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CHAPTER 1.0
INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The City of Goleta (City) adopted the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) in October 2006. The GP/CLUP is the primary means for guiding future changes in Goleta. Through it, the GP/CLUP guides the City when rendering decisions about growth, housing, environmental protection, neighborhood compatibility, preservation, public facilities and services, and transportation. Prior to the adoption of the GP/CLUP, the City, acting as the lead agency, determined that the proposed GP/CLUP could result in significant adverse environmental effects as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., “CEQA”), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the “CEQA Guidelines”), and the City’s Environmental Guidelines (“Goleta Guidelines”; CEQA, CEQA Guidelines and Goleta Guidelines collectively referred to as “CEQA Regulations”). Consequently, the City prepared a program-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the propose project or the implementation of implementing the GP/CLUP.

The City prepared this Addendum to the Final EIR for the GP/CLUP (SCH #2005031151) that was certified in October 2006 (2006 Final EIR). This Addendum addresses one site-specific amendment to the General PlanGP/CLUP relating to two parcels legally described as Parcels A & B of Parcel Map No. 11,218 filed in the Santa Barbara County Recorder’s Office in Book 7, Page 19 of Parcel Maps, Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 073-030-020 and 073-030-021 (the “Property”). which would specifically amend the General PlanGP/CLUP Land Use Element by changing the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) to change the land use designation for APN 073-030-020 and -021 and redesignating the Property from Medium Density Residential (R-MD) and Office and Institutional (I-OI) to Community Commercial (C-C) (the “Project” or the “GPA”).

This amendment to the GP/CLUP is referenced as the General Plan Amendment (GPA) throughout this Addendum.

The 2006 Final EIR is a Program EIR evaluating the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the GP/CLUP. From 2008 to 2010, a series of City-initiated amendments to the GP/CLUP were completed, along with a Supplemental EIR and Addenda to the 2006 Final EIR to address the changes in environmental effects associated with related City-initiated GP/CLUP amendments. From 2008 to 2010, three project-specific amendments to the GP/CLUP were adopted, along with an EIR and an Addendum to an EIR and Supplemental EIR. All of these CEQA documents comprise the “GP/CLUP GPA” as a whole because these documents collectively provide the complete environmental analysis of the GP/CLUP as it is currently written. The environmental documents amending the 2006 Final EIR are listed in Table 1 and incorporated by reference into this addendum.

This Addendum addresses any new or modified environmental impacts associated with the Westar Mixed Use Village project GPA and the associated change in potential environmental impacts and mitigations measures from those documented in the GP/CLUP EIR. This document has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and State CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.)) (collectively “the CEQA Regulations,” unless otherwise stated).
This GPA to the GP/CLUP is requested by the applicant of the Westar Mixed Use Village Project (Westar Project), 08-143-GPA-RZ-OA-TM (32,048)-DP-DRB; 10-040-CUP (minor); 10-041-CUP (major); 10-097-OA (DA). The Westar Project would develop a mix of 274 multi-family residential apartment units and 88,704 square feet of commercial space and 5 additional live/work condominium units on a 23.558 gross acre site/23.465 net acre site. The GPA does not pertain to the entire project site, but only to the southern 9.765 net acres. The Westar Project’s potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Westar Mixed Use Project are addressed in a separate environmental document (Westar Mixed Use Project Environmental Impact Report 11-EIR-001, SCH #201007106) which is available for general public reference at City Hall and the Goleta Valley Public Library.

1.2 CEQA GUIDELINES – ADDENDUMS TO EIRS AND SUBSEQUENT EIRS

According to CEQA Guidelines §§ Sections 15163(a) and 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Lead Agency or the Responsible Agency will prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines § Section 15162 calling for the requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred. CEQA Guidelines § Section 15164(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires substantial evidence that a subsequent EIR is not unnecessary.

CEQA Guidelines § Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines states that, for a project covered by a certified EIR, preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR is required instead of an addendum rather than an addendum is required only if one or more of the following conditions occur:

1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

3) New information of substantial importance, which was unknown and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

   a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
   b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
   c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
   d) Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

As set forth in this Addendum, none of these conditions described above will occur as a result of the amendment to the GP/CLUP the GPA. Therefore, consequently, an
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Addendum is appropriate for this project, not a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 or supplemental EIR pursuant to Section 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Table 1 summarizes the addenda and SEIR to the 2006 Final EIR that have been prepared and were certified from 2007 through 2012, which, along with the 2006 Final EIR, comprise the “GP/CLUP EIR.” These documents too voluminous to be included with this document, but are incorporated by reference into this document and are available for review in the City Clerk’s office.

