generations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OS 7.8 Provision of Open Space in New Development.</strong> A minimum open space area shall be required in new development situated in certain land use categories, as set forth in the applicable policies of the Land Use Element. These private open space areas shall be in addition to any public park and open space land that may be required to be dedicated pursuant to the Quimby Act or other state or local statutes. Although private open space areas may be reserved to protect resources or avoid development in areas subject to hazards, such reservations shall include lands usable for outdoor recreation activities, where feasible.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> The project would exceed the minimum R-MD open space and landscaped area of 0.40 by providing 0.42 acres, and the project would exceed the minimum C-C open space and landscaped area of 0.05 by providing 0.21. The project’s private residential recreational facilities include a central recreational area (providing a community clubhouse, pool/spa area, and half basketball court) and recreation/open space area opportunities in other areas of the residential component with amenities including open play areas, tot lots, a bocce ball court, seating, picnic, and bar-b-que areas, all of which would be connected through a network of pedestrian walkways/jogging trails. Within the R-MD open space and landscaped area, the project would provide a “Mini or Pocket Park” along Glen Annie Road which would be available for public use. This public facility would not include active recreation amenities, but it would include landscaped open play and paved gathering areas. The total private and public recreational area provided on-site would be approximately 3.54 acres, of which 2.91 acres would provide passive recreation and 0.63 acres would provide active recreation. The project’s commercial component would include patios, plazas, and public seating areas accessible to shoppers, project residents, and the general public offering public gathering areas. For purposes of this analysis these gathering areas are considered amenities to the commercial component and are not counted toward the total acreage of open space or recreation to meet demands of the project residents or general public. The project would increase demands on the capacity of existing public passive open space areas and active recreational land. Therefore, the project would be required to pay park and recreation fees for the acquisition and improvement of parks, recreation facilities, and open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project's private open space areas described above are in addition to any public park and open space land that may be required to be dedicated to the City and any park and recreation fees required to be paid pursuant to the Quimby Act or other state or local statutes. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Open Space policy OS 6.2 and OS 9.2.

### OS 8: PROTECTION OF NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL SITES

**Objective:** To identify and protect prehistoric and historic cultural sites and resources from destruction or harmful alteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OS 8.1 Definition. [GP/CP]</strong> Cultural resources include Native American archaeological sites and areas of the natural landscape that have traditional cultural significance. Archaeological sites include prehistoric sites that represent the material remains of Native American societies and their activities and ethno-historic sites that are Native American settlements occupied after the arrival of European settlers in California. Such archaeological sites may include villages, seasonal campsites, burial sites, stone tool quarry sites, hunting sites, traditional trails, and sites with rock carvings or paintings. Areas of traditional cultural significance include Native American sacred areas where religious ceremonies are practiced or which are central to their origins as a people, as well as areas traditionally used to gather plants for food, medicinal, or economic purposes.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> The project site has been the subject of numerous cultural resource evaluations, including a peer review of available archaeological studies, as part of the project EIR analysis. City staff has contacted local interested Native Americans regarding the site and project. The peer review concluded that the project site is considered sensitive for archaeological resources and grading and subsurface construction activity associated with the project could result in the destruction or degradation of archaeological resources, if present. The project has been conditioned to allow observation of grading and construction activities (CR 2-1 and CR 2-2), to host pre-construction meetings (CR 2-3), and to provide for the evaluation protection and mitigation of cultural resources if resources are discovered (CR 2-4, CR 2-5 and CR 2-6). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Open Space policy OS 8.3, OS 8.4, OS 8.5, OS 8.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OS 8.3 Preservation.** The City shall protect and preserve cultural resources from destruction. The preferred method for preserving a recorded archeological site shall be by preservation in place to maintain the relationship between the artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation in place may be accomplished by deed restriction as a permanent conservation easement, avoidance through site planning and design, or incorporation of sites into other open spaces to prevent any future development or use that might otherwise adversely impact these resources. | **Consistent.** See additional discussion of consistency with Open Space policy OS 8.1, OS 8.4, OS 8.5, OS 8.6. |
### POLICY

**OS 8.4: Evaluation of Significance.** For any development proposal identified as being located in an area of archaeological sensitivity, a Phase I cultural resources inventory shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist or other qualified expert. All sites determined through a Phase 1 investigation to potentially include cultural resources must undergo subsurface investigation to determine the extent, integrity, and significance of the site. Where Native American artifacts have been found or where oral traditions indicate the site was used by Native Americans in the past, research shall be conducted to determine the extent of the archaeological significance of the site.

**OS 8.5 Mitigation.** If research and surface reconnaissance shows that the project area contains a resource of cultural significance that would be adversely impacted by proposed development and avoidance is infeasible, mitigation measures sensitive to the cultural beliefs of the affected population shall be required. Reasonable efforts to leave these resources in an undisturbed state through capping or covering resources with a soil layer prior to development shall be required. If data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, the City shall confer with the affected Native American nation or most-likely descendants, as well as agencies charged with the responsibility of preserving these resources and organizations having a professional or cultural interest, prior to the removal and disposition of any artifacts.

**OS 8.6: Monitoring and Discovery.** Onsite monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and appropriate Native American observer shall be required for all grading, excavation, and site preparation that involves earth moving operations on sites identified as archaeologically sensitive. If cultural resources of potential importance are uncovered during construction, the following shall occur:

- a. The grading or excavation shall cease and the City shall be notified.
- b. A qualified archeologist shall prepare a report assessing the significance of the find and provide recommendations regarding appropriate disposition.
- c. Disposition will be determined by the City in conjunction with the affected Native American nation.

### DISCUSSION

**Consistent.** See additional discussion of consistency with Open Space policy OS 8.1, OS 8.3, OS 8.5, OS 8.6.
### POLICY

| **Policy OS 9: Financing Public Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Facilities** |
| **Objective:** To establish equitable methods that will generate sufficient financial resources to meet future needs for acquisition and improvement of public parks, recreation facilities, and open space areas |

### DISCUSSION

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project would exceed the minimum R-MD open space and landscaped area of 0.40 by providing 0.4265, and the project would exceed the minimum C-C open space and landscaped area of 0.05 by providing 0.21.

The project would increase demands on the capacity of existing public passive open space areas and active recreational land. The additional population would exacerbate this deficiency. Therefore, the project would be required to pay park and recreation fees to the City, that will be used for the acquisition and improvement of public parks, recreation facilities, and open space.

However, as the project would provide a “Mini or Pocket Park” along Glen Annie Road which would be available for public use but privately owned and maintained by the future residents, a partial credit based on the approved Quimby and development fee credit schedule, not to exceed 50 percent, may be given against the requirement of land dedication or payment of fees in lieu if the City Council finds that it is in the public interest to do so.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Open Space policy OS 6.2 and OS 9.2.

### CONSERVATION ELEMENT

**CE 1: ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT AREA DESIGNATIONS AND PUBLIC POLICY**

**CE 1.1 Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas.** ESHAs shall include, but are not limited to, any areas that through professional biological evaluation are determined to meet the following criteria:

- **a.** Any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and that could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.
- **b.** Any area that includes habitat for species

**Consistent.** The applicant submitted biological reports for the site (Dudek, Tree Concern), consistent with the definition of ESHA as provided in CE 1.1. These reports were peer reviewed as part of EIR preparation, in addition to additional independent review and research regarding the site’s biological resources.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.
and plant communities recognized as threatened or endangered by the state or federal governments; plant communities recognized by the State of California (in the Terrestrial Natural Communities Inventory) as restricted in distribution and very threatened; and those habitat types of limited distribution recognized to be of particular habitat value, including wetlands, riparian vegetation, eucalyptus groves associated with monarch butterfly roosts, oak woodlands, and savannas.

c. Any area that has been previously designated as an ESHA by the California Coastal Commission, the California Department of Fish and Game, City of Goleta, or other agency with jurisdiction over the designated area.

**CE 1.2 Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas.** ESHAs in Goleta are generally shown in Figure 4-1, and Table 4-2 provides examples of the ESHAs and some locations of each. The provisions of this policy shall apply to all designated ESHAs. ESHAs generally include but are not limited to the following:

a. Creek and riparian areas.
b. Wetlands, such as vernal pools.
c. Coastal dunes, lagoons or estuaries, and coastal bluffs/coastal bluff scrub.
d. Beach and shoreline habitats.
e. Marine habitats.
f. Coastal sage scrub and chaparral.
g. Native woodlands and savannahs, including oak woodlands.
h. Native grassland.
i. Monarch butterfly aggregation sites, including autumnal and winter roost sites, and related habitat areas.
j. Beach and dune areas that are nesting and foraging locations for the western snowy plover.
k. Nesting and roosting sites and related habitat areas for various species of raptors.
l. Other habitat areas for species of wildlife or plants designated as rare, threatened, or endangered under state or federal law.
m. Any other habitat areas that are rare or especially valuable from a local, regional, or statewide perspective.

Consistent. Neither figure 4-1 nor Table 4-2 designates an ESHA on the project site.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation Element policies CE 1.1, CE 1.3, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 1.9, CE 3.3, CE 3.5, CE 3.6, CE 5.2, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, CE 8.4 CE 9.1, CE 9.2, CE 9.4 and CE 9.5.
POLICY

CE 1.3 Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs. Any area not designated on the ESHA map in Figure 4-1 that meets the ESHA criteria for the resources specified in CE 1.1 shall be granted the same protections as if the area was shown on the map. Proposals for development on sites where ESHAs are shown on the map or where there is probable cause to believe that ESHAs may exist shall be required to provide the City with a site-specific biological study that includes the following information:

a. A base map that delineates topographic lines, parcel boundaries, and adjacent roads.

b. A vegetation map that identifies species that may be indicators of ESHAs.

c. A soils map that delineates hydric and nonhydric soils, if applicable.

CE 1.6 Protection of ESHAs. ESHAs shall be protected against significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses or development dependent on and compatible with maintaining such resources shall be allowed within ESHAs or their buffers. The following shall apply:

a. No development, except as otherwise allowed by this element, shall be allowed within ESHAs and/or ESHA buffers.

b. A setback or buffer separating all permitted development from an adjacent ESHA shall be required and shall have a minimum width as set forth in subsequent policies of this element. The purpose of such setbacks shall be to prevent any degradation of the ecological functions provided by the habitat area.

c. Public accessways and trails are considered resource-dependent uses and may be located within or adjacent to ESHAs. These uses shall be sited to avoid or minimize impacts on the resource to the maximum extent feasible. Measures—such as signage, placement of boardwalks, and limited fencing or other barriers—shall be implemented as necessary to protect ESHAs.

d. The following uses and development may be allowed in ESHAs or ESHA buffers only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives and will be subject to requirements for mitigation measures to avoid or lessen impacts to the maximum extent feasible: 1) public road crossings, 2) utility lines, 3) resource crossings, 2) utility lines, 3) resource

DISCUSSION

Consistent. Neither figure 4-1 nor Table 4-2 designates an ESHA on the project site; however, there was probable cause to believe that ESHAs may exist on the site. The applicant submitted biological reports for the site (Dudek, Tree Concern), consistent with the definition of ESHA as provided in CE 1.1 and with the required information of CE 1.3.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation Element policies CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 1.9, CE 3.3, CE 3.5, CE 3.6, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, CE 8.4 CE 9.1, CE 9.2, CE 9.4 and CE 9.5.

Consistent with Mitigation. Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the project would result in direct impacts to ESHAs including removal of 0.052 acres of low-functioning isolated wetlands, a single mature coast live oak tree, and vegetation removal and construction activities that may affect nesting birds on the project site. In addition, the site may contain Southern Tarplant, and it would be directly impacted if it does exist onsite. While impacts would occur to ESHAs, the standards set forth in the Conservation Element include measures to offset impacts and ESHAs (CE 1.7, CE 3.5, CE 3.6, CE 8.4, CE 9.5), and the project has been conditioned in accordance with these feasible standards to enhance ESHAs: collection of Southern Tarplant seeds and incorporation into bioswale (MM BIO 2-1), creation of 6,795 square foot onsite wetland/bioswale (MM BIO 2-1), exclusion of potentially invasive ornamental species from landscape plan (MM BIO 4-1), incorporate 10 1-gallon oaks or 3 24-inch box oaks into the landscape plan (MM BIO 5-1), prior to construction perform bird field surveys (MM BIO 7-1), prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (MM WQ 1-1, MM WQ 2-2), apply for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Permit (MM WQ 2-1), prepare stormwater quality protection/BMPs maintenance agreement that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the (MM WQ 2-3), and prevent illegal discharges to the storm drains (MM WQ 2-4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>restoration and enhancement projects, 4) nature education, 5) biological research, and 6) Public Works projects as identified in the Capital Improvement Plan, only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives.</td>
<td>Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. If the provisions herein would result in any legal parcel created prior to the date of this plan being made unusable in its entirety for any purpose allowed by the land use plan, exceptions to the foregoing may be made to allow a reasonable economic use of the parcel. Alternatively, the City may establish a program to allow transfer of development rights for such parcels to receiving parcels that have areas suitable for and are designated on the Land Use Plan map for the appropriate type of use and development.</td>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policy LU 1.7, and Conservation Element policies CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.3, CE 1.7, CE 1.9, CE 3.3, CE 3.5, CE 3.6, CE 5.2, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, CE 8.4 CE 9.1, CE 9.2, CE 9.4 and CE 9.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CE 1.7: Mitigation of Impacts to EHSAs. New development shall be sited and designed to avoid impacts to ESHAs. If there is no feasible alternative that can eliminate all impacts, then the alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant impacts shall be selected. Any impacts that cannot be avoided shall be fully mitigated, with priority given to onsite mitigation. Offsite mitigation measures shall only be approved when it is not feasible to fully mitigate impacts on site. If impacts to onsite ESHAs occur in the Coastal Zone, any offsite mitigation area shall also be located within the Coastal Zone. All mitigation sites shall be monitored for a minimum period of 5 years following completion, with changes made as necessary based on annual monitoring reports. Where appropriate, mitigation sites shall be subject to deed restrictions. Mitigation sites shall be subject to the protections set forth in this plan for the habitat type unless the City has made a specific determination that the mitigation is unsuccessful and is to be discontinued.

Consistent with Mitigation. Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the project would result in direct impacts to ESHAs including removal of 0.052 acres of low-functioning isolated wetlands, a single mature coast live oak tree, and vegetation removal and construction activities that may affect nesting birds on the project site. In addition, the site may contain Southern Tarplant, and it would be directly impacted if it does exist onsite. As no feasible project alternative has been identified to eliminate all ESHA impacts, feasible onsite mitigation measures are proposed for all ESHA impacts except for one to be consistent with this policy.

Consistent with Mitigation. Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the project would result in direct impacts to ESHAs including removal of 0.052 acres of low-functioning isolated wetlands, a single mature coast live oak tree, and vegetation removal and construction activities that may affect nesting birds on the project site. In addition, the site may contain Southern Tarplant, and it would be directly impacted if it does exist onsite. As no feasible project alternative has been identified to eliminate all ESHA impacts, feasible onsite mitigation measures are proposed for all ESHA impacts except for one to be consistent with this policy.

Onsite mitigations would consist of collection of Southern Tarplant seeds and incorporation into bioswale (MM BIO 2-1), creation of 6,795 square foot onsite wetland/bioswale (MM BIO 2-1), exclusion of potentially invasive ornamental species from landscape plan (MM BIO 4-1), incorporate 10 1-gallon oaks or 3 24-inch box oaks into the landscape plan (MM BIO 5-1), prior to construction perform bird field surveys (MM BIO 7-1), prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (MM WQ 1-1, MM WQ 2-2), apply for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Permit (MM WQ 2-1), prepare stormwater quality protection/BMPs maintenance agreement that addresses maintenance...
POLICY | DISCUSSION
--- | ---

requirements for all improvements associated with the (MM WQ 2-3), and prevent illegal discharges to the storm drains (MM WQ 2-4).

Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.


| CE 1.9 Standards Applicable to Development Projects. | Consistent with Mitigation. Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the project would result in direct impacts to ESHAs including removal of 0.052 acres of low-functioning isolated wetlands, a single mature coast live oak tree, and vegetation removal and construction activities that may affect nesting birds on the project site. In addition, the site may contain Southern Tarplant, and it would be directly impacted if it does exist onsite.

The project site does not contain any wildlife corridors or habitat networks to preserve, nor is the site adjacent to any known ESHAs with special-status species.

The project does include a subdivision resulting in the creation of eleven useable lots, which would contain ESHA and ESHA buffers created by project mitigation measures. New onsite ESHA would include 6,795 square foot onsite wetland/bioswale that could incorporate Southern Tarplant. The landscape plan would incorporate 10 1-gallon oaks or 3 24-inch box oaks but would exclude potentially invasive ornamental species. A fuel modification plan, sensitive to onsite ESHA, would be prepared and reviewed by the Fire Department and City approved biologists.

The project would include substantial grading and construction of a 120,500 cubic-foot subsurface stormwater detention chamber. To reduce or avoid erosion, siltation, runoff, infiltration and net increases in baseline flows to any receiving water body, the project would include the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, application for the

---

| 4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING | 4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING |

---

| Site designs shall preserve wildlife corridors or habitat networks. Corridors shall be of sufficient width to protect habitat and dispersal zones for small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and birds. | Site designs shall preserve wildlife corridors or habitat networks. Corridors shall be of sufficient width to protect habitat and dispersal zones for small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and birds. |

| Land divisions for parcels within or adjacent to an ESHA shall only be allowed if each new lot being created, except for open space lots, is capable of being developed without building in any ESHA or ESHA buffer and without any need for impacts to ESHAs related to fuel modification for fire safety purposes. | Land divisions for parcels within or adjacent to an ESHA shall only be allowed if each new lot being created, except for open space lots, is capable of being developed without building in any ESHA or ESHA buffer and without any need for impacts to ESHAs related to fuel modification for fire safety purposes. |

| Site plans and landscaping shall be designed to protect ESHAs. Landscaping, screening, or vegetated buffers shall retain, salvage, and/or reestablish vegetation that supports wildlife habitat whenever feasible. Development within or adjacent to wildlife habitat networks shall incorporate design techniques that protect, support, and enhance wildlife habitat values. Planting of nonnative, invasive species shall not be allowed in ESHAs and buffer areas adjacent to ESHAs. | Site plans and landscaping shall be designed to protect ESHAs. Landscaping, screening, or vegetated buffers shall retain, salvage, and/or reestablish vegetation that supports wildlife habitat whenever feasible. Development within or adjacent to wildlife habitat networks shall incorporate design techniques that protect, support, and enhance wildlife habitat values. Planting of nonnative, invasive species shall not be allowed in ESHAs and buffer areas adjacent to ESHAs. |

| All new development shall be sited and designed so as to minimize grading, alteration of natural landforms and physical features, and vegetation clearance in order to reduce or avoid soil erosion, creek siltation, increased runoff, and reduced infiltration of stormwater and to prevent net increases in baseline flows for any receiving water body. | All new development shall be sited and designed so as to minimize grading, alteration of natural landforms and physical features, and vegetation clearance in order to reduce or avoid soil erosion, creek siltation, increased runoff, and reduced infiltration of stormwater and to prevent net increases in baseline flows for any receiving water body. |

| Light and glare from new development shall be controlled and directed away from wildlife | Light and glare from new development shall be controlled and directed away from wildlife |
### POLICY

- **habitats.** Exterior night lighting shall be minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures, shielded, and directed away from ESHAs.
- f. All new development should minimize potentially significant noise impacts on special-status species in adjacent ESHAs.
- g. All new development shall be sited and designed to minimize the need for fuel modification, or weed abatement, for fire safety in order to preserve native and/or nonnative supporting habitats. Development shall use fire-resistant materials and incorporate alternative measures, such as firewalls and landscaping techniques, that will reduce or avoid fuel modification activities.
- h. The timing of grading and construction activities shall be controlled to minimize potential disruption of wildlife during critical time periods such as nesting or breeding seasons.
- i. Grading, earthmoving, and vegetation clearance adjacent to an ESHA shall be prohibited during the rainy season, generally from November 1 to March 31, except as follows: 1) where erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, or installation of geofabrics have been incorporated into the project and approved in advance by the City; 2) where necessary to protect or enhance the ESHA itself; or 3) where necessary to remediate hazardous flooding or geologic conditions that endanger public health and safety.
- j. In areas that are not adjacent to ESHAs, where grading may be allowed during the rainy season, erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, and installation of geofabrics shall be implemented prior to and concurrent with all grading operations.

### DISCUSSION

- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Permit, preparation of a stormwater quality protection/BMPs maintenance agreement, and prevention measures to minimize illegal discharges to the storm drains.

The project has been conditioned for exterior night lighting to be of low intensity, low glare design, and to be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels (MM AES 9-1).

The project has also been conditioned for a City approved biologist to perform bird field surveys prior to the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (MM BIO 7-1).

The project has also been conditioned to limit grading to April to November unless a City approved erosion control plan is in place and all erosion control measures are in effect (MM WQ 1-1).


---

### CE 3: PROTECTION OF WETLANDS

**Objective:** To preserve, protect, and enhance the functions and values of Goleta’s wetlands.

**CE 3.3: Site-Specific Wetland Delineations.** In considering development proposals where an initial site inventory or reconnaissance indicates the presence or potential for wetland species or indicators, the City shall require the submittal of a detailed biological study of the site, with the addition of a delineation of all wetland areas on the project site. Wetland delineations shall be based on the definitions contained in Section 13577(b) of Title 14 Consistent. A biological survey of the property was conducted in June 2005 (Dudek). In May 2011, the applicant submitted a site-specific wetland delineation for the site (Dudek). The wetland delineation was peer-reviewed by Envicom Corporation and found to be consistent with the definition of Wetlands as provided in CE 3.1 and the requirements of a site-specific wetland.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of the California Code of Regulations. A preponderance of hydric soils or a preponderance of wetland indicator species will be considered presumptive evidence of wetland conditions. At a minimum, the delineation report shall contain:</td>
<td>delineation in CE 3.3. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. A map at a scale of 1&quot;:200’ or larger showing topographic contours.</td>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation Element policies CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 1.9, CE 3.5, CE 3.6, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, CE 8.4 CE 9.1, CE 9.2, CE 9.4 and CE 9.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. An aerial photo base map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A map at a scale of 1&quot;:200’ or larger with polygons delineating all wetland areas, polygons delineating all areas of vegetation with a preponderance of wetland indicator species, and the locations of sampling points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A description of the survey methods and surface indicators used for delineating the wetland polygons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. A statement of the qualifications of the person preparing the wetland delineation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE 3.5 Protection of Wetlands Outside the Coastal Zone.** The biological productivity and the quality of inland wetlands shall be protected and, where feasible, restored. The filling of wetlands outside the Coastal Zone is prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that:

a. The wetland area is small, isolated, not part of a larger hydrologic system, and generally lacks productive or functional habitat value.

b. The extent of the fill is the least amount necessary to allow reasonable development of a use allowed by the Land Use Element.

c. Mitigation measures will be provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, including restoration or enhancement of habitat values of wetlands at another location on the site or at another appropriate offsite location within the City.

Consistent with mitigation. The site-specific wetland delineation prepared for the site (Dudek) indicated the proposed project would result in direct impacts to a total of 0.052 acres for four low-functioning isolated wetlands occur on the 23.558-acre site. It was also determined that the low-functioning isolated wetlands are not regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers nor the California Department of Fish & Game. The project site is located outside the Coastal Zone and can be filled as the wetlands are small (0.016 acres, 0.023 acres, 0.003 acres, and 0.01 acres), isolated (one is located near Hollister Avenue, one is located close to the center of the project site, and two are located on the opposite ends of an engineered cut on the north end of the project site), not part of a larger hydrologic system and lacks productive or functional habitat value.

The extent of the fill would total 2,266 square feet on a 1,025,838-square foot project site. Mitigation measures would triple the amount of wetlands onsite (MM BIO 2-1) to 6,795 square feet. The wetlands would be part of the bioswale system that could incorporate Southern Tarplant if that species is found onsite.

A fuel modification plan, sensitive to onsite ESHA, would be prepared and reviewed by
<table>
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**POLICY**

**DISCUSSION**

the Fire Department and City approved biologists (MM PS 1-2). The plan would study the buffer, type and size of the development, edge effects, topography and transitional habitat.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation Element policies CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 1.9, CE 3.3, CE 3.6, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, CE 8.4 CE 9.1, CE 9.2, CE 9.4 and CE 9.5.

**CE 3.6 Mitigation of Wetland Fill.** Where any dike or fill development is permitted in wetlands in accordance with the Coastal Act and the policies of this plan, at a minimum mitigation measures shall include creation or substantial restoration of wetlands of a similar type. Adverse impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 unless the project proponent provides evidence that the creation or restoration of a lesser area of wetlands will fully mitigate the adverse impacts of the fill. However, in no event shall the mitigation ratio be less than 2:1. All mitigation measures are subject to the requirements of CE 1.7.

**Consistent with mitigation.** See CE 3.5.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

**CE 5: PROTECTION OF OTHER TERRESTRIAL HABITAT AREAS**

**Objective:** To preserve, protect, and enhance unique, rare, or fragile native flora and plant communities

**CE 5.2 Protection of Native Grasslands.** In addition to the provisions of Policy CE 1, the following standards shall apply:

| a. For purposes of this policy, existing native grasslands are defined as an area where native grassland species comprise 10 percent or more of the total relative plant cover. Native grasslands that are dominated by perennial bunch grasses tend to be patchy. Where a high density of separate small patches occurs in an area, the whole area shall be delineated as native grasslands. |
| b. To the maximum extent feasible, development shall avoid impacts to native grasslands that would destroy, isolate, interrupt, or cause a break in continuous habitat that would (1) disrupt associated animal movement patterns and seed dispersal, or (2) increase vulnerability to weed invasions. |

**Consistent with mitigation.** See CE 3.5.

According to *Wetland Delineation of the Westar Hollister Avenue Property* (May 19, 2011), the native perennial grass California meadow barley occupies 15 percent absolute cover at wetland sampling points associated with Wetland 1 – Rye-grass Wetland, 15 percent absolute cover at sampling points associated with Wetland 2 – Emergent Wetland, and 20 percent absolute cover at the sampling point associated with Isolated Depression 2. The 10 percent relative cover threshold is therefore exceeded at each of these areas. The areas at Wetland 1 and Isolated Depression 2 that contain 10 percent or greater relative cover of California meadow barley are native grassland ESHAs, in addition to their coincident status as wetland ESHAs (Refer to Figure 4.3-1). The vegetation at Wetland 2 – Emergent Wetland contains wetland plant species and is not native grassland. The native grass California...
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Westar Mixed-Use Village

Final EIR

July 2012

POLICY

c. Removal or disturbance to a patch of native grasses less than 0.25 acre that is clearly isolated and is not part of a significant native grassland or an integral component of a larger ecosystem may be allowed. Removal or disturbance to restoration areas shall not be allowed.
d. Impacts to protected native grasslands shall be minimized by providing at least a 10-foot buffer that is restored with native species around the perimeter of the delineated native grassland area.
e. Removal of nonnative and invasive exotic species shall be allowed; revegetation shall be with plants or seeds collected within the same watershed whenever feasible.

