

ATTACHMENT B

Findings for Approval and Statement of Overriding Considerations Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan

Case Nos. 14GPA-00000-00018, 14GPA-00000-00019, 11ORD-00000-00015,
13ORD-00000-00011, 11RZN-00000-00002, and 15RZN-00000-00004
14EIR-00000-00005

1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

1.1 FINDINGS PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21081 AND THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15090 AND 15091:

1.1.1 CONSIDERATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) (14EIR-00000-00005) was presented to the Planning Commission and all voting members of the Planning Commission have reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and its appendices prior to approving the project. In addition, all voting members of the Planning Commission have reviewed and considered testimony and additional information presented at or prior to its public hearings. The Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission and is adequate for this project.

1.1.2 FULL DISCLOSURE

The Planning Commission finds and certifies that the Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00005) and its appendices constitute a complete, accurate, adequate and good faith effort at full disclosure under CEQA. The Planning Commission further finds and certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.

1.1.3 LOCATION OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Clerk of the Planning Commission located at 105 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101.

1.1.4 FINDINGS THAT A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT IS AVOIDED

Agricultural Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified one significant project-specific impact related to the direct conversion of prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use on housing opportunity site 6 (HOS 6), the South Patterson Triangle (Impact AG-1).

Mitigation: The selection and approval of Alternative E, the environmentally superior alternative, will eliminate the Class I impact to agricultural resources. Alternative E

would be the same as the EGVCP except that the land use designation and zoning of HOS 6 would remain Agriculture. Thus, future development will be reduced from 48 single-family residential units to one single-family residence, a net buildout reduction of 47 units. The remainder of the EGVCP will remain the same, including the revisions to the Urban/Rural boundary, addition of the Mixed Use zone, and all of the policies and development standards. The Final EIR identified mitigation (MM LU-1) to add a policy and two development standards to the EGVCP requiring additional measures and review for HOS 6 for consistency with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and review by the Airport Land Use Commission, as the site is located within the Santa Barbara Airport approach zone. With selection and approval of Alternative E, the site will continue to be designated and used for agriculture, as it is today, and this mitigation will not be necessary.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that there is no other feasible mitigation for the direct and permanent loss of prime agricultural soils that would result from the conversion of HOS 6 to a non-agricultural use. The Planning Commission finds that adoption of the EGVCP as revised by incorporation of the environmentally superior alternative (Alternative E) eliminates the Class I impact to agricultural resources.

1.1.5 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS ARE MITIGATED TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT FEASIBLE

The Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00005) and its appendices for the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan (EGVCP) identify 35 environmental impacts which cannot be fully mitigated and are therefore considered unavoidable (Class I). Those impact areas are: Transportation and Circulation; Aesthetics/Visual Resources; Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Public Services and Facilities-Water Supply; and Parks, Recreation, and Trails. To the extent the impacts remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, legal, technical, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations included herein. For each of these Class I impacts identified by the Final EIR, feasible changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate to the maximum extent feasible the environmental effects, as discussed below.

Transportation and Circulation

Impacts: The Final EIR determined that the EGVCP would contribute additional vehicle trips that would result in seven significant and unavoidable impacts: (1) the Hollister Avenue two-lane segments west of Nogal Drive and east of Modoc Road would exceed acceptable volume capacity standards (Impact TC-1); (2) the Highway 101 southbound ramp/Turnpike Road intersection would exceed the acceptable LOS D operating standard during the morning peak hour (Impact TC-2); (3) development of housing opportunity site 2 would significantly increase traffic volume contributing to cumulative impact to the Hollister Avenue two-lane segment west of Nogal Drive (Impact TC-10); (4)

development of housing opportunity site 7 would significantly increase traffic volume causing a project site-specific impact to the Hollister Avenue two-lane segment west of Nogal Drive (Impact TC-19); (5) development of housing opportunity site 7 would significantly increase traffic volume contributing to the cumulative impacts to the Hollister Avenue two-lane segment west of Nogal Drive and east of Modoc Road (Impact TC-20); (6) development of housing opportunity site 8 would significantly increase traffic volume causing a project site-specific impact to the Hollister Avenue two-lane segment west of Nogal Drive (Impact TC-21); and (7) development of housing opportunity site 8 would significantly increase traffic volume contributing to the cumulative impacts to the Hollister Avenue two-lane segment west of Nogal Drive and east of Modoc Road (Impact TC-22). The Final EIR also identified significant cumulative impacts on transportation and circulation associated with the impacted roadway segment and intersection identified in project-specific Impacts TC-1 and TC-2 when considered with cumulative development of projects located within the cities of Goleta and Santa Barbara.

Mitigation: Beyond the programmatic mitigation policies and development standards included in the EGVCP, which improve coordination between land use and transportation planning and promote alternative modes of transportation, the Final EIR identifies two measures to mitigate the identified Class I impacts. MM TC-1 proposes widening the two-lane segment of Hollister Avenue to four lanes, which will require the replacement of the railroad bridge over Hollister Avenue. MM TC-1 will mitigate Impacts TC-1, TC-10, TC-19, TC-20, TC-21, TC-22, and cumulative impacts to less than significant levels. The County Public Works Department has completed a Project Study Report and is moving forward with developing 65% engineering plans and an Environmental Impact Report for the Hollister Avenue-State Street Improvement Project, which will fulfill this mitigation measure. However, due to uncertainties regarding funding and timing of the improvements, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts.

MM TC-2 proposes several options for addressing the impact to the Highway 101 southbound ramp/Turnpike Road intersection (Impact TC-2 and cumulative impacts to the intersection). MM TC-2 identifies several intersection improvements, any of which would reduce impacts at this intersection. All of the options discussed will mitigate the impact to less than significant levels. However, the intersection is a facility operated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and any improvements will require review, approval, and funding by Caltrans. Due to uncertainties regarding funding and timing of the identified improvements, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that would further reduce impacts.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR and adopted here, which lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible. Nonetheless, the project's contribution to transportation and circulation impacts will remain significant

and unavoidable due to uncertainties in timing and funding of the needed improvements. In addition, as discussed further under Finding 1.1.7, the mitigation identified in MM TC-2 that could avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and not the County. The Planning Commission finds that residual significant impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed within the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified a cumulatively considerable contribution to visual character impacts as a result of the amount of development allowed under the EGVCP.