Table 1
2006 General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan
Environmental Impact Report Addenda and SEIRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of Environmental Document</th>
<th>CC Resolution No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-200</td>
<td>Track 1 - Housing Element Update</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>09-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-201</td>
<td>Track 2 - Minor Amendments</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>08-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-033</td>
<td>Track 2.5 - Building Intensity Standards</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>09-32/09-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-202</td>
<td>Track 3 - Substantive Amendments</td>
<td>Supplemental EIR &amp; Addendum</td>
<td>09-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-050</td>
<td>Villages at Los Carneros</td>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>EIR – 08-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GPA – 08-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-102</td>
<td>Haskell’s Landing</td>
<td>Addendum (EIR &amp; Supplemental EIR by County)</td>
<td>Addendum – 09-26 GPA – 09-30 &amp; 09-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addendum – 10-56 GPA – 10-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-123</td>
<td>Housing Element Update</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>Addendum – 11-07 GPA – 11-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-196</td>
<td>Montecito Bank and Trust Project</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>Addendum – 112-080 and 081XX GPA – 12-XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-128</td>
<td>Willow Springs Phase Two</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>Addendum – 112-080 and 081XX GPA – 12-XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

This is an Addendum to the GP/CLUP EIR. This Addendum addresses new or modified environmental impacts associated with the change in land use designation of 7000 Hollister Avenue Parcels A & B of Parcel Map No. 11,218 (APN 073-030-020 and 021) from Medium Density Residential (R-MD) and Office and Institutional (I-OI) to Community Commercial (C-C).

The scope of analysis contained within this Addendum addresses each of the environmental resource areas that were previously analyzed in the GP/CLUP EIR. This Addendum addresses the following environmental issues:

- aesthetics and visual resources;
- agriculture and farmland;
- air quality (includes greenhouse gas emissions);
- biological resources;
- cultural resources;
- geology, soils, and mineral resources;
- hazards and hazardous materials;
- population and housing;
- water resources;
- land use and recreation;
- noise;
- public services and utilities; and
- transportation and circulation.
1.4 ADOPTION AND AVAILABILITY OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to the GP/CLUP EIR will be considered for recommendation for certification by the City of Goleta Planning Commission and certification by the City of Goleta City Council.

The Addendum is available for general public reference at the following locations:

City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Services Dept 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B Goleta, California 93117

Goleta Valley Public Library 500 North Fairview Avenue Goleta, California 93117
CHAPTER 2.0
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The City is located in southern Santa Barbara County, California, west of the City of Santa Barbara between the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Pacific Ocean as shown in Figure 2-1 of the GP/CLUP EIR. The City and surrounding area is generally referred to as the Goleta Valley. Goleta is bisected by U.S. Highway 101 (US-101), which extends in an east-west alignment across the City. State Route 217 (SR-217) connects US-101 with the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) to the south. Portions of the City are bordered by UCSB and by the City of Santa Barbara, including the Santa Barbara Airport. The southern portions of Goleta are within the California Coastal Zone subject to the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission (see GP/CLUP EIR, Figure 2-2, Coastal Zone Boundary).

Access into and through the City is provided primarily through US-101. Other major east-west arterials include Hollister Avenue, Calle Real, and Cathedral Oaks Road. Major north-south arterials are Patterson Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Los Carneros Road, and Storke-Glen Annie Road. The project site (APN 075-030-020 and -021) is on Hollister Avenue at the intersection of Marketplace Drive as shown in Figure 1.
2.2 GOLETA’S GENERAL PLAN/COASTAL LAND USE PLAN (GP/CLUP)

California state planning law, at Section 65300 of the California Government Code §§ 65300, et seq., requires that cities adopt a general plan as a guide to their physical development. The role of the general plan is to act as the City's constitution for the physical use of resources, to express the community's preservation and development goals, and to establish public policy relative to the distribution of future public and private land use. The plan must contain the seven elements mandated by state law and may include other optional elements.

The fundamental goals of the GP/CLUP are to: (1) ensure a high quality environment by protecting and conserving the community’s cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources; (2) provide a sustainable economy that is not solely dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for current and future residents; (3) maintains adequate service standards, including level of service (LOS) on area highways; and (4) enables income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs. These goals are retained as part of the Addendum and were used as a guide during the GP/CLUP and environmental review processes to date.

2.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The GP/CLUP, GP/CLUP EIR, and this Addendum are available for review at City Hall and are posted on the City’s website (www.cityofgoleta.org). Opportunities for public participation included an environmental hearing on November 10, 2011. Additional opportunities for public participation include an environmental hearing and future noticed public hearings of the Planning Commission and the City Council. The first Planning Commission public hearing consisted of an introduction to the project and a site visit on June 25, 2012. The Planning Commission’s second public environmental hearing on July 30, 2012 will be held in conjunction with the environmental hearing on the include a review of the environmental impact report and this addendum for the associated development Project.

The environmental hearing will be conducted as follows:

HEARING DATE/TIME: NOVEMBER 10, 2011 AT 6:00 PM

PLACE: Goleta City Hall – Council Chambers
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

2.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This GPA to the GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1 (Land Use Plan Map) relates to the change in land use designation for APN 073-030-021 (Parcel A) and APN 073-030-020 (Parcel B) located at 7000 Hollister Avenue the Property. Parcel A is a 1.23 acre parcel with a land use designation of Office and Institutional (I-OI). Parcel B is a 22.32 acre parcel with a land use designation of Medium Density Residential (R-MD). Collectively, these two parcels total 23.558-gross acres of the City’s approximate 5,075 gross acres (4.6% of the City’s land area).