DISCUSSION

brome occurs on the property only as widely scattered and very small patches on drier microsites, and does not constitute native grassland habitat.
The acreages of the onsite patches of native grassland ESHA, which are associated with Wetland 1 – Rye-Grass Wetland and Isolated Depression 2, are each substantially less than 0.25 acres and are clearly isolated and not part of a significant native grassland. They are also isolated within non-native habitats at a site that is surrounded by urban development. Therefore, impacts to native grassland ESHAs comprised of 10 percent or more relative cover of California meadow barley are less than significant and are allowed per CE 5.2.c.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, and CE 1.9.

CE 8: PROTECTION OF SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

Objective: To preserve and protect habitats for threatened, endangered, or other special-status species of plants and animals in order to maintain biodiversity

CE 8.1 ESHA Designation. Requisite habitats for individual occurrences of special-status plants and animals, including candidate species for listing under the state and federal endangered species acts, California species of special concern, California Native Plant Society List 1B plants, and other species protected under provisions of the California Fish and Game Code shall be preserved and protected, and their occurrences, including habitat requirements, shall be designated as ESHAs.

These habitats include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Special-status plant species such as Santa Barbara honeysuckle (Lonicera subspicata var. subspicata), southern tarplant (Centromadia parryi ssp. australis) and black-flowered figwort (Scrophularia atrata).
e. Nesting and roosting areas for various species of raptors such as Cooper’s hawks (Accipiter cooperii), red-tailed hawks (Buteo jamaicensis), white-tailed kites (Elanus leucurus), and turkey vultures (Cathartes aura).

Consistent. A focused Southern Tarplant survey of the property was submitted in July 2011 (Dudek). The survey was peer-reviewed by Envicom Corporation and found to be consistent with the methodology recommended by USFWS and CDFG guidelines and that the Southern Tarplant is not on the project site. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

A biological survey of the property was conducted in June 2005 (Dudek). No sensitive species (or nests) were observed during biological surveys of the site in 2005 or in 2010 (Enviacom Corporation); however, the California Natural Diversity Database Rarefind 3 application search for reported sensitive Element Occurrences (EO) for the three coastal quadrangles Dos Pueblos Canyon, Goleta, and Santa Barbara returns fourteen sensitive elements of which three have potential to occur at the site: Ferruginous hawk, White-tailed kite and Big free-tailed bat. The ferruginous hawk can reasonably be expected to occur on the project site. The White-tailed kite is a CDFG Fully Protected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>species, which roosts and breeds on several sites in the Goleta area and would be expected to forage on the project site. The big free-tailed bat might be expected to forage aerially over the site, but they are not expected to roost, aestivate, or hibernate thereon. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation policy CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, and CE 8.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE 8.2: Protection of Habitat Areas.</strong> All development shall be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance of, or adverse impacts to, special-status species and their habitats, including spawning, nesting, rearing, roosting, foraging, and other elements of the required habitats.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> Southern Tarplant is not on the project site. The project has been conditioned to perform bird field surveys prior to construction (MM BIO 7-1). This condition would feasibly reduce adverse short-term construction impacts and ensure special-status species and their habitats are protected. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation policy CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, CE 8.3, and CE 8.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE 8.3 Site-Specific Biological Resources Study.</strong> Any areas not designated on Figure 4-1 that meet the ESHA criteria for the resources specified in CE 8.1 shall be accorded the same protections as if the area were shown on the figure. Proposals for development on sites where ESHAs are shown on the figure, or where there is probable cause to believe that an ESHA may exist, shall be required to provide the City with a site-specific biological study that includes the following information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. A base map that delineates topographic lines, parcel boundaries, and adjacent roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A vegetation map that 1) identifies trees or other sites that are existing or historical nests for the species of concern and 2) delineates other elements of the habitat such as roosting sites and foraging areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A detailed map that shows the conclusions regarding the boundary, precise location and extent, or current status of the ESHA based on substantial evidence provided in the biological studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A written report that summarizes the survey methods, data, observations, findings, and recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> Figure 4-1 does not designate an ESHA on the project site. However, there was probable cause to believe that ESHAs may exist on the site. The applicant submitted biological reports for the site (Dudek, Tree Concern), consistent with the definition of ESHA as provided in CE 1.1 and with the required information of CE 8.3. A biological survey of the property was conducted in June 2005 (Dudek). No sensitive species (or nests) were observed during biological surveys of the site in 2005 or in 2010 (Envicom Corporation). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation policy CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, and CE 8.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY

**CE 8.4: Buffer Areas for Special-Status Species.** Development shall be designed to provide a 100-foot buffer around active and historical nest sites for protected species of raptors when feasible. In existing developed areas, the width of the buffer may be reduced to correspond to the actual width of the buffer for adjacent development. If the biological study described in Subpolicy CE 8.3 determines that an active raptor nest site exists on the subject property, whenever feasible no vegetation clearing, grading, construction, or other development activity shall be allowed within a 300-foot radius of the nest site during the nesting and fledging season.

### DISCUSSION

Consistent. A biological survey of the property was conducted in June 2005 (Dudek). No sensitive species (or nests) were observed during biological surveys of the site in 2005 or in 2010 (Envicom Corporation); however, the California Natural Diversity Database Rarefind 3 application search for reported sensitive Element Occurrences (EO) for the three coastal quadrangles Dos Pueblos Canyon, Goleta, and Santa Barbara returns fourteen sensitive elements of which three have potential to occur at the site: Ferruginous hawk, White-tailed kite and Big free-tailed bat. The ferruginous hawk can reasonably be expected to occur on the project site. The White-tailed kite is a CDFG Fully Protected species, which roosts and breeds on several sites in the Goleta area and would be expected to forage on the project site. The big free-tailed bat might be expected to forage aerially over the site, but they are not expected to roost, aestivate, or hibernate thereon.

The project could result in vegetation removal and grading, and if conducted during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31) would have the potential to result in the loss of trees and shrubs that could contain active bird nests. In addition, grading would also affect herbaceous vegetation that could support ground nesting species. As there is potential for raptor species to be on the project site, the project has been conditioned to perform bird field surveys prior to construction (MM BIO 5-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policies LU 1.7 and LU 2.2, and Conservation policy CE 1.1, CE 1.2, CE 1.6, CE 1.7, CE 8.1, CE 8.2, and CE 8.3.

### CE 9: PROTECTION OF NATIVE WOODLANDS

**Objective:** To maintain and protect existing native trees and woodlands as a valuable resource needed to support wildlife and provide visual amenities.

**CE 9.1 Definition of Protected Trees.** New development shall be sited and designed to preserve the following species of native trees: oaks (*Quercus* spp.), walnut (*Juglans californica*), sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), cottonwood (*Populus* spp.), willows (*Salix* spp.), or other native trees that are not otherwise protected in ESHAs, unless as otherwise allowed in CE 9.

Consistent with mitigation. The applicant submitted an arborist report for the site in October 2009 (Tree Concern), consistent with the definition of protected tree as provided in CE 9.1. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE 9.2 Tree Protection Plan.</strong> Applications for new development on sites containing protected native trees shall include a report by a certified arborist or other qualified expert. The report shall include an inventory of native trees and a Tree Protection Plan.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The applicant submitted an arborist report for the site in October 2009 (Tree Concern). The report included an inventory of native trees and found a single mature coast live oak tree, which meets the necessary criteria to be considered a protected tree pursuant to the CE 9.1, would be impacted by the project. The report included recommended mitigation measures for the direct impact to the single mature coast live oak. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation policies CE 9.1, CE 9.4, and CE 9.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE 9.4 Tree Protection Standards.</strong> The following impacts to native trees and woodlands should be avoided in the design of projects: 1) removal of native trees; 2) fragmentation of habitat; 3) removal of understory; 4) disruption of the canopy, and 5) alteration of drainage patterns. Structures, including roads and driveways, should be sited to prevent any encroachment into the protection zone of any protected tree and to provide an adequate buffer outside of the protection zone of individual native trees in order to allow for future growth. Tree protection standards shall be detailed in the Tree Protection Ordinance called for in CE-IA-4.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> The project would have a direct impact to the single mature coast live oak. According to the arborist report, the critical root zone of this tree would be encroached upon by more than 75 percent, which is anticipated to necessitate removal of the tree. As impacts to the single mature coast live oak cannot be avoided, the project has been conditioned to replace the tree onsite at a 10:1 ratio with 1-gallon oaks or at a 3:1 ration with 24-inch box oaks (MM BIO 3-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation policies CE 9.1, CE 9.4, and CE 9.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE 9.5 Mitigation of Impacts to Native Trees.</strong> Where the removal of mature native trees cannot be avoided through the implementation of project alternatives or where development encroaches into the protected zone and could threaten the continued viability of the tree(s), mitigation measures shall include, at a minimum, the planting of replacement trees on site, if suitable area exists on the subject site, or offsite if suitable onsite area is unavailable, consistent with the Tree Protection Ordinance (see also CE-IA-4). The Tree Protection Ordinance shall establish the mitigation ratios for replacement trees for every tree removed. Where onsite mitigation is not feasible, offsite mitigation shall be provided by planting of replacement trees at a site within the same watershed. If the tree removal occurs at a site within the Coastal Zone, any offsite mitigation area shall also be located within the Coastal Zone.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with Mitigation.</strong> See CE 9.4. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation policies CE 9.1, CE 9.2, and CE 9.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum sizes for various species of replacement trees shall be established in the Tree Protection Ordinance. Mitigation sites shall be monitored for a period of 5 years. The City may require replanting of trees that do not survive.</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. The 23.558-acre project site is primarily undeveloped, except for 1.23 acres in the southeast corner that is developed with two buildings and a paved parking area. The site topography generally slopes evenly north to south with gradients typically ranging from 1 to 10 percent. No significant natural slopes are present within or immediately adjacent to the site. Site topography generally results in sheet flow runoff in a southward direction toward Hollister Avenue. The project would require changes and/or modifications to existing on-site drainage patterns. The primary modifications would be removal of the existing engineered cut in the north portion of the project site, the re-direction of portions of the stormwater runoff that currently drains south and southeast toward the Hollister Avenue, and re-direction of most stormwater runoff that currently drains north or west along the west and northwest portions of the site. The overall changes would result in a lesser slope across the project site; existing drainage directions (to the south) would not be substantially altered. To accommodate this change to the on-site movement of surface water, new surface drains, storm drain lines, and a 120,500 cubic-foot subsurface stormwater detention chamber or group of chambers located beneath the commercial center parking lot in the southwest quadrant of the site would be constructed. This would result in no increase in post-development peaks flows relative pre-development flow, and post-development flow rates and volumes leaving the site would be equal to or less than the pre-development flow rates and volumes. The project also results in a decrease in the effective impervious area from pre-development (4.0 percent) to post-development (3.5 percent) conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE 10: WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AND WATER QUALITY**

**Objective:** To prevent the degradation of the quality of groundwater basins and surface waters in and adjacent to Goleta

**CE 10.1: New Development and Water Quality.**

New development shall not result in the degradation of the water quality of groundwater basins or surface waters; surface waters include the ocean, lagoons, creeks, ponds, and wetlands. Urban runoff pollutants shall not be discharged or deposited such that they adversely affect these resources.
4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project would involve site disturbance during construction of building, sidewalks, roadways, patios, landscaping, and associated facilities. For post-development impacts, the primary source of pollutants in stormwater runoff would be driveways and parking areas that carry oil, grease, and other materials deposited on the pavement surfaces. In addition, runoff from landscaped areas may contain sediment, pesticides, herbicides, and other chemical compounds. To mitigate avoid degradation of the water quality of groundwater basins or surface waters, the project has been conditioned to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan including all applicable items in CE 10.6 (MM WQ 1-1, MM WQ 2-2), apply for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Permit (MM WQ 2-1), prepare stormwater quality protection/BMPs maintenance agreement that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with the (MM WQ 2-3), and prevent illegal discharges to the storm drains (MM WQ 2-4). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 10.2, CE 10.3, CE 10.4, CE 10.6, CE 10.7 and CE 10.8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| New development shall be sited and designed to protect water quality and minimize impacts to coastal waters by incorporating measures designed to ensure the following: | See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 10.1, CE 10.3, CE 10.4, CE 10.6, CE 10.7 and CE 10.8. |
| a. Protection of areas that provide important water quality benefits, areas necessary to maintain riparian and aquatic biota, and areas susceptible to erosion and sediment loss. | |
| a.b. Limiting increases in areas covered by impervious surfaces. | |
| a.c. Limiting the area where land disturbances occur, such as clearing of vegetation, cut-and-fill, and grading, to reduce erosion and sediment loss. | |
| a.d. Limiting disturbance of natural drainage features and vegetation. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE 10.3</strong> Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management. New development shall be designed to minimize impacts to water quality from increased runoff volumes and discharges of pollutants from nonpoint sources to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the City’s Storm Water Management Plan or a subsequent Storm Water Management Plan approved by the City and the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Post construction structural BMPs shall be designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter stormwater runoff in accordance with applicable standards as required by law. Examples of BMPs include, but are not limited to, the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Retention and detention basins.  
- b. Vegetated swales.  
- c. Infiltration galleries or injection wells.  
- d. Use of permeable paving materials.  
- e. Mechanical devices such as oil-water separators and filters.  
- f. Revegetation of graded or disturbed areas.
- g. Other measures as identified in the City’s adopted Storm Water Management Plan and other City-approved regulations. |

**Consistent with mitigation.** See CE 10.1.  
See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 10.1, CE 10.2, CE 10.4, CE 10.6, CE 10.7 and CE 10.8.

| **CE 10.4:** New Facilities. New bridges, roads, culverts, and outfalls shall not cause or contribute to creek bank erosion or creek or wetland siltation and shall include BMPs to minimize impacts to water quality. BMPs shall include construction phase erosion control, polluted runoff control plans, and soil stabilization techniques. Where space is available, dispersal of sheet flow from roads into vegetated areas, or other onsite infiltration practices, shall be incorporated into the project design. |

**Consistent with mitigation.** See CE 10.1.  
See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 10.1, CE 10.2, CE 10.3, CE 10.6, CE 10.7 and CE 10.8.

| **CE 10.6:** Stormwater Management Requirements. The following requirements shall apply to specific types of development: |

- a. Commercial and multiple-family development shall use BMPs to control polluted runoff from structures, parking, and loading areas.  
- b. Restaurants shall incorporate BMPs designed to minimize runoff of oil and grease, solvents, phosphates, and suspended solids to the storm drain system.  
- c. Gasoline stations, car washes, and automobile repair facilities shall incorporate BMPs designed to minimize runoff of oil and grease, solvents, car battery acid, engine coolants, and gasoline to the stormwater |

**Consistent with mitigation.** See CE 10.1.  
See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 10.1, CE 10.2, CE 10.3, CE 10.4, CE 10.7 and CE 10.8.
### 4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>system.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See CE 10.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Outdoor materials storage areas shall be designed to incorporate BMPs to prevent stormwater contamination from stored materials.</td>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 10.1, CE 10.2, CE 10.3, CE 10.4, CE 10.6 and CE 10.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d,e). Trash storage areas shall be designed using BMPs to prevent stormwater contamination by loose trash and debris.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE 10.7 Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans.** New development shall protect the absorption, purifying, and retentive functions of natural systems that exist on the site. Drainage Plans shall be designed to complement and use existing drainage patterns and systems, where feasible, conveying drainage from the site in a nonerosive manner. Disturbed or degraded natural drainage systems shall be restored where feasible, except where there are geologic or public safety concerns. Proposals for new development shall include the following:

a. A Construction-Phase Erosion Control and Stormwater Management Plan that specifies the BMPs that will be implemented to minimize erosion and sedimentation; provide adequate sanitary and waste disposal facilities; and prevent contamination of runoff by construction practices, materials, and chemicals.

b. A Post-Development-Phase Drainage and Stormwater Management Plan that specifies the BMPs—including site design methods, source controls, and treatment controls—that will be implemented to minimize polluted runoff after construction. This plan shall include monitoring and maintenance plans for the BMP measures.

**CE 10.8: Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities.** New development shall be required to provide ongoing maintenance of BMP measures where maintenance is necessary for their effective operation. The permittee and/or owner, including successors in interest, shall be responsible for all structural treatment controls and devices as follows:

a. All structural BMPs shall be inspected, cleaned, and repaired when necessary prior to September 30th of each year.

\(a, b\). Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance should be performed after storms as needed throughout the rainy season, with any major repairs completed prior to the
### Policy Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beginning of the next rainy season.</td>
<td><strong>CE 12: PROTECTION OF AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.c. Public streets and parking lots shall be swept as needed and financially feasible to remove debris and contaminated residue.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> The project would place sensitive receptors from air pollutants within 500 feet of the US 101 corridor. The project would construct residential units within 265 feet from the nearest east-bound travel lane of the US 101. The primary outdoor recreation area would be sited at the southern end of the residential portion of the project and is separated from the combined UPRR/US 101 corridor by intervening structures. The pool area is 500 feet from the freeway centerline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.d. The homeowners association, or other private owner, shall be responsible for sweeping of private streets and parking lots.</td>
<td>An analysis of mobile source emissions and associated health risks was conducted. The analysis concluded that although freeway and railroad proximity may be causes for concern, the calculated risks from diesel particulate matter exposure are within generally acceptable levels. However the risk is conservatively identified as significant, and warrants that all reasonably available mitigation should be implemented. The project has been conditioned for ventilation systems with enhanced particulate removal efficiency be provided for all residential units within 500 feet of the US 101 (MM AQ 3-1) and a recommended condition would require these same ventilation systems to be provided to all residential units. The management of the apartment component would be responsible to replace filters as recommended by the manufacturer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE 12.1: Land Use Compatibility.** The designation of land uses on the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) and the review of new development shall ensure that siting of any new sensitive receptors provides for adequate buffers from existing sources of emissions of air pollutants or odors. Sensitive receptors are a facility or land use that includes members of the population sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Sensitive receptors may include children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. If a development that is a sensitive receptor is proposed within 500 feet of U.S. Highway 101 (US-101) an analysis of mobile source emissions and associated health risks shall be required. Such developments shall be required to provide an adequate setback from the highway and, if necessary, identify design mitigation measures to reduce health risks to acceptable levels. |

| In consultation with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department Protection District Hazardous Materials Unit, a database search was conducted to determine the types of chemicals that are used and the types of waste generated within a 2,000-foot radius of the project site. The resulting evaluation of | |
#### POLICY

| EXPOSURE OF SENSITIVE RECEPTORS | DEVELOPMENT TO HAZARDS WITHIN 2,000 FEET OF THE PROJECTS SITE REVEALED THAT NONE ARE LISTED IN THE 2010 OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT "TOXICITY CRITERIA DATABASE" AND ARE THEREFORE NOT CONSIDERED TO BE AIR TOXICS. BASED ON THIS REVIEW, IT WAS DETERMINED THAT PROJECT RESIDENTS WOULD NOT BE EXPOSED TO SIGNIFICANT HEALTH RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THESE BUSINESSES AND THEIR OPERATIONS. HOWEVER, THE TYPES OF BUSINESSES AND USE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AT THE INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES WITHIN 2,000 FEET MAY CHANGE OVER TIME. IN ADDITION, BECAUSE PROJECT LANDSCAPING WOULD PROVIDE AN EFFECTIVE VISUAL BUFFER BETWEEN THE ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES, FUTURE RESIDENTS UNFAMILIAR WITH THE AREA MAY NOT REALIZE THAT THERE ARE INDUSTRIAL USES TO THE WEST. THEREFORE, MITIGATION IS RECOMMENDED IN THE EIR DISCLOSING THE PRESENCE OF THE ADJACENT INDUSTRIAL ZONING TO FUTURE RESIDENTS (OWNERS OR RENTERS) AS WELL AS HOW TO OBTAIN HAZARD RELATED INFORMATION, IF APPLICABLE, ABOUT THE VARIOUS BUSINESSES (E.G., TYPES OF WHETHER HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ARE USED) (MM HAZ 2-1). THIS MEASURE ENSURES THAT THE PRESENCE OF THE ADJACENT INDUSTRIAL AREA IS DISCLOSED TO FUTURE RESIDENTS AS WELL AS WHERE INTERESTED PARTIES CAN OBTAIN FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT HAZARDOUS MATERIALS USED AT THESE NEIGHBORING BUSINESSES. THEREFORE, THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH IS POLICY. | **DISCUSSION** |

| CE 12.2: CONTROL OF AIR EMISSIONS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT | THE FOLLOWING SHALL APPLY TO REDUCTION OF AIR EMISSIONS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT: |

- a. Any development proposal that has the potential to increase emissions of air pollutants shall be referred to the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District for comments and recommended conditions prior to final action by the City. |
- b. All new commercial and industrial sources shall be required to use the best-available air pollution control technology. Emissions control equipment shall be properly maintained to ensure efficient and effective operation. |
- c. Wood-burning fireplace installations in new residential development shall be limited to low-

| **CONSISTENT WITH MITIGATION** | THE PROJECT WAS REFERRED TO THE APCD FOR COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS. |

The project would generate long-term project emissions that are primarily associated with traffic generated by the project. The specific uses that would occur within the commercial portion of the project site have not been identified and were not assessed; however, these stationary sources would typically require permits or would be subject to regulation by the APCD that would prevent significant air quality impacts. Fireplaces are not proposed in the residential units. However, the project must be... |
### POLICY

- Emitting State- and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-certified fireplace inserts and woodstoves, pellet stoves, or natural gas fireplaces. In locations near monarch butterfly ESHAs, fireplaces shall be limited to natural gas.
- Adequate buffers between new sources and sensitive receptors shall be required.
- Any permit required by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District shall be obtained prior to issuance of final development clearance by the City.

### DISCUSSION

The operational impacts of the project’s proximity of mixed-uses was also evaluated and found that commercial uses could generate odors that would be detectable at the residences. The specific uses that would occur within the commercial portion of the project site have not been identified and were not assessed. However, the project has been conditioned to prepare an odor abatement plan (MM AQ 4-1), which includes requirements for a contact person for complaints, to establish restrictions for hours of operations and deliveries (based on individual tenant needs), refuse storage, and rear-of-store maintenance requirements, among others.

See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policy CE 12.1, CE 12.3 and CE 12.4.

---

### CE 12.3: Control of Emissions during Grading and Construction

- Construction site emissions shall be controlled by using the following measures:
  - Watering active construction areas to reduce windborne emissions.
  - Covering trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials.
  - Paving or applying nontoxic solid stabilizers on unpaved access roads and temporary parking areas.
  - Hydroseeding inactive construction areas.
  - Enclosing or covering open material stockpiles.
  - Revegetating graded areas immediately upon completion of work.

---

**Consistent with mitigation.** Project grading is estimated to include 49,100 cubic yards of cut and 48,800 cubic yards of compacted fill, with a potential net export of 300 cubic yards of dirt from the project site. The project has been conditioned consistent with CE 12.3 including conditions related to watering activities, stopping grading activities due to weather conditions, BMPs, Tarping all vehicles exporting cut material from the project site to the point of storage, treating stockpiled soils with soil binders, daily clean up, and revegetating/spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed in a manner that prevents dust generation, and designating a dust control monitor (MM AQ 1-1) and notifying all drivers of vehicles transporting soils of project conditions (MM AQ 1-2). Other project conditions include restrictions on construction equipment and the hauling of soil to reduce release of particulates offsite (MM AQ 1-3) limitations on diesel fuel emissions (MM AQ 1-4), and asbestos handling (MM AQ 1-5). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policy CE 12.1, CE 12.2 and CE 12.4.
POLICY

CE 12.4: Minimizing Air Pollution from Transportation Sources. The following measures are designed to reduce air pollution from transportation sources:

a. Hollister Corridor Mixed Use. The Land Use Plan for the Hollister Corridor is designed to:
   1) Provide new housing near existing workplaces and commercial services to encourage short trips by foot and bicycle.
   2) Provide new housing near existing bus routes with convenient and high frequency service.
   3) Provide new housing near the US-101 ramps so as to minimize the length of auto trips on streets within the community.
   4) Provide new housing at locations near the existing Amtrak line, which could be considered for commuter rail service in the future.

b. Other Land Use Policies: The following land use policies are designed to reduce demand for auto travel and promote less polluting modes such as bus transit, walking, and bicycling:
   1) Clustering of moderate density housing and incorporation of residential apartments on upper floors of buildings, particularly in Goleta Old Town.
   2) Integration of new housing into existing neighborhood commercial centers.
   3) Emphasis on moderate density residential development rather than low-density sprawl.
   4) Integrating pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities into new development.
   5) Establishment of a fixed urban boundary to reduce sprawl outward from the existing urbanized area.

c. Transportation Policies: The following transportation measures are designed to lower emissions of air pollutants by promoting efficient use of the street system:
   1) Fine-tuning of intersections and their operations to minimize delays.
   2) Coordinated signal timing to improve traffic flow.
   3) Promotion of improved transit services.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with mitigation. This policy identifies various land use patterns and project design elements intended to reduce vehicular emissions. Due to the mixed-use nature of the project, on a site specifically designated for moderate density housing, near Highway 101 ramps, the incorporation of design features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking and construction of a fully improved bus stop to encourage use of public transit, and the project site proximity to shopping and nearby job opportunities, this project is considered consistent with this policy.

