CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION – MST2006-00564

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the "Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970," as amended to date, this Draft Negative Declaration has been prepared for the following project:

PROJECT LOCATION: 457 North Hope Avenue

PROJECT PROPONENT: Trudi Carey, The Carey Group

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a nine parcel subdivision of a 2.96 acre vacant lot, currently located within the County of Santa Barbara's jurisdiction. Proposed parcel sizes would range from 10,387 to 13,419 net square feet. As part of the project, the site would be annexed to the City of Santa Barbara. A General Plan designation of Residential (5 units/acre) and Zoning designation of One Family Residential (E-3 - 7,500 square feet/lot) is proposed. The proposed project site would be developed in two phases. The first phase would include the rough grading of the whole site and construction of infrastructure. The second phase would include the development of each parcel with a single-family residential unit.

The infrastructure being constructed during the first phase would include, but not be limited to, new water lines, sewer lines, a public road and drainage improvements. A new cul-de-sac road would be constructed to serve all of the proposed parcels and would be dedicated to the City after construction. On street parking and a sidewalk would be provided on the south side of the street. An existing City water main, currently located along the northern property line, would be relocated within the new right-of-way, along with other utilities serving the parcels. An approximate ten foot wide buffer would be provided between the northern lot line and the edge of the new right-of-way. The buffer area would be divided among eight of the nine parcels. The ten-foot wide buffer would be privately owned and maintained collectively by all of the parcel owners. Two detention basins would be provided to accept drainage from the road. One basin would be at the west end of the proposed road and one detention basin would be at the east end of the road near Hope Avenue. Grading for installation of infrastructure would be approximately 1,550 cubic yards of cut and 2,150 cubic yards of fill with approximately 600 cubic yards of import.

The second phase of the development would be the construction of single family homes on each of the nine proposed parcels. Development of the homes would be reviewed individually through the applicable review process, such as design review and building permit review. Based upon the proposed parcel size, it can be assumed that development could be up to 30 feet in height and an approximately 4,000 square feet in size (includes garage, habitable space and hardscape). Each parcel would include a detention basin that would be configured to accept drainage from the development on that particular parcel, consistent with applicable regulations.

1. Annexation of the property from Santa Barbara County to the City of Santa Barbara;
2. A General Plan Amendment to designate the property as Residential, 5 units/acre upon annexation (Chapter 28.07);
3. A Zoning Map Amendment to zone the property E-3/S-D-2 (One Family Residential/Special District Zone) upon annexation (Chapter 28.10);
4. A Modification to reduce the street frontage of one lot (SBMC §28.92.110.A.); and
5. A Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the division of one lot into nine parcels (Chapter 27.07).

NEGATIVE DECLARATION FINDING:

Based on the attached Initial Study prepared for the proposed project, it has been determined that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Alli DeBerk
Environmental Analyst

7-13-11
Date

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION

INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST MST20006-00564

PROJECT: 457 HOPE AVENUE

July 15, 2011

This Initial Study has been completed for the project described below because the project is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and was determined not to be exempt from the requirement for the preparation of an environmental document. The information, analysis and conclusions contained in this Initial Study are the basis for deciding whether a Negative Declaration (ND) is to be prepared or if preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to further analyze impacts. Additionally, if preparation of an EIR is required, the Initial Study is used to focus the EIR on the effects determined to be potentially significant.

APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER

Applicant Representative: Trudi G Carey; The Carey Croup, Inc, Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Applicant/Owner: Giardini Di Cipriani, LLC, C/O The Carey Croup, Inc, Santa Barbara, CA 93111

PROJECT ADDRESS/LOCATION

The approximate 2.96 acre lot is located at 457 North Hope Avenue, approximately one mile north of State Street and immediately opposite Lincolnwood Drive.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (See **Exhibit A - Project Plans**)

Project Components: The project consists of a nine lot subdivision of a 2.96 acre vacant lot, currently located within the County of Santa Barbara's jurisdiction. Proposed lot sizes would range from 10,387 to 13,419 net square feet and the slopes would range from approximately 5% along Hope Avenue to approximately 11% at the western side of the lot as shown in the table:

Lot	Required Area	Slope	Gross SF	Net SF	Street Frontage
1	7,500 sf	5.27%	17,182	13,419	85.7
2	7,500 sf	4.71%	13,993	11,268	71.7
3	7,500 sf	6.41%	14,015	11,290	71.7
4	7,500 sf	7.58%	14,038	11,313	71.7
5	7,500 sf	8.76%	14,060	11,335	71.7
6	7,500 sf	9.67%	14,083	11,311	72.8
7	7,500 sf	9.87%	12,650	10,387	75.0
8	11,250f	11.06%	12,052	11,252	28.3
9	7,500 sf	6.18%	14,076	11,661	108.2
Average	7,500 sf	7.72	14,017	11,471	72.98
Total			126,149	103,236	

As part of the project, the site would be annexed to the City of Santa Barbara. A General Plan designation of Residential (5 units/acre) and Zoning designation of One Family Residential (E-3 - 7,500 square feet/lot) is proposed. The proposed project site would be developed in two phases. The first phase would include the rough grading of the whole site and construction of infrastructure. The second phase would include the development of each lot with a single-family residential unit.

The infrastructure being constructed during the first phase would include, but not be limited to, new water lines, sewer lines, a public road and drainage improvements. A new cul-de-sac road would be constructed to serve all of the proposed lots and would be dedicated to the City after construction. On street parking and a sidewalk would be provided on the south side of the street. An existing City water main, currently located along the northern property line, would be relocated within the new right-of-way, along with other utilities serving the lots. An approximate ten foot wide buffer would be provided between the northern lot line and the edge of the new right-of-way. The ten-foot wide buffer would be privately owned and maintained collectively by all of the lot owners. Two detention basins would be provided to accept drainage from the road. One basin would be at the west end of the proposed road and one detention basin would be at the east end of the road near Hope Avenue.

The second phase of the development would be the construction of single family homes on each of the nine proposed lots. Development of the homes would be reviewed individually through the applicable review process, such as design review and building permit review. Based upon the proposed lot size, it can be assumed that development could be up to 30 feet in height and an approximately 4,000 square feet in size (includes garage, habitable space and hardscape). Each lot would include a detention basin that would be configured to accept drainage from the development on that particular lot, consistent with applicable regulations.

Grading: Grading for installation of infrastructure would be approximately 1,550 cubic yards of cut and 2,150 cubic yards of fill with approximately 600 cubic yards of import. Grading for individual lots is unknown and depends on the individual homes; however, given the configuration of the lots and topography, it is expected to be relatively minor.

Required Permits/Discretionary Actions: The project would require the following permits and discretionary actions:

1. Detachment from County Fire Protection District and Goleta Water District and Annexation of the property from Santa Barbara County to the City of Santa Barbara;
2. A General Plan Amendment to designate the property as Residential, 5 units/acre upon annexation;
3. A Zoning Map Amendment to zone the property E-3/S-D-2 (One Family Residential/Special District Zone) upon annexation;
4. A Modification to reduce the street frontage of one lot; and
5. A Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the division of one lot into nine lots.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Land Use

Existing Site Development & Use: Currently the site is a vacant lot. Until eighteen months ago, the site was developed with three single family houses and farmed. The applicant obtained a demolition permit from the County of Santa Barbara

Building and Safety Division and removed all structures in early 2010.