The amendment to the GP/CLUP GPA would only alter the southern 9.849-gross acres of the 23.558-gross acres (1.9% of the City’s land area). The northern 13.709-gross acres of the 23.558-gross acre site would retain the land use designation of R-MD and is not part of this amendment to the GP/CLUP as no change is requested.

October 7, 2011, July 18, 2012
The **amendment to the GP/CLUP GPA** would decrease the inventory of land designated Medium Density Residential (R-MD) by 8.619 acres from its current 217.72 acres to 209.101 acres (4.1% of the City's land area). The amendment to the GP/CLUP would decrease the inventory of land designated Office and Institutional (I-OI) by 1.23 acres from its current 94.9 acres to 93.67 acres (1.8% of the City's area). The amendment to the GP/CLUP would increase the inventory of land designated Community Commercial (C-C) by 9.849 acres from its current 83.04 acres to 92.889 acres (1.9% of the City's land area). This would result in a change in Figure 2-1 of the Land Use Element of the GP/CLUP as shown below in Figure 2.

**Figure 2 – Existing and Proposed General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Land Use Designations**

*For the purposes of this Addendum, the pThe Westar Project being analyzed would includes both commercial and residential development on the southern 9.849 acres of the site. A hypothetical "reasonably worst case" development, which is approximately ten percent larger than the Westar Mixed Use Project, would include the following general parameters:

1. The GP/CLUP EIR included qualitative analysis that at full Plan buildout residential units would be included in mixed-use projects, such as construction of some units on sites occupied by shopping centers. In addition, LU 3.3 Community Commercial allows for the development of "Mixed-use, including residential, development at densities up to 12 units per acre may be permitted subject to approval of a conditional use permit in appropriate locations provided that it is compatible with adjacent uses, does not break up the continuity of commercial use at the sidewalk level, or is not within the airport approach zone as designated in the Safety Element."*
Residential units: 26 units (including live/work residential space)

Commercial space:
- Restaurants: 18,700 SF
- Drug store: 16,500 SF
- 5 units live/work space: 3,500 SF (work area only)
- Retail: 41,300 SF
- Office: 20,000 SF
- Total: 100,000 SF

The following analysis focuses on long-term impacts associated with changing the land use designations and having the site build out with retail uses as outlined above. Impacts associated with short-term construction are not expected to increase appreciably as a result of the amendment to the GP/CLUP. As previously noted, cumulative impacts are not expected to change relative to those discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

2 Per General Plan Land Use Element Table 2-2 Office uses are permissible uses in the C-C land use designation. Per Zoning Ordinance Section 35-231.5.1.h SC Zone District Permitted Uses: Professional and Commercial offices occupying not more than 20% of the gross square footage of the total building area.
CHAPTER 3.0
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATION

The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this Addendum are the same as those contained within the GP/CLUP EIR. While the criteria for determining significant impacts are unique to each issue area, the analysis applies a uniform classification of the impacts based on the following definitions:

- A designation of no impact is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- A less-than-significant impact would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
- An impact that is less than significant with mitigation incorporated avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
- A significant and unavoidable impact would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and no feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Based on the above criteria, the environmental impact analysis assesses each issue area to determine the significance level. These impacts are categorized using the City’s guidance for classifying project-related impacts, as follows:

- Class I impacts are significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated, reduced, or avoided. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City adopted a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section § 15093, explaining why project benefits outweigh the disturbance caused by these significant environmental impact or impacts.
- Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly reduced or avoided through the implementation of GP/CLUP policies, or by other recommended mitigation. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City made findings pursuant to CEQA Section § 15091, that impacts have been mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementing the recommended mitigation measures.
- Class III impacts are adverse impacts that are less than significant. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City was not required to make CEQA findings regarding these impacts.
- Class IV impacts include changes to the environment as a result of GP/CLUP implementation that would be beneficial.

The amendment evaluated in this Addendum involves a change in the GP/CLUP land use designation. The GP/CLUP amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor any substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involve no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and require no new or modified mitigation measures.

3.2 REQUIREMENTS FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

The CEQA Guidelines (Section § 15130) requires a reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of a project. Cumulative impacts are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines, Section § 15355).
Potential cumulative impacts are further described as follows:

(a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section §15355(a)).

(b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (CEQA Guidelines, Section §15355(b)).

Furthermore, according to CEQA Guidelines, Section §15130(a)(1):

As defined in Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.

In addition, as stated in the CEQA Guidelines, Section §15064(i)(5), it should be noted note that:

The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the project’s incremental effects are cumulatively considerable.