However, even with the intent to reduce vehicular emissions, the project-related transportation emissions would exceed significance threshold for two ozone precursor pollutants (ROG and NOx). Therefore, project operational air quality impacts would be considered significant. The project has been conditioned to prepare an Alternative Transportation/Transportation Demand Management Program to help reduce ROC and NOx emissions associated with project generated vehicular trips (MM AQ 2-1).

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policies LU 1.2, LU 1.10 and LU 1.11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a linked pedestrian circulation system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Provision of a bikeway system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Encouragement of employer-based trip reduction measures such as subsidized bus fares, flexible work hours, vanpools, and similar measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE 13: ENERGY CONSERVATION**

**Objective:** To promote energy efficiency in future land use and development within Goleta, encourage use of renewable energy sources, and reduce reliance upon fossil fuels.

**CE 13.1: Energy Efficiency in Existing and New Residential Development.** The City shall promote the following practices in existing and new residential construction:

- a. Retrofitting of existing residential structures to reduce energy consumption and costs to owners and tenants is encouraged. These retrofits may include: increased insulation, weather stripping, caulking of windows and doors, low-flow showerheads, and other similar improvements. Master metering is discouraged, and conversions to individual metering where practicable is preferred.

- b. The City shall enforce the State’s residential energy conservation building standards set forth in Title 24 through its plan check and building permit issuance processes.

- c. New residential development and additions to existing homes shall be designed to provide a maximum solar orientation when appropriate, and shall not adversely affect the solar access of adjacent residential structures. Use of solar water heating systems, operational skylights, passive solar heating, and waste heat recovery systems is encouraged.

**Consistent with mitigation.** All new residential buildings must comply with Chapter 15.13—Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code “Energy Efficiency Standards,” which require energy savings measures that exceed the 2010 California Energy Code, as adopted by the Goleta Municipal Code, 2008 State of California Title 24 Energy Requirements by 15% and with the 2010 State of California Green Building Code, as adopted as the Green Building—Goleta Municipal Code of the City, in Chapter 15.12; Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code. The project has been conditioned to be consistent with this policy (MM GHG 1-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

In addition, the use of a photovoltaic system is being studied and could be incorporated into the project at a later date, reducing the project’s demand for electricity drawn from the SCE grid.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policy LU 2.3, Conservation Element policies CE 13.2 and CE 13.3, and Housing Element policies HE 9.4 and HE 9.5.

**CE 13.2 Energy Efficiency in Existing and New Commercial and Industrial Development.** The following measures shall be employed to reduce energy consumption in existing and new commercial and industrial buildings:

- a. Reduction of energy consumption in existing buildings through improved design and management of heating, ventilation, air conditioning systems, and lighting is encouraged. Master metering is discouraged, and conversions to metering for individual tenant spaces shall be promoted where feasible.

- b. The City shall enforce the state’s residential energy conservation building standards set forth in Title 24 through its plan check and building permit issuance processes.

**Consistent with mitigation.** All new commercial buildings must comply with the Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 15.13—Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code “Energy Efficiency Standards,” which require energy savings measures that exceed 2008 State of California Title 24 Energy Requirements by 15% and with the 2010 State of California Green Building Code, as adopted for the Green Building Code of the City, in Chapter 15.12; Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code. The project has been conditioned to be consistent with this policy (MM GHG 1-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.
4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>energy conservation building standards set forth in Title 24 through its plan check and building permit issuance processes.</td>
<td>In addition, the use of a photovoltaic system is being studied and could be incorporated into the project at a later date, reducing the project’s demand for electricity drawn from the SCE grid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The City shall encourage nonresidential buildings to be designed in a manner that is appropriate for local climate conditions, taking into account natural light and ventilation, placement of landscaping, and use of integrated energy systems. This encompasses concepts such as cogeneration, waste heat systems, and other similar technologies.</td>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Element policy LU 2.3, Conservation Element policies CE 13.1 and CE 13.3, and Housing Element policies HE 9.4 and HE 9.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CE 13.3 Use of Renewable Energy Sources.** For new projects, the City encourages the incorporation of renewable energy sources. Consideration shall be given to incorporation of renewable energy sources that do not have adverse effects on the environment or on any adjacent residential uses. The following considerations shall apply:

- a. Solar access shall be protected in accordance with the state Solar Rights Act (AB 2473). South wall and rooftop access should be achievable in low-density residential areas, while rooftop access should be possible in other areas.
- b. New development shall not impair the performance of existing solar energy systems. Compensatory or mitigation measures may be considered in instances where there is no reasonable alternative.
- c. Alternative energy sources are encouraged, provided that the technology does not contribute to noise, visual, air quality, or other potential impacts on nearby uses and neighborhoods.

**CE 15: WATER CONSERVATION AND MATERIALS RECYCLING**

**Objective:** To conserve scarce water supply resources and to encourage reduction in the generation of waste materials at the source and recycling of waste materials.

**CE 15.3: Water Conservation for New Development.** In order to minimize water use, all new development shall use low water use plumbing fixtures, water-conserving landscaping, low flow irrigation, and reclaimed water for exterior landscaping, where appropriate.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project has been conditioned to minimize the use of outdoor water by requiring the use of native and/or drought tolerant landscaping, water-conserving irrigation, and recycled water, grouping plant material by water needs, limiting turn and slopes, mulching and utilizing soil moisture sensing devices (MM WS 1-2), to minimize the use of indoor water by insulating all hot water lines, installing recirculating, point-of-use or on-demand water heaters, prohibiting self regenerating water systems.
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE 15.4 Waste Reduction and Recycling.</th>
<th>Consistent with mitigation. The project would generate solid waste during operations. This waste would be generated by residents, customers and businesses. Much of the solid waste generated from operations of the project would be recyclable, such as newspaper, magazines, paper, cardboard plastics, glass, metals, and etcetera. The project has been conditioned to implement a Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) which would include the provision of bins designated for storage or recyclables within the project site, a green waste source reduction program, a Source Reduction Plan (SRP), describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposed by the project, implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation, and funding (MM SW 2-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City shall promote waste reduction and recycling programs for residences and businesses encourage commercial composting and education programs, recycle public green waste materials for mulch and compost, reuse removed trees for lumber when possible, and implement waste and recycling standards for all new developments and remodels.</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. The project would generate solid waste during operations. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAFETY ELEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE 1: SAFETY IN GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> To avoid siting of development or land use activities in hazardous areas, and where this is infeasible, require appropriate mitigation to lessen or minimize exposure to hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE 1.3: Site-Specific Hazards Studies.</strong> Applications for new development shall consider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

exposure of the new development to coastal and other hazards. Where appropriate, an application for new development shall include a geologic/soils/geotechnical study and any other studies that identify geologic hazards affecting the proposed project site and any necessary mitigation measures. The study report shall contain a statement certifying that the project site is suitable for the proposed development and that the development will be safe from geologic hazards. The report shall be prepared and signed by a licensed certified engineering geologist or geotechnical engineer and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the City.

The site-specific geotechnical reports and additional information from previous environmental documents in the general site area (Padre Associates, 1999); data from City of Goleta (General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan documents, 2008); and published information for the Goleta-Santa Barbara area (e.g., United States Geological Survey [USGS], 2009) were peer reviewed by a certified engineering geologist (Envicom Corporation). The peer review concurs with the GMU conclusions that:

1. There are no active or potentially active earthquake faults underlying the project site and therefore the project site is not located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone (for active surface faulting). However, as is true of much of California, the project site would still subject to seismic shaking during earthquake events and therefore future construction must comply with Zone 4 seismic safety standards to avoid potentially significant impacts associated with seismic shaking.

2. Based on the information available, the main El Encanto fault at the project site may (1) be located off the site to the north, (2) may be present beneath the site and has not been active in the upper 150 feet of upper Pleistocene marine terrace deposits, or (3) may not be a fault, but may reflect some form of buried erosional channel and/or a surface geomorphic feature (e.g., sea cliff or strand line) associated with past sea level changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The site is relatively flat; therefore, impacts from landslides or other forms of natural slope instability, or landform alteration are unlikely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Liquefaction-induced seismic settlement is negligible, and lateral spreading is not considered a site hazard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The uppermost 5 feet of soil would be compressible and deeper soils are estimated to have low compressibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Onsite soils should be considered severely corrosive to ferrous metals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Onsite soils have a negligible sulfate exposure for concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Onsite soils should be considered highly expansive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Percolation testing confirmed that native soils that underlie the stormwater storage area have low infiltration rates, typically less than 0.5 inch/hour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Additionally, it was found that static settlement should not exceed 1.0 inch total and 0.5 inch over 40 feet differential if geotechnical recommendations are followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The geotechnical design report concluded that the proposed grading and improvements and structures are feasible and practical (GMU, 2011).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There is a potential for increased short-term erosion and sedimentation due to construction activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

The project has been conditioned to incorporate all grading and earthwork recommendations from the project geotechnical and soils reports shall be incorporated into the final project design, including the Final Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plans (MM GEO 1-1), and a final grading and erosion control plan shall be designed to minimize erosion (MM GEO 4-1 and WQ 1-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 4.1, SE 4.3, SE 4.4, SE 4.11 and SE 5.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE 1.4 Deed Restriction in Hazardous Areas.</strong> As a condition of development on property subject to the hazards addressed in this Safety Element, the property owner shall be required to execute and record a deed restriction that acknowledges and assumes responsibility for the risks; waives any future claims of damage or liability against the City; and agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City against any and all liability, claims, damages, and/or expenses arising from any injury to any person or damage to property due to such hazards.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> The southern 4.64 acres of the project site are covered by the F(APR) Approach Zone and 0.16 acres are located within one mile from Runway 7/25. Runway 7/25 is 6,500 feet long and is considered a “Large Air Carrier Runway.” Based upon a typical depiction of the Large Air Carrier Runway and the related safety zones depicted and described within Figure 9L of the CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, the project is located within the Santa Barbara Airport’s Safety Compatibility Zone #3 (Inner Turning Zone). The Inner Turning Zone would overlay both residential and commercial development on the project site. The project has been conditioned to require the property owner to execute and record a deed restriction prior to recordation, consistent with the language in SE 1.4 that acknowledges and assumes responsibility for the risks associated with development in the Approach Zone (MM LU 6-3). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 9.1, SE 9.2, SE 9.3, and SE 9.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE 1.5 Subdivisions of New Lots in Hazard Areas.</strong> Land divisions, including lot line adjustments, shall be prohibited in areas subject to geologic, seismic, flooding, and other hazards unless it is demonstrated by the subdivider that all lots in the new subdivision will have sufficient buildable land area that is situated outside the hazardous portions of the property.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> Physical characteristics of the project site and/or availability of feasible mitigation ensure that the proposed project can be developed in a manner that does not expose future residents and/or commercial tenants/visitors to unacceptable risks associated with air emissions from Highway 101 or businesses at the industrial properties within 2,000 feet the project site, hazards related to infrastructure, earthquakes, unstable soils, flooding, contaminated soils, tsunamis, and radon gas exposure, and etcetera. Implementation of Mitigation Measures identified in the Air Quality, Geology, Hazards and Hydrology sections would reduce hazards and risks to less than significant levels and ensure project consistency with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Elevation policies CE 12.1, CE 12.2, CE 12.4, Safety Element policies SE 1.3, SE 1.4, SE 1.9, SE 4.3, SE 4.4, SE 4.11, SE 4.12, SE 5.2, SE 6.4, SE 9.1, SE 9.2, SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SE 1.9 Reduction of Radon Hazards.** The City shall require the consideration of radon hazards for all new construction and require testing of radon levels for construction of homes and buildings located in areas subject to moderate or high potential for radon gas levels exceeding 4.0 picocuries as shown on maps produced by the California Division of Mines and Geology. The City shall require new homes to use radon-resistant construction where needed based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidelines.

**Consistent with mitigation.** Radon gas studies performed by the California Bureau of Mines and Geology and the Department of Health Services (DHS) from 1989-1993 indicate that Santa Barbara County falls within the Zone 1 designation, which suggests that there is a low to moderate potential for exposure to radon gas at or above the EPA recommended level of 4.0 pico curies per liter (pCi/L)\(^\text{18}\). According to DHS, 278 radon tests were conducted in the zip code including the project site (93117). Radon levels greater than or equal to 4 pCi/L were observed in 44 of the tests conducted in this area (EEI, September 10, 2003). The project has been conditioned to test for radon gas, and if gas is present above the recommended EPA exposure level (4.0 pci/L), habitable structures shall be designed to provide venting and/or any other EPA approved mitigation measures identified to reduce such exposure (MM HAZ 7-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

**SE 4: SEISMIC AND SEISMICALLY INDUCED HAZARDS**

**Objective:** To minimize the potential for loss of life and property and economic and social disruption resulting from seismic events and seismically induced hazards.

**SE 4.1 Information on Faults and Geologic Hazards.** The City will maintain up-to-date information on faults and geologic hazards in and offshore of Goleta as provided in source documents from the California Division of Mines and Geology, the U.S. Geological Survey, and other agencies. As new information from geologic studies becomes available, the City shall incorporate this information into its maps and resources pertaining to seismic hazards.

**Consistent.** The City shall must incorporate this information into its maps and resources pertaining to seismic hazards.

See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.3, SE 4.3, SE 4.4, SE 4.11 and SE 5.2.

**SE 4.3: Geotechnical and Geologic Studies Required.** Where appropriate, the City shall require applications for planning entitlements for new or expanded development to address potential geologic and seismic hazards through the preparation of geotechnical and geologic reports for City review and acceptance.

**Consistent with mitigation.** See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.3, SE 4.1, SE 4.4, SE 4.11 and SE 5.2.

**SE 4.4: Setback from Faults.** New development shall not be located closer than 50 feet to any active or potentially active fault line to reduce potential

**Consistent with mitigation.** See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.3, SE 4.1, SE 4.3, SE 4.11 and SE 5.2.

\(^\text{18}\) Village at Los Cameros Final EIR, 07-EIR-001.
**POLICY** | **DISCUSSION**
---|---
Damage from surface rupture. Nonstructural development may be allowed in such areas, depending on how such nonstructural development would withstand or respond to fault rupture or other seismic damage. | SE 5.2.

**SE 4.11: Geotechnical Report Required.** The City shall require geotechnical and/or geologic reports as part of the application for construction of habitable structures and essential services buildings (as defined by the building code) sited in areas having a medium-to-high potential for liquefaction and seismic settlement. The geotechnical study shall evaluate the potential for liquefaction and/or seismic-related settlement to impact the development, and identify appropriate structural-design parameters to mitigate potential hazards. | Consistent with mitigation. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.3, SE 4.1, SE 4.3, SE 4.4, and SE 5.2.

**SE 4.12 Safety Measures for Tsunami Hazard Areas.** The following shall apply in tsunami hazard areas:

- New developments shall include design features or other measures that provide for safe harbor on site.
- Existing critical facilities within the tsunami hazard area should be reviewed by the City Building Official, or designee, in conjunction with the appropriate state agency, to ensure that adequate areas for safe harbor are available on site and/or that other measures or features exist to minimize risk of injuries and deaths in the event of a tsunami.
- The City, in cooperation with the County and/or State Offices of Emergency Services, encourages development of an emergency notification and evacuation plan in response to a tsunami warning. The City shall cooperate with these agencies to develop educational materials informing people of the causes of tsunamis, tsunami characteristics and warning signs (such as a locally felt earthquake or unusually recession of near-shore waters), and appropriate tsunami-response measures. These educational materials shall be made available to residents of and visitors to Goleta. | Consistent. The project site is located outside the flood hazard area for the tsunami hazard area. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

**SE 5: SOIL AND SLOPE STABILITY HAZARDS**

**Objectives:** To promote safely sized, sited, and designed development in erosion-prone hazard areas. To reduce the potential loss of both public and private property in areas subject to steep slopes and erosion hazards.

**SE 5.2: Evaluation of Soil-Related Hazards.** The City shall require structural evaluation reports with appropriate mitigation measures to be provided for all Consistent with mitigation. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.3, SE 4.1, SE 4.3, SE 4.4, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new subdivisions, and for discretionary projects proposing new nonresidential buildings or substantial additions. Depending on the conclusions of the structural evaluation report, soil and geological reports may also be required. Such studies shall evaluate the potential for soil expansion, compression, and collapse to impact the development; they shall also identify mitigation to reduce these potential impacts, if needed.</td>
<td>SE 4.11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SE 6: FLOOD HAZARDS

**Objective:** To minimize damage to structures and the danger to life caused by stream flooding, dam failure inundation, and other flooding hazards.

**SE 6.4: Avoidance of Flood Hazard Areas.** The City shall discourage any new intensive development in any flood hazard area. Similarly, the City shall require appropriate flood mitigation for intensification of existing development in any flood-prone area. The City shall not approve development within areas designated as the 100-year floodplain that would obstruct flood flow (such as construction in the designated floodway), displace floodwaters onto other property, or be subject to flood damage. The City shall not allow development that will create or worsen drainage problems.

Consistent. The project site is located outside the flood hazard area for the 100-year storm event. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

SE 7: URBAN AND WILDLAND FIRE HAZARDS

**Objective:** To reduce the threat to life, structures, and the environment caused by urban and wildland fires.

**SE 7.1: Fire Prevention and Response Measures for New Development.** New development and redevelopment projects shall be designed and constructed in accordance with National Fire Protection Association standards to minimize fire hazards, with special attention given to fuel management and improved access in areas with higher fire risk, with access or water supply deficiencies, or beyond a 5-minute response time.

Consistent with mitigation. The primary access to the project would be from Hollister Avenue via a central private drive that bisects the commercial area and continues directly to the residential site. The main drive divides as it approaches the residential area. The easterly drive continues to an intersection with Glen Annie Road, providing a secondary ingress/egress. The westerly extension of the main drive loops behind the commercial structures then continues south back to Hollister Avenue along the western property line. These drives define the boundary between the residential and commercial areas.

The project’s circulation system is designed as a loop road, internally connecting the residential and commercial roadway system, including emergency access on and from Hollister Avenue, Glen Annie Road and Sespe Lane. The loop road configuration provides alternative access routes through the site to residents and guests as well as for emergency vehicles. The project circulation...
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>system and layout of structural development meet Fire Department – Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District (Fire Department) standards, subject to Fire Department review and approval of final plans. A fuel modification plan, sensitive to onsite ESHA, would be prepared and reviewed by the Fire Department and City approved biologists (MM BIO 2-3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would improve circulation by connecting Sespe Lane to Hollister Avenue at a signalized intersection, per MM TR 2-1 and MM TR 6-1 increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road, per MM TR 3-1 and MM TR 7-1 vastly improve the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection LOS and provide safe bicycle passage through the modified intersection, per MM TR 7-2 maintain the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection LOS. These circulation improvements would be available to residents, emergency vehicles, and the general public, which would provide a connection.

Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.


### SE 7.2: Review of New Development.

Applications for new or expanded development shall be reviewed by appropriate Santa Barbara County Fire Department personnel to ensure they are designed in a manner that reduces the risk of loss due to fire. Such review shall include consideration of the adequacy of "defensible space" around structures at risk; access for fire suppression equipment, water supplies, construction standards; and vegetation clearance. Secondary access may be required and shall be considered on a case-by-case basis. The City shall encourage built-in fire suppression systems such as sprinklers, particularly in high-risk or high-value areas.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project has been reviewed by the Fire Department. A Conditions Letter from the Fire Department dated February 28, 2011 is on file with the City and the project has been conditioned to comply with Fire’s that Letter (MM PS 1-1).


### SE 7.5: Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems.

The City shall require the installation of automatic fire sprinklers for; a) all new buildings that have a total floor area of 5,000 square feet or more and b) any

**Consistent.** The project would contain 1918 residential buildings and 90,054,874 square feet of commercial development. All of these buildings would have a floor area greater than
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existing building proposed for remodeling or an addition, which, upon completion of the remodel or addition, will have a total floor area of 5,000 square feet or more. The 5,000-square-foot threshold cited in criteria a) and b), above, shall be reduced to 1,000 square feet for any building zoned or used for commercial or industrial purposes if such building is within 100 feet of any residentially zoned parcel.

5,000 square feet; therefore, fire sprinklers would be required accordingly. MM PS 1-1 requires compliance with Fire Department review letter dated 02/28/2011, which requires installation of fire sprinklers according to the Fire Department requirements. The Fire Department would review all building plans as part of the building permit approval process to ensure compliance. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.


---

**DISCUSSION**

Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards

**Objective:** To minimize the risk of potential short- and long-term hazards associated with the operation of the Venoco Ellwood facilities and other oil and gas extraction, processing, and transportation facilities.

**SE 8.13 Setbacks from Gas Pipelines.** The City shall generally require a minimum setback of 25 feet from the centerline of gas gathering and transmission pipelines, including public-utility high-pressure pipelines, for all buildings and structures to prevent damage to the pipeline by external mechanical forces and to permit operators timely and unhindered access for repair, maintenance, survey, and emergency response. Exceptions to this requirement shall include:

a. Corridor-type locations such as roads and highways, and corridor-type uses such as other pipelines, bicycle and pedestrian paths, utilities, and appurtenances of corridors located in public rights-of-way.

b. Pipeline endpoints and interconnecting pipelines.

c. Replacement of a public-utility pipeline with a functionally equivalent pipeline.

d. Instances where this requirement is preempted by state or federal law.

e. Instances where the City finds the 25-foot setback poses an undue hardship to proposed development, provided that any reduced setback shall not be less than 15 feet and shall substantially accomplish the purpose.

Consistent with mitigation. The project would construct Building A 24.5 feet & Building H 20 feet away from the Hollister Avenue property line. A high-pressure pipeline is located on the project site 5 feet north of the southern property line. A 25-foot setback from the centerline of the high-pressure pipeline is required, resulting in a 30-foot structural setback from the southern property line unless an undue hardship is determined, which could result in a 20-foot structural setback from the southern property line. The project has been conditioned to ensure the pipeline is installed and maintained correctly (MM HAZ 5-1) and to require compliance with the 25-foot setback from the high-pressure pipeline (MM HAZ 5-2). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

---

SE 9: AIRPORT-RELATED HAZARDS

**Objective:** To minimize the risk of potential hazards associated with aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Airport.

**SE 9.1 Clear Zone and Airport Approach Zone Regulations.** The City will maintain and enforce

Consistent with mitigation. The southern 4.64 acres of the project site are covered by
through appropriate zoning measures the Clear Zone and Airport Approach Zone regulations pursuant to the plans and policies of the Santa Barbara County ALUC. The City may also require, as a condition of approval of development applications, dedication of avigation easements for areas within the Airport Clear Zones and Airport Approach Zones (see Figure 5-3).

the F(APR) Approach Zone and 0.16 acres are located within one mile from Runway 7/25. The project has been conditioned to require the property owner to execute and record a deed restriction prior to recordation, consistent with the language in SE 1.4 that acknowledges and assumes responsibility for the risks associated with development in the Approach Zone (MM LU 6-3), and the project has been conditioned to record an avigation easement for areas within the Airport Approach Zones between the applicant property owner and the City of Santa Barbara (MM LU 6-4). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.


SE 9.2 Height Restrictions. The City shall ensure that the heights of proposed buildings, other structures, and landscaping conform to airport operational requirements to minimize the risk of aircraft accidents. The City shall establish and maintain standards in its zoning ordinance for building and structure height restrictions for development in proximity to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. To ensure compliance with height restrictions, proposed development or uses that require ALUC review pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan shall be referred to the ALUC for review.

Consistent with mitigation. As part of the Inland Zoning Ordinance, the City has adopted a Flight Airport Approach Overlay [F(APR)] zone to regulate height limitations on structures and appurtenances (including vegetation) to maintain compatibility with airport operations from a noise and safety standpoint.

The southern 4.64 acres of the project site area covered by the F(APR) Approach Zone and 0.16 acres are located within one mile from Runway 7/25. Buildings A & H are within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone and would have a maximum height of approximately 24 feet with architectural features potentially extending several feet higher. Additionally, Buildings B & I are within the Runway 7/25 Approach Zone and their roof heights would vary widely ranging from 19 feet to 32 feet; architectural decorative features would extend up to four feet above the roof-line. All building heights would be below the Inland Zoning Ordinance SC zone district maximum height limit of 35 feet and the Approach Zone height restriction of 96 feet\(^\text{19}\). Per conditions associated with SE 9.3 and SE 9.4 the project would be referred to the ALUC for review (MM LU 6-1). Therefore, all of the

---

\(^{19}\) City Goleta Zoning Ordinance, Section 35-247.5 Height Restrictions. Runway 7: one vertical foot per 50 horizontal feet in distance from runway end. Runway 25: one vertical foot per 34 horizontal feet in distance from runway end. Runway 7/25 is located approximately 4,800 feet southeast. Runway 7: 4,800/50 = 96 feet; Runway 25 4,800/34 = 141 feet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings would be within the airport overlay height restrictions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.4, SE 9.1, SE 9.3, and SE 9.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SE 9.3 Limitations on Development and Uses.**
The City shall establish and maintain standards in its zoning ordinance for use restrictions for development near the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. These standards should identify uses that may be compatible in each zone. Proposed development or uses that require ALUC review pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan shall be referred to the ALUC for review.

**Consistent with mitigation.** As part of the Inland Zoning Ordinance, the City has adopted a Flight Airport Approach Overlay [F(APR)] zone to regulate land uses within the ALUP’s Approach Zone and one-mile zone. Zoning regulations include land use restrictions within these areas to maintain compatibility with airport operations from a noise and safety standpoint. The F-APR zoning requires more stringent regulations for uses within one mile of a runway. Additionally, Runway 7/25 is 6,500 feet long and is considered a “Large Air Carrier Runway.” Based upon a typical depiction of the Large Air Carrier Runway and the related safety zones depicted and described within Figure 9L of the CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, the project is located within the Santa Barbara Airport’s Safety Compatibility Zone #3 (Inner Turning Zone). The Inner Turning Zone would overlay both residential and commercial development on the project site. The project site has potential to be the location of an airplane accident, which would be at a minimum an unlikely frequency of occurrence but of a major consequence.