Access and Parking: The project site is accessed directly from Hope Avenue via an improved driveway that served the previous site development. With no development on site, there is no formal parking.

Existing Site Characteristics

Aesthetics: The vacant lot is mostly devoid of vegetation, except for a few non-native trees in the south-western corner of the lot and is surrounded by residential development on all sides. Adjacent residences are one to two stories and located on lots of 8,000 to 15,000 square feet with urban landscaping. The closest open area is the cemetery approximately 500 feet to the south.

Biological Resources: The western half of the project site was developed with three single family residences and a driveway along the southern property line provided access. The eastern half of the site was under agricultural use. The residences and hardscape were removed approximately eighteen months ago. There is very little vegetation on the site and it is mainly non-native grasses. Along the south-western property line are a few mature non-native trees. Because the site is surrounded with urban residential development, there is little opportunity for a wildlife corridor. Wildlife found on site would be typical to the urban environment, such as gophers, skunks, raccoons and rabbits.

Cultural Resources: The project site is not located within any identified archaeological sensitivity zones, and based upon an archeological report prepared for a nearby development there are no known resources in the area. The site is highly disturbed through the previous agricultural use and below grade utility lines that cross the site. The structures were not considered historic and were allowed to be demolished by the County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development.

Geophysical

Topography: The project site is comprised of slopes averaging 7%. The highest point of elevation on the property is approximately in the middle of the lot and then descends to the south-west and the south-east corners. The lot is at a higher elevation than the lots to the west and generally levels out to the east. Finally, the properties immediately north of the project site are at a higher elevation.

Seismic/Geologic Conditions: The majority of the site was previously farmed. The project site has moderate to slight slopes. According to the City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) maps, the south-east corner of the site is within a 200 foot buffer of an apparently active fault zone. Also according to the MEA maps, the site does contain potentially expansive and erosive soils. A Foundation Exploration, dated August 21, 2010, was prepared by Coast Valley Testing, Inc. (Exhibit B) which is incorporated by reference and summarized herein. Seven auger borings were drilled to a depth of 30 feet throughout the project site. No ground water was encounter in any of the borings. Because no ground water was found, the likelihood of liquefaction is low.

Hazards: The project site is not located with a high fire hazard area and there are no known underground fuel tanks on site. The border of the nearest high fire hazard area is approximately a half of a mile north. While the project site is within the County of Santa Barbara jurisdiction, City of Santa Barbara Fire Station 4 would respond to calls to the site.

Noise: The project site neither causes nor would it expose future residents to any noise levels above 60 dbL according to the City's Master Environmental Assessment maps.

Water Environment

Flooding: The project site is not located within a mapped flood hazard area or adjacent to any drainage areas

Creeks/Drainage: There are no on-site creeks or local drainage features. The properties along the northern property line are at a higher elevation than the project site, which sends runoff onto the site. Due to the varying topography, runoff from the project site flows off site to the east, west and south in a sheet flow manner. The nearest natural drainage channel is Arroyo Burro Creek, which is approximately 800 feet east of the project site. Adjacent to the project site is a concrete "v" ditch along the western property line which serves a subdivision. On the eastern side of the property is Hope Avenue which conveys runoff to the south.

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

Assessor's Lot Number:	057-170-012	**General Plan Designation:**	Residential (County)
Zoning:	Res 4.6 (County)	**Lot Size:**	2.96 acres
Existing Land Use:	Vacant	**Proposed Land Use:**	Single family residential
Slope:	5 – 11%		
SURROUNDING LAND USES:			
North:	Single Family Residential		
South:	Single Family Residential		
East:	Single Family Residential		
West:	PUD Residential		

PLANS AND POLICY DISCUSSION

(CEQA Guidelines 15063, Contents of Initial Study specifies inclusion of "An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls.)

Land Use and Zoning Designations:

The project sit is located with the Hope Neighborhood and is described in the Land Use Element as being bounded by the City limits to the west and north, Arroyo Burro Creek to the east and Via Lucero to the south. The Hope Neighborhood is comprised mainly of single family residences. The Via Lucero area includes a mix of single family and multi-family residential development.

The project site is currently located within the County of Santa Barbara and is zoned single family residential, 8,000 square feet minimum (8-R-1). The current County General Plan Land Use Plan designation is residential with a density of 4.6 units per acre. As part of the project, the site would be rezoned to one-family residential, 7,500 square feet minimum, and Upper State Street Area Special District Zone (E-3/SD-2). As illustrated in the table below, the differences in densities between the County and City land use and zoning designations are minor. Note that this theoretical build-out comparison does not include a reduction of square footage of the project site to accommodate public right-of-way to provide access. When public right-of-way is excluded, the actual number of lots would be less.

	County (Existing)	City (Proposed)
General Plan Land Use Designation	Residential	Residential
Theoretical Project Buildout	4.6 units/ac = 14 units	5 units/ac = 15 units
Zoning Ordinance Designation	8-R-1 Single Family Residential	E-3 Single Family Residential
Theoretical Project Buildout	8,000 s.f. lot area/unit = 16 units	7,500 s.f. lot area/unit =17 units

The proposed nine lot subdivision would be consistent with both the existing County land use and zoning designations and the proposed City land use and zoning designations. The proposed public right-of-way dedications would reduce the potential build-out of the site by approximately two units, which could still result in a greater theoretical density than the proposed nine lot subdivision. The project includes a request to reduce the required distance of the street frontage of one lot (Lot 8). This lot is located at on the cul-de-sac and the reduced width of 28 feet would still provide adequate access and the proposed lot would be consistent with all applicable zoning requirements.

Land Use Compatibility:

The impacts from subject project, an annexation and nine-lot subdivision, are either less than significant or have no impact. Current City regulations would address any short term impacts from construction, such as hours of operation. The long-term residential use of the proposed property would be consistent with the proposed land use and with the surrounding single-family residential neighborhood and density. A full analysis of the required findings to approve the use and a discussion of neighborhood compatibility will be provided in the project's staff report.

General Plan Policies:

1. Housing Element

The Housing Element encourages construction of a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of various household types. The proposed project would result in nine new lots, which would allow future development of a corresponding number of single family residences. The neighborhood surrounding the project site is comprised of single-family residential development. The layout of the subdivision, with lots larger than required by the proposed zone district, received positive comments from the City's Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and requires final approval by the ABR prior to construction. Therefore, the proposed project can be found potentially consistent with the following policy. Therefore, the proposed project could be found consistent with the Housing Element.

2. Conservation Element

City Conservation Element policies provide that significant environmental resources of the City be preserved and protected. The Conservation Element requires implementation of resource protection measures for archaeological, historic and architectural resources; protection and enhancement of visual, biological and open space resources; protection of specimen and street trees; maintenance of air and water quality; and minimization of potential drainage, erosion and flooding hazards. The Conservation Element recognizes that while full implementation of the policies would be the most desirable, there are often competing demands for preservation, enhancement, development and conservation.

Archaeological Resources - The proposed project would not have the potential to result in significant impacts on either prehistoric or historic archaeological resources because they are not anticipated to be present on the project site. Therefore, the project could be found consistent with the archaeological resource policy of the Conservation Element.