Mitigation: Beyond the existing policies in the Land Use Element and Coastal Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, the EGVCP includes a number of proposed policies and standards that will help preserve the visual character of the area. Required review and approval of project designs by the Board of Architectural Review will, in many cases, help ensure visually and aesthetically compatible development. Combined these policies will reduce cumulative impacts but not to a less than significant level. The potential for residual cumulative impacts on visual resources are considered significant and unavoidable because of the inability to completely address the scale, number, and location of all the potential development.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that the policies and development standards in the EGVCP lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible but that no additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the impacts to less than significant levels. Thus, residual impacts to aesthetics/visual resources remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds the EGVCP's residual impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impacts: The Final EIR identified significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to operational air quality criteria pollutant emissions associated with buildout of the Plan overall and with buildout of housing opportunity site 7 in particular (Impact AQ-2). Cumulative air quality impacts were also identified for construction emissions.

Mitigation: Beyond the programmatic mitigation policies and development standards included in the EGVCP, the Final EIR identifies one mitigation measure (MM AQ-1) that addresses operational criteria pollutant emissions, which creates two new development standards to promote alternative modes of transportation and reduce vehicle trips and total vehicle miles traveled. This mitigation measure was incorporated into the EGVCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts. However, the reductions obtained with this mitigation cannot be precisely defined.

Therefore, impacts to air quality will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

For cumulative impacts, no additional feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce cumulative impacts below a level of significance. Construction and operational air quality impacts occurring in areas outside the Plan area are added to impacts expected within the Plan area. The combined effect of cumulative development is anticipated to result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to air quality.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR and adopted into the EGVCP which lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with these mitigation measures, impacts to air quality will remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds the EGVCP's residual impacts to air quality are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Biological Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified significant project specific and cumulative impacts related to environmentally sensitive vegetation communities and habitat (Impact BIO-1), sensitive (i.e., special status) plant species and habitat (Impact BIO-2), sensitive (i.e., special status) animal species and habitat (Impact BIO-3), jurisdictional wetlands and waters (Impact BIO-4), and wildlife movement corridors (Impact BIO-5).

Mitigation: Beyond the programmatic mitigation policies and development standards included in the EGVCP, the Final EIR recommends four mitigation measures (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, and MM BIO-4), which amend one Plan policy and create several new development standards.

Impacts to environmentally sensitive vegetation communities and habitat (Impact BIO-1) are reduced by MM-BIO-1, which requires the following changes and additions to the EGVCP: (1) adds four new plant communities to the list of environmentally sensitive habitats (ESH) and clarifies what is meant by some vegetation types; (2) creates a new development standard for the Urban and Mountainous Areas and EDRNs directing County staff to determine presence of sensitive biological resources prior to approval of Land Use or Coastal Development Permits and determine whether a project will impact sensitive resources; (3) creates a new development standard for rural agricultural zones directing County staff to determine the presence/absence of sensitive biological resources prior to approval of Land Use or Coastal Development Permits and determine whether a project will impact sensitive resources; and (4) requires an amendment to the ESH-GOL provisions of the County Land Use Development Code to require a permit for the removal of 5,000 square feet or more of sensitive vegetation in the absence of other development proposals. These mitigation measures were incorporated into the EGVCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts.

Under a reasonable worst-case scenario of full Plan area buildout, impacts to sensitive plant species and habitat will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Impacts to special status plant species and habitats (Impact BIO-2) are reduced as follows: (1) MM BIO-1 requires changes and additions to the EGVCP as discussed above; and (2) MM BIO-2 creates a new development standard that requires surveys for sensitive plant species when potentially suitable habitat is present on a project site. These mitigation measures were incorporated into the EGVCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable worst-case scenario of full Plan area buildout, impacts to special status plant species and habitats will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Impacts to special status animal species and habitats (Impact BIO-3) are reduced as follows: (1) MM BIO-1 requires changes and additions to the EGVCP as discussed above; and (2) MM BIO-3 creates several new development standards that require surveys for sensitive animal species when potentially suitable habitat or critical habitat is present on a project site. The development standards under this mitigation also identify specific mitigation measures to protect identified species and direction regarding when to consult federal and/or state agencies. These mitigation measures were incorporated into the EGVCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable worst-case scenario of full Plan area buildout, impacts to special status animal species and habitats will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and waters (Impact BIO-4) are reduced as follows: (1) MM BIO-1 requires changes and additions to the EGVCP as discussed above; and (2) MM BIO-4 creates four new development standards that require formal wetland delineations, wetland and project design to prevent net loss of wetland functions and values, evidence of compliance with federal and state permit requirements, and salvaged soil and other materials from vernal pools to be used for pool restoration. These mitigation measures were incorporated into the EGVCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable worst-case scenario of full Plan area buildout, impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and waters will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Impacts to wildlife movement corridors (Impact BIO-5) are reduced by MM BIO-1, which requires changes and additions to the EGVCP as discussed above. These mitigation measures were incorporated into the EGVCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable worst-case scenario of full Plan area buildout, impacts to wildlife movement corridors will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

For cumulative impacts, no additional feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce cumulative impacts below a level of significance. Biological resources impacts

occurring in areas outside the Plan area are added to impacts expected in the Plan area. The combined effect of cumulative development is anticipated to result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to biological resources.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR and adopted into the EGVCP which lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with mitigation measures, impacts to biological resources will remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds the EGVCP's residual impacts to biological resources are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Cultural Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to the potential for future development to impact unknown buried prehistoric archaeological resources and historical resources (Impact CR-1).

Mitigation: Beyond the existing policies in the Land Use Element and Coastal Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, and the programmatic mitigation policies and development standards included in the EGVCP, the Final EIR identifies one mitigation measure (MM CR-1) which will revise policies and development standards of the EGVCP and add a new objective, policy, and action to specifically address potential impacts to ethnic resources. These measures were incorporated in the final EGVCP. The potential for residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on subsurface archaeological resources and historic resources are considered significant and unavoidable because of the inability to completely avoid impacts on all archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures through project redesign or specifications.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR and adopted into the EGVCP which lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with mitigation measures, residual impacts to unknown prehistoric and archaeological resources and historic resources remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds the EGVCP's residual impacts to cultural resources are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Public Services and Facilities – Water Supply

Impacts: Although project-specific impacts associated with buildout of the Plan were found to be less than significant (Class III), the Final EIR identified a significant cumulative impact related to overall regional water supply associated with other growth in the region.