The project site is located north of the 60 dBA CNEL contour of Runway 7/25 as shown in the ALUP, and the City of Goleta Noise Element Figure 9-2. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan projects a very small reduction in future noise levels from the airport, so the future 60 dBA CNEL noise contour is expected to be further from the project site than depicted. Aircraft noise, both in terms of average and peak levels, does not measurably change the projected noise level or noise contour distances described above and is not considered to be a constraint to residential development as proposed at the Westar site; therefore, the project would not be subject to unacceptable levels or conflict with ALUP noise policies.

City staff analyzed the project density per a 25 persons per acre threshold for review. The City was unable to determine consistency with...
### POLICY
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the ALUP using any of the mathematical population density approaches, including the applicants, as the project concentration or population density would exceed the 25 people per acre threshold in each instance. In addition, while the project would not result in any incompatible uses within one mile of Runway 7/25, the project would result in “General merchandise-retail,” “Food-retail,” “Eating and drinking,” and “Other retail trade” located within the F(APR) just outside the one mile marker from the end of Runway 7/25 and is subject to ALUC review. As such, the project has been conditioned to be referred to the ALUC for review (MM LU 6.1). Subsequent to the Draft EIR public review period, if the applicant consulted the ALUC, and through a public hearing process, the ALUC determined that the project is consistent with the ALUP, the project would be consistent with this policy. However, in the event that approval is not granted by the ALUC, the project shall be returned to the City Council for further discretionary review. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. So additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.4, SE 9.1, SE 9.2, and SE 9.5.</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. See discussion in SE 9.4. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.4, SE 9.1, SE 9.2, and SE 9.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SE 9.5 Limitations on Density

The City shall establish and maintain standards in its zoning ordinance for density limitations for development near the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. These standards should comply with the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan and should specify the density considered compatible in each zone. Proposed developments that require ALUC review pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan shall be referred to the ALUC for review.  

#### Consistent with mitigation

See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 1.4, SE 9.1, SE 9.2, and SE 9.3.

---

### Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities

#### Objective: To minimize injuries, illnesses, loss of life and property, and economic and social disruption due to potential upsets associated with the storage, use, handling, and transport of hazardous materials, and to ensure proper oversight of hazardous waste sites within the city.

#### SE 10.3 Hazard Assessment Required for Hazardous Materials Facilities

For all new hazardous facilities, and for any proposed substantial increase in intensity of use for existing hazardous facilities, the City shall require a hazard assessment to be submitted as part of the development application. The hazard assessment shall identify the risks posed by the new or expanded facility and the geographical extent of significant risk.  

#### Consistent with mitigation

A site-specific evaluation of the project regarding electromagnetic fields of the overhead electrical transmission and distribution lines was conducted. The site has electric lines along the east, south and west property boundary. The 66 kV transmission line that currently runs along the west side of Glen Annie Road, the east boundary of the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>site, and turns west down Hollister Avenue, on the south boundary of the project site, would be relocated to the west and north boundaries of the site. The second aboveground 66 kV transmission line along the west side of Glen Annie Road would continue to run south along Glen Annie Road on the east boundary of the project site to Hollister Avenue, where it is under-grounded and travels east toward UCSB. All 16 kV distribution lines would be undergrounded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMF was modeled based on the anticipated configuration of the transmission and distribution lines. The modeling determined EMF exceeding 2 mG from the transmission lines would partially occur within the following buildings:

1. Residential Buildings 13, 15 & 17
2. Commercial Buildings G

Although at the maximum worst-case scenario EMF in Building G could reach 15 mG. As there is no significant scientifically verifiable relationship between EMF exposure and negative health consequences, there would be potential exposure to 2 mG of EMF within these structures, which is considered less than significant. The project has been conditioned to provide an EMF Disclosure Statement and EMF Information Package to potential tenants/buyers (MM HAZ 4-1) and to insert language into the final California Department of Real Estate Subdivision Public Report (MM HAZ 4-2). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

**SE 10.5 Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities.** The City shall consider the exposure of new development to risk of hazardous materials accidents and exposure as a part of its project and environmental review processes and require any appropriate mitigation measures. The City shall not allow any new residential development near hazardous facilities if these residences would be exposed to unacceptable and unmitigable risk.

Consistent with mitigation. The project could store and use regulated hazardous materials onsite including, without limitation, pool maintenance chemicals, fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, insecticides, and lubricants, and etcetera. The project has been conditioned to prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Plan to the satisfaction of the Santa Barbara County Fire Department Protection District (MM HAZ 3-1).

The project would also be constructed adjacent to the UPRR transit corridor, which would place residential structures and persons in proximity to the UPRR tracks creating a potential risk of upset associated
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with derailment, chemical leaks and fire. While the probability of an accident is very low, the project has been conditioned to require a Buyer Notification regarding risk of upset (MM HAZ 6-1) and to develop safe-harbor and/or evacuation procedures (MM HAZ 6-2). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VISUAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT

VH 1: SCENIC VIEWS

**Objective:** To identify, protect, and enhance Goleta’s scenic resources and protect views or vistas of these resources from public and private areas.

**VH 1.1: Scenic Resources.** An essential aspect of Goleta’s character is derived from the various scenic resources within and around the city. Views of these resources from public and private areas contribute to the overall attractiveness of the city and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents, visitors, and workforce. The City shall support the protection and preservation of the following scenic resources:

1. The open waters of the Pacific Ocean/Santa Barbara Channel, with the Channel Islands visible in the distance.
2. Goleta’s Pacific shoreline, including beaches, dunes, lagoons, coastal bluffs, and open coastal mesas.
3. Goleta and Devereux Sloughs.
4. Creeks and the vegetation associated with their riparian corridors.
5. Agricultural areas, including orchards, lands in vegetable or other crop production, and fallow agricultural lands.
7. Prominent natural landforms, such as the foothills and the Santa Ynez Mountains.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project site is highly visible from Hollister Avenue but is only briefly visible from the Glen Annie/Storke Road/US 101 Overpass. Avenue. Hollister Avenue is designated as a Local Scenic Corridor in VH 2.1, and views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from Hollister Avenue are considered scenic views that warrant protection in VH 1.1 and VH 1.4. In particular, the views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection is identified in Figure 6-1 as a scenic view to be protected. The project’s main entrance driveway would align with Marketplace Drive and its commercial component would be bifurcated along this driveway providing a wide view corridor through the project site that would maintain direct northern views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection. In total, three view corridors have been incorporated into the project design.

While, the project would not completely obstruct views of the Santa Ynez Mountains across the site, the project would substantially impair or block northeasterly views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from eastbound Hollister Avenue, including the elimination of ridgeline views.

The project would also substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality from the public Local Scenic Corridor. The project site has frontage on Hollister Avenue, a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designated Local Scenic Corridor. While the project site exhibits no discernable topographic relief, contains no significant geologic features, and no visually significant vegetation, important visual qualities are experienced from the Local Scenic Corridor. Indeed, the relatively flat unobstructed topographic profile of the undeveloped portion of the project site provides views of an expansive open visual character in the midst of an otherwise developed urban surroundings. Additionally, the project site provides short-range contiguous open area visual qualities and long-range public views of the Santa Ynez Mountains visual qualities. These elements contributed heavily to the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor designation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While some of the structural commercial and all of the residential development would be setback from Hollister Avenue, the expansive open visual character would be substantially degraded relative to the existing setting. The existing visual character of the site allows short-range uninterrupted views of approximately 850 feet to 1,050 feet deep into the undeveloped portion of the project site. Structural build-out would be dominated by retail commercial development along Hollister Avenue. Buildings A, B, H, &amp; I would be the first line of development visible from the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor. Buildings A and H would be the closest to the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor, whereas Building A is setback 24.5 feet from Hollister Avenue and Building H is setback 20 feet from Hollister Avenue (note Mitigation Measure HAZ 5-2 would require compliance with a 25-foot setback from the centerline of a high-pressure pipeline effectively increasing the setback to 30 feet for both Building A &amp; H). While Buildings B and I would be setback further from Buildings A and H, collectively these four buildings would significantly alter the existing visual character of the undeveloped portion of the project site from the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor by interfering with short-range views into the project site starting at a distance of 20 to 30 feet from Hollister Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From certain vantage points along the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Westar Mixed-Use Village Final EIR 4.9-93 July 2012*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor, these buildings could block the upwards of 97% of the short-range views into the project site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buildings C, D, E, F & G would provide a second line of development visible from Hollister Avenue that would also contribute to the degraded quality of the existing visual character of the undeveloped portion of the project site, but not to the same magnitude of the development adjacent to the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor. Collectively, construction of these buildings would substantially degrade the aforementioned open visual character in the foreground to a point where it would no longer be identifiable and would result in a significant impact on aesthetics and visual resources.

The site contains existing uninterrupted public views of the Santa Ynez Mountains. Although three scenic view corridors were incorporated into the design of the project, sweeping public views of Santa Ynez Mountains from the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor would be interrupted by the development varying in height from 24 to 35 feet. While the Santa Ynez Mountains can be viewed from certain vantage points through the three scenic view corridors, the long-range visual qualities of the Santa Ynez Mountains as a backdrop to the project site would be substantially limited, obstructed, or otherwise compromised by the configuration of the development. The dominant feature will be the commercial development, thus impeding the visual character and qualities experienced from the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor.

Collectively, construction of these buildings would substantially degrade the existing expansive open visual character and short-range and long range visual qualities and redefine the visual character of the project site experienced from the Hollister Avenue Local Scenic Corridor; however the project has been designed in accordance with VH 1.5 to protect the open space as much as possible. These design aspects used to minimize impacts to these scenic resources included limiting the height of the buildings on Hollister Avenue to 24 feet and limiting the size of the
### POLICY

- buildings on Hollister avenue to 7,000 and 10,000 square feet, clustering building sites and structures, and providing one shared main vehicular access at the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection to minimize curb cuts. The project lighting, landscaping and coloring will be further reviewed by the Design Review Board to minimize lighting intensity, provide screening and minimizing view blockages and to select colors and materials that harmonize with the surrounding landscape and development. The project has been conditioned to preserve and protect the ridgeline views and limit degradation of the character and visual quality of the site to the maximum extent feasible while still allowing development onsite.

- Conditions include receiving Final approval from the Design Review Board (MM AES 1-1), verifying height of structural development (MM AES 1-2), screening utilities (MM AES 3-3), undergrounding distribution lines (MM AES 3-4), preparing a composite utility plan (MM AES 3-5), provision of trash/recycling enclosures (MM AES 3-6), landscaping requirements (MM AES 3-7), Hollister Avenue landscaping restrictions (MM AES 5-1), exterior lighting requirements (MM AES 9-1). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with the compatibility portion of this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.8, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 2.1, VH 2.2, VH 2.3 and VH 2.6

### VH 1.4 Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views

- Views of mountains and foothills from public areas shall be protected. View protection associated with development that may affect views of mountains or foothills should be accomplished first through site selection and then by use of design alternatives that enhance, rather than obstruct or degrade, such views. To minimize structural intrusion into the skyline, the following development practices shall be used where appropriate:

  a. Limitations on the height and size of structures.
  b. Limitations on the height of exterior walls (including retaining walls) and fences.
  c. Stepping of buildings so that the heights of building elements are lower near the street and increase with distance from the public viewing area. Increased setbacks along

**Consistent with mitigation.** See discussion and mitigations in VH 1.1.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.8, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.5, VH 2.1, VH 2.2, VH 2.3 and VH 2.6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major roadways to preserve views and create an attractive visual corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Downcast, fully shielded, full cut off lighting of the minimum intensity needed for the purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Limitations on removal of native vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Use of landscaping for screening purposes and/or minimizing view blockage as applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Revegetation of disturbed areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Limitations on the use of reflective materials and colors for roofs, walls (including retaining walls), and fences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Selection of colors and materials that harmonize with the surrounding landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Clustering of building sites and structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VH 1.5 Protection of Open Space Views.** Views of open space, including agricultural lands, from public areas shall be protected. View protection associated with development should be accomplished first through site selection and then by use of design alternatives that enhance rather than obstruct or degrade such views. To minimize impacts to these scenic resources, the following development practices shall be used, where appropriate:

a. Limitations on the height and size of structures.

b. Clustering of building sites and structures.

c. Shared vehicular access to minimize curb cuts.

da. Downcast, fully shielded, full cut off lighting of the minimum intensity needed for the purpose.

e. Use of landscaping for screening purposes and/or minimizing view blockage as applicable.

f. Selection of colors and materials that harmonize with the surrounding landscape.

**Consistent with mitigation.** See discussion and mitigations in VH 1.1.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.8, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 2.1, VH 2.2, VH 2.3 and VH 2.6

**VH 1.6 Preservation of Natural Landforms.** Natural landforms shall be protected. Protection associated with development should be accomplished first through site selection to protect natural landforms and then by use of alternatives that enhance and incorporate natural landforms in the design. To minimize alteration of natural landforms and ensure that development is subordinate to surrounding natural features such as mature trees, native vegetation, drainage courses, prominent slopes, and bluffs, the following development practices shall be used, where appropriate:

**Consistent.** The site topography generally slopes evenly north to south with gradients typically ranging from 1 to 10 percent. No significant natural slopes are present within or immediately adjacent to the site. The project would require changes and/or modifications to existing topography. The primary modifications would be removal of the existing engineered cut in the north portion of the project site. The overall changes would result in a lesser slope across the project site.
### POLICY

| a. Limit grading for all development including structures, access roads, and driveways. Minimize the length of access roads and driveways and follow the natural contour of the land. |
| b. Blend graded slopes with the natural topography. |
| c. On slopes, step buildings to conform to site topography. |
| d. Minimize use of retaining walls. |
| e. Minimize vegetation clearance for fuel management. |
| f. Cluster building sites and structures. |
| g. Share vehicular access to minimize curb cuts. |

While the amount of grading estimated is substantial (49,100 cubic yards of cut and 48,800 cubic yards of compacted fill, with a potential net export of 300 cubic yards of dirt from the project site), the project grading would be blended to follow the natural north/south slopes and would step the residential buildings from the commercial buildings. The use of retaining walls is minimized considering the size of the project, but some retaining walls will be necessary to provide for circulation. The circulation pattern and access would minimize curb cuts.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

### VH 2: LOCAL SCENIC CORRIDORS

**Objective:** To protect and enhance the visual character and public views within and from Goleta’s scenic corridors and locations from which scenic vistas can be enjoyed.

**VH 2.1 Designated Scenic Corridors.** The Scenic Resources Map in Figure 6-1 identifies corridors that pass through, or provide visual access to, areas of high scenic value. These corridors, or segments of corridors, include but are not limited to the following:

- b. Cathedral Oaks Road.
- c. Hollister Avenue.
- d. Los Carneros Road.
- e. Fairview Avenue.
- f. Calle Real.

Consistent with mitigation. See discussion and mitigations in VH 1.1.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.8, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 2.2, VH 2.3 and VH 2.6.

**VH 2.2 Preservation of Scenic Corridors.** The aesthetic qualities of scenic corridors shall be preserved through retention of the general character of significant natural features; views of the ocean, foothills, and mountainous areas; and open space associated with recreational and agricultural areas including orchards, prominent vegetation, and historic structures. If landscaping is used to add visual interest or for screening, care should be taken to prevent a wall-like appearance. Bridges, culverts, drainage ditches and other roadway ancillary elements should be appropriately designed; side slopes and earthen berms adjacent to roadways should be natural in appearance.

Consistent with mitigation. See discussion and mitigations in VH 1.1.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.8, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 2.1, VH 2.3 and VH 2.6.

**VH 2.3 Development Projects Along Scenic Corridors.** Development adjacent to scenic corridors should not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas. To ensure visual compatibility with the scenic qualities, the following practices shall be used, where appropriate:

Consistent with mitigation. See discussion and mitigations in VH 1.1.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policy LU 1.8, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 2.1, VH 2.2, VH 2.6, VH 5.4 and VH 5.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Incorporate natural features in design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use landscaping for screening purposes and/or for minimizing view blockage as applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Minimize vegetation removal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Limit the height and size of structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Cluster building sites and structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Limit grading for development including structures, access roads, and driveways. Minimize the length of access roads and driveways and follow the natural contour of the land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Preserve historical structures or sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Plant and preserve trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Minimize use of signage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Provide site-specific visual assessments, including use of story poles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Provide a similar level of architectural detail on all elevations visible from scenic corridors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Place existing overhead utilities and all new utilities underground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Establish setbacks along major roadways to help protect views and create an attractive scenic corridor. On flat sites, step the heights of buildings so that the height of building elements is lower close to the street and increases with distance from the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VH 2.6 Gateways to the City.** The City should create prominent gateways at key entrances to Goleta. Features such as specimen trees, accent plantings, signage, public art, monuments, decorative pavement, and pedestrian amenities may be used to emphasize and enhance entries to the city including but not limited to:

a. Hollister Avenue at the eastern and western city boundaries.
b. Cathedral Oaks at the eastern and western city boundaries.
c. Old Town—Hollister Avenue at Fairview Avenue and SR-217.
d. Glen Annie Road, Los Carneros Road, Fairview Avenue, and Cambridge Drive at Cathedral Oaks Road.
e. Calle Real and Patterson Avenue.

**Consistent.** The Glen Annie/Storke Road/US 101 Overpass is also identified in Figure 6-1 as a scenic view to be protected and as a gateway to the City in VH 2.6. However, due to topography and angle of view, the project would not impact coastal plain views from the Glen Annie/Storke Road/US 101 Overpass. Nor would the project interfere with the City creating a prominent gateway at this key entrance. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.

**VH 3: COMMUNITY CHARACTER**

**Objective:** To protect and enhance Goleta’s visual character.

**VH 3.1: Community Design Character.** The visual character of Goleta is derived from the natural landscape and the built environment. The city’s **Consistent with mitigation.** The intent of this policy is to ensure that new development is designed in a manner to be consistent with...
### POLICY

- agricultural heritage, open spaces, views of natural features, established low-density residential neighborhoods, and small-scale development with few visually prominent buildings contribute to this character. Residential, commercial, and industrial development should acknowledge and respect the desired aspects of Goleta’s visual character and make a positive contribution to the city through exemplary design.

### DISCUSSION

- the City’s visual character as characterized by views of open spaces, natural features, low density neighborhoods, and few prominent buildings and structures. The overall design of the project is compatible with this community character. The project has been conditioned to contribute to the community’s design character. Conditions include receiving Final approval from the Design Review Board (MM AES 1-1), verifying height of structural development (MM AES 1-2), screening utilities (MM AES 3-3), undergrounding distribution lines (MM AES 3-4), preparing a composite utility plan (MM AES 3-5), provision of trash/recycling enclosures (MM AES 3-6), landscaping requirements (MM AES 3-7), Hollister Avenue landscaping restrictions (MM AES 5-1), exterior lighting requirements (MM AES 9-1). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policies LU 1.2, LU 1.8, LU 2.3, LU 3.1, LU 3.3, Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 1.5, VH 2.1, VH 2.2, VH 2.3 and VH 2.6

### VH 3.2: Neighborhood Identity.

- The unique qualities and character of each neighborhood shall be preserved and strengthened. Neighborhood context and scale shall be maintained. New development shall be compatible with existing architectural styles of adjacent development, except where poor quality design exists.

### Consistent with mitigation.

- This policy, and VH 3.3 and VH 3.4 are to ensure that the architectural design of new development is compatible with the City’s visual character.

- The project site is located within an urban area containing a mix of development including retail, light industrial, commercial, offices, and residential housing. The project is a mixed-use residential and commercial development. The project has been designed to connect an existing residential neighborhood to a new residential neighborhood, preserving the existing character, and to transition the residential uses to existing and new commercial uses along the Hollister Avenue corridor.

- The project’s design has been presented before the Design Review Board on four-five separate occasions, spanning November 2009 to November 2011. At each appearance the board members complimented the project on the quality of the site, architectural and landscape design. Additional appearances before the Design Review Board would further study the architectural (including materials and colors),
### POLICY

landscaping, lighting, utility screening, and other design components of the project.

The Aesthetic discussion in the EIR found that the scale, site design, mass, and height of the project along with its architectural theme would be compatible with that visual character of the surrounding built environment. The project design is sensitive to the adjacency of the structures to surrounding uses, particularly along its eastern border. Although the structures may be at a different scale than some existing structures to the west of the site, the development would be generally compatible with the overall character of the Hollister Avenue corridor.

The project balances compatibility with the 60-unit Pacific Glen two-story residential development and the two-story, tilt-up Storke/Hollister Research Center along Glen Annie Road, the Camino Real Marketplace along Hollister Avenue and single-story office buildings a two-story office building and an animal hospital along Santa Felicia Drive. The largest grade change occurs between the western property line and Santa Felicia Drive. Project landscaping and screening along the western property line differs from the appearance of the Santa Felicia Drive light industrial and research park developments, it is not visually incompatible with these developments. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with policies VH 3.2, VH 3.3, and VH 3.4.

The project has been conditioned to further integrate the project with the surrounding land developments. Conditions include receiving Final approval from the Design Review Board (MM AES 1-1), verifying height of structural development (MM AES 1-2), screening utilities (MM AES 3-3), undergrounding distribution lines (MM AES 3-4), preparing a composite utility plan (MM AES 3-5), provision of trash/recycling enclosures (MM AES 3-6), landscaping requirements (MM AES 3-7), Hollister Avenue landscaping restrictions (MM AES 5-1), exterior lighting requirements (MM AES 9-1). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

### DISCUSSION

#### VH 3.3: Site Design.

The city’s visual character shall be enhanced through appropriate site design. Site plans shall provide for buildings, structures, and consistent with mitigation. See discussion and mitigation in VH 3.2. See additional discussion of consistency with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uses that are subordinate to the natural topography, existing vegetation, and drainage courses; adequate landscaping; adequate vehicular circulation and parking; adequate pedestrian circulation; and provision and/or maintenance of solar access.</td>
<td>Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 3.2, VH 3.3, and VH 3.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH 3.4: Building Design.</strong> The city’s visual character shall be enhanced through development of structures that are appropriate in scale and orientation and that use high quality, durable materials. Structures shall incorporate architectural styles, landscaping, and amenities that are compatible with and complement surrounding development.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See discussion and mitigation in VH 3.2. See additional discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resource policy VH 3.2, VH 3.3, and VH 3.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH 3.5: Pedestrian-Oriented Design.</strong> The city’s visual character shall be enhanced through provision of aesthetically pleasing pedestrian connections within and between neighborhoods, recreational facilities, shopping, workplaces, and other modes of transportation, including bicycles and transit.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project includes landscaped green spaces and pedestrian walkways throughout the site and a walking/jogging trail. The project has been designed with features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking. Internal pedestrian walkways and bicycle access is provided within the site and to adjacent commercial and other developments. The project also includes a fully improved bus stop to encourage use of public transit. Collectively, these features facilitate alternative modes of transportation to jobs, shopping, and other activity centers as well as for recreation. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH 3.6 Public Spaces.</strong> The city’s visual character shall be enhanced by creating well-defined community outdoor gathering places that incorporate focal points such as parks, fountains, public art, and/or landscape features. Small public open spaces should be provided in each neighborhood either through acquisition in existing neighborhoods or by design in new neighborhood developments in order to establish community focal points.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project has been designed to provide an open space area, accessible to the general public, between the main drive and the live/work units on the project’s Glen Annie Road frontage. This public facility would not include active recreation amenities; but would include landscaped open play and paved gathering areas. A pedestrian walking/jogging trail, surfaced with decomposed granite, would be provided around the perimeter of the residential area. The project has also been designed to provide common open spaces and gathering areas in the residential and commercial components of the project providing areas to take in a sense of place and varying scales. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VH 4: DESIGN REVIEW**

**Objective:** To preserve, protect, and enhance Goleta’s character through high quality design.

**VH 4.4: Multifamily Residential Areas.** In addition to the items listed in Subpolicy VH 4.3, the following standards shall be applicable to multifamily residential development (see related Subpolicies LU 1.9 and LU 2.3):  

<p>| Consistent with mitigation. The residential portion of the project would be developed to R-MD standards at a density of 20 residential units per acre while maintaining an open space and landscaped area of 42.65 percent. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Roof lines should be varied to create visual interest.</td>
<td>The project includes 19 residential buildings in four building types with varied rooflines, building articulation and architectural details that help avoid the appearance of monolithic structures while distinguishing individual units from one another. An extensive, integrated landscape plan also breaks up the developments mass and scale. The project common open space is evenly spaced throughout the residential development and provides amenities to different age groups. The project is located next to a less dense existing residential development and does provide a “Mini or Pocket Park” along Glen Annie Road which would be available for public use. This public facility would not include active recreation amenities, but it would include landscaped open play and paved gathering areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Large building masses should be avoided, and where feasible, several smaller buildings are encouraged rather than one large structure. Multiple structures should be clustered to maximize open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Multifamily residential developments shall include common open space that is appropriately located, is functional, and provides amenities for different age groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Where multifamily developments are located next to less dense existing residential development, open space should provide a buffer along the perimeter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Individual units shall be distinguishable from each other. Long continuous wall planes and parking corridors shall be avoided. Three-dimensional façades are encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Extensive landscaping is encouraged to soften building edges and provide a transition between adjacent properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Storage areas for recycling and trash shall be covered and conveniently located for all residents and screened with landscaping or walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Safe and aesthetically pleasing pedestrian access that is physically separated from vehicular access shall be provided in all new residential developments whenever feasible. Transitional spaces, including landscape or hardscape elements, should be provided from the pedestrian access to the main entrance. Main entrances should not open directly onto driveways or streets. Safe bicycle access should be considered in all residential developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project's design has been presented before the Design Review Board on four separate occasions, spanning November 2009 to July-November 2011. At each appearance, the board members complimented the project on the quality of the site, architectural and landscape design. Additional appearances before the Design Review Board would further study the architectural (including materials and colors), landscaping, lighting, utility screening, and other design components of the project.

Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policies LU 1.2, LU 1.8, LU 1.10 and LU 2.3.
VH 4.5 Retail Commercial Areas. The following standards shall be applicable to retail commercial development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Buildings and structures shall be designed to be compatible with adjacent development relative to size, bulk, and scale.</td>
<td>Consistent. The commercial portion of the project would be developed to C-C standards. The commercial component does not exceed the recommended maximum (average) structure height of 35 feet, nor does the live/work component exceed the maximum residential density of 12 units per acre. In addition, the commercial component does not exceed the maximum building coverage of 0.30, but exceeds the minimum open space and landscaping of 0.05 and onsite parking requirements of the IZO SC zone district. The project would require setback modifications from the requirements of the SC zone district for every commercial lot to achieve a site plan that appears to be one collective shopping center on one lot and would be superior to an alternative site plan that meets all of the development standards, but separates the commercial buildings from one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Where appropriate, buildings should be sited at or near the front setback line to project a desirable architectural image contiguous to the street and to promote pedestrian access.</td>
<td>The Aesthetic discussion in the EIR found that the scale, site design, mass, and height of the project along with its architectural theme would be compatible with that visual character of the surrounding built environment. The project design is sensitive to the adjacency of the structures to surrounding uses, particularly along its eastern border. Although the structures may be at a different scale than some existing structures to the west of the site, the development would be generally compatible with the overall character of the Hollister Avenue corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Quality architectural design shall be maintained through the use of detailing and high quality, durable materials. Blank wall planes shall be avoided.</td>
<td>The project has been designed with features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking. Internal pedestrian walkways and bicycle access is provided within the site and to adjacent commercial and other developments. The project also includes a fully improved bus stop to encourage use of public transit. Collectively, these features facilitate alternative modes of transportation to jobs, shopping, and other activity centers as well as for recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Safe, convenient pedestrian and bicycle access shall be provided and encouraged via continuous sidewalks; bike lanes; and sufficient, secure, and protected bicycle parking. Landscaping should be used where possible to buffer pedestrians and cyclists from traffic. Where feasible, other pedestrian amenities such as outdoor seating shall be provided.</td>
<td>The project’s design has been presented before the Design Review Board on four-five separate occasions, spanning November 2009 to July-November 2011. At each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Commercial displays, outdoor dining, and outdoor shopping cart storage shall not encroach into pedestrian accessways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Shopping cart returns should be conveniently located and screened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Public transit shall be encouraged through effective placement of stops for local and regional transit services. Existing stops shall be upgraded as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Landscaping, including canopy trees, shall be used extensively to unify the structural development, reinforce the pedestrian scale, minimize heat and glare from pavement, and break up expanses of parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Shared vehicular access shall be considered to minimize the number of driveways and curb cuts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Where appropriate, parking lots should be located behind, beside, or beneath buildings to minimize visibility. Where buildings do not screen parking, landscaping, berms, or low walls shall be used to screen cars from adjacent roadways and other developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Parking lots should provide adequate space for maneuverability and safety. Angled parking spaces are encouraged rather than 90-degree parking stalls to increase visibility for drivers and pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**POLICY**

| l. | Loading areas and recycling and trash facilities shall be easily accessed and shall be screened from view with landscaping, fencing, or walls. Adjacent uses shall be considered when such areas are sited. |
| m. | Roof mounted equipment shall be screened and considered as part of the structure for height calculations. |

**DISCUSSION**

Appearance the board members complimented the project on the quality of the site, architectural and landscape design. Additional appearances before the Design Review Board would further study the architectural (including materials and colors), landscaping, lighting, utility screening, and other design components of the project.

The project design has contemplated the convenient location of shopping cart returns which do not encroach into pedestrian accessways and loading areas and recycling/trash facilities that are easily accessed and screened.

Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use policies LU 3.1 and LU 3.3.

---

**VH 4.9: Landscape Design.** Landscaping shall be considered and designed as an integral part of development, not relegated to remaining portions of a site following placement of buildings, parking, or vehicular access. Landscaping shall conform to the following standards:

- a. Landscaping that conforms to the natural topography and protects existing specimen trees is encouraged.
- b. Any specimen trees removed shall be replaced with a similar size tree or with a tree deemed appropriate by the City.
- c. Landscaping shall emphasize the use of native and drought-tolerant vegetation and should include a range and density of plantings including trees, shrubs, groundcover, and vines of various heights and species.
- d. The use of invasive plants shall be prohibited.
- e. Landscaping shall be incorporated into the design to soften building masses, reinforce pedestrian scale, and provide screening along public streets and off-street parking areas.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project has been designed with an extensive, integrated landscape plan that breaks up the developments mass and scale. The project would result in direct removal of a single mature coast live oak tree. However, the project has been conditioned to incorporate 10 1-gallon oaks or 3 24-inch box oaks into the landscape plan (MM BIO 3-1). The project has also been conditioned to minimize the use of outdoor water by requiring the use of native and/or drought tolerant landscaping, water-conserving irrigation, and recycled water, grouping plant material by water needs, limiting turn and slopes, mulching and utilizing soil moisture sensing devices (MM WS 1-2). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resources Element VH 4.4 and VH 4.5 and VH 4.9.

---

**VH 4.10 Streetscape and Frontage Design.** A unified streetscape shall be created to improve the interface between pedestrians and vehicles. The following design elements shall be incorporated where feasible:

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project would result in a new streetscape along the northern side of Hollister Avenue between Glen Annie Road and almost to Santa Felicia Drive. The project has prepared a landscape plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Abundant street trees and landscaped medians.</td>
<td>plan, which will be subject to review and approval of the Design Review Board, in consultation with Community Services, to ensure a unified streetscape consistent with policy VH 4.10 and TE 10.4. Incorporation of recommended MM AES 5-1 would help to avoid blocking of northerly views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Landscaping that buffers pedestrians and bicyclists from traffic without creating site distance conflicts.</td>
<td>See discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policies TE 6.4, TE 7.12 and TE 10.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Coordination of landscaping within the public right-of-way and adjacent development to provide an integrated street frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provision of street furniture including benches, planter seating, trash containers, and pedestrian scale light fixtures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Use of pavement treatments and decorative tree wells.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Accent planting, textured paving, and specimen trees used to establish identities at building entries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Traffic control and utility hardware such as backflow devices, traffic control cabinets, cable television boxes, and air vacuum and release enclosures shall be screened from view and colored to blend in with the surroundings. Such hardware should be placed outside sidewalks and away from intersections to the extent feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VH 4.11 Parking Lots.** Parking lots shall be adequately designed and landscaped. The following standards shall apply (see related Policy TE 9):  

| a. Adequate parking requirements shall be established for all zone districts and conditionally permitted uses. | Consistent. See discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policy TE 9.1. |
| b. Adequate parking space dimensions and aisle widths shall be established. | |
| c. Angled parking spaces are encouraged in order to maximize visibility for drivers and pedestrians. Retail parking lot design that includes 90-degree parking spaces is discouraged. | |
| d. Pedestrian circulation shall be adequate, clearly delineated, and integrated with internal vehicle circulation to allow for safe and convenient pedestrian links from parking areas to building entrances. Planting strips should be used between traffic zones and sidewalks wherever possible. | |
| e. Retail parking lots shall provide for adequate shopping cart storage that is adequately screened. | |
| f. Parking lot landscaping shall provide for adequate visual relief, screening, and shade. Adequate tree density shall be established and shall include approximately one tree for | |
4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>every four parking spaces. Deciduous trees in parking lots are discouraged due to the visual effects of loss of canopy.</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. The project’s lighting design has been conceptually presented before the Design Review Board. Additional appearances before the Design Review Board would further study the architectural style and scale of the lighting fixtures, the amount of project lighting as well as glare and spillover presented in a photometric plan (AES 1-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Parking lot lighting shall be considered relative to the selection and location of parking lot trees and their height at maturity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Shared parking arrangements are encouraged where neighboring uses have different peak use periods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Permeable parking surfaces and grass-incorporated paving systems are encouraged to reduce stormwater runoff. Water quality protection measures such as storm drain filters should be used to minimize pollutants that would result in impacts to downstream water bodies or habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH 4.12 Lighting.</strong> Outdoor lighting fixtures shall be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. The following standards shall apply:</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. No signs of any type are approved with this project. The project has been conditioned for all signs require a separate sign permit and Design Review Board (AES 3-9) and for the preparation of an overall sign plan (AES 3-10). The signage would conform to policy VH 4.13 and the Goleta Municipal Code sign regulations Sign Ordinance. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Outdoor lighting shall be the minimum number of fixtures and intensity needed for the intended purpose. Fixtures shall be fully shielded and have full cut off lights to minimize visibility from public viewing areas and prevent light pollution into residential areas or other sensitive uses such as wildlife habitats or migration routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Direct upward light emission shall be avoided to protect views of the night sky.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Light fixtures used in new development shall be appropriate to the architectural style and scale and compatible with the surrounding area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH 4.13 Signage.</strong> Signs shall maintain and enhance the city’s appearance through design, character, location, number, type, quality of materials, size, height, and illumination. The following standards shall apply:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Signs shall minimize possible adverse effects on nearby public and private property, including streets, roads, and highways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Signs shall be integrated into the site and structural design, shall be compatible with their surroundings, and shall clearly inform pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists of business names.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Signs shall not detract from views or the architectural quality of buildings, structures,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and/or the streetscape. Protrusion of signs and/or sign structures into the skyline should be minimized to avoid a cluttered appearance.

d. Signs shall be of appropriate and high quality style, color, materials, size, height, and illumination.

e. Lighting is considered an integral part of sign design and shall be controlled to prevent glare and spillage onto adjacent areas.

f. Internally illuminated cabinet or can signs shall be prohibited.

g. Billboards and other off-premises advertising signs shall be prohibited.

**VH 4.14: Utilities.** New development projects shall be required to place new utility lines underground. Existing overhead utility lines should be placed underground when feasible. Undergrounding of utility hardware is encouraged. Any aboveground utility hardware, such as water meters, electrical transformers, or backflow devices, shall not inhibit line of sight or encroach into public walkways and, where feasible, should be screened from public view by methods including, but not limited to, appropriate paint color, landscaping, and/or walls.

Consistent with mitigation. Two sets of 66 kV overhead electrical transmission lines originate from the substation and travel north/south along the east property line at the project site. At the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Glen Annie Road the transmission lines diverge: one line continuing underground to the south and the second line continuing above ground along the site’s south property line on the north side of Hollister Avenue. The project would relocate the 66kV overhead transmission lines that run along the visually prominent north side of Hollister Avenue of the project site to the less visible northern and western property lines.

The project would require utilities to be installed on site. The project has been conditioned to screen utilities (MM AES 3-3), underground distribution lines (MM AES 3-4), and preparing a composite utility plan (MM AES 3-5). These conditions not only require undergrounding of all utility distribution lines but screening of all utility service connections and roof-mounted mechanical equipment to improve project aesthetics. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

**VH 4.15 Site-Specific Visual Assessments.** The use of story poles, physical or software-based models, photo-realistic visual simulations, perspectives, photographs, or other tools shall be required, when appropriate, to evaluate the visual effects of proposed development and demonstrate visual compatibility and impacts on scenic views.

Consistent. The applicant and EnviCom Corporation utilized software-based models and photo-realistic visual simulations to evaluate the visual effects of the proposed development and to demonstrate visual compatibility and impacts on scenic views. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and/or the streetscape. Protrusion of signs and/or sign structures into the skyline should be minimized to avoid a cluttered appearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Signs shall be of appropriate and high quality style, color, materials, size, height, and illumination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Lighting is considered an integral part of sign design and shall be controlled to prevent glare and spillage onto adjacent areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Internally illuminated cabinet or can signs shall be prohibited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Billboards and other off-premises advertising signs shall be prohibited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH 4.14: Utilities.</strong> New development projects shall be required to place new utility lines underground. Existing overhead utility lines should be placed underground when feasible. Undergrounding of utility hardware is encouraged. Any aboveground utility hardware, such as water meters, electrical transformers, or backflow devices, shall not inhibit line of sight or encroach into public walkways and, where feasible, should be screened from public view by methods including, but not limited to, appropriate paint color, landscaping, and/or walls.</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. Two sets of 66 kV overhead electrical transmission lines originate from the substation and travel north/south along the east property line at the project site. At the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Glen Annie Road the transmission lines diverge: one line continuing underground to the south and the second line continuing above ground along the site’s south property line on the north side of Hollister Avenue. The project would relocate the 66kV overhead transmission lines that run along the visually prominent north side of Hollister Avenue of the project site to the less visible northern and western property lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project would require utilities to be installed on site. The project has been conditioned to screen utilities (MM AES 3-3), underground distribution lines (MM AES 3-4), and preparing a composite utility plan (MM AES 3-5). These conditions not only require undergrounding of all utility distribution lines but screening of all utility service connections and roof-mounted mechanical equipment to improve project aesthetics. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VH 4.15 Site-Specific Visual Assessments.</strong> The use of story poles, physical or software-based models, photo-realistic visual simulations, perspectives, photographs, or other tools shall be required, when appropriate, to evaluate the visual effects of proposed development and demonstrate visual compatibility and impacts on scenic views.</td>
<td>Consistent. The applicant and EnviCom Corporation utilized software-based models and photo-realistic visual simulations to evaluate the visual effects of the proposed development and to demonstrate visual compatibility and impacts on scenic views. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY

**VH 4.16 Green Building.** The City encourages the incorporation of green building practices in design. Such practices may include the use of recycled materials, drought-tolerant and native plants, energy efficient features, water conservation, allowance for solar access, and permeable surfaces.

### DISCUSSION

**Consistent.** See discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 13.1, CE 13.2, CE 13.3, and CE 15.3. Visual and Historic Resources Element policy VH 4.11.

---

**Policy VH 5: Historic Resources**

**Objective:** To identify, protect, and encourage preservation of significant architectural, historic, and prehistoric sites, structures, and properties that comprise Goleta’s heritage.

**VH 5.2 Locally Significant Historic Resources.** Structures or sites, including landscaping, having special historic, aesthetic, or cultural value to Goleta shall be designated as **locally significant historic resources**. A locally significant historic resource may include those resources listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register for Historic Places, State Historic Landmarks, or the Santa Barbara County Landmarks/Places of Historical Merit inventories, as well as resources designated by the City. The City shall use the following eligibility criteria when considering a site or structure, including landscaping, for designation as a locally significant historic resource:

a. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, architectural, landscape architectural, or natural history.

b. It is identified with persons or events of local, state, or national history.

c. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction or is an example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

d. It represents works of a notable builder, designer, architect, or landscape architect.

e. It includes a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic, prehistoric, or scenic properties that are unified aesthetically.

f. It has a location with unique physical characteristics, including landscaping, or is a view or vista representing an established visual feature of a neighborhood or community.

g. It embodies elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship representing a significant structural, architectural, or landscape architectural achievement.

h. It reflects significant geographical patterns associated with different eras of settlement and growth.

i. It is one of a few remaining examples

**Consistent with mitigation.** See discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resources Element policies VH 5.4 and VH 5.6.
### POLICY

- possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural, landscape architectural, or historical type.
- It includes rare or specimen plant materials associated with a particular period or style of landscape history.

### DISCUSSION

Consistent with mitigation. See discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resources Element policies VH 5.2 and VH 5.6.

#### VH 5.4 Preservation of Historic Resources

Historic resources and the heritage they represent shall be protected, preserved, and enhanced to the fullest extent feasible. The City shall recognize, preserve and rehabilitate publicly owned historic resources and provide incentive programs to encourage the designation, protection, and preservation of privately owned historic resources. Various incentives or benefits to the property owner shall be considered, such as direct financial assistance, reduced permitting fees to upgrade structures, flexibility with regard to allowed uses, compliance with the State Historic Building Code rather than the Uniform Building Code, façade conservation easements, identification of grant sources, provision of information regarding rehabilitation loan financing, and tax advantages.

Consistent with mitigation.

- See discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resources Element policies VH 5.2 and VH 5.6.

#### VH 5.6 Demolition of Historic Structures

Structures proposed for demolition shall be subject to a Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 historical study. If a structure or site is determined important to the city’s heritage, preservation or relocation shall be pursued before demolition. In the event preservation or relocation is not feasible and/or demolition is deemed acceptable, the Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 historical study shall identify appropriate mitigation measures, which may include but not be limited to the following:

- a. Provide public notice of the availability of the structure through advertisements or other means.
- b. Salvage and reuse building elements that have value and may be irreplaceable such as cornices, columns, mantels, doors, hardware, and lighting fixtures.

Consistent with mitigation. Per the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, the project site contains a portion of the Southern Pacific Railroad (engineered cut representing the former site of a portion of the Southern Pacific Railroad) as a Local Historic Landmark as identified with map number 45 on Table 6-1 and Figure 6-2. The project would result in the elimination of this historical resource.

The applicant submitted a Historical Resources Management Report to assess the historical significance of the former SPRR railroad cut (Post/Hazeltine). The Post/Hazeltine report concluded that the railroad cut does not merit designation as a locally significant resource, nor does it meet the criteria for listing on the State or National registers.

The Post/Hazeltine report was peer reviewed (Envicom Corporation), and the peer review assessment disagrees with the Post/Hazeltine conclusions and asserts that the railroad cut does qualify for designation as a locally significant resource per criteria a, b and i of VH 5.2 and may also be eligible for listing on the State and National registers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy VH 5.6 provides for the demolition of historic resources. A Phase 1 historical study has been prepared for the historic resource by the applicant, and a Phase 2 historical study including mitigation measures was prepared through the peer review. Preservation of the entire historical resource is not feasible. As the historical resource is a cut grade, relocation is not feasible. As preservation or relocation of the historical resource is not feasible, the project has been conditioned to allow the demolition of the historic resource. Conditions include Preparation of a Historic American Engineering Record (MM CR 1-1), surveying the perimeter of the alignment and filling the alignment with contrasting materials and installing a plaque and/or information board (MM CR 1-2), submit an street name applicant with historically appropriate street names (MM CR 1-3). Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy. See discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resources Element policies VH 5.2 and VH 5.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT**

Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System

**Objectives:** To create and maintain a balanced and integrated transportation system to support the mobility needs of Goleta’s residents and workforce, with choice of bus transit, bicycle, and pedestrian as well as private automobile modes. To reduce the percentage of peak-hour person-trips that are made by automobile and provide the facilities that will enable diversion of trips from automobiles to other modes. To develop, maintain, and operate a balanced, safe, and efficient multimodal transportation system to serve all persons, special-needs populations, and activities in the community.

**TE 1.6 Development Review.** As a condition of approval of new non-residential projects, the City may require developers to provide improvements that will reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles. These improvements may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Preferential parking spaces for carpools.
- Bicycle storage, parking spaces, and shower facilities for employees.
- Bus turnouts and shelters at bus stops.
- Other improvements as may be appropriate to the site.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project has been designed with features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking. Internal pedestrian walkways and bicycle access is provided within the site and to adjacent commercial and other developments. The project also includes a fully improved bus stop to encourage use of public transit. Collectively, these features facilitate alternative modes of transportation to jobs, shopping, and other activity centers as well as for recreation.

The project has been conditioned to prepare an Alternative Transportation/Transportation...
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**POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Management Program (MM AQ 2-1) which would include the following elements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The applicant shall contact the Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) to identify appropriate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs that are available to serve both patients and employees. Notice of all available TDM programs shall be given to all new employees when they are hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Notice of MTD bus routes and schedules shall be posted and maintained up-to-date in a central location(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Separate male and female shower facilities shall be provided onsite and be available for use during and after work hours for all employees. Notice of these facilities shall be provided to all new employees when hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. All employees shall be advised on any ride sharing program or similar successor program administered by the Santa Barbara Association of Governments. The applicant shall request that all employees register semi-annually in the ride sharing program and shall make an effort to encourage participation in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. An employee lunch room shall be provided and shall include the following amenities; refrigerator, microwave oven, sinks, food preparation tables, and tables/chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Secure bicycle storage shall be provided onsite throughout both the residential and commercial components.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policy CE 12.4, and Transportation Element policies TE 2.1, TE 2.2, and TE 2.4.

---

**Policy TE 2: Transportation Demand Management**

**Objective:** To attempt to influence individual travel behavior, particularly by workers at larger-scale employers, to lower future increases in peak-hour commute trips and other trips by persons in single-occupant vehicles.
## POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TE 2.1 Reduction/Shifting of Peak-Hour Vehicle Trips.</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City supports efforts to limit traffic congestion through reducing low-occupancy auto trips and shifting peak-hour vehicle trips to off-peak hours. Possible means for accomplishing this include the following:</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policy CE 12.4, and Transportation Element policies TE 1.6, TE 2.2, and TE 2.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Increased telecommuting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Establishment of flexible work schedules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Provision of incentives for carpooling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provision of vanpools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Car sharing/ride sharing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Guaranteed ride home programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Safe routes to school programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Provision of pedestrian amenities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Provision of bicycle facilities and amenities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Public information and promotion of ridesharing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TE 2.2 Land Use Strategies to Reduce Automobile Travel Demand.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City supports the following land use strategies, as provided in the Land Use and Housing Elements, which may enable greater reliance by commuters, shoppers, and others, on alternative modes of travel:</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policy CE 12.4, and Transportation Element policies TE 1.6, TE 2.1, and TE 2.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Live-work development, wherein residential units in some areas may be designed to include work spaces for the residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mixed-use development on individual sites, whereby residential and non-residential uses are permitted in an integrated development project on a single site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mixed-use development within particular subareas of the city, whereby varying uses on separate parcels are located in close proximity to one another so as to enable walking and bicycling between residences, workplaces, and shopping areas. These sub-areas include, but are not limited to: Old Town, the Hollister Corridor, and the Calle Real-Fairview Avenue areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The provision of onsite commercial services for employees in new non-residential development, such as but not limited to cafeterias, childcare, financial services, convenience retail services, concierge services, and others as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The provision of onsite or nearby employee housing within business parks, office and institutional uses, and other employment concentrations as appropriate, to encourage walking to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY

**TE 2.4 Employer-Based or Project-Based Transportation Management Plans.** When appropriate, the City may as a condition of approval require proposed larger-sized non-residential developments with 100 or more employees to prepare and adopt a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and to maintain a designated Transportation Manager. The TMP shall establish quantified objectives for trip reduction and shall identify the specific measures that will be employed to accomplish trip reduction, including but not limited to the measures identified in TE 2.1. The Transportation Manager shall work with Santa Barbara County Association of Governments’ (SBCAG) Traffic Solutions (the county’s rideshare organization) and the City in developing, implementing, and monitoring the TDM measures and shall provide an annual report to the City on the status and effectiveness of the measures.

**Consistent with mitigation.** See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policy CE 12.4, and Transportation Element policies TE 1.6, TE 2.1, and TE 2.2.

---

### DISCUSSION

**Policy TE 3: Streets and Highways Plan and Standards**

**Objective:** To provide a street network, including appropriate provisions for bicycles and pedestrians, that is adequate to support the mobility needs of city residents and businesses.

**TE 3.5 Collector Streets and Roads.** Routes designated as collector streets are shown in Figure 7-2. The following criteria and standards apply to these roads:

- **Definition/Function:** Collector streets and roads function to collect traffic from local streets and roads and to carry that traffic to major or minor arterials. Collectors may also link two arterials as well as collecting traffic from local streets and abutting driveways. Collector roads are designed to provide access to local streets within residential and commercial areas or to connect streets of higher classifications to permit adequate traffic circulation.

- **Collector Road Design Standards:** The following standards shall apply:
  1. Collector streets shall generally not exceed two travel lanes (one lane in each direction) and shall generally be undivided roads.
  2. Collectors generally should not form a continuous system, so that they cannot easily be used as substitutes for arterials.
  3. Intersections of collectors with cross-routes are provided at grade. Intersection controls shall give priority to traffic flow on the arterial rather than the collector.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The primary access to the project would be from Hollister Avenue via a central private drive with a public access easement that bisects the commercial area and continues directly to the residential site. The main drive is a collector street as it collects traffic from local streets/driveways and connects to a major arterial.

The main drive into the project site would consist of a 25-foot wide two-lane inbound section and a 25-foot wide two-lane outbound section separated by an 8-foot wide median. The entry would taper from 58-feet wide at Hollister Avenue to 40-feet wide where the shopping center abuts the residential complex. The main access driveway would further taper to 30-feet at the Glen Annie Road entrance. Stop signs would be installed on the Sespe Lane approach and the project’s internal driveway/road approach to Glen Annie Road to control traffic flows. The total length of this collector street is approximately 840 feet long, which would not provide a substitute for arterials.

Internal driveways/road are required to meet California Building Code standard for widths, turning radii, and emergency vehicle access.
### POLICY

| 4) Collector streets and roads shall include facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles. |
| 5) At a minimum, collectors shall include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Collectors may include landscaped strips between curb and sidewalk. |
| 6) Parking may be required in appropriate segments on either or both sides of the street. |

### DISCUSSION

The proposed design of the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection and the secondary access points does not raise potential safety concerns. A potential safety concern was identified in the EIR regarding the main/central intersection, but the project has been conditioned to correct internal circulation safety concerns (TR 1-1).

Final review and approval of construction plans by the Community Services would ensure adequate circulation design and roadway improvements to accommodate safe ingress/egress/residential roadway compatibility, emergency vehicle access, and adequate roadway capacity to serve the project. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policy TR-TE 13.1.