Visual Resources – The project is not anticipated to obstruct important public scenic views to the ocean or lower elevations of the City, and is not anticipated to substantially obstruct upper foothill or mountain views from the beach or lower elevations of the City. The project site is surrounded by existing one and two-story, single-family residential developments. The project will not affect a prominent public view of an important visual resource. As discussed in Section 1. Aesthetics, visual impacts related to views were determined to be less than significant. Therefore, the project could be found consistent with the visual resources policies of the Conservation Element.

3. Seismic Safety/Safety Element

The City's Seismic Safety/Safety Element requires that development be sited, designed and maintained to protect life, property and public well being from seismic and other geologic hazards, and to reduce or avoid adverse economic, social, and environmental impacts caused by hazardous geologic conditions. The Seismic Safety/Safety Element addresses a number of potential hazards including, geology, seismicity, flooding, liquefaction, tsunamis, high groundwater, and erosion. The project site is subject to geologic and environmental constraints. As discussed in Section 5, Geophysical Conditions, potential impacts associated with these types of hazards would be adequately addressed by adhering to the California Building Code and recommendations in the soil and foundation report. Therefore, the proposed project could be found consistent with the Seismic Safety/Safety Element.

4. Noise Element

The City's Noise Element includes policies intended to achieve and maintain a noise environment that is compatible with the variety of human activities and land uses in the City. The proposed project would not generate a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels in the area in the long term due to the future development being consistent with the surrounding residential neighborhood. Short-term construction noise is minimized through implementation of the recommended mitigation measures (refer to Section 7, Noise). Therefore, the proposed project could be found consistent with the Noise Element.

5. Circulation Element

The City's Circulation Element contains goals and implementing measures to reduce adverse impacts to the City's street system and parking by reducing reliance on the automobile, encouraging alternative forms of transportation, reviewing traffic impact standards, and applying land use and planning strategies that support the City's mobility goals. Traffic and circulation impacts resulting from the proposed project are negligible, and thus the project could be found consistent with the Circulation Element.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following checklist contains questions concerning potential changes to the environment that may result if this project is implemented. If no impact would occur, **NO** should be checked. If the project might result in an impact, check **YES** indicating the potential level of significance as follows:

Significant: Known substantial environmental impacts. Further review needed to determine if there are feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives to reduce the impact.

Potentially Significant: Unknown, potentially significant impacts that need further review to determine significance level and whether mitigable.

Potentially Significant, Mitigable: Potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels with identified mitigation measures agreed-to by the applicant.

Less Than Significant: Impacts that are not substantial or significant.

1. AESTHETICS Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Affect a public scenic vista or designated scenic highway or highway/roadway eligible for designation as a scenic highway?	✓	
b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect in that it is inconsistent with Architectural Board of Review or Historic Landmarks Guidelines or guidelines/criteria adopted as part of the Local Coastal Program?		Less Than Significant
c)	Create light or glare?		Less Than Significant

Visual Aesthetics - Discussion

Issues: Issues associated with visual aesthetics include the potential blockage of important public scenic views, project on-site visual aesthetics and compatibility with the surrounding area, and changes in exterior lighting.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Aesthetic quality, whether a project is visually pleasing or unpleasing, may be perceived and valued differently from one person to the next, and depends in part on the context of the environment in which a project is proposed. The significance of visual changes is assessed qualitatively based on consideration of the proposed physical change and project design within the context of the surrounding visual setting. First, the existing visual setting is reviewed to determine whether important existing visual aesthetics are involved, based on consideration of existing views, existing visual aesthetics on and around the site, and existing lighting conditions. Under CEQA, the evaluation of a project's potential impacts to scenic views is focused on views from public (as opposed to private) viewpoints. The importance of existing views is assessed qualitatively based on whether important visual resources such as mountains, skyline trees, or the coastline, can be seen, the extent and scenic quality of the views, and whether the views are experienced from public viewpoints. The visual changes associated with the project are then assessed qualitatively to determine whether the project would result in substantial effects associated with important public scenic views, on-site visual aesthetics, and lighting.

Significant visual aesthetics impacts may potentially result from:

- Substantial obstruction or degradation of important public scenic views, including important views from scenic highways; extensive grading and/or removal of substantial amounts of vegetation and trees visible from public areas without adequate landscaping; or substantial loss of important public open space.
- Substantial negative aesthetic effect or incompatibility with surrounding land uses or structures due to project size, massing, scale, density, architecture, signage, or other design features.
- Substantial light and/or glare that poses a hazard or substantial annoyance to adjacent land uses and sensitive receptors.

Visual Aesthetics – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is within the Hope Neighborhood as described in the Land Use Element. The development in this neighborhood is comprised of residential uses, with single family residences being the majority of the development. Typically, the single family residences are located on lots of 6,000 – 20,000 square feet. Hope Avenue, along with North La Cumbre Road on the west, is the main-north south transportation artery between State Street and Foothill Road and it is not designated as a scenic road. Traveling north on Hope Avenue, intermittent views of the Santa Ynez Mountains can be seen in the background.

Most of this neighborhood is developed with residences and the only open space is Cavalry Cemetery to south. The topography rises gently from State Street to Foothill with little to no viewing points within the project vicinity. Typical vegetation in the neighborhood is urban with a mix of native and non-native plants. Depending on the age of the surrounding subdivisions, more mature trees can be found among the development and most residences have lawns.

The project site is vacant, with a few mature trees located at the perimeter of the lot. The project site is a long rectangular shape, approximately 200 feet wide along the Hope Avenue frontage and 650 feet deep to the rear property corner. Because of the configuration of the lot, each of the proposed lots would be laid out in a linear fashion, from front lot line to rear lot line. The topography rises slightly from Hope Avenue, and then crests in the middle portion, before descending to western property line. There are no trail easements on site and a public sidewalk extends along the front property line.

Because of the pattern of the surrounding residential development, rear yards of adjacent residential development abut three sides of the project site, which creates an additional buffer between the project site and neighboring properties. The only exception is one residence to the south which is accessed by a ten foot wide driveway, which is a separate lot, and it extends the entire length of the project site.

The City's Conservation Element contains the following policies that would apply to the project site:

> Visual Resources Policy 3.0 – "New development shall not obstruct scenic view corridors, including those of the ocean and lower elevations of the City viewed respectively from the shoreline and upper foothills, and of the upper foothills and mountains viewed respectively from the beach and lower elevations of the City."
>
> Visual Resources Policy 4.0 – "Trees enhance the general appearance of the City's landscape and should be preserved and protected."

1.a) Scenic Views

The proposed project would create nine new lots, which would be developed with single family residences in the future and each would be subject to design review. Grading for the project would include infrastructure for the houses, which include the proposed public road along the northern property line, and all utilities. The proposed road would generally follow the existing contours and would be buffered from the adjacent residences by an approximate ten foot wide landscape area. Because of the configuration and topography of the project site, public views of the lot from Hope Avenue will be the new public road and the development on the first four lots. There are no public vistas in the area and no designated scenic highways. There would be *no impacts* to scenic views

1.b) On-Site Aesthetics

The project site is currently vacant. Previous development of the site included three farm houses, located on the western portion of the project site, and an open field agricultural area between the houses and Hope Avenue. With the creation of nine new lots and the potential build out of nine new single family residences, the general character of the project site would change. Although construction of the individual homes is not part of this project, any future home built in the subdivision would be required to comply with the City's zoning standards for single-family development (e.g. minimum setbacks, open space area, maximum net floor area, and a maximum building height of 30 feet). Additionally, future residences would be subject to review by the Single Family Design Board (SFDB) unless, for example, they are less than one story and seventeen feet in height, less than 4,000 square feet, and do not exceed the maximum floor area permitted by SBMC §28.15.083. The proposed project, including the grading for the infrastructure, is subject to the Single Family Design Review Board (SFDB). The SFDB reviewed the grading plan at Conceptual Review and provided positive feedback on the layout of the lots and the minutes are attached (Exhibit G). The future development would be similar in height and bulk to the existing surrounding development. Therefore, the project design and impacts on aesthetics are considered a *less than significant* impact.