Mitigation: In addition to existing policies in the Conservation Element (Groundwater Resources section) of the Comprehensive Plan, the EGVCP includes 12 programmatic mitigation policies promoting the protection of an adequate water supply and the conservation of water resources. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that will reduce the cumulative impact to water supply below a level of significance. Due to the uncertainties associated with water deliveries and unprecedented multiple dry years, the cumulative impact of Plan area buildout to water supply will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that no feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR or are known that reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to water supply; therefore, impacts to water supply will remain significant and unavoidable. However, the Planning Commission finds the EGVCP's residual impacts to water supply are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Parks, Recreation, and Trails

Impacts: The Final EIR identified significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to adverse physical environmental effects resulting from the construction of additional, or expansion of existing, recreational facilities (Impact PR-2). The adverse effects resulting from this development include potential effects to agricultural, biological and cultural resources.

Mitigation: The EGVCP includes a number of programmatic policies and development standards that reduce the environmental effects of constructing new or expanding existing parks, trails, and other recreational facilities. In addition, Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of the Final EIR include other mitigation measures to mitigate buildout of the Plan, which will also mitigate impacts related to the construction or expansion of parks, trails, and other recreational facilities. Combined these measures will reduce project-specific and cumulative impacts but not to a less than significant level. Site designs and specific park, recreation, and trail projects are not proposed at this time, and it is unknown whether feasible on-site or off-site mitigation opportunities will be available at the time such projects are proposed. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which will further reduce impacts below a level of significance. Therefore, adverse impacts resulting from construction or expansion of recreational facilities will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR and adopted into the EGVCP which lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with mitigation measures, impacts resulting from construction or expansion of recreational facilities will remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds the EGVCP's residual impacts of parks, recreation, and trails are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

1.1.6 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN IMPACTS ARE MITIGATED TO INSIGNIFICANCE BY MITIGATION MEASURES

The Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00005) identified several subject areas for which the project is considered to cause or contribute to significant, but mitigable environmental impacts (Class II). For each of these Class II impacts identified by the Final EIR, feasible changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or mitigate to the maximum extent feasible the environmental effects, as discussed below.

Land Use and Planning

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impacts resulting from Plan buildout and rezones associated with: (1) land use compatibility (Impact LU-1); (2) construction-related compatibility impacts (Impact LU-2); and (3) with respect to housing opportunity site 6 the proposed high residential density could potentially conflict with the density limits of the Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) (one component of Impact LU-3).

Mitigation: Beyond the existing policies in the Land Use Element and Coastal Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, the EGVCP incorporates numerous programmatic policies and development standards that mitigate potentially significant impacts associated with land use compatibility impacts. In addition, the Final EIR identified mitigation MM LU-1 to address the potential conflict with the Draft ALUCP that would result from rezoning housing opportunity site 6. However, with selection and approval of Alternative E, the site will continue to be designated and used for agriculture, as it is today, and mitigation MM LU-1 will not be necessary.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that the programmatic policies and development standards of the EGVCP will reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP must comply with these policies and development standards.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impacts resulting from Plan rezones and buildout that could potentially change the visual character of the urban and coastal areas and housing opportunity sites (Impact VIS-1); mitigable project-specific and cumulative impacts to public scenic views, routes and gateways in the urban and coastal areas and housing opportunity sites (Impact VIS-2); and mitigable project-specific and cumulative impacts from increased light and glare (Impact VIS-3).

Mitigation: Beyond the existing policies in the Land Use Element and Coastal Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, and the Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines in the Land Use and Development Code and Coastal Zoning Ordinance, the EGVCP

incorporates numerous programmatic policies and development standards that mitigate potentially significant impacts to aesthetic/visual resources. In addition, the Final EIR identifies one measure to further mitigate potentially significant impacts. MM VIS-1 adds an additional development standard to the EGVCP directing the County to apply the outdoor lighting standards for the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan area to the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan area. This measure was incorporated in the final EGVCP. The impacts will be less than significant with implementation of these mitigation measures.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that MM VIS-1 mitigates or avoids significant effects on aesthetics/visual resources to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with the above noted mitigation measures.

Agricultural Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impacts as a result of potential land use incompatibility at the agricultural interface (Impact AG-2). The Final EIR also identified potentially significant but mitigable cumulative impacts.

Mitigation: Beyond the existing policies in the Land Use Element and Coastal Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, the EGVCP includes programmatic policies and development standards that mitigate buildout under the plan to a level of insignificance. The impacts to agricultural resources will be less than significant with implementation of the EGVCP programmatic measures.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that the programmatic policies and development standards of the EGVCP will reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with these policies and development standards.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific air quality impacts due to: (1) short-term construction activity, which would generate criteria pollutants (Impact AQ-2); (2) air contaminants associated with US Highway 101 and other land uses (Impact AQ-3); and (3) nuisance odors (Impact AQ-4).

Mitigation: Standard conditions included in the County's *Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures* (revised November 2014) to reduce construction-related emissions will apply to construction activity associated with Plan area buildout. These include measures to limit fugitive dust (PM₁₀). In addition, the EGVCP incorporates a number of programmatic policies and development standards that mitigate potentially significant impacts. The Final EIR identifies two measures to further mitigate potentially significant impacts to air quality to less than significant levels. MM AQ-2 mitigates exposure of

stationary sensitive receptors to air contaminants associated with other land uses and U.S. Highway 101 by adding two development standards to the EGVCP. One requires ventilation systems meeting identified minimum standards on residential development within 500 feet of Highway 101. The other requires air quality disclosure statements, also for residential development within 500 feet of Highway 101. MM AQ-3 adds two development standards to the EGVCP that prohibit wood-burning fireplaces and require the development and submittal of an Odor Abatement Plan. These measures were incorporated in the final EGVCP. The impacts will be less than significant with implementation of these mitigation measures.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that MM AQ-2 and MM AQ-3 mitigate or avoid significant effects on air quality to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with the above noted mitigation measure.

Biological Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impacts to: (1) sensitive vegetation communities with implementation of the applicable EGVCP plan policies, programs, and standards (Impact BIO-1); (2) sensitive plant species with implementation of the applicable EGVCP plan policies, programs, and standards (Impact BIO-2); (3) sensitive wildlife species with implementation of the applicable EGVCP plan policies, programs, and standards (Impact BIO-3); (4) jurisdictional wetlands and waters with implementation of the applicable EGVCP plan policies, programs, and standards (Impact BIO-4); and (5) wildlife movement corridors with implementation of the applicable EGVCP plan policies, programs, and standards (Impact BIO-5).

Mitigation: Numerous policies and development standards of the EGVCP addressing biological resources avoid or lessen potential impacts on biological resources to a level of insignificance. In addition, the Final EIR identified two mitigations measures (MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2) that will further reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. These measures were incorporated in the final EGVCP.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 avoid or lessen the identified significant effects on biological resources to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with the above noted mitigation measures.