The cumulative impact analysis evaluated in the GP/CLUP EIR comprises: (1) the citywide impact analysis from full buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP; and (2) outside the City boundary, the cumulative impacts analysis is based on known or foreseeable projects in the unincorporated Santa Barbara County, City of Santa Barbara, and UCSB. The City’s prior previous adoption of the GP/CLUP involved no immediate direct physical environmental impacts. Rather, the Plan set the stage for future development within the City, and as such, the EIR analysis focused on the “indirect” impacts of adoption of the GP/CLUP. These impacts would result primarily from development associated with:

- Development of existing vacant lands consistent with the land use plan map;
- Redevelopment of existing developed lands to more intensive or different uses;
- Major planned street and highway and infrastructure improvements, consistent with the transportation improvement map; and
- Future development consistent with the proposed land use map and GP/CLUP goals, objectives, and policies.

The cumulative environment on which this future City development was assumed to occur included future growth within the region including the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, Santa Barbara County from Highway 154 to the eastern City boundary and from Gaviota to the western City boundary, and UCSB.

The City of Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County, and UCSB growth projections for the region were added to growth assumed for the City, which is already factored into the GP/CLUP to arrive at the cumulative environment.

Because these impacts would occur over time as part of individual residential and commercial/industrial development projects, a project horizon year (2030) was established for purposes of analysis in the GP/CLUP EIR. The growth and changes in land use that were analyzed as impacts of the project throughout the GP/CLUP EIR were projected to the year 2030, employing a cumulative analysis methodology.
No revisions to the cumulative impact analysis presented in the GP/CLUP EIR are necessary as part of this Addendum.

3.3 ANALYSIS

3.3.1 Potential Environmental Effects Analysis

Aesthetic and Visual Resources

Section 3.1 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for aesthetics and visual resources relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with aesthetics and visual resources that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

All projects, regardless of land use designation, would be processed through the design review and planning processes. Each project would be evaluated for compliance with the General Plan's Visual and Historic Policies. In particular, the Design Review Board and staff would utilize VH 4 Design Review and the following policies to guide development: Policy VH 1.4 (Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views), VH 1.6 (Preservation of Natural Landforms), VH 2.2 (Preservation of Scenic Corridors), VH 2.3 (Development Projects Along Scenic Corridors) and VH 3 Community Character policies.

Land use designations within the General Plan do not have setbacks. However, corresponding zone districts do have setbacks. The two existing zone districts have a front yard setback of 50 feet (Industrial Research Park; M-RP) and 20 feet (Design Residential; DR) and the Shopping Center (SC) zone district has a front yard setback of 20 feet. On this project site, the M-RP zone district has a frontage of approximately 150 feet along Hollister Avenue and the DR zone district has a frontage of approximately 900 feet along Hollister Avenue. Therefore, structural development within the C-C land use designation could be constructed 30 feet closer to the Hollister Avenue for the 150 easternmost feet of the project site. However, a high-pressure gas pipeline runs the length of the project site 5 feet into the project site, and General Plan Policy SE 8.13 requires a 25-foot setback from the centerline of any underground high-pressure pipeline for occupied structures except in 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. Due to the presence of an existing high-pressure pipeline on a mostly vacant project site, Policy SE 8.13 effectively creates a front yard setback of 30 feet across the entire project site. This effective 30-foot setback would allow structural development to be constructed 20 feet closer to Hollister Avenue than currently allowed along the 150 easternmost feet of the project site and would push structural development 10 feet further from Hollister Avenue than currently allowed along the 900 westernmost feet of the project site. Other factors that could restrict the structural development include landscaping, parking and circulation requirements. However, the City’s zoning regulations do not differentiate where these improvements are to be physically located within the buildable area of the project site. In consideration of the unchanged buildable area along Hollister Avenue, no change to visual impacts should occur in terms of the location of structural development constructed along Hollister Avenue. Additionally, the southern 4.64 acres of the project site are located within the Santa Barbara Airport Approach Zone (F(APR). The F(APR) could restrict building locations/densities for uses allowed within the existing and proposed land use designations subject to the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review. Therefore, no change to visual impacts should occur in terms of building locations.
The existing and proposed land use designations would both allow buildings of up to three-stories or a maximum of 35 feet in height. In addition, the F(APR) could restrict building height regardless of the land use designation subject to ALUC review. In addition, Policy VH 2.1 designates Hollister Avenue as a scenic corridor and a scenic view across the property toward the mountains to be protected. Collectively, these General Plan GP/CLUP policies would result in will require careful City evaluations review of the views viewshed during the Westar Project project review and would ensure that view corridors are carefully considered. Therefore Accordingly, the Project would not change no change to the visual impacts should occur in terms of related to maximum allowed structure heights, which could impact views toward the Santa Ynez mountains.