1.c) Lighting/Glare

The project would result in a build out of nine residential units and a public road, all of which would require outdoor lighting typical of a residential development. Exterior lighting would be subject to compliance with the requirements of

SBMC Chapter 22.75, the City's Outdoor Lighting and Design Ordinance. The ordinance provides that exterior lighting be shielded and directed to the ground such that no undue lighting or glare would affect surrounding residents, roads, or habitat areas. All lighting along the public street will require review and approval by the City's Single Family Design Board. Additionally, building materials for single-family homes typically do not include materials with the potential for significant glare, and roofing and siding materials must be of a nonreflective nature per SBMC §28.15.045. As such, project impacts on lighting and glare would be *less than significant*.

Visual Aesthetics - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Visual Aesthetics - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

2. AIR QUALITY		NO	YES
	Could the project:		*Level of Significance*
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		Less Than Significant
b)	Exceed any air quality emission threshold?		Less Than Significant
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is designated in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?		Less Than Significant
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants?		Less Than Significant
e)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		Less Than Significant
f)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?		Less Than Significant
g)	Create objectionable odors?		Less Than Significant

Air Quality - Discussion

Issues. Air quality issues involve pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust, stationary sources (i.e. gas stations, boilers, diesel generators, dry cleaners, oil and gas processing facilities, etc), and minor stationary sources called "area sources" (i.e. residential heating and cooling, fireplaces, etc.) that contribute to smog, particulates and nuisance dust associated with grading and construction processes, and nuisance odors. Stationary sources of air emissions are of particular concern to sensitive receptors, as is construction dust and particulate matter. Sensitive receptors are defined as children, elderly, or ill people that can be more adversely affected by air quality emissions. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics.

Smog, or ozone, is formed in the atmosphere through a series of photochemical reactions involving interaction of oxides of nitrogen [NOx] and reactive organic compounds [ROC] (referred to as ozone precursors) with sunlight over a period of several hours. Primary sources of ozone precursors in the South Coast area are vehicle emissions. Sources of particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) include demolition, grading, road dust, agricultural tilling, mineral quarries, and vehicle exhaust.

The City of Santa Barbara is part of the South Coast Air Basin. The City is subject to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are more stringent than the national standards. The CAAQS apply to six pollutants: photochemical ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide,

particulate matter, and lead. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) provides oversight on compliance with air quality standards and preparation of the County Clean Air Plan.

Santa Barbara County is considered in attainment of the federal eight-hour ozone standard, and in attainment of the state one-hour ozone standard. The County does not meet the state eight-hour ozone standard or the state standard for particulate matter less than ten microns in diameter (PM_{10}); but does meet the federal PM_{10} standard. The County is in attainment for the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standard and unclassified for the state $PM_{2.5}$ standard.

The SBCAPCD has also issued several notifications and requirements regarding toxic air emissions generated from activities such as gasoline dispensing, dry cleaning, freeways, manufacturing, etc., that may require projects with these components to mitigate or redesign features of the project to avoid excessive health risks. Additionally, SBCAPCD requires submittal of an asbestos notification form for each regulated structure that is proposed to be demolished or renovated.

Global Climate Change (GCC) is a change in the average weather of the earth that can be measured by changes in wind patterns, storms, precipitation and temperature. Although there is not unanimous agreement regarding the occurrence, causes, or effects of GCC, there is a substantial body of evidence that climate change is occurring due the introduction of gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. Common greenhouse gases (GHG) include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, ozone and aerosols. Natural processes emit GHG that help to regulate the earth's temperature; however, it is believed that substantial increases in emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle use, have substantially elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations. While other greenhouse gases have higher global warming potential, carbon dioxide is emitted in such vastly higher quantities that it accounts for 85 percent (in terms of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) of all greenhouse gas emissions by the United States. Greenhouse gas emissions, therefore, are typically measured in terms of mass carbon dioxide equivalents, which is the product of the mass of a particular greenhouse gas and its specific global warming potential (CO2 has a global warming potential of 1).

California is a substantial contributor of GHG (2nd largest contributor in the U.S. and the 16th largest contributor in the world); with transportation and electricity generation representing the two largest contributing factors (41 and 22 percent, respectively). According to the US EPA greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. amounted to 7,260 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents in 2005. The California Energy Commission estimates that California emissions in 2004 were approximately 482 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents.

Assembly Bill 32 created the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 that requires the California Air Resources Board to adopt regulations to evaluate statewide greenhouse gas emissions, and then create a program and emission caps to limit statewide emissions to 1990 levels. The program is to be adopted by 2012 and implemented in a manner achieving emissions compliance by 2020. AB 32, therefore, creates an emission reduction goal for the state of 173 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents by 2020. AB 32 does not directly amend CEQA or other environmental laws, but it does acknowledge that emissions of greenhouse gases cause significant adverse impacts to human health and the environment.

California State Senate Bill 97, enacted in 2007, required that the CEQA Guidelines be amended to include "guidance for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emission or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions." The California Office of Planning and Research developed amendments to the CEQA Guidelines which were adopted by the California Natural Resources Agency on December 30, 2009 and became effective March 18, 2010. These amendments established a general framework for addressing global climate change impacts in the CEQA process. A number of state and regional agencies within California are working to develop procedures to evaluate climate change impacts in CEQA documents and to determine whether those impacts are significant. While these standards are being developed for Santa Barbara County, SBCAPD recommends that CEQA documents include: 1) a discussion of a project's impacts to and from global climate change; 2) a quantification of greenhouse gas emissions from all project sources; and 3) a discussion of how climate change impacts have been be mitigated to the extent reasonably possible for each project.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A project may create a significant air quality impact from the following:

- Exceeding an APCD pollutant threshold; inconsistency with District regulations; or exceeding population forecasts in the adopted County Clean Air Plan.
- Exposing sensitive receptors, such as children, the elderly or sick people to substantial pollutant exposure.
- Substantial unmitigated nuisance dust during earthwork or construction operations.
- Creation of nuisance odors inconsistent with APCD regulations.

Long-Term (Operational) Impact Guidelines: The City of Santa Barbara uses the SBCAPCD thresholds of significance for evaluating air quality impacts. The APCD has determined that a proposed project will not have a significant air quality impact on the environment if operation of the project will:

- Emit (from all project sources, both stationary and mobile) less than 240 pounds per day for ROC and NO_x, and 80 pounds per day for PM_{10};
- Emit less than 25 pounds per day of ROC or NO_x from motor vehicle trips only;
- Not cause a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone);
- Not exceed the APCD health risks public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- Be consistent with the adopted federal and state air quality plans for Santa Barbara.