Flooding and Water Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific and cumulative impacts from Plan area buildout due to: (1) potentially exposing some properties to flood hazards (Impact WR-1); (2) increases in impervious surfaces that could locally increase runoff and result in localized drainage problems (Impact WR-2); and (3) storm water quality impacts (Impact WR-3).

Mitigation: Beyond the existing policies in the Land Use Element and Coastal Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, the EGVCP includes programmatic policies and development standards that mitigate flooding and water resources impacts to a level of insignificance.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that the programmatic policies and development standards of the EGVCP will reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with these policies and development standards.

Cultural Resources

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable impacts to prehistoric resources on all housing opportunity sites and potentially significant but mitigable impacts to historic resources on housing opportunity sites 3, 7, and 8 (Impact CR-1).

Mitigation: In addition to programmatic policies in the EGVCP, the Final EIR identified MM CR-1 which will revise policies and development standards of the EGVCP and add a new objective, policy, and action to specifically address potential impacts to ethnic resources. These policies were incorporated in the final EGVCP.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that MM CR-1 will reduce impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with the above noted mitigation measures.

Public Facilities – Wildland Fire

Impacts: The Final EIR identified a potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impact due to buildout within the Rural Area (designated as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone) which would expose people and property to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires (Impact SERV-2).

Mitigation: The EGVCP includes programmatic policies and development standards that mitigate impacts associated with wildland fires to a level of insignificance. The impacts to public facilities will be less than significant with implementation of the EGVCP programmatic measures.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that the programmatic policies and development standards of the EGVCP will reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with these policies and development standards.

Noise

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific and cumulative impacts from: (1) placing residences near noise sources including highways, airports, and commercial uses that may generate noise in excess of County thresholds (Impact NOS-1); and (2) exposure of existing sensitive receptors to construction-generated noise (Impact NOS-3).

Mitigation: In addition to programmatic policies in the EGVCP, the Final EIR identified two mitigation measures to further reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. MM NOS-1 adds development standards to the EGVCP to require site specific exterior acoustical studies to minimize exposure of residents to noise above County thresholds and to ensure that projects will not create stationary noise sources that will impact nearby sensitive receptors. MM NOS-2 adds development standards to the EGVCP to limit construction-generated noise. These policies were incorporated in the final EGVCP.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that MM NOS-1 and MM NOS-2 and the programmatic policies and development standards of the EGVCP will reduce noise impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with these policies and development standards.

Geologic Hazards and Soils

Impacts: The Final EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific and cumulative impacts from: (1) exposure of structures to seismic hazards (Impact GEO-1); (2) soil erosion as a result of excessive grading (Impact GEO-2); and (3) unstable earth conditions such as landslides, expansive soils, and radon gas (Impact GEO-3).

Mitigation: In addition to policies in the Seismic Safety and Safety Element of the Comprehensive Plan and provisions in the County of Santa Barbara Building Code, the EGVCP includes programmatic policies and development standards that mitigate buildout under the EGVCP to a level of insignificance.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that the programmatic policies and development standards of the EGVCP will reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with these policies and development standards.

Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset

Impacts: The Final EIR identified a potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impact associated with locating new residential development on housing opportunity sites 5, 6, 7 and 8, which have the potential for exposure to residual pesticides or herbicides

from past agricultural practices or other hazardous materials on or adjacent to the site due to other past uses (Impact HAZ-1).

Mitigation: In addition to policies in the Hazardous Waste Element and the Seismic Safety and Safety Element of the Comprehensive Plan, the EGVCP includes a programmatic development standard to further mitigate impacts associated with hazardous materials to a level of insignificance.

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that implementation of the programmatic policies and development standards of the EGVCP will reduce impacts from hazardous materials/risk of upset to a level of insignificance. Future development under the EGVCP shall comply with these policies and development standards.

1.1.7 FINDINGS THAT MITIGATION OF CERTAIN IMPACTS IS WITHIN THE RESPONSIBILITY AND JURISDICTION OF ANOTHER PUBLIC AGENCY

Findings: The Planning Commission finds that changes or alterations to the project that could avoid or substantially lessen the following significant environmental impacts are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and not the County. Such changes can and should be adopted by the California Department of Transportation.

Impact: The Final EIR determined that the EGVCP would contribute additional vehicle trips that would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the Highway 101 southbound ramp/Turnpike Road intersection: the Level of Service (LOS) would exceed the acceptable LOS D operating standard during the morning peak hour (Impact TC-2). The Final EIR also identified significant cumulative impacts on transportation and circulation associated with this impacted intersection when considered with cumulative development of projects located within the cities of Goleta and Santa Barbara.

Mitigation: MM TC-2 identifies several intersection improvements for addressing the impact to the Highway 101 southbound ramp/Turnpike Road intersection, any of which would reduce impacts at this intersection. All of the options will mitigate the impact to less than significant levels. However, the intersection is a facility operated by Caltrans and any improvements will require review, approval, and funding by Caltrans. Due to uncertainties regarding funding and timing of the identified improvements, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

1.1.8 FINDINGS THAT IDENTIFIED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT FEASIBLE

The Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00005) evaluated a no project alternative, a reduced growth alternative, and five housing opportunity site alternatives that consider reduced residential densities and two alternative housing opportunity sites as methods of reducing

or eliminating potentially significant environmental impacts. The Planning Commission finds that six of the identified alternatives are infeasible for the reasons stated.

1. No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes that the existing 1993 Goleta Community Plan (GCP) is not updated and implementation of the 1993 policies and development standards would continue unchanged. The projected buildout under the 1993 GCP would result in less residential, commercial, and mixed residential/commercial development. No housing opportunity sites would be created nor would the Mixed Use zone be created for the Hollister Avenue – State Street commercial corridor. None of the policies, development standards, and actions of the EGVCP would be implemented and LUDC amendments would not be adopted.