One change between the existing land use designations and the proposed C-C designation relates to maximum lot coverage. The two existing land use designations have a maximum lot coverage of 0.40 (I-OI) and 0.30 (R-MD), but the C-C land use designation does not have a maximum coverage standard. The SC zone district that corresponds to the C-C land use designation, however, does have a maximum lot coverage of 0.30 that would also apply to the Westar Project. Consequently, therefore, the lot coverage would not be expected to exceed 0.30.

Given these constraints and requirements, the land use designation change Project is not expected to result in any new significant aesthetics/visual resources impacts in the GP/CLUP EIR and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Residual impacts are expected to be significant As discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR, residual impacts from the Project are expected to be significant. However, the land use designation change Project is not expected to substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects previously identified in the GP/CLUP EIR.

Agriculture and Farmland

Section 3.2 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for agriculture and farmlands relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with agriculture and farmland that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

As the change in land use designation Since the Project does not include changes to agricultural land use designations, the land use designation change it would not affect the analysis presented in the GP/CLUP EIR.

Air Quality

Section 3.3 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for air quality relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with air quality that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified a potential Class I impact (Impact 3.3-5) relating to cumulative ROG and NOx emissions. Potential Class II impacts (Impact 3.3-6) relating to cumulative PM10 emissions and long-term cumulative contributions to operational greenhouse gas emissions were also identified (Class II Impact 3.3-7). The mitigation measure (AQ-1) to these and other air quality impacts directed that a policy be added to the General Plan GP/CLUP requiring the preparation of a Greenhouse Gas
Reduction Plan. This policy has been added to the GP/CLUP and the study is underway and expected to be completed in 2012.

The proposed change to C-C uses could result in 6,310 average daily trips that would contribute to cumulatively significant ROG, NOx, and PM10 emissions evaluated in the GP/CLUP EIR. However, the Project is not expected to result in any new significant cumulative air quality impacts and no changes to mitigation measures in the GP/CLUP EIR are necessary.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As part of the Air Quality analysis, Section 3.3.1.8 of the Track 3 Supplemental EIR to the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the City boundary:

- Environmental setting for greenhouse gas emissions relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified a potential Class I impact (Impact 3.3-5) relating to cumulative ROG and NOx emissions. Potential Class II impacts (Impact 3.3-6) relating to cumulative PM10 emissions and long-term cumulative contributions to operational greenhouse gas emissions as a result of GP/CLUP implementation were also identified (Impact 3.3-7). The mitigation measure (AQ-1) to these and other air quality impacts directed that a policy be added to the General Plan GP/CLUP requiring the preparation of a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. This policy has been added to the GP/CLUP and the study is underway and expected to be completed in 2012.

Future development would contribute to cumulatively significant greenhouse gas emissions evaluated in the GP/CLUP EIR. Additionally, the building intensity standards for physical development of the site expected under the new land use designation pursuant to the Project are not appreciably different than under the current land use designation (i.e., lot coverage, setback, height and resulting total square footage). The land use designation change in the Project is not expected to be significant in terms of energy use as it relates to the GP/CLUP EIR. Accordingly, the land use designation change is not expected to result in any new significant cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts and no changes to mitigation measures to the GP/CLUP EIR are necessary.

Residual impacts are expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR, but the proposed land use designation change—Project is not expected to substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Biological Resources

Section 3.4 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for biological resources relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with biological resources that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

Biological surveys completed by Dudek in April 2005 and Envicom Corporation in December 2010, revealed that the Westar project—Project site is vegetated predominantly by non-native...
grassland. The surveys also found that the site could also serve as foraging habitat for sensitive species and could have nesting birds.

In May 2011, Dudek conducted a wetland delineation of the property to further examine the hydrologic features initially identified in their 2005 biological survey. The wetland delineation was peer-reviewed by Envicom Corporation and which found that a total of 0.052 acres of low-functioning isolated wetlands occur on the 23.55 acre site. Only 0.013 acres of low-functioning isolated wetlands occur on the southern 9.83 acres associated with the GPA as shown below in Figure 3. 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.

In July 2011, Dudek also conducted a Southern Tarplant survey of the property to further examine if this species, a California Native Plant Society List 1B plant species, was located onsite. The Southern Tarplant survey was peer-reviewed by Envicom Corporation and found that Tarplant is not on the portion of the property proposed for a land use designation change.

Other than the 0.013 acres of low-functioning isolated wetlands, no other Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA), sensitive plant or wildlife species or wetlands were found on the GPA site.

Regardless of the type of development that might occur on the Westar Project site (e.g., residential, office and institutional or commercial), as a result of the Project, there is the potential for

---

3 The location of the low-functioning isolated wetlands is superimposed over the Project site plan as of October 2011. The site plan was modified in November 2011, primarily in the northeast corner of the Project site; however, the revisions to the site plan do not impact the Biological Resources analysis within this CEQA addendum to the GP/CLUP FEIR (SCH#20050503115) for the Westar Mixed-Use Village Project
biological resources on site to be impacted. Mitigation measures included in the GP/CLUP EIR would reduce those impacts to insignificant levels.