Utilizing the SBCAPCD Screening Table, a residential project proposing less than 103 detached single family houses (assuming density of 3 units per acre) is not expected to exceed any threshold of significance of 25 pounds per day from vehicles for ROC and NOx emissions.

Short-Term (Construction) Impacts Guidelines: Projects involving grading, paving, construction, and landscaping activities may cause localized nuisance dust impacts and increased particulate matter (PM_{10}). Substantial dust-related impacts may be potentially significant, but are generally considered mitigable with the application of standard dust control mitigation measures. Standard dust mitigation measures are applied to projects with either significant or less than significant effects.

Exhaust from construction equipment also contributes to air pollution. Quantitative thresholds of significance are not currently in place for short-term or construction emissions. However, SBCAPCD uses combined emissions from all construction equipment that exceed 25 tons of any pollutant except carbon monoxide within a 12-month period as a guideline threshold for determining significance of construction emission impacts.

Cumulative Impacts and Consistency with Clean Air Plan: If the project-specific impact exceeds the ozone precursor significance threshold, it is also considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. When a project is not accounted for in the most recent Clean Air Plan growth projections, then the project's impact may also be considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments and Air Resources Board on-road emissions forecasts are used as a basis for vehicle emission forecasting. If a project provides for increased population growth beyond that forecasted in the most recently adopted CAP, or if the project does not incorporate appropriate air quality mitigation and control measures, or is inconsistent with APCD rules and regulations, then the project may be found inconsistent with the CAP and may have a significant impact on air quality.

Global Climate Change: According to recent amendments to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would have significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emission if it would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. A number of state and regional agencies within California are currently working to develop procedures to determine specifically how this significance determination should be interpreted and to develop plans and policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In the meantime, projects should be designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the extent reasonably possible.

Air Quality – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is currently vacant and surrounding land uses are comprised of residential uses. Hope Avenue provides access to the project site and serves local traffic.

2.a) Clean Air Plan

Direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for in the 2010 Clean Air Plan emissions growth assumptions. Appropriate air quality mitigation measures, including construction dust suppression, would be applied to the project, consistent with CAP and City policies, and are identified herein as recommended mitigation measures. The project could be found consistent with the 2010 Clean Air Plan; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

b-f) Air Pollutant Emissions, Sensitive Receptors, and Cumulative Impacts

Long-Term (Area Source & Operational) Emissions:

Substantial long-term project emissions could potentially stem from stationary sources which may require permits from the SBCAPCD and from motor vehicles associated with the project and from mobile sources. Examples of stationary emission sources that require permits from APCD include gas stations, auto body shops, diesel generators, boilers and large water heaters, dry cleaners, oil and gas production and processing facilities, and wastewater treatment facilities.

As proposed, the project would be a residential development, with all of the uses and vehicle trips associated with this type of development. Total build out of the project site would result in nine new single-family residential units, which is substantially below that SBAPCD screening level of 103 or more residential units. The project would not include stationary sources and. The combined operational (vehicle), area, and stationary source emissions from all long term project sources would be below the SBAPCD threshold of 240 pounds per day of ROC or NOx and 80 pounds per day of PM10. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a *less than significant* effect on long term air quality.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions:

Construction of the proposed project could result in emissions of pollutants due to grading, fumes, and vehicle exhaust. Sensitive receptors (residents) located adjacent to the project site could be affected by dust and particulates during project site grading and vehicle exhaust from construction equipment.

The project would involve grading, paving, and landscaping activities which could cause localized dust related impacts resulting in increases in increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). SBCAPCD recommends standard dust control measures for any discretionary project involving earth-moving activities. Dust-related impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant, and would be further reduced with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures identified below.

Diesel and gasoline powered construction equipment also emit particulate matter, NOx, and ROC. In order for emissions from construction equipment to be considered a significant environmental impact, combined emissions from all construction equipment would need to exceed 25 tons of any pollutant (except carbon monoxide) within a 12-month period. Project construction emissions are estimated to be less than 3 tons per year (calculated using the URBEMIS 9.2.4 computer model and SBCAPCD emission factor data), which is substantially less than this threshold. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a *less than significant impact*. However, the SBCAPCD recommends measures for limiting vehicle exhaust, which are identified below as recommended mitigation measures.

Global Climate Change:

Sources of carbon dioxide emissions that could result from the project include project-related traffic, natural gas use, landscape maintenance, consumer product use, solid waste generations, site lighting, and potable water delivery. Short-term and long term direct emissions of carbon dioxide that would result from the development of the project were estimated using the URBEMIS 9.2.4 computer program and SBAPCD emission factors as follows:

Construction CO_2 Emissions (tons/year)	**Proposed Operational CO_2 Emissions (lbs/day)**	**Threshold**
98.95	714.5	N/A

Construction emissions would be limited to the construction period and would be reduced through construction equipment emission control measures required as standard conditions of approval and shown below as recommended mitigation measures.

The California Energy Commission (CEC) estimates that California emissions in 2004 were approximately 492 Million Metric Tons of Carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO2E). The project's long-term direct emissions of carbon dioxide would not hinder the State's attainment of greenhouse gas emission reductions under AB 32 (173 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents by 2020). Vehicle trips are part of the CO2 calculation and the project-related average daily trips and vehicle miles traveled are also relatively small. The project's potential impacts on circulation systems (public transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle) are included in the Transportation Section of this Initial Study. The project would be required to comply with the California 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards.

Development and long-term operation of the project would also result in the generation of indirect CO2 emissions. However, the indirect CO2 emissions associated with energy use, solid waste and water conveyance for nine single family

residences would not result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions or hinder the State's attainment of greenhouse gas emission reductions under AB 32. SBCAPCD has estimated that under worst case scenarios, the average residential project in Santa Barbara County emits 1.87 tons of CO2 per year per household due to energy use.

Finally, the project would not exceed other air quality significance thresholds adopted by the SBCAPCD. The project would, therefore, not result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions or impede the ability of the State to attain greenhouse gas reduction goals and impacts would be considered *less than significant*.

2.g) Odors

The project is limited to residential uses, and would not include land uses involving odors or smoke. The project would not contain features with the potential to emit substantial odorous emissions, from sources such as commercial cooking equipment, combustion or evaporation of fuels, sewer systems, or solvents and surface coatings.

Due to the nature of the proposed land use and limited size of the project, project impacts related to odors would be considered *less than significant*.

Air Quality – Recommended Mitigations

AQ-1 **Construction Dust Control - Watering.** During site grading and transportation of fill materials, regular water sprinkling shall occur using reclaimed water whenever the Public Works Director determines that it is reasonably available. During clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation, sufficient quantities of water, through use of either water trucks or sprinkler systems, shall be applied to achieve minimum soil moisture of 12% to prevent dust from leaving the site. Each day, after construction activities cease, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be sufficiently moistened to create a crust. Throughout construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall also be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust raised from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will include wetting down such areas every three hours. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph.

AQ-2 **Construction Dust Control – Tarping.** Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered from the point of origin and maintain a freeboard height of 12 inches.

AQ-3 **Construction Dust Control – Gravel Pads.** Gravel pads shall be installed to reduce mud/dirt track out from unpaved truck exit routes.