The No Project Alternative would result in greater impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP, primarily due to the absence of new policies and development standards provided in the EGVCP that would provide additional resource protection than provided by the 1993 GCP:

- Land Use Compatibility
- Transportation and Circulation regarding bicycle facilities policies, programs and standards
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality: Criteria Pollutants, Odors, Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Flooding and Water Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services: Emergency Response Plans and Wildland Fire
- Geologic Hazards and Soils
- Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset

The No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP:

- Land Use Plan Consistency
- Air Quality: Plan Consistency
- Public Resources: Fire Protection, Law Enforcement, Library, Schools, Solid Waste, Water and Wastewater Facilities, Water Supplies, Wastewater Capacity
- Noise

The No Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP because less development would occur under this alternative:

- Land Use Construction-Related Compatibility
- Transportation and Circulation especially as the impacts related to development of housing opportunity sites
- Parks, Recreation, and Trails

The No Project Alternative fails to achieve several of the basic objectives of the project. It would not encourage an appropriate mix of commercial and residential infill or revitalize the Hollister Avenue – State Street commercial corridor with the adoption of the Mixed Use zone. It would not provide greater protection and enhancement of habitat areas and watersheds through new and enhanced policies and development standards protecting biological resources and the rezone of significant acreage in the rural mountains and foothills from outdated Ordinance 661 zones to Mountainous Area. It would not protect visual resources, cultural resources, or agricultural lands to the maximum extent feasible. Finally, the No Project Alternative would not ensure the transportation system is well-planned, with multi-modal access and well-designed urban areas that use land efficiently and maximize attractive and interconnected open spaces. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the project (as adopted incorporating Alternative E) is preferable to the No Project Alternative.

2. Reduced Growth Alternative

The Reduced Growth Alternative is similar in most respects to the EGVCP, and includes the revisions to the Urban/Rural boundary, addition of the Mixed Use zone, and all of the new policies and development standards. The difference is that the Reduced Growth Alternative would reduce the residential land use densities on all of the housing opportunity sites while maintaining commercial zoning on housing opportunity sites 5 and 7. The Reduced Growth Alternative would result in 522 fewer residential units and approximately 318,000 square feet of additional commercial development.

The Reduced Growth Alternative would reduce residential buildout. Thus, it would primarily result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP:

- Land Use: Plan Consistency
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Public Scenic Views, Light and Glare
- Air Quality: Plan Consistency, Odors, Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Flooding and Water Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Noise
- Geologic Hazards and Soils
- Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset
- Parks, Recreation, and Trails

However, transportation and circulation impacts to roadway segments and intersections would remain Class I and would be somewhat greater, primarily due to increased commercial buildout.

The Reduced Buildout Alternative would result in reduced impacts relative to the EGVCP on the following resources:

- Land Use Compatibility and Construction-Related Compatibility
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Visual Character Changes
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality: Sensitive Receptors

Although the Reduced Growth Alternative primarily results in similar environmental impacts and reduces some impacts relative to the project, the reduction would not be substantial enough to eliminate Class I impacts. Furthermore, Class I transportation impacts would be slightly greater with this alternative.

The Planning Commission finds that the Reduced Growth Alternative, by reducing allowable residential densities on housing opportunity sites and eliminating the Mixed Use zone, does not meet two basic objectives of the EGVCP. First, it does not provide appropriately designated land uses that encourage a variety of housing types and opportunities, including compatible affordable housing. Second, it does not revitalize the Hollister Avenue – State Street commercial corridor into a vibrant pedestrian oriented area with a mix of residential, commercial, and retail uses. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the project (as adopted incorporating Alternative E) is preferable to the Reduced Growth Alternative.

3. Alternative A: Housing Site A (Giorgi South Hollister) with Reduced Growth

Alternative A is similar in most respects to the EGVCP, and includes the revisions to the Urban/Rural boundary, addition of the Mixed Use zone, and all of the new policies and development standards. The difference is that Alternative A would reduce residential density on housing opportunity sites 1 and 2; development would be limited to three single-family dwellings and 75 single-family dwellings, respectively. The alternative would add a new housing opportunity site A at the Giorgi South Hollister parcel. Alternative A would locate increased residential density on the northern portion of site A, with up to 276 multifamily residential units and five single-family dwellings. Alternative A would result in 129 fewer residential units compared to the project and the same amount of commercial development. Site A is 65 acres in size and in agricultural use (orchards). It is estimated that at least 14 acres would be converted from agricultural use to residential through this alternative.

Alternative A would result in greater impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP primarily due to the location of high density residential development on an

actively farmed agricultural property, a site that adjoins and is visible from Hollister Avenue:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Visual Character Changes and Public Scenic Views, Routes & Gateways
- Agricultural Resources

Alternative A would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP:

- Land Use Compatibility
- Land Use Construction-Related Compatibility
- Land Use Plan Consistency
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Increased Light and Glare
- Air Quality
- Flooding and Water Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Noise
- Geologic Hazards and Soils
- Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset
- Parks, Recreation, and Trails

Alternative A would result in reduced impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP because less development would occur under this alternative:

- Transportation and Circulation
- Biological Resources

Alternative A primarily results in similar environmental impacts and reduces some impacts to transportation and biological resources relative to the project by changing the location of future high density residential development from housing opportunity sites 1 and 2 to housing opportunity site A. However, the reduction would not be substantial enough to eliminate Class I impacts. In addition, site A, on Hollister Avenue, is more visible to the public, and development on this site would have greater visual impacts. Furthermore, a new Class I impact would result due to the permanent conversion of approximately 14 acres of actively-farmed prime soils with this alternative. Combined with development of housing opportunity site 6, Alternative A would result in additional impacts to agricultural resources by increasing the conversion of urban agricultural lands. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the project (as adopted incorporating Alternative E) is preferable to the Alternative A.

4. Alternative B: Housing Site B (Hodges/San Marcos Growers Parcel 1) with Reduced Growth

Alternative B is similar to the EGVCP, and includes the revisions to the Urban/Rural boundary, addition of the Mixed Use zone, and all of the new policies and development standards. The difference is that Alternative B would reduce residential density on housing opportunity sites 1 and 2; development would be limited to three single-family dwellings and 75 single-family dwellings, respectively. The alternative would add a new housing opportunity site B at the Hodges/San Marcos Growers Parcel 1. Alternative B would locate increased residential density on site B, with up to 276 multifamily residential units and two single-family dwellings. Alternative B would result in 131 fewer residential units compared to the project and the same amount of commercial development. Site B is 27 acres in size and in agricultural use (nursery and row crops). It is estimated that one-half to three-quarters of the site would be converted from agricultural use to residential as a part of this alternative.