Residual impacts from the Project are not expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

**Cultural Resources**

Section 3.5 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for cultural resources relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with cultural resources that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

*General Plan* GP/CLUP Table 6-1 and Figure 6-2 identifies Historical Resource #45 on the northern 13.709 acres of the Property project site, but the northern portion of the Property site is not being addressed in this Addendum as the requested land use designation change Project only concerns affects the southern 9.849 acres of the entire project site. Property (see 11-EIR-001 for information regarding the historical resource identified on the northern 13.709 acres of the project site). No historical resources have been identified on the southern 9.849 acres of the project site. As the southern portion of the project site does not include a historical resource, the land use designation change would not affect the analysis presented in GP/CLUP GP/CLUP EIR.

The entire project site Property is has been the subject of numerous cultural resource evaluations, including a peer review of available archaeological studies, as part of the project EIR Westar Project CEQA analysis. City staff has contacted local interested Native Americans regarding the site and project. The peer review concluded that the project site Property 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. Regardless of the type of development that might occur on the site as a result of the Project (i.e., whether the Westar Project is approved or not), i.e., residential, office and institutional or commercial, there is the potential for cultural (archaeological) resources on site to be impacted. Mitigation measures included in the GP/CLUP EIR would reduce those impacts to insignificant levels.

Residual impacts are not expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

**Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources**

Section 3.6 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for geology, soils and mineral resources relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with geology, soils and mineral resources that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.
The GP/CLUP EIR identified potential geologic impacts associated with buildout relating to exposure of people or structures to adverse effects resulting from seismic activity, landslides, liquefaction, etc. (Impacts 3.6-1 through 3.6-4).

Figure 5-1 (Geologic Hazards Map) in the City’s General Plan GP/CLUP indicates shows the El Encanto Fault crosses the site from northwest to southeast. The El Encanto Fault is potentially active based on the definitions commonly used for fault investigation in California. GMU (2009, and 2011) conducted a fault investigation and concluded there are no sufficiently active/potentially active and well-defined faults present within the project site. This conclusion is based upon a review of previous local and regional geology and geomorphology studies, analysis of aerial photography, a site-specific seismic reflection geophysical survey, three fault trench excavations (T-1, T-2, and T-3), and an age-date of marine terrace deposits. With this conclusion, neither an earthquake fault hazard zone nor a fault setback are required because the studies conducted found no active surface fault within the project site and, based on the age of the marine terrace deposits, there has been no surface fault rupture at the site within at least the past 58,000 to 60,000 years, and possibly the past 125,000 years. Through additional geotechnical exploration and analysis, GMU (2011) reconfirmed that “there are no active surface faults within the property. However, the site is located within close proximity to several active faults, and may therefore be subject to strong ground motions in the future.”

As buildout is not expected to change appreciably under the C-C land use designation, no new impacts to geology, soils and mineral resources would be expected to occur.

Residual impacts are not expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Section 3.7 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for hazards and hazardous materials relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

Technical studies were performed by EEI (September 2003) with peer review by Citadel Environmental Services relating to hazard impacts including potential exposure to hazardous materials, the potential for exposure to electromagnetic fields, hazards associated with the site’s location near the railroad tracks and a high pressure natural gas line and the potential for radon gas at the site.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified potential hazard impacts, including a Class I impact (Impact 3.7-2) due to risks associated with the transport of hazardous materials on the railroad tracks that are on the north side of the site. Risks associated with the proximity to the Santa Barbara Airport are classified as Class II in the GP/CLUP EIR.

Regardless of the type of development that might occur on the site, i.e., residential, office and institutional or commercial, there is the potential for exposure to the above mentioned hazards. The change in land use designation from residential to commercial would result in employees/residents. This land use designation change would result in people potentially exposed to hazards. The change in land use designation is not expected to result in new impacts or mitigation measures as compared to those discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.
Residual impacts are expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR, but the proposed land use designation change is not expected to substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Population and Housing**

Section 3.8 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for population and housing relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with population and housing that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified potential Class II impacts relating to the jobs-housing balance in the City (Impacts 3.8-1 through 3.8-4), including impacts relating to the increase in housing units and increase in jobs.

Impact 3.8-3 found that an additional 3,880 residential units were possible at full buildout, a Class II impact that could reduced to a level of insignificance. Impact 3.8-4 found that full buildout would result in approximately 3,400 to 3,900 new jobs, a Class II impact that could be mitigated to a level of insignificance with implementation of other General PlanGP/CLUP policies. The GPA would allow for new commercial and residential development. No new jobs-housing balance impacts are expected as a result of the amendment to the GP/CLUP and the application of the Housing Element policies, such as GP/CLUP Policy HE 3.2 which would mitigate employee housing impacts from non-residential development.