AQ-4 **Construction Dust Control – Minimize Disturbed Area/Speed.** Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

AQ-5 **Construction Dust Control – Disturbed Area Treatment.** After clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or demolition is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated to prevent wind erosion. This may be accomplished by:

a. Seeding and watering until grass cover is grown;

b. Spreading soil binders;

c. Sufficiently wetting the area down to form a crust on the surface with repeated soakings as necessary to maintain the crust and prevent dust pickup by the wind;

d. Other methods approved in advance by the Air Pollution Control District.

AQ-6 **Construction Dust Control – Surfacing.** All surfaces for roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., shall be laid as soon as possible. Additionally, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

AQ-7 **Stockpiling.** If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist by applying water at a rate of 1.4 gallons per hour per square yard, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Apply cover when wind events are declared.

AQ-8 **Construction Dust Control – Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC).** The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when construction work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure.

AQ-9 Engine Size. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

AQ-10 Equipment Numbers. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.

AQ-11 Equipment Maintenance. Construction equipment shall be maintained to meet the manufacturer's specifications.

AQ-12 Catalytic Converters. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.

AQ-13 Diesel Catalytic Converters. Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed, if available.

AQ-14 Diesel Replacements. Diesel powered equipment shall be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.

AQ-15 Idling Limitation. All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to Title 13, Section 2485 and 2449 of the California Code of Regulations, limiting engine idling times. Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks and disel fueled or alternative diesel fueled off-road compression ignition vehicle during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units shall be used whenever possible.

AQ-16 Worker Trips. Construction worker trips shall be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

AQ-17 Asbestos & Lead-Containing Materials. Pursuant to APCD Rule 1001, the applicant is required to complete and submit an APCD Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Compliance Checklist at least 10 working days prior to commencing any alterations of the buildings. Any abatement or removal of asbestos and lead -containing materials must be performed in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Permits shall be obtained for the Air Pollution Control District prior commencement of demolition of the structures containing asbestos and/or lead. Disposal of material containing asbestos and/or lead shall be in sent to appropriate land fills that are certified to accept this material.

AQ-18 Portable diesel equipment - All portable diesel-powered construction equipment shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registration program or shall obtain an APCD permit.

AQ-19 Mobile construction equipment - Fleet owners of mobile construction equipment are subject to the California Air Resource Board (CARB) Regulation for In-use Off-road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13 California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, Section 2449), the purpose of which is to reduce diesel particulate matter (PM) and criteria pollutant emission from in-use (existing) off-road diesel-fueled vehicles. The current requirements include idling limits of 5 minutes, labeling of vehicles with ARB-issued equipment identification numbers, reporting to ARB, and vehicle sales disclosures For more information, please refer to the CARB website at www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm

Refer to the Traffic section for alternative transportation measures that would reduce automotive vehicle use and associated exhaust emissions. Refer to the Public Services and Utilities and Service Systems sections for a discussion of recycling and additional energy consumption measures that would minimize energy consumption and emissions.

Air Quality - Residual Impacts

Less Than Significant.

3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Could the project result in impacts to:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?		Less Than Significant
b) Locally designated historic, Landmark or specimen trees?	✓	
c) Natural communities (e.g. oak woodland, coastal habitat, etc.).	✓	
d) Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?	✓	
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?		Less Than Significant

Biological Resources - Discussion

Issues: Biological resources issues involve the potential for a project to substantially affect biologically-important natural vegetation and wildlife, particularly species that are protected as rare, threatened, or endangered by federal or state wildlife agencies and their habitat, native specimen trees, and designated landmark or historic trees.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Existing native wildlife and vegetation on a project site are qualitatively assessed to identify whether they constitute important biological resources, based on the types, amounts, and quality of the resources within the context of the larger ecological community. If important biological resources exist, project effects to the resources are qualitatively evaluated to determine whether the project would substantially affect these important biological resources. Significant biological resource impacts may potentially result from substantial disturbance to important wildlife and vegetation in the following ways:

- Elimination or substantial reduction or disruption of important natural vegetative communities and wildlife habitat or migration corridors, such as oak woodland, coastal strand, riparian, and wetlands.
- Substantial effect on protected plant or animal species listed or otherwise identified or protected as endangered, threatened or rare.
- Substantial loss or damage to important native specimen trees or designated landmark or historic trees.

Biological Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is currently vacant and is comprised mostly of non-native vegetation. Two ash trees and one pepper tree are located on the perimeter of the project site, and one pepper tree straddles the southern lot line. A report on the health of the trees was prepared by Westree on June 17, 2010, and is incorporated by reference and summarized herein (Exhibit C). The Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) did not identify any important biological resources on the project site. The project is surrounded on all sides by urban development consisting of single family development on lots of 8,000 to 10,000 square feet, typically landscaped with ornamental vegetation.

3.a) Endangered species or their habitats

The project site is vacant and there is no native habitat on site. The proposed development of the site would be similar to the adjacent single family development. There is no open space with native habitat near the project site that would provide habitat for endangered species. Impacts from the grading and development of the project site would be *less than significant*.

3. b) Specimen Trees

The proposed project would not require the removal of the pepper trees or the ash trees. However, the ash trees are considered a nuisance and could be removed without impact to biological resources. The project would result in *no impacts* to specimen trees.

There are no locally designated historic or landmark trees on the project site, thus there would be *no impact* on landmark trees.

3.c) Natural Communities

Based on a review of the City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) maps, the project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to, any natural communities and therefore the project would result in *no impacts* to natural communities.

3.d) Wetland Habitat

Based on a review of the City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) maps, the project site does not include, nor is it adjacent to, any wetland habitats and therefore the project would result in *no impacts* to wetland habitat.

3.e) Wildlife Migration

The project site is surrounded on all sides by urban, single-family, residential development. Each of these surrounding lots is landscaped with ornamental vegetation and typically includes solid fencing between lots. No migratory species are expected on the site and no non-urbanized wildlife would be displaced as a result of the project. Because of the surrounding existing development, with no open spaces nearby, the project site would not be an area for ground migration and any subsequent development of the site would result in *less than significant* impacts to wildlife migration.

The project site does include three mature trees along the property lines that may be habitat for transitory or nesting birds. These trees would remain as part of the project. Additionally, the project site is located in an urban area, so migratory birds are not expected. Nevertheless, the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protects all migratory non-game native bird species, and the applicant must comply with this Act. Compliance with the requirements of the MBTA would ensure that the project has a *less than significant* impact on migratory birds.

Biological Resources – Recommended Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Biological Resources - Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	Disturb archaeological resources?		Less Than Significant
b)	Affect a historic structure or site designated or eligible for designation as a National, State or City landmark?	✓	
c)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect ethnic cultural values or restrict religious uses in the project area?	✓	

Cultural Resources - Discussion

Issues: Archaeological resources are subsurface deposits dating from Prehistoric or Historical time periods. Native American culture appeared along the channel coast over 10,000 years ago, and numerous villages of the Barbareno Chumash flourished in coastal plains now encompassed by the City. Spanish explorers and eventual settlements in Santa Barbara occurred in the 1500's through 1700's. In the mid-1800's, the City began its transition from Mexican village to American city, and in the late 1800's through early 1900's experienced intensive urbanization. Historic resources are above-ground structures and sites from historical time periods with historic, architectural, or other cultural importance. The City's built environment has a rich cultural heritage with a variety of architectural styles, including the Spanish Colonial Revival style emphasized in the rebuilding of Santa Barbara's downtown following a destructive 1925 earthquake.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Archaeological and historical impacts are evaluated qualitatively by archeologists and historians. First, existing conditions on a site are assessed to identify whether important or unique archaeological or historical resources exist, based on criteria specified in the State CEQA *Guidelines* and City Master Environmental Assessment *Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historical Structures and Sites*, summarized as follows:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there exists a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with an important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If important archaeological or historic resources exist on the site, project changes are evaluated to determine whether they would substantially affect these important resources.