Alternative B would result in greater impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP primarily due to the location of high density residential development on an actively farmed agricultural property that adjoins and is highly visible from Hollister Avenue:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Visual Character Changes and Public Scenic Views, Routes & Gateways
- Agricultural Resources

Alternative B would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP:

- Land Use Construction-Related Compatibility
- Land Use Plan Consistency
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Increased Light and Glare
- Air Quality: Plan Consistency, Sensitive Receptors, Odors, GHG Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Flooding and Water Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Noise
- Geologic Hazards and Soils
- Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset
- Parks, Recreation, and Trails

Alternative B would result in reduced impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP because less development would occur under this alternative:

- Land Use Compatibility
- Transportation and Circulation
- Air Quality: Criteria Pollutants

Alternative B primarily results in similar environmental impacts and reduces some impacts to transportation, land use compatibility, and air quality to the project by changing the location of future high density residential development from housing opportunity sites 1 and 2 to housing opportunity site B. However, the reduction would not be substantial enough to eliminate Class I impacts. In addition, site B, on Hollister Avenue, is more visible to the public, and development on this site would have greater visual impacts. Furthermore, a new Class I impact would result due to the permanent conversion of this actively-farmed property. Approximately 14 to 20 acres of the 27-acre site, which includes prime soils, would be needed to support the residential density proposed by this alternative. Combined with development of housing opportunity site 6, Alternative B would result in additional impacts to agricultural resources by increasing the conversion of urban agricultural lands. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the project (as adopted incorporating Alternative E) is preferable to the Alternative B.

5. Alternative C: Housing Site A (Giorgi South Hollister) with Site 2 (Tatum/Santa Barbara High School)

Alternative C is similar to the EGVCP, and includes the revisions to the Urban/Rural boundary, addition of the Mixed Use zone, and all of the new policies and development standards. The difference is that Alternative C would reduce residential density on housing opportunity sites 1 and 2 and add housing opportunity site A. Development on housing opportunity site 1 would be reduced from 204 multifamily units to three single-family dwellings. Development on housing opportunity site 2 would be reduced from 276 multifamily dwelling units to 204 multifamily units. Alternative C would add a new housing opportunity site A at the Giorgi/South Hollister parcel with up to 276 multifamily residential units and five single-family dwellings. Alternative C would result in a net increase of one additional residential unit compared to the project and the same amount of commercial development. Site A is 65 acres in size and in agricultural use (orchards). It is estimated that approximately 14 acres of the site would be converted from agricultural use to residential as a part of this alternative.

Alternative C would result in greater impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP primarily due to high density residential development on an actively farmed agricultural property that adjoins and is highly visible from Hollister Avenue:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Visual Character Changes and Public Scenic Views, Routes and Gateways
- Agricultural Resources

Alternative C would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP:

- Land Use Compatibility
- Land Use Construction-Related Compatibility
- Land Use Plan Consistency
- Transportation and Circulation: Plan Wide Roadways, Specific Roadway, Specific Intersections, 20-Year Buildout Roadway, 20-Year Buildout Intersections
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Increased Light and Glare
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources: Wildlife Movement Corridors, Adopted Conservation Plans
- Flooding and Water Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Noise
- Geologic Hazards and Soils
- Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset
- Parks, Recreation, and Trails

Alternative C would result in reduced impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP because less development would occur under this alternative:

- Transportation and Circulation: Plan Wide Intersections
- Biological Resources: Sensitive Vegetation Communities, Sensitive Plant and Wildlife Species, Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters

Alternative C primarily results in similar environmental impacts overall and reduces some impacts to transportation and biological resources relative to the project by changing the location of future high density residential development from housing opportunity site 1 to housing opportunity site A. However, the reduction would not be substantial enough to eliminate Class I impacts. In addition, site A, on Hollister Avenue, is more visible to the public, and development on this site would have greater visual impacts. Furthermore, a new Class I impact would result due to the permanent conversion of approximately 14 acres of actively-farmed prime soils with this alternative. Combined with development of housing opportunity site 6, Alternative C would result in additional impacts to agricultural resources by increasing the conversion of urban agricultural lands. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the project (as adopted incorporating Alternative E) is preferable to the Alternative C.

6. Alternative D: Housing Site B (Hodges/San Marcos Growers Parcel 1) with MTD

Alternative D is similar to the EGVCP, and includes the revisions to the Urban/Rural boundary, addition of the Mixed Use zone, and all of the new policies and development standards. The difference is that Alternative D would reduce residential density on housing opportunity site 2. Development on housing opportunity site 1 would remain the same as with the Plan (204 multifamily units and one single family dwelling unit). Development on housing opportunity site 2 would be reduced from 276 multifamily dwelling units to 75 single-family dwelling units. The alternative would add new housing opportunity site B at Hodges/San Marcos Growers Parcel 1, shifting the planned residential density from site 2. Alternative D would allow up to 276 multifamily residential units and two single family dwellings on site B. Alternative D would result in 71 additional residential units compared to the project and the same amount of commercial development. Site B is 27 acres in size and in agricultural use (nursery and row crops). It is estimated that one-half to three-quarters of the site would be converted from agricultural use to residential as a part of this alternative.

Alternative D would result in greater impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP primarily due to the location of high density residential development on an actively farmed agricultural property that adjoins and is highly visible from Hollister Avenue:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Visual Character Changes and Public Scenic Views, Routes & Gateways
- Transportation and Circulation: Plan Wide Roadways, Specific Roadway, Specific Intersections, 20-Year Buildout Roadway, 20-Year Buildout Intersections
- Agricultural Resources: Direct Conversion of Prime Agricultural Land

Alternative D would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the EGVCP:

- Land Use Compatibility
- Land Use Construction-Related Compatibility
- Land Use Plan Consistency
- Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Increased Light and Glare
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Flooding and Water Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Noise
- Geologic Hazards and Soils

- Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset
- Parks, Recreation, and Trails

Alternative D primarily results in similar environmental impacts overall. However, site B, on Hollister Avenue, is more visible to the public, and development on this site would have greater visual impacts than the project. Furthermore, a new Class I impact would result due to the permanent conversion of this actively-farmed property. Approximately 14 to 20 acres of the 27-acre site, which includes prime soils, would be needed to support the residential density proposed by this alternative. Combined with development of housing opportunity site 6, Alternative D would result in additional impacts to agricultural resources by increasing the conversion of urban agricultural lands. Therefore, the Planning Commission finds that the project (as adopted incorporating Alternative E) is preferable to the Alternative D.

2.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan (EGVCP), incorporated herein by reference, contains a set of goals, policies, development standards, and actions that apply to the Eastern Goleta Valley Plan area. The EGVCP is part of, and consistent with, the County Comprehensive Plan, including the Coastal Land Use Plan. However, the EGVCP is tailored to a smaller geographical area and generally provides greater environmental and other benefits to the Eastern Goleta Valley Plan area as compared to the County Comprehensive Plan.