---

**Policy TE 4: Target Level of Service Standards**

**Objectives:** To maintain an adequate LOS on the city street system, including at intersections, to provide for the mobility needs of the community. To avoid further degradation of service levels at intersections where existing service levels do not meet target standards.

| Traffic LOS standard C shall apply citywide to major arterials, minor arterials, and collector roadways and signalized and unsignalized intersections, except as provided in TE 4.2. The standard shall apply to daily traffic volumes and both AM and PM peak hours for intersections, and to average daily traffic volumes (ADT) for roadway segments. Table 7-3 provides descriptions of the LOS categories. |

| TE 4.2 Modified Level of Service Standard for Specific Intersections at Planned Capacity. | Consistent with mitigation. See discussion within Transportation Element policy TE 13.1 for consistency with Transportation Element policies TR-TE 4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, TE 13.5. |
| Any intersection or arterial link that is developed to the maximum permitted number of lanes (see Policy TE 3 and TE 6.5) shall be considered to be at “planned capacity,” and the forecasted volume to capacity ratio with all planned transportation improvements, as shown in Table 7-1, shall be the applicable LOS standard. As of 2005, the Storke-Hollister intersection was the only intersection in the city at “planned capacity,” and the applicable volume to capacity standard is 0.89. |

---

**Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements**

**Objective:** To identify and describe the major future improvements to the street and highway system that will be needed to accommodate the forecasted future traffic volumes, based upon the Land Use Plan, at acceptable levels of service.

| Proposed major street and highway improvements are shown in Figure 7-3 and Table 7-4. Major proposed improvements are deemed |
necessary to maintain the City's LOS standards as set forth in this plan. Additional recommended improvements may be appropriate in the long term and are desirable to enhance Goleta's circulation system, but are not necessary to maintain LOS standards. Specific improvements will be implemented as conditions require and funding is available. The design of specific improvement projects will be determined as each project is implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TE 5.12 Storke Road Capacity Improvements—Hollister to US-101.</strong> This project, identified as #12 in Figure 7-3, includes the addition of up to one lane in each direction on Storke Road from Hollister Avenue to US-101. This would be accomplished by widening the roadway and/or reconfiguring the existing turn lane.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See discussion within Transportation Element policy TE 13.1 for consistency with Transportation Element policies TR-TE 4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, TE 13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TE 5.13 Storke Road Capacity Improvements—Whittier to Southern City Limits.</strong> This project, identified as #13 in Figure 7-3, includes the addition of up to one lane in each direction on Storke Road south of Whittier Drive to the southern city limit. This would be accomplished by widening the roadway and/or reconfiguring the existing travel lanes.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See discussion within Transportation Element policy TE 13.1 for consistency with Transportation Element policies TR-TE 4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, TE 13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character**

**Objectives:** To ensure that the standards used for the design and development of new roadways and improvements to existing roadways reflect and support the character of adjacent development. To create streetscapes that will enhance neighborhood quality.

**TE 6.4 Streetscape Amenities.** Street design standards should incorporate appropriate pedestrian and neighborhood-enhancing elements in roadway design based on the density of development and the type of roadway. These elements may include wider sidewalks, separated sidewalks, planting strips, landscaped medians, benches, street trees, and pedestrian-oriented streetlights. **Consistent with mitigation.** See discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resource Element policy VH 4.10 and Transportation Element policies TE 7.12 and TE 10.4.

**TE 6.5 Limitation on Expansion of Intersections.** No city intersection, excluding freeway ramps and the Storke/Hollister intersection, shall exceed a total of seven lanes on any leg including through-travel lanes and turn lanes, even if this requirement reduces the LOS below the target LOS set forth in Subpolicies TE 4.1 and TE 4.2. **Consistent with mitigation.** See discussion within Transportation Element policy TE 13.1 for consistency with Transportation Element policies TR-TE 4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, TE 13.5

**Policy TE 7: Public Transit (Bus Transportation)**

**Objectives:** To support the efforts by MTD and other transit providers to sustain and expand the bus transit system to serve the needs of local and regional commuters, the transit-dependent population, and other users in a convenient, reliable, and efficient manner. To increase bus ridership levels in order to reduce peak-period automobile trips on area roadways.

**TE 7.12 Transit Amenities in New Development.** The City shall require new or substantially renovated development to incorporate appropriate measures to facilitate transit use, such as integrating bus stop design with the design of the development. Bus Consistent with mitigation. The project incorporates appropriate measures with the design of the development to facilitate transit use, such as integrating bus stop design (bus turnouts). Additionally, all-weather shelters,
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POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lighting, benches, and other appropriate amenities that may be deemed appropriate would be provided to create a unified streetscape consistent with the policy VH 4.10 and TE 10.4. Such design features would undergo DRB review in consultation with Community Services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See additional discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resource Element policy VH 4.10 and Transportation Element policies TE 1.6, TE 7.12 and TE 10.4.

Policy TE 9: Parking

**Objectives:** To ensure that an adequate amount of parking is provided to accommodate the needs of existing, new, and expanded development, with convenient accessibility and attention to good design. To assure that on- and off-street parking is responsive to the varying and unique needs of individual commercial areas and residential neighborhoods.

**TE 9.1 Off-Street Parking.** The primary source of parking supply for new development of all types of uses within the city shall be off-street parking spaces that are provided on site within the development.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project would provide 945-921 parking spaces on the site, with 360 spaces provided in surface lots for the commercial uses, 545-551 spaces provided for the apartment units, and 10 spaces for the live-work units.

Based on the number of parking spaces required for the types of land uses proposed, the IZO parking requirement for the project would be 764, 762 spaces. The 360 spaces provided for the commercial uses would exceed the IZO requirement of 221 spaces and provide a buffer for peak parking periods. The 545-551 parking spaces provided for the apartments would exceed the IZO requirement of 533-531 spaces and the 10 garage spaces provided for the live-work units would meet the Inland IZO requirement of 10 spaces.

In addition, the project would modify on-street parking on Glen Annie Road to provide a net addition of 15 spaces for public use. Currently 64 On-street parallel parking spaces are available along Glen Annie Road. The project would widen Glen Annie Road to provide additional parking along the west side of the road as well as widen the cul-de-sac to increase those spaces. A total of 79 spaces would be available with the modifications. There would be 18 ninety-degree spaces, 13 angled spaces, and 11 parallel spaces along the west side of the Glen Annie Road. The widened cul-de-sac would provide 10 parking spaces. It is noted that the Glen Annie Road
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>width has been designed so that vehicles pulling out of the angled parking stalls do not back out past the centerline and interfere with northbound traffic flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All individual parking spaces are clearly delineated and have easy ingress and egress by vehicles. No compact parking spaces are proposed. Access would have adequate geometrics as it is required to meet California Building Code standard for widths, turning radii, and emergency vehicle access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping is proposed throughout the parking areas and would provide buffers to pedestrians and break up the large expanse of parking areas. Additional appearances before the Design Review Board (AES 1-1) would further study the landscaping and lighting components of the project and achieve consistency with VH 4.11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TE 9.2 Adequacy of Parking Supply in Proposed Development.** The City shall require all proposed new development and changes/intensifications in use of existing nonresidential structures to provide a sufficient number of off-street parking spaces to accommodate the parking demand generated by the proposed use(s), and to avoid spillover of parking onto neighboring properties and streets.  

**Consistent.** See discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policy TE 9.1. |

**TE 9.3 Parking in Residential Neighborhoods.** Any proposed new or expanded use in residential areas shall provide adequate onsite parking to support the use. Adequate parking shall be provided to minimize the need for parking in public rights-of-way and to avoid spillover of parking onto adjacent uses and into other areas. The existing supply of on-street parking spaces shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Off-street parking for proposed new single-family dwellings in all residential use categories shall be provided in enclosed garages. Driveway aprons in single-family residential neighborhoods shall have sufficient widths and depths to allow parking of two standard-sized vehicles in front of the garage.  

**Consistent.** See discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policy TE 9.1. |

**TE 9.4 Parking within Commercial and Industrial Areas.** The following standards shall apply to parking within nonresidential areas:  

1. An adequate number and appropriate type of parking spaces shall be provided on site for  

**Consistent.** See discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policy TE 9.1. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new development or changes of use in commercial, business park, and other industrial areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supplemental satellite parking facilities are encouraged for large employers to prevent spillover parking into neighboring areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In determining the adequacy of proposed parking for new or substantially modified development, the City may consider proximity to transit facilities and the provisions of a TMP where it is demonstrated that the plan’s measures will sufficiently reduce the demand for onsite parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conditions of approval for large nonresidential projects may include a requirement to prepare a TMP that includes monitoring of parking lot utilization and measures that will be implemented if the event that the supply of onsite parking spaces is inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provision of large amounts of excess parking is discouraged, except that surplus landscaped areas may be identified and reserved for future expansion of parking areas if warranted by future conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Compact parking spaces and 90-degree parking stalls are discouraged in parking lots serving high-turnover uses, such as (but not limited to) retail commercial centers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TE 9.5 Parking Lot Design.** Design standards applicable to retail, commercial, business parks, and parking lots are set forth in the Visual and Historic Resources Element Subpolicies VH 4.5, 4.7, and 4.11. In addition, the following standards and criteria shall apply to parking lots of three or more spaces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TE 9.5 Parking Lot Design.</th>
<th>Consistent. See discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policy TE 9.1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Parking lot design shall provide that all individual spaces are clearly delineated and have easy ingress and egress by vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Proposals that include compact parking spaces shall be subject to discretionary approval by the City, and the number of compact parking spaces shall not exceed 20 percent of the total; parking spaces for oversized vehicles shall be included when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Access driveways and aisles shall have adequate geometrics, and the layout shall be clear, functional, and well organized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Pedestrian walkways between the parking area and the street, main entrance, and transit stops should be protected by landscaped or other buffers to the extent feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY

| e. The visual impact of large expanses of parking lots shall be reduced by appropriate response to the design standards set forth in the Visual and Historic Resources Element’s Policy VH 4. |

### DISCUSSION

**Policy TE 10: Pedestrian Circulation**

**Objective:** To encourage increased walking for recreational and other purposes by developing an interconnected, safe, convenient, and visually attractive pedestrian circulation system.

**TE 10.4 Pedestrian Facilities in New Development.** Proposals for new development or substantial alterations of existing development shall be required to include pedestrian linkages and standard frontage improvements. These improvements may include construction of sidewalks and other pedestrian paths, provision of benches, public art, informational signage, appropriate landscaping, and lighting. In planning new subdivisions or large-scale development, pedestrian connections should be provided through subdivisions and cul-de-sacs to interconnect with adjacent areas. Dedications of public access easements shall be required where appropriate.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project has been designed with features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking. Internal pedestrian walkways and bicycle access is provided within the site and to adjacent commercial and other developments. The project also includes a fully improved bus stop to encourage use of public transit. Collectively, these features facilitate alternative modes of transportation to jobs, shopping, and other activity centers as well as for recreation.

The project includes a streetscape involving the construction of sidewalks and other pedestrian paths, provision of benches, bus stop, landscaping, and lighting. The development plans, signage, landscape plan, and bus turn-out plans are subject to review of the Design Review Board in consultation with Community Services to ensure pedestrian facilities are appropriately incorporated.

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Visual and Historic Resource Element policy VH 4.10 and Transportation Element policies TE 1.6, TE 7.12 and TE 10.4.

**Policy TE 11: Bikeways Plan**

**Objective:** To encourage increased bicycle use for commuting and recreational purposes by developing an interconnected circulation system for bicycles that is safe, convenient, and within a visually attractive environment

**TE 11.4: Facilities in New Development.** Bicycle facilities such as lockers, secure enclosed parking, and lighting shall be incorporated into the design of all new development to encourage bicycle travel and facilitate and encourage bicycle commuting. Showers and changing rooms should be incorporated into the design of all new development where feasible. Transportation improvements

**Consistent with mitigation.** See discussion of consistency with Transportation Element policy TE 1.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>necessitated by new development should provide onsite connections to existing and proposed bikeways.</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. A Traffic, Circulation, and Parking Study for the project was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) on behalf of the applicant. As part of the preparation of this EIR, the ATE study, dated September 14, 2010, was peer reviewed by Linscott Law and Greenspan (LLG). LLG also conducted supplemental analysis. The LLG peer review and supplemental analysis is provided in a memo dated January 26, 2011. Subsequent to the peer review, ATE submitted a Revised Traffic and Circulation Study dated February 28, 2011. The ATE Revised Traffic and Circulation Study and the LLG peer review and supplemental analysis complied with the items required per TE 13.1. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development

Objective: To ensure that new development is supported by adequate capacities in transportation systems, including city streets and roads, without reducing the quality of services to existing residents, commuters, and other users of the city street system

TE 13.1 Traffic Studies for Development Proposals. Future development in Goleta will cause added burdens on the transportation system. Traffic analyses and reports shall be required for development proposals which the City Engineer and Planning Director determine may have effects on the local street system, including but not limited to possible degradation of service levels, potential creation of safety hazards, potential adverse effects on local neighborhood streets, or other substantial transportation concerns. When required by the City, traffic studies shall be performed by a qualified transportation engineer under a contract with the City. The costs of the traffic study, including costs of City staff time, shall be the responsibility of the project applicant.

The project would develop a new internal circulation system within the project site, create new access driveway connections to existing roadways, modify existing intersection configurations, generate traffic on the roadway system serving the site, and generate the demand for parking at the site.

Consistent with the Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan (GTIP), the project would include a new roadway connecting the Glen Annie Road/Sespe Lane intersection to the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection to provide an alternative to using the Hollister Avenue/Glen Annie Road intersection. This road would contain a public access easement and would serve as primary access to the project site.

As part of the project, a traffic signal would be installed at the Glen Annie Road/Hollister Avenue T-intersection, maintaining full access and providing a fully controlled signalized T-intersection. Two crosswalks would also be installed to allow pedestrians to safely cross Glen Annie Road and Hollister Avenue at this location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Also consistent with the GTIP, eastbound access to Hollister Avenue at the Hollister Avenue/Glen Annie Road intersection would be eliminated to increase the eastbound left-turn storage bays that extend from the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection. The southbound approach from Glen Annie Road would be restriped for right turns only and appropriate signage would be installed.</td>
<td>Hollister Avenue would be widened along the project's frontage to provide an eastbound left-turn lane and a westbound right-turn lane for traffic inbound to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The northbound approach from Marketplace Drive would be restriped to provide one shared left-thru lane and one right-turn lane. The northbound right-turn lane overlap arrow would be removed to allow westbound Hollister U-turns, which are expected to increase due to the turn movement restriction planned at Hollister Avenue/Glen Annie Road. The design of the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection does not raise potential safety concerns.</td>
<td>Secondary access for the project would be provided via a new driveway connection to Hollister Avenue at the west end of the project site and two connections to Glen Annie Road along the east side of the site. The driveway connection to Hollister Avenue at the west end of the site would be limited to right turns (ingress and egress) by the raised median on Hollister Avenue. The northern connection to Glen Annie Road is at the Glen Annie Road/Sespe Lane intersection. Stop signs would be installed on the Sespe Lane approach and the project’s internal driveway/road approach to Glen Annie Road to control traffic flows. The southern connection to Glen Annie Road would be located opposite the driveway to the existing office buildings on Glen Annie Road and stop signs would be installed on the project’s internal driveway approach to control traffic flows. The design of the secondary access points does not raise potential access concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The internal access and circulation system for the project site would adequately accommodate the traffic volumes that would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Discussion

A potential safety concern was identified in the EIR regarding the main/central intersection, which involves four legs with crosswalks on three sides, and other legs intersecting in close proximity, also with crosswalks. The project has been conditioned to correct these internal circulation safety concerns.

The EIR traffic analysis concludes:

1. The project is forecast to generate a net increase of 7,855 ADT, 280 AM peak hour trips, and 732 PM peak hour trips.
2. The project would generate a net increase of 5,235 ADT, 280 AM peak hour trips, and 479 PM peak hour trips on the study-area street network beyond the project site.
3. The segment of Storke Road north of Hollister Avenue is forecast to carry volumes above the acceptable capacity standard with the addition of project generated traffic, which generates a significant roadway impact.
4. The US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection is forecast to operate at LOS D during the AM peak hour period with the addition of project traffic, which generates a significant impact. No significant impacts would occur during the PM peak hour.
5. The existing left-turn storage provided at the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection accommodates PM peak hour queues, except for the eastbound Hollister Avenue left-turn movement; however, the existing + project queue model assumes the street network improvements (increased storage capacity of eastbound Hollister Avenue left-turn storage bays and an additional northbound lane on northbound Storke Road between Hollister Avenue and the US 101 Southbound Ramp and changing the northbound right-turn lane at the US 101 Southbound Ramp intersection to a free right-turn lane). Prior to the implementation of these measures, the project would result in the potential for a significant impact.
6. The US 101 SB Ramp/Storke Road intersection is forecast to operate at LOS D during the AM peak period under existing + project conditions. The project would result in a significant impact under Congestion Management Plan criteria. No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant impacts would occur during the PM peak hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The project's impacts to US 101 segments located in the study-area would be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The project-generated traffic volumes would result in significant cumulative impacts on the Storke Road north of Hollister Avenue roadway segments and the Storke Road south of Whittier Drive roadway segments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The project-generated traffic volumes would result in significant cumulative traffic impacts at the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection and the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The project would, under cumulative conditions, exceed CMP thresholds at the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection, the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection, the Hollister Avenue/Los Carneros Road and the US 101 SB Ramp/Los Carneros Road intersection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EIR identifies the following required mitigation measures to address significant traffic impacts and ensure consistency with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Transportation policies:

1. Correct internal circulation safety concerns (MM TR 1-1).
2. Increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road by providing an additional northbound lane along Storke Road that would extend from Hollister Avenue to the existing right-turn that serves the US 101 southbound on-ramp at the Storke Road interchange (MM TR 2-1 and MM TR 6-1). This mitigation measure includes direction regarding the permittee’s fair-share contribution of the cost incurred, reimbursement agreement and GTIP funding options.
3. Improve the US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road intersection to achieve a LOS A operating condition during the AM peak hour by modifying the northbound right-turn lane channelization island for vehicles turning right from Storke Road onto the US 101 southbound on-ramp and provide safe bicycle passage through the modified intersection (MM TR 3-1 and MM TR 7-1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road by providing two travel lanes in each direction, creating a four-lane roadway along southbound Storke Road that would extend from Whittier Drive to El Colegio Road (MM TR 6-2). This mitigation measure includes direction regarding the permittee’s fair-share contribution of the cost incurred, reimbursement agreement and GTIP funding options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contribute fees to the GTIP fund to achieve a LOS D operating condition during the PM peak hour at the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection (MM TR 7-2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of these mitigation measures would ensure consistency with Transportation policies TR-TE 4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, and TE 13.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TE 13.3 Maintenance of LOS Standards.** New development shall only be allowed when and where such development can be adequately (as defined by the LOS standards in Policy TE 4) served by existing and/or planned transportation facilities. Transportation facilities are considered adequate if, at the time of development:

a. Existing transportation facilities serving the development, including those to be constructed by the developer as part of the project, will result in meeting the adopted LOS standards set in Policy TE 4; or

b. A binding financial commitment and agreement is in place to complete the necessary transportation system improvements (except for the planned new grade-separated freeway crossings), or to implement other strategies which will mitigate the project-specific impacts to an acceptable level, within 6 or fewer years; and

c. Any additional offsite traffic mitigation measures are incorporated into the impact fee system for addressing cumulative transportation impacts of future development.

**Consistent with mitigation.** See discussion within Transportation Element policy TE 13.1 for consistency with Transportation Element policies TR-TE 4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, TE 13.5.
### 4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

#### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TE 13.4</strong> Options If Traffic Mitigations Are Not Fully Funded.</th>
<th><strong>DISCUSSION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the transportation capital improvements needed to maintain adopted transportation LOS standards are not able to be funded, then the City shall take one or more of the following four actions:</td>
<td>Consistent with mitigation. See discussion within Transportation Element policy TE 13.1 for consistency with Transportation Element policies TR-TE.4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, TE 13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Phase or delay development until such time that adequate fiscal resources can be provided to build the necessary facilities transportation improvements (or to include them in the impact fee system).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require the developer to construct the necessary transportation system improvements, with a reimbursement agreement that uses future payments of impact fees by other projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reduce the scope of the development to reduce the traffic generation below the thresholds set in Policy TE 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Require the developer to identify alternative strategies, such as transit improvements, improving signalization, improving other streets, adding pedestrian or bicycle improvements, etc., to mitigate potential traffic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TE 13.5 Developer-Constructed Transportation Improvements. Developers shall be required to construct transportation improvements along their property frontages in accordance with City standards. The Developer shall be required to provide all necessary access and circulation facilities within the property; such facilities shall be designed to meet City standards. | Consistent with mitigation. See discussion within Transportation Element policy TE 13.1 for consistency with Transportation Element policies TR-TE.4.1, TE 4.2, TE 5.1, TE 5.12, TE 5.13, TE 6.5, TE 13.1, TE 13.3, TE 13.4, TE 13.5 |

### PUBLIC FACILITIES ELEMENT

Policy PF 3: Public Safety Services and Facilities

**Objective:** Ensure that adequate fire and police services and facilities are available to meet the needs of both existing and new development in the city as well as service demands from outside Goleta’s boundaries

#### Fire Protection Standards. The Santa Barbara County Fire Department employs the following three standards with respect to provision of fire protection services:

| a. A firefighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 in population is considered "ideal," although a countywide ratio (including rural areas) of one firefighter per 4,000 population is the absolute minimum standard. Considering the daytime population in Goleta due to employees and customers, all fire stations within Goleta fell short of this service standard as of 2005. |
| b. A ratio of one engine company per 16,000... | Consistent with mitigation. Adequate public services is required for new projects at the time of development or sufficient funding for completion of any necessary new public service improvements. Such services are currently available for provision of water, wastewater collection, stormwater management facilities, streets, schools, and parks and no new facilities would be required in order to provide these services to the project. |

Fire protection services would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD). The closest station to the project...
population, assuming four firefighters per station, represents the maximum population that the Santa Barbara County Fire Department has determined can be adequately served by a four-person crew. Fire stations 11 and 12 (see Table 8-1) did not satisfy this standard as of 2005. Currently, all three fire engines that serve Goleta are staffed with only three-person crews. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) guidelines state that engine companies shall be staffed with a minimum of four on-duty personnel.

c. The third fire protection standard is a 5-minute response time in urban areas. This incorporates the following NFPA response-time objectives:

1) One minute (60 seconds) for turnout time.
2) Four minutes (240 seconds) or less for the arrival of the first-arriving engine company at a fire suppression incident and/or 8 minutes (480 seconds) or less for the deployment of a full first-alarm assignment at a fire suppression incident.
3) Four minutes (240 seconds) or less for the arrival of a unit with first-responder or higher level capability at an emergency medical incident.
4) Eight minutes (480 seconds) or less for the arrival of an advanced life support unit at an emergency medical incident, where this service is provided by the fire department.

1. A firefighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 persons is the ideal goal. However, one firefighter for every 4,000 persons is the absolute maximum population that can be adequately served.
2. A ratio of one engine company per 12,000 persons, assuming three firefighters per station (or 16,000 persons assuming four firefighters per station), represents the maximum population that the SBCFD determined can be adequately served by a three-person crew.
3. A five-minute response time in urban areas.

The mandated Cal-OSHA requirement for firefighter safety, known as the “two-in-two-out rule”, is also applicable. This rule requires a minimum of two personnel to be available outside a structure prior to entry by firefighters to provide an immediate rescue for trapped or fallen firefighters, as well as immediate assistance in rescue operations.

Station 11 has an engine company with a staff of three personnel, consisting of an engine company captain, engineer, and firefighter. This engine company provides immediate response on incidents as determined by the type of call.

Station 11 also houses a Truck Company (ladder truck), which is staffed with three personnel. This truck company is designated a countywide emergency response rescue vehicle and is not solely dedicated to serve Station 11’s first-in district. As such, Truck Company 11 is not relied on to provide immediate response for the service population in the Station 11 district.
Fire Station 11 currently does not meet the NFPA and SBCFD guidelines, as follows (City of Goleta, General Plan/CLUP Final EIR, Table 3.12-1, 2006):

1. The current ratio of firefighters to population at Fire Station 11 is 1:7,198.
2. Fire Station 11 currently serves a population of 21,594 (2000 Census), which is above the ratio of one engine company (three-person crew) per 12,000 population by approximately 6,040 people.
3. Response time from Fire Station 11 is typically within 5 minutes.

The SBCFD has also recently implemented a dynamic deployment system, for its fire engines, in addition to the traditional static deployment system from fire stations when the station’s engine is “in-house”. Dynamic deployment allows for the dispatching of engines already on the road to emergency calls rather than dispatching by a station’s “first in area”, as has been the previous practice. Basically, dynamic deployment uses a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (non-emergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered “in-service” and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County’s GPS, County dispatch has real-time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station’s service area the call originates from. This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer. The Fire Department has also added a battalion chief as the fourth fire fighter on scene, in order to meet the “two-in-two-out rule”.

The project residential and commercial-related population would add to the population already served by Fire Station 11, as shown in the above guidelines. The 5-minute response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>guideline would be met. In the event Fire Station 11 would need back-up, other available engine companies would respond via static and/or dynamic deployment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fire protection would also require the provision of adequate onsite fire protection facilities. The Fire Department will require defensible space, serviceable access, adequate fire hydrants, adequate building addressing, adequate interior fire sprinkler system, adequate fire or emergency alarm system, and approved locking systems for any gated access ways, among other standard conditions.

Cumulative development in the City would affect fire protection service, due to an increase in emergency calls to primary and secondary responding stations Citywide (City of Goleta, Cumulative Development Projects List, July 2011). In particular, the western Goleta area is the most underserved area in Goleta relative to NFPA and SBCFD service guidelines. While fire protection services would still be provided Citywide, some emergency calls from the project and other cumulative development projects may experience delayed response. Depending on the volume of calls being handled by any given station, response may be within 5 minutes, may be delayed, and/or first response may come from a back-up fire station through static and/or dynamic deployment.

The deficiency in fire protection service in western Goleta would be addressed by the construction of future Fire Station 10 on property owned by the City at 7952 Hollister Avenue. Such construction is identified in the General Plan. A Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (Final MND) prepared for Fire Station 10 site acquisition/selection was adopted by the City Council (Fire Station 10 Site Selection; November 2010). The Final MND found that Fire Station 10 would result in no significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts and potentially significant but mitigable (Class II) impacts in the areas of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water...
Quality, Noise, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities/Service Systems. The Final MND includes mitigation measures for all Class II impacts that would reduce impacts below the level of significance.

The project would be subject to payment of Development Impact Fees adopted for the purpose of requiring projects to pay a fair share of fire protection services and facilities associated with cumulative development. Fees are due at final inspection. The project would pay a Fire Protection Fee for replacement of fire apparatus and equipment and a Fire Facility Fee to assist in financing fire protection capital facilities, such as Fire Station 10. Based on the most recent 2010 DIF schedule, the Fire Protection Fee would be $0.10/SF (based on inclusion of interior fire sprinkler system) and would be $48,668\(^{20}\). The Fire Facility Fee would be $540/1000 SF and $772/unit and would be $264,017\(^{21}\). As a result of payment of these fees, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on fire protection services fulfills its obligation and the project is considered consistent with the above policies.