Cultural and Historic Resources Policy 1.0 – "Activities and development which could damage or destroy archaeological, historic, or architectural resources are to be avoided."

Cultural Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site was developed in the late 1800's with three residences and several accessory buildings. Part of the project site was planted with lemon trees and other agricultural crops. A historic structures report (Exhibit D), which is incorporated by reference and summarized herein, was prepared by historian Ronald L. Nye, Ph.D, who concluded that the structures did not have historical value due to the severe alterations of the houses. The applicant obtained a demolition permit from Santa Barbara County Planning and Development and removed all of the structures approximately eighteen months ago. The project site is not within a prehistoric watercourse according to the City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) maps and due to the previous ground disturbance from agricultural use of the site, a Phase I Archeological Report was not required.

4.a) Archaeological Resources

The project would include excavation of up to three feet in the level area to prepare the project site for the foundations of the proposed development. All existing utility lines would be relocated in the proposed public road right-of-way. Due to the highly disturbed nature of the site, and because the project is not located within a mapped archeological sensitivity area, the probability of encountering archeological resources is low. Additionally, a Phase I Archeological Report was prepared for a nearby project site, which is closer to Arroyo Burro Creek and no resources were found. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*. However, as with any ground disturbing activity, there is the remote possibility of encountering unknown buried deposits. For this reason, a standard condition of approval will be added to the project to alert contractors and construction personnel to the possibility of encountering archaeological resources within the project site. If archaeological resources are encountered, work in the area of the find shall be halted and a professional archaeologist consulted.

4.b) Historic Resources

The project site is currently vacant. Prior to receiving a demolition permit, historian evaluated all structures and concluded that the structures did not have historic value, nor was there any person of note who lived on site. The project would have *no impacts* to historic resources.

4.c) Ethnic/Religious Resources

There is no evidence that the site involves any ethnic or religious use or importance. The project would have *no impact* on historic, ethnic or religious resources.

Cultural Resources – Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Cultural Resources – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

5. GEOPHYSICAL CONDITIONS Could the project result in or expose people to:		NO	YES Level of Significance
a)	Seismicity: fault rupture?		Less Than Significant
b)	Seismicity: ground shaking or liquefaction?		Less Than Significant
c)	Seismicity: seiche or tsunami?	✓	
d)	Landslides or mudslides?		Less Than Significant
e)	Subsidence of the land?		Less Than Significant
f)	Expansive soils?		Less Than Significant
g)	Excessive grading or permanent changes in the topography?		Less Than Significant

Geophysical Conditions - Discussion

Issues: Geophysical impacts involve geologic and soil conditions and their potential to create physical hazards affecting persons or property; or substantial changes to the physical condition of the site. Included are earthquake-related conditions such as fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction (a condition in which saturated soil looses shear strength during earthquake shaking); or seismic sea waves; unstable soil or slope conditions, such as landslides, subsidence, expansive or compressible/collapsible soils; or erosion; and extensive grading or topographic changes.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Potentially significant geophysical impacts may result from:

- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to seismic conditions, such as earthquake faulting, ground shaking, liquefaction, or seismic waves.
- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to geologic or soil conditions, such as landslides, settlement, or expansive, collapsible/compressible, or expansive soils.
- Extensive grading on slopes exceeding 20%, substantial topographic change, destruction of unique physical features; substantial erosion of soils, overburden, or sedimentation of a water course.

Geophysical Conditions – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project is approximately 3 acres in size and is vacant. The topography is generally higher in the center of the property, tapering to a lower elevation at the western and eastern property lines. The site was previously developed with three residences and accessory buildings, which were all demolished approximately eighteen months ago. A water main is located along the northern portion of the project site. There are no natural water courses on site or within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Arroyo Burro Creek is located over 800 feet to the east. Drainage flows on site from the north and flows off site to the east and west.

5.a) Seismic Hazards

A portion of the proposed project development area (approximately two lots) is within MEA 200 foot buffer zone, which indicates that an earthquake fault, likely the north-east branch of the Moore Ranch fault, may be nearby. Geologic maps indicate that this fault is located generally east and south-east of the project site boundaries. Impacts from fault rupture would be *less than significant*. The City of Santa Barbara is not considered an Earthquake Fault Zone as prescribed under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Additionally, current building code will require that any development be constructed to address all geologic conditions of the site.

5.b) Seismic Hazards - Ground shaking or Liquefaction

The project site is located in a seismically active area of southern California. Significant ground shaking as a result of a local or regional earthquake is likely to occur during the life of the project. The soil testing did not encounter groundwater within the first 30 feet of the surface and the soils encountered consisted of sandy clays. Therefore, the site is not believed to be affected by secondary ground failure phenomena such as liquefaction or excessive ground settlement caused by strong ground shaking. Impacts related to ground shaking and liquefaction are considered *less than significant*.

5.c.) Seismic Hazard - Seiche or Tsunami

The project site is not located adjacent to any lakes or other enclosed bodies of water, and is located several miles from the coast and outside the City's tsunami run up area. Therefore, because of the project location, there would be *no impacts* from a seiche or tsunami.

5.d.) Geologic or Soil Instability Landslides:

There are no steep slopes on the project site. The project site slopes are between 5%-11% and due to the low ground water table cited in the foundation report prepared for the project, the soil is fairly stable. The only significant change of topography off site is the property to west, which is approximately ten feet lower than the project site. However, this is an engineered slope that created a building pad for the adjacent residence and appears to be stable. Therefore impacts from geologic or soil instability would be *less than significant*.

5.e.) Geologic or Soil Instability-Subsidence

The eventual development of the site would result in nine new homes, each with driveways, walkways and patios. The existing surface soils, which extend to a depth of 18 to 30 inches, were found to be moderately expansive. The preliminary soils report provided several recommendations to address subsidence impacts. The recommendations include types of foundations that would withstand subsidence, the thickness of the slabs, and size of rebar. Therefore, impacts from subsidence would be *less than significant*. Additionally, the recommendations include over excavation to a depth of 12 inches for patios and driveways. By following the recommendations of the foundation report and compliance with the building code, impacts would be further reduced.

5.f.) Geologic or Soil Instability - Expansive Soils

The project site area is comprised of sandy clay and clayey sand material, which is associated with expansive soils. A preliminary foundation report was prepared for the project that included recommendations for further soil testing of the site and engineering the structural foundations based upon the soil types. By following the recommendations of the geotechnical report for site preparation and foundation design, impacts would be *less than significant*.

5.g) Topography; Grading/ Erosion

The existing topography is at the highest point in the center of the lot. To the east the topography lowers by six feet at Hope Avenue and to the west the topography lowers at the property line by approximately eight feet. The preliminary grading plans demonstrate that the project will generally follow the existing topography, with a minor amount of leveling on each pad to accommodate the future development. Impacts from grading would be *less than significant*.