The Final EIR (14EIR-00000-00005) for the EGVCP, incorporating Alternative E, states that the project will have unavoidable adverse environmental effects on Aesthetics/Visual Resources, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Parks, Recreation, and Trails, Public Services and Facilities, and Transportation and Circulation. The Planning Commission has balanced “the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits” of the project against these effects and makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations, which warrants approval of the project notwithstanding that all identified adverse environmental effects are not fully avoided or substantially lessened. [CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)] The Planning Commission finds that the benefits of the “proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects,” and therefore, “the adverse environmental effects may be considered ‘acceptable.’” [CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)]

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15092, and 15093, any unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the project (the EGVCP incorporating Alternative E) are acceptable due to the following environmental benefits and overriding considerations:

- A. The EGVCP provides for necessary and orderly development to accommodate population growth within the planning horizon consistent with the goals and policies of the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan (Government Code Section 65060.1).

- B. The EGVCP provides for orderly economic and population growth within a reasonable time horizon in an area that has adequate public services (i.e., water, sewer, roads) in accordance with Land Use Element Land Use Development Policy 4 and Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 2-6, protects agriculture (Agricultural Element Goal 1), provides for needed recreation and opens space areas, including public trails, protects natural resources, preserves the area's character and scenic views, and balances the needs of future residents with the needs of existing residents.
- C. The EGVCP has the potential to limit adverse impacts and contribute to the long-term protection of the Eastern Goleta Valley's environment by facilitating affordable housing on housing opportunity sites which will reduce vehicle miles traveled, by reducing potential impacts in the foothills through the application of the Environmentally Sensitive Habitat and Riparian Corridor Overlays and the Mountainous-Goleta zone district, by preserving viable agriculture in both Urban and Rural Areas, and by focusing additional growth in the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan area on those areas most suitable to accommodate it.
- D. The EGVCP includes numerous policies, development standards, and actions that avoid or minimize significant environmental effects of actions proposed or allowed under the EGVCP (e.g., rezones, high-density residential development). Thus, the EGVCP is "self-mitigating" to a large degree.
- E. The EGVCP provides for affordable housing by designating six housing opportunity sites with high residential land use densities (20 units per acre) to encourage infill development. Combined, the EGVCP allows for the development of up to 549 multifamily residential units, which will contribute to the stock of affordable housing (Housing Element Policy 1.1 and Programs 1.3 and 1.15).
- F. The EGVCP plans for sustainable communities that provide varied housing opportunities and multimodal transportation capabilities by rezoning the Hollister Avenue – State Street commercial corridor to a Mixed Use zone that will create attractive and diverse areas that include a mix of housing, shopping, workplace, and entertainment uses; foster a variety of small, entrepreneurial, and flexible residential-based businesses; and provide flexibility and connectivity in the arrangement and location of residential, commercial, and/or industrial development that is accessible, attractive, and inviting to pedestrians (Housing Element Program 1.16). The Mixed Use zone will accommodate up to 177 multifamily residential units.
- G. The EGVCP provides for a more orderly and stable Urban/Rural boundary to delineate the Rural Area, with active productive agriculture, mountainous areas, and generally larger parcels, from the Urban Area with more intensive residential and commercial development on smaller parcels, in accordance with Land Use Element Land Use Development Policy 3.
- H. The EGVCP protects valuable, actively-farmed, prime and non-prime agricultural lands by establishing larger minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area, strengthening the Urban/Rural boundary, and adopting policies and development standards to ensure continued viability of

local food systems and further protect existing urban agricultural lands from encroachment of nonagricultural uses consistent with Agricultural Element Policies I.F and III.B.

- I. The EGVCP protects important biological resources of the various habitats found within the Plan area, and preserves the value of these lands for their important biologic, hydrologic, and aesthetic qualities in accordance with the Conservation Element, Preservation of Natural Systems.
- J. The EGVCP policies protect and preserve historical, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with the Land Use Element Historical and Archaeological Sites Policies 1 through 5; the Conservation Element Archaeological Sites, Conclusions, and Recommendations; the Coastal Land Use Plan Policies 10-1 through 10-5; and recent State law (Assembly Bill 52).
- K. The EGVCP protects coastal bluffs, hillsides, watersheds, and creeks with development standards for grading and required erosion control measures, management of stormwater runoff with Low Impact Development measures, and development prohibitions on extreme slopes in accordance with Coastal Land Use Plan Policies 3-1 through 3-7, 3-13 through 3-19, and 9-41; and Land Use Element Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies 1 through 7, and Streams and Creeks Policy 1. These environmental benefits outweigh potential effects on other biological and cultural resources.
- L. The EGVCP provides for an adequate circulation system of streets, existing and planned bikeways, and other alternative modes of transportation, including public transit, which strives to achieve a balance between land use and roadway and intersection capacity in accordance with Circulation Element Policy B. Furthermore, the EGVCP encourages alternative modes of transportation and multimodal transportation improvements in accordance with Circulation Element Policy C and the state's *Update to the General Plan Guidelines: Complete Streets and the Circulation Element*, and should, therefore, help reduce future significant impacts.
- M. The EGVCP incorporates the environmentally superior alternative. The other alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR, including the No Project Alternative, would either result in environmental impacts of greater severity than those of the adopted Plan or have been found to be incapable of meeting most objectives of the Plan.
- N. The EGVCP provides clarity for future developers and land use regulators. The plan's clear and updated policies and development standards will streamline the project-review process for individual applications for future development by providing a framework that will reduce the amount of future project-specific review, environmental review, time, uncertainty, and cost in the permit process.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) require the County to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to avoid or mitigate to the maximum extent feasible the environmental effects. Chapter 8 of the Final EIR includes a mitigation monitoring and reporting program designed to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during project implementation, including specifications for each adopted mitigation measure that identify the action required and the monitoring that must occur. The mitigation monitoring and reporting program of the Final EIR is also included as Attachment D of the staff report to the Planning Commission dated June 10, 2015, and is hereby adopted as the monitoring and reporting program for this project.