Residual impacts are not expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

**Water Resources**

Section 3.9 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for water resources relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with water resources that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified adequacy of water supplies to serve new development as a Class II impact as well as a Class I cumulative impact (Impacts 3.9-1 through 3.9-7 and 3.9-9). The 1.23 acre parcel designated I-OI has already been receiving water service from the Goleta Water District. The conversion from the existing commercial use to the proposed commercial use is not expected to change water demand. The GP/CLUP EIR assumed that the 9.849 acre parcel designated Medium Density Residential would use approximately 56.632 acre-feet per year (AFY)\(^4\). The water use for the hypothetical “reasonably worst case” development would be considerably lower (28.98 AFY)\(^5\), which is a net savings of 27.652 AFY; Therefore, no new impacts to water resources are expected.


\(^5\) City of Goleta, *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, October 2002, Water Demand Rates for Residential DR 20 ([0.23 AFY/unit] x [26 units] + Shopping Center [100,000 SF] x [0.23 AFY/1,000 SF]) = 5.98 AFY + 23 AFY = 28.98 AFY
Residual impacts resulting from the Project are expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR, but the land use designation change it is not expected to substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Land Use and Recreation**

Section 3.10 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for land use and recreation relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with land use and recreation that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified several Class II impacts relating to potential conflicts with land use policies, habitat conservation plans, neighborhood compatibility and/or regulations relating to buildout of the City.

The change in the GP/CLUP land use designations from I-OI and R-MD to C-C Project would alter the land uses allowed onsite. The uses allowed in the I-OI land use designation are similar to those allowed in the C-C land use designation (see Table 2), although the uses allowed in the R-MD designation differ considerably from those allowed in C-C land use designated areas (see Table 3). The allowed uses in the existing and changed land use categories are as follows:
Table 2
Summary of Allowed Uses and Standards
I-OI v. C-C Land Use Designations
1.23 Acres (APN 073-030-021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowable Uses</th>
<th>Office and Institutional (I-OI) Existing (from Table 2-3 in GP/CLUP)</th>
<th>Community Commercial (C-C) New Proposed (from Table 2-2 in GP/CLUP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses allowed in both I-OI and C-C:</strong></td>
<td>• Building/Landscape materials and equipment</td>
<td>• Building/Landscape materials and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Business services</td>
<td>• Business services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Eating and drinking establishments</td>
<td>• Eating and drinking establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational services</td>
<td>• Medical and health-related services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entertainment and recreation services</td>
<td>• Medical and health-related services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finance, insurance and real estate</td>
<td>• One caretaker unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Medical and health-related services</td>
<td>• Other Retail Trade Establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One caretaker unit per parcel</td>
<td>• Personal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other Retail Trade Establishments</td>
<td>• Professional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal services</td>
<td>• Public &amp; Quasi-Public Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional services</td>
<td>• Religious institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public &amp; Quasi-Public Uses</td>
<td>• Residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Religious institutions</td>
<td>• Wireless Communications/Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wireless Communications/Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses allowed only in I-OI:</strong></td>
<td>• Assisted-living Residential Units</td>
<td>• Assisted-living Residential Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bio-Medical Technology</td>
<td>• Bio-Medical Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Technology Services</td>
<td>• Other Advanced Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other Advanced Technology</td>
<td>• Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>• Scientific &amp; Similar Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scientific &amp; Similar Instruments</td>
<td>• Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Resid. Density</strong></td>
<td>• 20 units/acre</td>
<td>• 12 units/ acre maximum (no minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure Height</strong></td>
<td>• 35 feet</td>
<td>• 35 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio</strong></td>
<td>• 0.40</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Recommended standard*
Table 3
Summary of Allowed Uses and Standards
R-MD v. C-C Land Use Designations
9.83 Acres (APN 073-030-020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed Uses</th>
<th>Medium Density Residential (R-MD) Existing (from Table 2-1 in GP/CLUP)</th>
<th>Community Commercial (C-C) Changed (from Table 2-2 in GP/CLUP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses allowed in both R-MD and C-C:</td>
<td>Uses allowed in both C-C and R-MD:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiunit Apartment Dwellings</td>
<td>• Public &amp; Quasi-Public Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public &amp; Quasi-Public Uses</td>
<td>• Religious institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Religious Institutions</td>
<td>• Residential units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single-Family Attached &amp; Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>Uses allowed only in C-C:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses allowed only in R-MD:</td>
<td>• Apparel and Specialty Stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assisted Living Residential Units</td>
<td>• Building/Landscape materials/equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Home Occupations</td>
<td>• Business services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small-Scale Day Care Center</td>
<td>• Car wash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coastal-Related Commercial</td>
<td>• Eating and drinking establishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medical and health-related services</td>
<td>• Entertainment and recreation services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One caretaker unit per parcel</td>
<td>• Finance, insurance and real estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other Retail Trade Establishments</td>
<td>• Food and Drug Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal services</td>
<td>• General merchandise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional services</td>
<td>• Hotels, Motels, B and Bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wireless Communications/Telecommunications</td>
<td>• Large-Scale Retail Establishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medical and health-related services</td>
<td>• Other Retail Trade Establishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One caretaker unit per parcel</td>
<td>• Other services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal services</td>
<td>• Professional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wireless Communications/Telecommunications</td>
<td>• Financial services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density</td>
<td>• Other services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum 15 du/acre</td>
<td>• Wireless Communications/Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximum 20 du/acre</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Height</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of structures that would be allowed under the existing R-MD and I-OI land use designations as compared to structures allowed in the C-C land use designation are similar (see above in Tables 2 and 3) and would be restricted by the Airport Approach Zone that overlies the part of the property.