**PF 3.2 New Fire Station in Western Goleta.** The Santa Barbara County Fire Department has determined that the most under-served area in Goleta is the extreme western portion near Winchester Canyon. In conjunction with the fire department, the City shall provide a site consisting of approximately 2 acres of land for proposed new Fire Station 10 to serve the western area of the city, as shown on the map in Figure 8-1. The Santa Barbara County Fire Department will construct Fire Station 10 as soon as funding becomes available. Consistent. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 7.1, SE 7.2 and SE 7.5, and Public Facilities Element polices PF 3.1, PF 3.2, PF 3.3, PF 3.4, PF 9.2, PF 9.3, PF 9.6 and PF 9.7.

**PF 3.3: Impact Fees for Fire Protection Facilities/Equipment.** Construction of the new Fire Station 10 shall be funded in part by revenues from an impact fee imposed on new development within the city, as well as upon development in the nearby unincorporated areas. Such fees may also be Consistent. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 7.1, SE 7.2 and SE 7.5, and Public Facilities Element polices PF 3.1, PF 3.2, PF 3.3, PF 3.4, PF 9.2, PF 9.3, PF 9.6 and PF 9.7.

---

\(^{20}\) (Residential units and clubhouse maintenance building gross square footage 396,626 + Commercial gross square footage 90,054)(0.10)

\(^{21}\) ((90,054sf/1,000sf)) +((279 units)(772/unit))
### POLICY

|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- Two routes of ingress and egress shall be required for any new development or subdivision of land requiring approval of a discretionary action. This requirement may be waived by the City when secondary access cannot be provided and maintenance of fire safety standards are ensured by other means.
- All private roads that provide access to structures served by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department shall be constructed at a minimum to the department’s standards.
- All nonagricultural development in the foothills area shall include provisions for connection to the GWD or another public water purveyor.
- Emergency access shall be a consideration in the siting and design of all new development within the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PF 3.8: Impact Fee for Police Facilities</th>
<th>Consistent with mitigation. The project will be required to pay development impact fees for police protection services. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PF 3.9: Safety Considerations in New Development</th>
<th>Consistent. Implementation of the project would not have any significant impact on safety or demand for police services. Site security measures including security lighting would be incorporated into the project’s design. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Policy PF 4: Water and Sewer Facilities**

**Objective:** Ensure that adequate water supply and distribution facilities and sewage collection facilities and treatment capacity are available to meet the cumulative needs of both existing users and new development in the city as well as outside Goleta’s boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PF 4.1: Water Facilities and Services</th>
<th>Consistent with mitigation. The project’s estimated water demand represents approximately 0.69 percent of the 14,600 AFY of demand for GWD water, and approximately 0.61 percent of the 16,472 AFY of water available to the GWD annually through the year 2030 (not including an additional 2,000 AFY of GWD’s recycled water delivery capacity). GWD forecasts regional water demand to increase by about 2,083 AFY to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- The City shall coordinate with GWD regarding new development within its boundaries to allow the GWD to continue to plan its capital improvements in an orderly manner consistent with the levels of growth allowed by the Land Use Plan.
- The City shall review and monitor GWD’s
POLLICY

existing Urban Water Management Plan, adopted in December 2005, and future updates to that plan, and shall monitor actions of GWD to meet the projected long-term water demand.

c. The City shall monitor and compare the planned and potential consumption of the available and planned water capacity within the service area of the GWD. If the available and planned capacity of water supply and delivery services is not adequate to serve the planned and potential consumption, then the City shall take one or more of the following three actions in order of priority:

1) Phase development within the city consistent with the Land Use Plan until such time that adequate resources can be identified to provide adequate supplies and improvements and urge other entities in the service areas to also reassess their plans.

2) Reassess the City’s Land Use Plan to reduce the demand for services to the degree necessary to match the supply and urge other entities in the service areas to also reassess their plans.

3) Explore and support ways to reduce consumption in order to conserve available capacity and to reduce the volume of discharges of treated effluent in ocean waters.

d. Environmental review of new development shall evaluate the adequacy of water supply capacity to serve cumulative demand for all existing and planned development, including during extended periods of drought.

e. Water piping systems should be interconnected (“looped”) wherever feasible to facilitate the reliable delivery of water to all locations within the city. The distribution system should be sized to provide minimum operating pressure of 45 pounds per square inch (psi) under normal conditions and 20 psi under emergency conditions such as fires.

f. Water supply and delivery systems shall be available in time to meet the demand created by new development or shall be assured through the use of bonds or other sureties. An assured water supply and delivery system shall be identified prior to discretionary approvals of projects to the satisfaction of the City. GWD or

DISCUSSION

16,683 AFY between the years 2010 and 2030. The project’s demand would be 4.8 percent of this increase in water demand over the current planning period in the area served by the GWD. Based on normal weather annual water supplies, the project’s demand would exceed the GWD supplies by approximately 211 AFY for the year 2030. Until a “Can and Will Service” letter has been received from GWD, the project’s water supply has not been secured.

The project would connect to existing GWD potable and reclaimed lines on Hollister Avenue/Glen Annie Road. These lines will not be located within an ESHA or ESHA buffer. Other specific applicable requirements of this policy, e.g., use of low water-use plumbing fixtures and drought-tolerant landscaping irrigated by reclaimed water, are standard City conditions of any project approval.

The project has been conditioned to secure a Can and Will Service letter from GWD (MM WS 1-1), to minimize the use of outdoor water by requiring the use of native and/or drought tolerant landscaping, water-conserving irrigation, and recycled water, grouping plant material by water needs, limiting turn and slopes, mulching and utilizing soil moisture sensing devices (MM WS 1-2), to minimize the use of indoor water by insulating all hot water lines, installing recirculating, point-of-use or on-demand water heaters, prohibiting self regenerating water softening, equipping lavatories and drinking fountains with self-closing valves and installing water sense specification toilets in each unit (MM WS 1-3). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.
the project applicant may provide several alternative methods of documentation, including an unconditional “ability to serve” letter from the district.

g. The applicant and GWD shall demonstrate prior to issuance of final land use clearance that sufficient capacity shall be available to serve the development and all other cumulative projects within GWD’s service area. This may be evidenced by an unconditional “will serve” letter or contract for service from GWD. All required water infrastructure for a project shall either be in place at the time of approval of the land use clearance or shall be assured through the use of bonds, payment of fees, or other sureties to the City’s and GWD’s satisfaction.

h. Within new subdivisions, offsite and onsite water distribution systems required to serve the subdivision shall be in place and contain water at sufficient quantity and pressure prior to the issuance of any building permit. Model homes may be exempted from this policy, subject to approval by the City.

i. The City shall encourage and actively promote long-term water conservation through water-conserving features in new development, including low water-use plumbing fixtures and drought-tolerant landscaping. The City also encourages the reclamation of treated wastewater and development of distribution facilities for reclaimed water to serve appropriate uses and locations.

j. New water lines shall not be located within an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) or ESHA buffer unless there is no feasible alternative location. The City supports the decommissioning and relocation of existing facilities located within ESHA or ESHA buffers.

k. The City shall require new water infrastructure to be located and painted so as to not be visually obtrusive and, where feasible, to be located within roadway rights-of-way or existing utility easements.

l. The City shall seek to protect the quality and quantity of groundwater resources, including those that serve households and businesses that rely on private wells. The City encourages that such existing development be connected to the public water system of GWD and that the private wells be properly abandoned and
closed.
m. All new development within the City shall be served by the public water system.
n. New development along corridors identified by the GWD in its Master Plan as locations of future water conveyance facilities shall provide appropriate easements as a condition of approval.

**POLICY**

**DISCUSSION**

**PF 4.2: Sewer Facilities and Services.** The following criteria, standards, and procedures shall apply to water facilities and services:

a. The City shall monitor and compare the planned and potential consumption of the available and planned sewer capacity within the service areas of these utilities. If the available and planned capacity of sewerage services is not adequate to serve the planned and potential consumption, then the City shall take one or more of the following three actions in order of priority:

1) Phase development within the City consistent with the Land Use Plan until such time that adequate resources can be identified to provide supplies and improvements and urge other entities in the service areas to also reassess their plans.

2) Reassess the City’s Land Use Plan to reduce the demand for services to the degree necessary to match the supply and urge other entities in the service areas to also reassess their plans.

3) Explore and support ways to reduce consumption in order to conserve available capacity and reduce the volume of discharges of treated effluent in ocean waters.

b. The City shall encourage effective and cost-efficient organization and delivery systems for provision of wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal services within its boundaries.

c. The City shall work with the GSD to ensure completion of a Capacity Management Alternatives Study to determine the scope of needed improvements for a higher level of treatment in order to improve the quality of effluent discharged by an outfall into ocean waters offshore from Goleta Beach Park. The City supports completion of this project as quickly as possible. The study should include a full evaluation of alternatives and costs. Alternatives should avoid construction

Consistent with mitigation. The project would generate 60,341 gallons of wastewater per day. A total of 3.12 million gpd of treatment capacity at the GSD plant is reserved for the GWSD system and GWSD currently uses 1.71 million gpd. The remaining surplus treatment capacity of 1.41 million gallons per day would accommodate the project’s estimated wastewater flows, which would require an estimated 4.3 percent of the available treatment capacity. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact regarding wastewater treatment capacity. Additionally, GWSD reports that the existing wastewater conveyance pipelines at the project site have adequate capacity to accommodate project-related wastewater flows. However, until a Sewer Connection Permit has been received from GWSD, the project’s sewer supply has not been secured. The project has been conditioned to secure a Sewer Connection Permit from GWSD (MM WW 1-1); Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of excess wastewater treatment capacity.</td>
<td>d. The City shall encourage recycling of treated wastewater to reduce water consumption and reduce ocean discharges of treated effluent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The City shall encourage recycling of treated wastewater to reduce water consumption and reduce ocean discharges of treated effluent.</td>
<td>e. Sewage collection and wastewater treatment capacity shall be available in time to meet the demand created by new development or shall be assured through the use of bonds or other sureties. The adequacy of sewerage facilities shall be identified prior to discretionary approvals of projects to the satisfaction of the City. The applicable sanitation district or project applicant may provide several alternative methods of documentation, including and unconditional “ability to serve” letter from the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Sewage collection and wastewater treatment capacity shall be available in time to meet the demand created by new development or shall be assured through the use of bonds or other sureties. The adequacy of sewerage facilities shall be identified prior to discretionary approvals of projects to the satisfaction of the City. The applicable sanitation district or project applicant may provide several alternative methods of documentation, including and unconditional “ability to serve” letter from the district.</td>
<td>f. The applicant and the applicable sanitation district shall demonstrate prior to issuance of final land use clearance that sufficient capacity and facilities shall be available to serve the development and all other cumulative projects within the service area. This may be evidenced by an unconditional “will serve” letter or contract for service from the district. All required wastewater management infrastructure for a project shall either be in place at the time of approval of the land use clearance or shall be assured through the use of bonds, payment of fees, or other sureties to the City’s and the applicable district’s satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The applicant and the applicable sanitation district shall demonstrate prior to issuance of final land use clearance that sufficient capacity and facilities shall be available to serve the development and all other cumulative projects within the service area. This may be evidenced by an unconditional “will serve” letter or contract for service from the district. All required wastewater management infrastructure for a project shall either be in place at the time of approval of the land use clearance or shall be assured through the use of bonds, payment of fees, or other sureties to the City’s and the applicable district’s satisfaction.</td>
<td>g. All necessary sewerage collection facilities shall be in place at the time of approval of building permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. All necessary sewerage collection facilities shall be in place at the time of approval of building permits.</td>
<td>h. New sewer lines shall not be located within ESHA or ESHA buffer unless there is no feasible alternative location. The City supports the decommissioning and relocation of existing facilities located within ESHA or ESHA buffers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. New sewer lines shall not be located within ESHA or ESHA buffer unless there is no feasible alternative location. The City supports the decommissioning and relocation of existing facilities located within ESHA or ESHA buffers.</td>
<td>i. Development along corridors identified by sewer providers in their master plans as location of future sewerage facilities shall provide appropriate easements as a condition of approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Development along corridors identified by sewer providers in their master plans as location of future sewerage facilities shall provide appropriate easements as a condition of approval.</td>
<td>j. The City shall discourage and oppose extension of sewer service into any land area not designated for urban development, including to areas west of Goleta and the Embarcadero Community Services District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The City shall discourage and oppose extension of sewer service into any land area not designated for urban development, including to areas west of Goleta and the Embarcadero Community Services District.</td>
<td>k. Within the urban boundary, all new development shall be required to connect to the public sewerage system. New septic systems shall not be approved within the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban boundary unless it is demonstrated that there is no feasible alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Independent community sewer systems shall not be approved or established for new development within the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy PF 5: School Facilities  
**Objective:** Ensure that adequate public school services and facility capacities are available to meet the long-term needs of both existing and new development in the city as well as service demands from outside Goleta’s boundaries.

**PF 5.2 Assessment of School Impacts of Large Development Projects.** Applications for residential development within the city shall be referred to the school districts for their review and comments. The City shall require the assessment of impacts of large development projects on school facility needs through the preparation of environmental documents pursuant to CEQA.

Consistent. The project application was referred to the school district. The Initial Study prepared for the project assessed the impact of 279 additional residential units on the school facilities. The assessment found the project would not require the construction of new school facilities or require the alteration of existing school facilities.

Policy PF 6: Utilities  
**Objective:** Ensure that adequate utility services and facility capacities are available to meet the needs of both existing and new development in the city as well as service demands from outside Goleta’s boundaries.

**PF 6.2: Undergrounding of Overhead Utilities.** The City shall encourage the undergrounding of electrical power lines and other overhead utilities to the greatest extent practical, as follows:

a. The City shall pursue funding opportunities to underground existing overhead utilities, including SCE’s dedicated underground funding (“Rule 20A/20B”), private funding, and assessment districts. The City shall establish priorities for locations for potential undergrounding projects.

b. To the extent practicable, all utilities shall be required to be placed underground in new development (see related Subpolicy VH 4.14).


Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development  
**Objective:** To ensure that land use decisions are based on the planned capacity of capital facilities and that such facilities are provided when they are needed to support new development.

**PF 9.1: Integration of Land Use and Public Facilities Planning.** The Land Use Plan and actions on individual development applications shall be consistent with the existing or planned capacities of necessary supporting public facilities and the fiscal capacity of the City to finance new facilities.

a. The City shall integrate its land use and public works planning activities with an ongoing program of long-range financial planning to ensure that the City’s Land Use Plan is supported by quality public facilities.

b. Individual land use decisions, including but not

Consistent with mitigation. The project would require service from public utilities. Adequate public utilities and services exist to support the project, and the project has been conditioned to secure water and sewer service (MM WS 1-1 and MM WW 1-1). In addition, as part of the project conditions of approval, the City will require the payment of impact fees to contribute to the fiscal capacity of the respective City agencies for the long-term sustainability of parks (MM REC 1-1), transportation (MM TR 7-2), fire protection,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>limited to General Plan amendments, shall be based on a finding that any proposed development can be supported by adequate public facilities.</td>
<td>library services, public administration, and sheriff services. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PF 9.2: Phasing of New Development.</strong> Development shall be allowed only when and where it is demonstrated that all public facilities are adequate and only when and where such development can be adequately served by essential public services without reducing levels of service elsewhere.</td>
<td>Consistent. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 7.1, SE 7.2 and SE 7.5, and Public Facilities Element polices PF 3.1, PF 3.2, PF 3.3, PF 3.4, PF 9.2, PF 9.3, PF 9.6 and PF 9.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PF 9.3: Responsibilities of Developers.</strong> Construction permits shall not be granted until the developer provides for the installation and/or financing of needed public facilities. If adequate facilities are currently unavailable and public funds are not committed to provide such facilities, the burden shall be on the developer to arrange appropriate financing or provide such facilities in order to develop. Developers shall provide or pay for the costs of generating technical information as to impacts the proposed development will have on public facilities and services. The City shall require new development to finance the facilities needed to support the development wherever a direct connection or nexus of benefit or impact can be demonstrated.</td>
<td>Consistent. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 7.1, SE 7.2 and SE 7.5, and Public Facilities Element polices PF 3.1, PF 3.2, PF 3.3, PF 3.4, PF 9.2, PF 9.3, PF 9.6 and PF 9.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PF 9.6 Concurrency.</strong> The City shall develop ordinances and procedures to achieve “concurrency” for facilities essential to support development. Pursuant to those procedures, the City shall evaluate the impact of any new development on the capacity of the supporting public facilities and require, prior to final development approval, that financing be in place to correct any public facility deficiency. The evaluation of impacts shall include an analysis of the cumulative effects of other development proposals in the service area.</td>
<td>Consistent. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 7.1, SE 7.2 and SE 7.5, and Public Facilities Element polices PF 3.1, PF 3.2, PF 3.3, PF 3.4, PF 9.2, PF 9.3, PF 9.6 and PF 9.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PF 9.7: Essential Services for New Development.</strong> Development shall be allowed only when and where all essential utility services are adequate in accord with the service standards of their providers and only when and where such development can be adequately served by essential utilities without reducing levels of service below the level of service guidelines elsewhere.</td>
<td>Consistent. See additional discussion of consistency with Safety Element policies SE 7.1, SE 7.2 and SE 7.5, and Public Facilities Element polices PF 3.1, PF 3.2, PF 3.3, PF 3.4, PF 9.2, PF 9.3, PF 9.6 and PF 9.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Domestic water service, sanitary sewer service, stormwater management facilities, streets, fire services, schools, and parks shall be considered essential for supporting new development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A development shall not be approved if it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>causes the level of service of an essential utility service to decline below the standards referenced above unless improvements to mitigate the impacts are made concurrent with the development for the purposes of this policy. &quot;Concurrent with the development&quot; shall mean that improvements are in place at the time of the development or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If adequate essential utility services are currently unavailable and public funds are not committed to provide such facilities, developers must provide such facilities at their own expense in order to develop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOISE ELEMENT

*Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards*

**Objectives:** To protect Goleta’s residents, workers, and visitors from excessive noise by applying noise standards in land use decisions. To ensure compatibility of land uses with noise exposure levels, and to neither introduce new development in areas with unacceptable noise levels nor allow new noise sources that would impact existing development.

**NE 1.1: Land Use Compatibility Standards.** The City shall use the standards and criteria of Table 9-2 to establish compatibility of land use and noise exposure. The City shall require appropriate mitigation, if feasible, or prohibit development that would subject proposed or existing land uses to noise levels that exceed acceptable levels as indicated in this table. Proposals for new development that would cause standards to be exceeded shall only be approved if the project would provide a substantial benefit to the City (including but not limited to provision of affordable housing units or as part of a redevelopment project), and if adequate mitigation measures are employed to reduce interior noise levels to acceptable levels.

**Consistent with mitigation.** The project site is exposed to the following noise sources:

1. UPRR
2. U.S. 101
3. Santa Barbara Municipal Airport
4. Hollister Avenue

Noise contours were estimated for acceptable noise levels for residential use: 70 dB CNEL for outdoor public recreation areas; 65 dB for outdoor common (private) recreation areas (this is also the level at which indoor noise would be reduced to 45 dB with standard construction); and 60 dB for outdoor living areas.

Using reasonable worst case noise exposure assumptions, the EIR found that northern 430 to 450 feet of the project site (containing all of the residential buildings except building 49 and 49 1) lies within the 65 dB CNEL noise exposure contour with the primary sources of noise being the adjacent UPRR/US 101 corridor.

The normally acceptable noise level for commercial use is 67.5 db CNEL. The EIR found that the southern 115 feet of the project site (containing Commercial Building A and H and portions of B & I) is within the 67.5 dB CNEL from Hollister Avenue traffic. Additionally, the project site is located north of...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the 60 dBA CNEL contour of Runway 7/25 as shown in the ALUP and Noise Element Figure 9-2. The Noise Element projects a very small reduction in future noise levels from the airport, so the future 60 dBA CNEL noise contour is expected to be further from the project site than depicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project is estimated to increase noise levels on Hollister Avenue by up to +0.7 dB and on Glen Annie would be less than 0.5 dB, which is an imperceptible change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise generated by the commercial uses would not result in a significant noise impact upon on-site or adjacent off-site residences based on these criteria. However, various activities associated with the commercial uses would result in the potential for noise nuisance impacts, such as, pass-by truck noise at the residential units closest to the roadway if it occurs between 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM when there is greater noise sensitivity, and from roof-top mechanical equipment humming or on/off cycling noise at the commercial buildings closest to on-site residences where there is a line of sight between rooftop equipment and upper story residences and less than 200 feet of separation, or special events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise levels up to 67.5 dBA are considered normally acceptable for office buildings, business commercial, or professional uses, as shown above in Table 4.10-6. As shown in Figure 4.10-1, Portions of commercial buildings Avenue would be located within the 67.5 dBA CNEL contour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With regard to exterior noise levels, the project’s primary common open space, trails, walkways and recreational facilities, are shielded to be exposed to noise levels below 70 dBA from railway and traffic noise. However, the northern facades of any upper story residential units with a direct line of sight to US 101 may be exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA CNEL may have private outdoor living spaces located within the 65dBA CNEL contour and which is significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | The project has been conditioned to prepare a noise mitigation plan (N 3-1), to submit an acoustical study to reduce interior noise to 45
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NE 1.2: Location of New Residential Development</th>
<th>Consistent with mitigation. See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dB CNEL (MM N 4-1) and outdoor living spaces to 60 dBA CNEL (MM N 5-1). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 3.4, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION

**NE 1.2: Location of New Residential Development.** Where sites, or portions of sites, designated by the land use element for residential use exceed 60 dBA CNEL, the City shall require measures to be incorporated into the design of projects that will mitigate interior noise levels and noise levels for exterior living and play areas to an acceptable level. In the event that a proposed residential or mixed-use project exceeds these standards, the project may be approved only if it would provide a substantial benefit to the City, including but not limited to, provision of affordable residential units. Mitigation measures shall reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA CNEL or less, while noise levels at exterior living areas and play areas should in general not exceed 60 dBA CNEL and 65 dBA CNEL, respectively.

**NE 1.4 Acoustical Studies.** An acoustical study that includes field measurement of noise levels may be required for any proposed project that would: a) locate a potentially intrusive noise source near an existing sensitive receptor, or b) locate a noise-sensitive land use near an existing known or potentially intrusive noise source such as a freeway, arterial roadway, railroad, industrial facility, or airport traffic pattern. Acoustical studies should identify noise sources, magnitudes, and potential noise mitigation measures and describe existing and future noise exposure. The acoustical study shall be funded by the applicant and conducted by a qualified person or firm that is experienced in the fields of environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics. The determination of applicability of this requirement shall be made by the Planning and Environmental Services Department by applying the standards and criteria of Table 9-2.

**NE 1.5 Acceptable Noise Levels.** New construction and substantial alterations of existing construction shall include appropriate noise insulation measures (such as insulation, glazing, and other sound attenuation measures) so that such construction or renovations comply with state and building code standards for allowable interior noise levels. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> To seek measures and operational changes that result in a reduction in noise and noise-related impacts generated by the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 3.4, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> To prevent community and environmental disruptions by limiting single-event and nuisance noise levels, so that relative quiet and peace is achieved and maintained at residential areas and other sensitive receptors</td>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> To prevent community and environmental disruptions by limiting single-event and nuisance noise levels, so that relative quiet and peace is achieved and maintained at residential areas and other sensitive receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE 6.4 Restrictions on Construction Hours.</strong> The City shall require, as a condition of approval for any land use permit or other planning permit, restrictions on construction hours. Noise-generating construction</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> The project would result in construction related noise. Residents at Pacific Glen residential development and surrounding nonresidential...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY

activities for projects near or adjacent to residential buildings and neighborhoods or other sensitive receptors shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Construction in nonresidential areas away from sensitive receivers shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Construction shall generally not be allowed on weekends and state holidays. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. All construction sites subject to such restrictions shall post the allowed hours of operation near the entrance to the site, so that workers on site are aware of this limitation. City staff shall closely monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours, and shall promptly investigate and respond to all noncompliance complaints.

NE 6.5 Other Measures to Reduce Construction Noise

The following measures shall be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise:

a. All construction equipment shall have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment shall have an unmuffled exhaust system.

b. Contractors shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including but not limited to changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise.

c. To the extent practicable, adequate buffers shall be maintained between noise-generating machinery or equipment and any sensitive receivers. The buffer should ensure that noise at the receiver site does not exceed 65 dBA CNEL. For equipment that produces a noise level of 95 dBA at 50 feet, a buffer of 1600 feet is required for attenuation of sound levels to 65 dBA.

DISCUSSION

uses would be subjected to construction noise. The project has been conditioned to restrict construction hours (MM N 1-1), to reduce the construction noise (MM N 1-2), and to shield stationary construction that exceeds 65 dBA at the project boundaries and/or is within 1,600 feet from sensitive receptors (MM N 1-3). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element NE 6.5.
### Policy Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of more noise-tolerant components (parking, utility areas, and maintenance facilities) between noise sources and sensitive receptor areas.</td>
<td>NE 7.6, and NE 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE 7.3 Architectural Techniques.</strong> The City shall encourage the use of architectural techniques to meet noise attenuation requirements. Such techniques include: a) using noise-tolerant rooms such as garages, kitchens, and bedrooms to shield noise-sensitive rooms such as bedrooms and family rooms and b) using building façade materials that help shield noise.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 3.4, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE 7.4 Alternatives to Sound Walls.</strong> The City shall encourage new development near highway and railroad noise sources to identify alternatives to sound walls to reduce noise impacts.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 3.4, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE 7.5 Implementation of Recommendations from Acoustical Analyses.</strong> For projects where an acoustical analysis is required because of potential noise impacts, the City, through its development review and building permit processes, shall ensure that all appropriate noise reduction measures are incorporated.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 3.4, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE 7.6 Noise-Insulation Standards for Multi-Family Dwellings.</strong> In compliance with state law, the City shall require all multi-family residential developments that are proposed within the 60-dBA-CNEL noise contour to include appropriate noise-insulation measures.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 3.4, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, NE 7.6, and NE 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE 7.7 Acoustic Design Manual Requirements.</strong> For residential projects where mitigation is required to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA CNEL, the City Building Official shall require incorporation of measures listed in the current version of the Acoustic Design Manual for the appropriate amount of noise reduction.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent with mitigation.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Noise Element policy NE 1.1, NE 1.2, NE 1.4, NE 1.5, NE 3.4, NE 4.1, NE 5.5, NE 7.2, NE 7.3, NE 7.4, NE 7.5, and NE 7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Element

**Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships**

**Objectives:** Take an active approach in sharing resources to effectively create and respond to opportunities to achieve housing goals. Establish a monitoring and policy/actions/priorities update process to assess progress in accomplishing housing actions identified in this element on an ongoing basis and respond to changing conditions and housing needs. Identify shared responsibilities from all sectors within the community (government, business, neighborhoods, nonprofits, etc.) and work with other jurisdictions and agencies to effectively address Goleta’s housing needs.