4.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

4.1 AMENDMENTS TO THE DEVELOPMENT CODE AND ZONING MAP

Findings required for all amendments to the County Land Use and Development Code and the County Zoning Map. In compliance with Section 35.104.060 of the County Land Use and Development Code (LUDC), prior to the approval or conditional approval of an application for an Amendment to the Development Code or Zoning Map, the review authority shall first make all of the following findings:

4.1.1 The request is in the interests of the general community welfare.

As it pertains to the Eastern Goleta Valley, the 1993 Goleta Community Plan does not fully address current community concerns. The EGVCP strengthens the Urban/Rural boundary, allows continued infill and transit-oriented development, identifies housing opportunity sites for affordable housing, protects urban and rural agriculture and mountainous areas, protects sensitive biological and cultural resources, and avoids and mitigates adverse effects where feasible. In doing so, the project respects service, resource, and infrastructure capacities while accommodating development to a degree and in a manner which provides the greatest community welfare without compromising community values, environmental quality, or the public health and safety. Overall, the EGVCP, the LUDC amendments, and revisions to the zoning maps, which would create a new Mixed Use zone and enhance protection of sensitive biological resources and aesthetics, are in the interests of the general community welfare.

4.1.2 The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the requirements of State planning and zoning laws, and this Development Code.

As discussed in Attachment F of the staff report to the Planning Commission, dated June 10, 2015, herein incorporated by reference, the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the LUDC. The EGVCP is broad and comprehensive in scope, covering, updating, and refining topics addressed by the 1993 Goleta Community Plan, including but not limited to those in the Land Use, Energy, Circulation, Environmental

Resources Management, Seismic Safety and Safety, Scenic Highways, Conservation, Noise, Housing, Agricultural, and Open Space elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Adoption of the EGVCP and associated amendments to the County LUDC and zoning maps will provide more effective State planning and zoning laws by providing a clearer and more efficient permit process that will benefit the public. The LUDC is amended to be consistent with the EGVCP, and the proposed project is consistent with the remaining portions of the LUDC that would not be revised by the LUDC ordinance amendment. In the future, individual projects developed in compliance with the EGVCP will also be assessed for consistency with all applicable requirements of the LUDC. Therefore, the EGVCP is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, State planning and Zoning laws and the County LUDC.

4.1.3 The request is consistent with good zoning and planning practices.

The EGVCP incorporates many contemporary and sustainable zoning and planning practices into the Plan and the LUDC amendments. For example, the project includes a new Mixed Use zone and enhances protection of sensitive biological, cultural and aesthetic/visual resources. The bulk of future growth is accommodated by existing commercial land use and zoning, the new Mixed Use zone along the Hollister Avenue – State Street commercial corridor, and the increased residential density land use and zoning for the housing opportunity sites. The LUDC amendments incorporate other successful regulations used elsewhere in the unincorporated Santa Barbara County, such as revised ESH permit requirements comparable to the existing LUDC regulations for the unincorporated Toro Canyon Plan and Montecito Community Plan areas, and outdoor lighting regulations comparable to those adopted for the Santa Ynez Valley, Mission Canyon, and Summerland community plans. Therefore, the project is consistent with good zoning and planning practices.

4.2 AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE II, LCP, OR ZONING MAP AMENDMENT (REZONE) FINDINGS

Findings required for All Amendments to the Article II Zoning Ordinance, the Local Coastal Program, and the County Zoning Map. In compliance with Section 35-180.6 of the Article II Zoning Ordinance, prior to the approval or conditional approval of an application for an Amendment to the Article II Zoning Ordinance, the Local Coastal Program or the County Zoning Map, the review authority shall first make all of the following findings:

4.2.1 The request is in the interests of the general community welfare.

As it pertains to the Eastern Goleta Valley, the 1993 Goleta Community Plan does not fully address current community concerns. The EGVCP strengthens the Urban/Rural boundary, allows for continued infill residential development, protects urban and rural agriculture, protects sensitive biological and cultural resources, and avoids and mitigates adverse effects where determined to be feasible. In doing so, the project respects service, resource, and infrastructure capacities while accommodating development to a degree and in a manner which provides the greatest community welfare without compromising

community values, environmental quality, or the public health and safety. The zoning changes that will increase residential development density do not occur within the Coastal Zone. Overall, the EGVCP, the Article II amendments, and revisions to the zoning maps are in the interests of the general community welfare.

4.2.2 The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Coastal Land Use Plan, the requirements of the State planning and zoning laws, and this Article.

As discussed in Attachment F of the staff report to the Planning Commission, dated June 10, 2015, herein incorporated by reference, the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Coastal Land Use Plan, and the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance. The EGVCP is broad and comprehensive in scope, covering, updating, and refining topics addressed by the previously certified 1993 Goleta Community Plan, including but not limited to those in the Coastal Land Use Plan and the Energy, Circulation, Environmental Resources Management, Seismic Safety and Safety, Scenic Highways, Conservation, Noise, Housing, Agricultural, and Open Space elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Adoption of the EGVCP and associated amendments to the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance, and zoning maps will provide more effective State planning and zoning laws by providing a clearer and more efficient permit process that will benefit both the public and County staff. The Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance is amended to be consistent with the EGVCP, and the proposed project is consistent with the remaining portions of Article II that would not be revised by the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance Amendment. In the future, individual projects developed in compliance with the EGVCP will also be assessed for consistency with all applicable requirements of Article II. Therefore, the EGVCP is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the Coastal Land Use Plan, State planning and Zoning laws and Article II.

4.2.3 The request is consistent with good zoning and planning practices.

The EGVCP incorporates many contemporary and sustainable zoning and planning practices into the Plan, and the Article II amendments include successful regulations used elsewhere in the unincorporated Santa Barbara County. For example, residential design guidelines were adopted by the Planning Commission in 2006 but have not been certified by the Coastal Commission and incorporated into Article II. The Article II amendments include the regulations needed to allow future residential development within the Coastal Zone of the Eastern Goleta Valley to move forward consistently with residential development throughout the rest of the Eastern Goleta Valley. The Article II amendments also include outdoor lighting regulations comparable to those adopted for the Santa Ynez Valley, Mission Canyon, and Summerland community plans. Therefore, the project is consistent with zoning and planning practices.

4.3 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FINDINGS

Government Code Section 65358 requires a general plan amendment to be in the public interest.

The comprehensive plan amendment is in the public interest for the following reasons. The EGVCP is a planning and growth management plan that addresses future development in the EGVCP area. It proposes new goals, policies, development standards, and actions to provide a range of housing types and opportunities, including compatible affordable housing, protect urban and rural agricultural resources, improve multimodal circulation, protect biological resources and water quality, and preserve community character. The primary intent of the EGVCP is to articulate the community's expressed desire to preserve neighborhood character and charm and to protect and enhance the quality of life enjoyed by residents and visitors. Overall, it is in the public interest to address future development in the EGVCP area by adopting the goals, policies, development standards, and actions of the EGVCP.