Regardless of what uses are present on the Property as a result of the Project – whether the Westar Project is built or not – the impacts from the Project whether the southern portion of the property is built out as mostly residential and partially office and industrial, as it is currently designated, or as commercial, as proposed, these impacts are not expected to change with the change in land use designation.

Therefore, Accordingly, the land use impacts of the requested land use designation changes are less than significant and no new impacts to land use are expected to occur.
The land use designation change Project can would result in future residents. Consequently, there would be a demand for recreation facilities. However, this potential population increase would not affect the recreation impacts addressed—analyzed in the GP/CLUP EIR—would not change. Consequently, the Project does not require any change to the mitigation measures in the GP/CLUP EIR.

Residual impacts are not expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

**Noise**

Section 3.11 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for noise relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with noise that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified potential Class I and II long term impacts due to potential exposure of existing or planned noise sensitive receptors to increased noise (Impacts 3.11-1 through 3.11-5 and 3.11-7). The change from residential to commercial Project would potentially reduce the number of people exposed to noise. Furthermore, while residential neighborhoods are considered to be “sensitive noise receptors,” commercial development is not. The Project considered to be a “sensitive noise receptor,” and this change of use would thus further reduce the number of people exposed to noise. Therefore, accordingly, the noise impact would be reduced from that discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

Residual impacts resulting from the Project are expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR, but the land use designation change is not expected to substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Public Services and Utilities**

Section 3.12 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for public services and utilities relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with public services and utilities that would result from the project; and
- Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified Class II impacts relating to increased demand for public services including police and fire protection and school facilities (Impacts 3.12-1 through 3.12-6). The Project would result in structural development and uses that would contribute to the cumulatively significant demand on police and fire protection and school facilities. No new impacts to public services and utilities are expected.

Residual impacts are not expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Section 3.13 of the GP/CLUP EIR describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- Environmental setting for transportation and circulation relating to the project;
- The impacts associated with transportation and circulation that would result from the project; and
• Mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

The GP/CLUP EIR identified Class I and II transportation and circulation impacts (Impacts 3.13-1 and 3.13.-2), even with funding and construction of all identified mitigation measures.

A traffic study was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (2011) analyzing the existing land use designations and the proposed land use designations Project, and the analysis was peer reviewed by City staff. The methodology used was to remove the traffic associated with buildout of the entire property (467 units) from the traffic forecasts and to replace it with the traffic associated with the a 13.7 net acre residential development at 20 units per acre (274 units) and the hypothetical “reasonably worst case” development of 26 residential units and 100,000 SF of C-C uses.

The average daily trips associated with the hypothetical “reasonably worst case” development would be 6,3107 (ITE, 2003). The peak hour AM trips associated with the hypothetical “reasonably worst case” development would be 2688 (ITE, 2003). The peak hour PM trips associated with the hypothetical “reasonably worst case” development would be 5769 (ITE, 2003).

The traffic associated with the GPA Project was distributed over the street network to see if there were significant changes in Levels of Service at key intersections, both in total and during the morning and afternoon peak hours. One change in PM Peak Hour traffic would be at the Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive intersection adjacent to the project site. This intersection would go from LOS A to LOS B, which is within acceptable City standards. All other intersection and roadway impacts would remain as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR.

Residual impacts from the Project are expected to be significant as discussed in the GP/CLUP EIR, but the land use designation change is not expected to substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects.

3.4.2 Conclusions

As shown in this analysis, the change in land use designation from Office and Institutional and Medium Density Residential to Community Commercial Project would not result in any new significant impacts and would not increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts. No changes to mitigation measures would occur are required as a result of the project. Additionally, none of the other conditions described in CEQA Sections §§ 15162 and 15163 are met. Therefore, this Addendum is considered the appropriate level of CEQA review for the project.

7 Average Daily Trip Generation on a weekday (apartment (220): (6.72 per unit average rate)(300 units)+(shopping center 820):(42.94 per 1,000 square feet)(100,000 square feet)=6,310

8 Average Daily Trip Generation on a weekday (apartment (220): (0.55 per unit average rate)(300 units)+(shopping center 820):(1.03 per 1,000 square feet)(100,000 square feet)=268

9 Average Daily Trip Generation on a weekday (apartment (220): (0.67 per unit average rate)(300 units)+( shopping center 820):(3.75 per 1,000 square feet)(100,000 square feet)=576
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