**HE 2.5 Neighborhood Meetings.** Developers of all major residential projects are encouraged to have meetings with neighborhood residents early in the process to undertake problem solving and facilitate faster, more informed and constructive development review and decision making. The City shall facilitate neighborhood participation in the project review and decision-making process. **Consistent.** The applicant was encouraged to meet with the adjacent property neighborhood residents early in the process. City staff was informed of the meetings, but did not attend. The City facilitated public participation as part of the City Council General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment Initiation hearing, a Planning Commission Conceptual Review, and through four Design
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**Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs**

**Objective:** Create housing nearby to where people work and encourage participation in the City’s affordable housing program from commercial, office, industrial, and other nonresidential uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong></td>
<td>The project includes 274 new residential apartment units, including one, two and three-bedroom units. The project would initially operate as a market rate rental project, although there are no restrictions as to the length of time within which the 274 units must remain as rentals. A rental affordability restriction is not proposed nor does the Housing Element require affordability restrictions for rental projects to encourage construction of additional rental units. Local workforce housing demand includes demand for rental units. If the project is to be converted to condominiums, a new planning application and associated environmental review would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong></td>
<td>The project includes 5 new for-sale live/work units, which per HE 3.3 can provide affordable employee housing, generate additional economic activity in the community, and help maintain an appropriate jobs-to-housing balance. Per the direction of the Planning Director early in the process, the project includes the live/work units to provide a new type of housing not currently available in Goleta. As a result, both the supply and the variety of housing opportunities to meet the need of Goleta’s workforce would increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong></td>
<td>The project would result in an estimated 273 jobs being created. The project would provide 2748 residential apartment units and 5 live/work units with an estimated residential population of 835 residents. The project would therefore provide affordable housing and affordable employee housing to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HE 3.1: Housing for Local Workers.** The City encourages housing developers to provide an adequate supply and variety of housing opportunities that are specifically designed to meet the needs of Goleta’s workforce, striving to match housing types and affordability with household incomes of the local workforce.

Additionally, the dedication of 1 of the 5 live/work units subject to a long-term affordability covenant or deed restriction was determined to be infeasible, as such, the project has been conditioned to provide an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment to meet the inclusionary requirements per HE 11.3 (MM LU 7-1).

Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.
**POLICY**

| to contribute to the provision of affordable employee housing. The proposed amount of floor area and type of nonresidential use shall be factors in establishing the requirement for individual projects. Alternatives to satisfy this requirement may, at the discretion of the City, include payment of a development impact fee, provision of housing on site, housing assistance as part of employee benefit packages, or other alternatives of similar value. |
| offset all new employment opportunities onsite and provide additional affordable housing opportunities for the community. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. |

| HE 3.3 Live/Work Development. [GP] Live/work units can provide affordable employee housing, generate additional economic activity in the community, and help maintain an appropriate jobs-to-housing balance in Goleta. The City will encourage opportunities for live/work developments in appropriate locations where housing can be provided for workers on site or through caretaker or other types of housing. |
| Consistent. The project includes 5 new for-sale live/work units, which per HE 3.3 can provide affordable employee housing, generate additional economic activity in the community, and help maintain an appropriate jobs-to-housing balance. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy. |

| Policy HE 4: Variety of Housing Choices and Affordable Housing Opportunities |
| Objective: Provide a variety of choices in the type, size, cost, and location of new housing units; encourage more efficient use of existing housing and vacant sites and redevelopment of obsolescent existing development. |

| HE 4.2: Variety of Housing Choices. In response to the broad range of housing needs in Goleta, the City will strive to achieve a mix of housing types, densities, affordability levels, and designs. The City will work with developers of nontraditional housing and seek innovative approaches in financing, design, construction, and types of housing to meet local housing needs. This includes, but is not limited to, the following types of housing at varying affordability levels: |
| Consistent. The project includes 274 new residential apartment units, including one, two and three-bedroom units and 5 live/work condominium units, an alternative to detached single family homes. All units would be located close to jobs and transit. As such, the project is considered consistent with this policy. |

| a. Ownership and rental housing. |
| b. Small and large units. |
| c. Single- and multifamily housing. |
| d. Housing close to jobs and transit. |
| e. Mixed-use housing. |
| f. Single Room Occupancy units. |
| g. Shared living opportunities. |
| h. Manufactured housing and mobile homes. |
| i. Self-help or “sweat equity” housing. |
| j. Housing cooperatives. |
| k. Assisted-living residential units. |

| Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta’s RHNA |
| Objective: Identify adequate sites designated at densities to accommodate the City’s SBCAG-assigned fair share of the south coast’s RHNA and particularly the need for extremely low, very low, low-, and moderate-income housing |

| HE 6.2 Vacant Sites with Existing Residential Zoning. Vacant sites with existing zoning for residential use, particularly those designated for 20 units per acre or more, shall be developed with a |
| Consistent. The project includes a Zone change to the southern portion of the property by changing the MHS/AHO DR-12.3 and M-RP zone designations to a SC zone |
variety of housing types and income levels. designation, and the project includes a zone change to the northern portion of the property by changing the MHS/AHO DR-12.3 zone designation to DR-20 units per acre zone designation. The residential component of the project is to be constructed at a density of 20 units per acre, and would provide a variety of housing types per the discussion of HE 4.2. The commercial component of the project includes 5 new for-sale live/work units, which per HE 3.3 can provide affordable employee housing. The project includes the live/work units to provide a new type of housing not currently available in Goleta. As a result, both the supply and the variety of housing opportunities to meet the need of Goleta’s workforce would increase.

Additionally, the dedication of 1 of the 5 live/work units subject to a long-term affordability covenant or deed restriction was determined to be infeasible, as such, the project has been conditioned to provide an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment to meet the inclusionary requirements per HE 11.3 (MM LU 7-1).

Policy HE 7: Opportunities for Mixed-Use Housing

**Objective:** Allow housing in nonresidential areas where residential use is appropriate to the setting and where mixed-use projects can be encouraged to address jobs and housing needs.

**HE 7.1 Mixed-Use Housing.** Well-designed mixed-use residential/nonresidential developments are encouraged by the City at locations where residential use is appropriate to the setting and development impacts can be mitigated, including, but not limited to, Old Town. The City will develop incentives to encourage mixed-use development in appropriate locations.

Consistent. The project is a mixed-use residential and commercial development located between Hollister Avenue and US-101. The project has been designed to connect an existing residential neighborhood to a new residential neighborhood, preserving the existing character, and to transition the residential uses to existing and new commercial uses along the Hollister Avenue corridor.

The project would result in impacts as documented within this environmental impact report; however, mitigation is proposed to less the impacts as feasible. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

**HE 7.2 Housing at Shopping Center Sites. [GP]**

The City will allow the development of housing in conjunction with the remodeling or redevelopment of shopping centers located within the Community Commercial land use category. Housing units may be constructed on a new second story above existing retail space or in separate buildings on the site.

Consistent. The project includes an Ordinance Amendment to allow for residential live/work units to be located within the commercial zone districts that are found within Community Commercial Land Use Designations, and the project includes 5 live/work units that will be constructed above retail space in a 90,054.88-square foot...
### Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design

**Objective:** Ensure that new housing is well designed to be compatible with and enhance Goleta’s neighborhoods and the community as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 9.2: Design and Neighborhood Context.</td>
<td>It is the City’s intent that neighborhood identity and sense of community should be enhanced by designing all new housing to have a sensitive transition of scale and compatibility in form to the surrounding area. Buffers will be provided in mixed-use areas between residential and nonresidential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 9.3: Housing Design Principles for Multifamily and Affordable Housing.</td>
<td>The intent in the design of new multifamily and affordable housing is to provide stable, safe, and attractive neighborhoods through high-quality architecture, site planning, and amenities that address the following principles (see related Policy VH 4):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reduce the Appearance of Building Bulk—Require designs that break up the perceived bulk and minimize the apparent height and size of new buildings, including the use of upper-story step-backs, variations in wall and roof planes, and landscaping. Application of exterior finish materials and trim, and windows and doors, for example, are important elements of building design and an indicator of overall building quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognize Existing Street Patterns—Incorporate transitions in height and setbacks from adjacent properties to respect adjacent development character and privacy. Design new housing so that it relates to the existing street pattern, creates a sense of neighborliness with surrounding buildings, and integrates pedestrian and bicycle systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enhance the “Sense of Place” by Incorporating Focal Areas—Design new housing around natural and/or designed focal points that are emphasized through direct pedestrian and bicycle pathway connections. Site design and placement of structures shall include the maximum amount of usable, contiguous open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Minimize the Visual Impact of Parking and Garages—Discourage residential designs in which garages dominate the public façade of the residential building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provide Buffers between Housing and Nonresidential Uses—Ensure compatibility of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>residential and nonresidential uses by addressing parking and driveway patterns, transitions between uses, entries, site planning, and the provision of appropriate buffers to minimize noise, lighting, or use impacts.</td>
<td><strong>f. Maximize Privacy for Individual Units</strong>—Site design, including placement of structures, pedestrian circulation, and common areas, as well as elements of architectural design such as, but not limited to, placement of windows, shall achieve a maximum degree of privacy for individual dwelling units within multifamily projects, including privacy for individual exterior spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <strong>Maximize Security and Safety</strong>—Site and architectural design of multifamily residential projects shall emphasize principles of “defensible space,” security for residents, and public safety and shall facilitate policing and observation by the City’s police department from public streets and rights-of-way to the extent feasible.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies CE 13.1 and CE 13.2 CE 13.3, and Housing Element policy HE 9.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HE 9.4: Resource Conservation.** The City will promote development and construction standards that provide resource conservation by encouraging housing types and designs that use renewable and/or sustainable materials, cost-effective energy conservation measures, and fewer resources (water, electricity, etc.) and therefore cost less to operate over time. The City encourages that individual residential units within multifamily housing projects be separately metered for all utilities, including, but not limited to, water, natural gas, and electricity (see related Policy CE 13).

**HE 9.5: Renewable Energy Technologies.** Promote the use of sustainable and/or renewable materials and energy technologies, such as solar, in new and rehabilitated housing when possible (see related Policy CE 13).

**Policy HE 10: Production of New Affordable Housing**

**Objective:** Provide incentives to encourage the development of long-term affordable housing.

**HE 10.3: “Designated” Affordable Housing Sites.** Given the limited availability of developable land within its boundaries, housing opportunity sites or areas are designated. These sites are vacant and designated for densities of 20 units per acre or greater (see maps, policies, and programs under Policy HE 6). Development proposals on these sites may be subject to special affordability provisions, pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Policy set forth in Policy HE 11, in recognition of the substantial increases in the land values as a consequence of rezoning of these sites from nonresidential zones to

**Consistent.** See discussion of consistency with Housing Element policy HE 3.1, HE 6.2, HE 6.3 and HE 11.1.
### Policy HE 11: Inclusion of Extremely Low-, Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development

**Objective:** Strengthen residential inclusionary requirements and incentives to require affordable housing as part of market-rate residential projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium-Density Residential.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy HE 11:</strong> Inclusion of Extremely Low-, Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project includes 5 new for-sale live/work units, which per HE 3.3 can provide affordable employee housing. Per the direction of the Planning Director early in the process, the project includes the live/work units to provide a new type of housing not currently available in Goleta. As a result, both the supply and the variety of housing opportunities to meet the need of Goleta's workforce would increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> Strengthen residential inclusionary requirements and incentives to require affordable housing as part of market-rate residential projects.</td>
<td>Additionally, the dedication of 1 of the 5 live/work units subject to a long-term affordability covenant or deed restriction was determined to be infeasible, as such, the project has been conditioned to provide an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment to meet the inclusionary requirements per HE 11.3 (MM LU 7-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 11.1 Inclusionary Housing Approach.</strong> To increase construction of housing affordable to persons employed locally, the City shall require residential projects including for-sale units to provide a percentage of units for extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households in accordance with HE 11.2 and 11.5 or 11.6. Alternatively, in accordance with HE 11.2, 11.3, and 11.4, the inclusionary requirement may be satisfied by paying an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment and/or by other alternative means.</td>
<td>See additional discussion of consistency with Housing Element policy HE 3.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The units provided through this policy shall be deed restricted for the longest term permitted by law. The inclusionary requirement shall apply to all housing, including, but not limited to, single-family housing; multifamily housing; condominiums; townhouses; stock cooperatives; and land subdivisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 11.2 Applicability of Inclusionary Requirements.</strong> The inclusionary requirement shall apply to residential projects including for-sale units as follows:</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> See discussion of consistency with Housing Element policy HE 113.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Projects consisting of one for-sale single-family unit shall be exempt from the inclusionary requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Projects consisting of two to four for-sale units shall be required to pay an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Projects of five or more for-sale units shall be required to construct the applicable number of units in accordance with HE 11.5 or 11.6, except that the City, at its sole discretion, may allow the inclusionary requirement for these projects to be satisfied by alternative means as set forth in HE 11.3 and 11.4. The applicability of these requirements, while at the sole discretion of the City, shall be determined by the Planning Director early in the application process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 11.3 Priorities for Meeting Inclusionary Requirements.</strong> The primary intent of the inclusionary requirement is to achieve the construction of new units on site. A second priority is construction of units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent. See discussion of consistency with Housing Element policy HE 113.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>off site or the transfer of sufficient land and cash to the City or a nonprofit housing organization to develop the required number of affordable units. If these options are determined to be infeasible by the City, other alternatives of equal value, such as, but not necessarily limited to, payment of an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment or acquisition and rehabilitation of existing units, may be considered at the sole discretion of the City.</td>
<td>Consistent. See discussion of consistency with Housing Element policy HE 11.3.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HE 11.4 Flexibility in Meeting Inclusionary Requirements.** It is the City’s intent to achieve the greatest percentage of affordable units possible. Creative ways to meet the City’s inclusionary requirement to help achieve City housing goals, especially for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income housing, such as through partnership with a nonprofit housing agency, are encouraged. In addition, trade-offs of extremely low-and very low-income units for moderate-income units may be considered, if it can be demonstrated that the City’s housing goals can be more effectively achieved. Such trade-off approaches may incorporate a unit equivalency based on a financial pro forma provided by the applicant. The applicability of these requirements, while at the sole discretion of the City, shall be determined by the Planning Director early in the application process. |

**HE 11.5 Establishment of Unit Percentages and Income Levels.** Except for designated affordable housing sites as set forth in HE 11.6, the inclusionary housing requirement shall be as follows (see related HE 11.9):

a. Proposed projects including for-sale units, including subdivisions for purposes of condominium conversions, will be required to provide either 15 percent or 20 percent affordable units of the total number of for-sale units, subject to the Planning Director’s direction and City Council’s approval. The 15 percent affordability requirement shall be provided to those applicants where the community services, such as new onsite or nearby park/open space facilities, resulting from the project exceed normal expectations. |

b. Proposed projects including for-sale units qualifying for a 15 percent affordability level shall provide 2 percent of the total number of for-sale units at prices affordable to extremely low- and very low-income households, 5 percent affordable to low-income households, 4 percent affordable to moderate-income households, and 4 percent | Consistent. See discussion of consistency with Housing Element policy HE 11.3.1. |
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>affordable to above moderate-income households earning 120 to 200 percent of the median income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Proposed projects including for-sale units qualifying for a 20 percent affordability level shall provide 5 percent of the total number of for-sale units at prices affordable to extremely low- and very low-income households, 5 percent affordable to low-income households, 5 percent affordable to moderate-income households, and 5 percent affordable to above moderate-income households earning 120 to 200 percent of the median income.

Requirements for provision of inclusionary units in projects including for-sale units for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households may be satisfied by providing the same number of rental units to these households.

#### HE 11.7 Long-Term Affordability of Inclusionary Units

Inclusionary units shall be subject to recordation of a regulatory agreement to provide affordable housing units and an affordability covenant or deed restriction. The term of affordability restrictions shall be based on applicable federal laws and financing mechanisms, generally 45 years but not less than 30 years. (See related HE 11.9.)

**Consistent.** See discussion of consistency with Housing Element policy HE 3.1 and 11.1.

#### HE 11.8 Additional Incentives for Onsite Production of Affordable Inclusionary Units

In instances where a developer of a 5-acre or larger site designated as Medium-Density Residential by the Land Use Plan Map in Figure 2-1 agrees to construct affordable inclusionary units in a manner consistent with HE 11.5 or HE 11.6, rather than pay an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment, the City shall provide the following incentives or concessions:

- The Lot Coverage Ratio standard set forth in the Land Use Element shall be increased from 0.3 to 0.4.

The preceding shall be in addition to other incentives or concessions offered pursuant to Policy HE 10.

**Consistent.** The project site is 23.55-acre site partially designated as Medium-Density Residential by the Land Use Plan Map in Figure 2-1. The project residential lot coverage ratio is 22.5%. The applicant did not request an increase in the allowable lot coverage ratio. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

### 4.9.4 Cumulative Impacts

As shown in Section 3.0 Related Projects, there are several developments near the project site. These include a recently approved bank drive-up window and office building (commercial uses) on the northwest corner of Storke Road and Hollister Avenue approximately 500 feet to the east, a hotel and restaurant (commercial uses) at the northeast corner of Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection approximately 0.20 mile to the east, a deployment center for ambulances (industrial use) approximately 0.25 mile to the west, and a proposed McDonalds...
drive-thru within the Camino Real Market Place to the south. These uses are considered compatible with the project. Therefore cumulative land use compatibility impacts associated with the project in combination with currently planned projects in the vicinity would not occur.

However, as discussed in Section 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the project would result in a significant contribution to significant unavoidable cumulative impacts associated with introduction of increased development along major transportation corridors and the potential for accidents or train derailments. The General Plan EIR identifies this as a significant unavoidable impact associated with buildout of the General Plan. A Statement of Overriding Impacts Considerations was adopted for this impact along with adoption of the General Plan.

Consistency with applicable plans and policies is generally assessed on an individual project basis.

### 4.9.5 Mitigation Measures

**Impact LU 1:** Temporary, short-term demolition and construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would potentially generate short-term compatibility/quality of life effects on occupants of existing surrounding uses.

*Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant*

Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.5 Geologic and Soils (MM GEO 1-1 and MM GEO 4-1) and Hydrology and Water Quality (MM WQ 1-1) would address potential compatibility issues associated with erosion, sedimentation and instability resulting from construction activities.

Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (MM HAZ 1-1, MM HAZ 1-2, MM HAZ 1-3 and MM HAZ 1-4) would address potential compatibility issues associated with handling hazardous materials resulting from construction activities.

Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.10 Noise (MM N 1-1, MM N 1-2 and MM N 1-3) would address potential compatibility issues associated with noise resulting from construction activities.

Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.9 Land Use and Planning (MM LU 6-2) would address potential compatibility issues associated with encroachment into navigable airspace from construction activities.

**Impact LU 2:** The project could create a compatibility conflict with surrounding land uses.

*Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant*

Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.1 Aesthetic (MM AES 1-1), Section 4.10 Noise (MM N 3-1 and N 4-1) and Section 4.13 Transportation and Traffic (MM TR 2-1, MM TR 3-1, MM TR 6-2, and MM TR 7-2) would address potential compatibility issues associated with the project and the scale of existing development, noise emanating from the project to adjacent sensitive receptors, and traffic circulation/volumes along Hollister Avenue and Storke Road.

**Impact LU 3:** The project would be consistent with the Goleta Municipal Code
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**zoning regulations Zoning Ordinance**—with approval of requested permits and associated modifications.

*Significance Before Mitigation: No Impact*

This impact is determined to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Impact LU 4**: The project would generate demand for parking that would be met by the on-site parking supply.

*Significance Before Mitigation: Less Than Significant*

This impact is determined to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Impact LU 5**: The project would create additional off-site public parking supply on Glen Annie Road.

*Significance Before Mitigation: Beneficial*

This impact is determined to be beneficial and no mitigation measures are required.

**Impact LU 6**: The project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

*Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant*

The project shall be referred by the ALUC for consistency with the ALUP during the Draft EIR public review period. At this point, the project may be inconsistent with the ALUP depending on the outcome of the ALUC’s review. However, mitigation measures cannot be identified until this determination is made.

**LU 6-1**: The project shall be reviewed and approved by the ALUC. In the event that approval is not granted by the ALUC, the project shall be returned to the City Council for further discretionary review pursuant to Public Utility Code Sections 21670-21678.

**Plan Requirement & Timing**: The applicant shall provide documentation of the ALUC meeting and final determination prior to approval of the Land Use Permit for physical development.

**Monitoring**: City staff shall verify ALUC review and approval.

**LU 6-21**: The permittee shall—must complete and file Form 7460-1 (Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration) with the FAA and shall—demonstrate to the Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee, that the project is either exempt from applicable construction regulations or complies with those regulations that govern the project.

**Plan Requirements and Timing**: Form 7460-1, with evidence of FAA action, shall—must be filed with the Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee, before the City prior to issuance of issues a Land Use Permit for any
commercial building.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance with this requirement before the City issues a Land Use permit for any commercial building prior to LUP issuance and with any applicable FAA regulations during grading and construction.

**LU 6-32:** The permittee must execute and record a deed restriction, in a form approved by the City Attorney, that acknowledges and assumes responsibility for airport safety risks; waives any future claims of damage or liability against the City; and agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City against any and all liability, claims, damages, and/or expenses arising from any injury to any person or damage to property due to such hazards. In addition, the applicant permittee must record a Real Estate Disclosure notice informing potential owners, lessees, or renters that the subject property is within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport’s Airport Influence Area and is subject to potential hazards from low-altitude aircraft overflights.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The applicant permittee must submit a copy of the recorded deed restriction and Real Estate Disclosure written to the satisfaction of the Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee, and the City Attorney before City staff prior to issuance of Land Use Permit.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee, must verify compliance with this requirement before prior to map recordation and issuance of Land Use Permit.

**LU 6-43:** Applicant shall record an avigation easement, in a form approved by the City Attorney and the Santa Barbara City Attorney, for areas within the Airport Approach Zones between the applicant and the City of Santa Barbara.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The applicant permittee must submit a copy of the recorded avigation easement, with written confirmation from the City of Santa Barbara that the avigation easement is acceptable to the City of Santa Barbara before the before final map recordation prior to issuance of Land Use Permit.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee, must verify compliance with this requirement before final map recordation prior to issuance of Land Use Permit.

**Impact LU 7:** The project could result in consistency impacts with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies

*Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant*
Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the following EIR Sections would address potential consistency issues associated with the project and General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies:

Section 4.1 Aesthetic (MM AES 1-1, MM AES 1-2, MM AES 3-2, MM AES 3-3, MM AES 3-4, MM AES 3-5, MM AES 3-6, MM AES 3-7, MM AES 3-8, MM AES 3-9, MM AES 3-10, MM AES 5-1, MM AES 9-1);
Section 4.2 Air Quality (MM AQ 1-1, MM AQ 1-2, MM AQ 1-3, MM AQ 1-4, MM AQ 1-5, MM AQ 2-1, MM AQ 3-1, MM AQ 4-1, MM AQ 4-1);
Section 4.3 Biological Resources (MM BIO 2-1, MM BIO 3-1, MM BIO 4-1, MM BIO 5-1);
Section 4.4 Cultural Resources (MM CR 1-1, MM CR 1-2, MM CR 1-3, MM CR 2-1, MM CR 2-2, MM CR 2-3, MM CR 2-4, MM CR 2-5, MM CR 2-6);
Section 4.5 Geology and Soils (MM GEO 1-1);
Section 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MM GHG 1-1);
Section 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (MM HAZ 3-1, MM HAZ 4-1, MM HAZ 4-2, MM HAZ 5-1, MM HAZ 5-2, MM HAZ 6-1, MM HAZ 6-2, MM HAZ 7-1);
Section 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (MM WQ 1-1, MM WQ 2-1, MM WQ 2-2, MM WQ 2-3, MM WQ 2-4);
Section 4.9 Land Use and Planning (MM LU 6-1, MM LU 6-3, MM LU 6-4, MM LU 7-1);
Section 4.10 Noise (MM N 1-1, MM N 1-2, MM N 1-3, MM N 3-1, MM N 4-1, MM N 5-1);
Section 4.11 Public Facilities –Fire Protection (MM PS 1-1)
Section 4.13 Transportation and Traffic (MM TR 1-1, MM TR 2-1, MM TR 3-1, MM TR 6-1, MM TR 6-2, MM TR 7-1, MM TR 7-2);
Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems (MM WS 1-1, MM WS 1-2, MM WS 1-3, MM WW 1-1, MM SW 1-1, MM SW 2-1)

LU 7-1:  The permittee must submit payment of an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment in an amount approved by the Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee must submit payment of an inclusionary housing in-lieu payment in an amount approved by the Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for any live/work residential building.

Monitoring: The Planning and Environmental Services Director, or designee, must verify compliance with this requirement before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for any live/work residential building.

4.9.6 Residual Impacts

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the project would not conflict with policy, and therefore the potential land use compatibility impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (Class II). With implementation of mitigation measures listed for Impact LU-7, General Plan policy consistency impacts would be reduced to less than significant (Class II). Prior to review of the project by the ALUC, the project’s potential inconsistency with the ALUP is considered significant and unavoidable (Class I).