The proposed development area, which includes the proposed public road, is comprised of slopes from 5% - 11% for the whole site. Grading for the project would include approximately 1,550 cubic yards of cut and 2,150 cubic yards of fill with 600 cubic yards of import. The gradient of the site would remain approximately the same to facilitate storm water runoff. Short term impacts from erosion due to wind and storm water runoff that could occur during grading would be *less than significant*. Standard construction conditions and Building Division requirements for an erosion control plan would apply to the project. Dust mitigations found under the Air Quality section would address the wind erosion impacts. With implementation of these standard requirements and mitigations, any potential adverse impacts would be further reduced.

Geophysical Conditions – Recommended Mitigation

G-1 **Geotechnical Studies** All recommendations contained in the foundation report prepared by Coast Valley Testing, Inc (August 21, 2009) shall be implemented. These recommendations shall include, but are not limited to requirements for inspections of excavated areas during vegetation clearing, grubbing prior to grading, grading, and review of design of foundations. .Scarification and wetting of recompacted areas to receive fill. Also, requirements for asphalt concrete flatwork, and concrete hardscape shall be followed. Grading and foundation plans shall be reviewed by a Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist to ensure compliance with the recommendations in the Coast Valley Testing, Inc. studies and comply with the findings of any additional subsurface exploration. Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for grading and building permits and subject to City Building and Safety Division review and approval.

Geophysical Conditions – Residual Impacts

Site preparation and structural development can be engineered to address all seismic, geologic and soil conditions such that public safety would be assured and potential property damage avoided. The project geophysical impacts would be less than significant. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, project geophysical impacts would be further reduced.

6. HAZARDS Could the project involve:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?		Less Than Significant
b) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazards?		Less Than Significant
c) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	✓	
d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?		Less Than Significant

Hazards - Discussion

Issues: Hazardous materials issues involve the potential for public health or safety impacts from exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous materials or risk of accidents involving combustible or toxic substances.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Significant impacts may result from the following:

- Siting of incompatible projects in close proximity to existing sources of safety risk, such as pipelines, industrial processes, railroads, airports, etc.
- Exposure of project occupants or construction workers to unremediated soil or groundwater contamination.
- Exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous substances due to improper use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Siting of development in a high fire hazard areas or beyond adequate emergency response time, with inadequate access or water pressure, or otherwise in a manner that creates a fire hazard

Hazards – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is currently undeveloped and previous uses of the site included residential and a small farming operation. A review of the Cortese List did not reveal any active remediation activities on the site, or any previous remediation activities on the project site or immediately adjacent sites. Further from the project site, Calvary Cemetery, located over 500 feet to the south, was a listed cleanup site for gasoline contamination on the Cortese List, but that case was closed in 1999. The project site is not within a high fire hazard area.

6.a) Accidental Explosion or Hazardous Substance Release

The proposed future development of the site would be residential. Residential uses are not substantial generators or users of hazardous materials that would have the potential to result in explosions or releases. Hazardous materials use and storage associated with the residential uses on the property would be limited to small amounts of common household, automotive, and gardening supplies, such as cleansers, paint, motor oil, and pesticides. There are several existing programs designed to inform the public of this issue and provide opportunities to dispose of household hazardous waste. Electronic waste, typical of what is used in homes, such as computers, televisions, appliances and other items would also be used and must be disposed of consistent with current regulations. Impacts would be *less than significant* because of the limited quantities of hazardous materials that would be used, and because any usage of hazardous materials would be subject to all applicable State and local requirements for management and disposal of such materials.

6.b) Health Hazard

Because the project site is vacant there would be no removal of hazardous structural material containing lead paint or asbestos. During the construction phase there could be relatively small amounts of hazardous materials generated by construction equipment use and maintenance. Impacts would be *less than significant*. The emissions associated with construction and operation would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and policies pertaining to hazardous materials. Also, equipment use, fueling and maintenance would be controlled on site to avoid any contamination entering the City's storm drain system. Other hazards, including air emissions, are discussed in the air

quality section. Compliance with existing regulations and recommended mitigations under the Air Quality section would ensure that hazardous material/waste impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The proposed residential use would not cause or create a long term health hazard. Impacts would be *less than significant*. Typical material used in residential development is regulated by both the State and Federal government and disposal of the material would be should be done consistent with State and Federal guidelines.

6.c.) Existing Sources of Health Hazards

The project site is vacant and surrounded by residential uses. Based upon the surrounding residential development and a review of the Cortese List, there are no known sources of health hazards, such as chemical storage tanks or industrial uses. Therefore, there would be *no impacts* from existing hazardous materials.

6.d) Fire Hazard

The proposed residential development would not be within a high fire hazard area, would be within an urban environment and all of the emergency services associated with the urban environment would be provided. Impacts associated with fire hazard would be *less than significant*. Each of the future residents would be constructed consistent with the building code, which includes a fire sprinkler requirement for all new development. The new public road would be constructed to current standards to provide adequate emergency vehicle access. Finally, a fire hydrant would be placed in proximity of the residential lots to provide an adequate supply of water to the fire engines.

Hazards - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Hazards – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

7. NOISE Could the project result in:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	Increases in existing noise levels?		Less Than Significant
b)	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		Less Than Significant

Noise - Discussion

Issues: Noise issues are associated with siting of a new noise-sensitive land use in an area subject to high ambient background noise levels, siting of a noise-generating land use next to existing noise-sensitive land uses, and/or short-term construction-related noise.

The primary source of ambient noise in the City is vehicle traffic noise. The City Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) *Noise Contour Map* identifies average ambient noise levels within the City.

Ambient noise levels are determined as averaged 24-hour weighted levels, using the Day-Night Noise Level (L_{dn}) or Community Noise Equivalence Level (CNEL) measurement scales. The L_{dn} averages the varying sound levels occurring over the 24-hour day and gives a 10 decibel penalty to noises occurring between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. to take into account the greater annoyance of intrusive noise levels during nighttime hours. Since L_{dn} is a 24-hour average noise level, an area could have sporadic loud noise levels above 60 dB(A) which average out over the 24-hour period. CNEL is similar to L_{dn} but includes a separate 5 dB(A) penalty for noise occurring between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. CNEL and L_{dn} values usually agree with one another within 1 dB(A). The Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}) is a single noise level, which, if held constant during the measurement time period, would represent the same total energy as a fluctuating noise. L_{eq} values are commonly expressed for periods of one hour, but longer or shorter time periods may be specified. In general, a change in noise level of less than three decibels is not audible. A doubling of the distance from a noise source will generally equate to a change in decibel level of six decibels.

Guidance for appropriate long-term background noise levels for various land uses are established in the City General Plan Noise Element Land Use Compatibility Guidelines. Building codes also establish maximum average ambient noise levels for the interiors of structures.

High construction noise levels occur with the use of heavy equipment such as scrapers, rollers, graders, trenchers and

large trucks for demolition, grading, and construction. Equipment noise levels can vary substantially through a construction period, and depend on the type of equipment, number of pieces operating, and equipment maintenance. Construction equipment generates noise levels of more than 80 or 90 dB(A) at a distance of 50 feet, and the shorter impulsive noises from other construction equipment (such as pile drivers and drills) can be even higher, up to and exceeding 100 dB(A). Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic, and after completion of the initial demolition, grading and site preparation activities, tends to be quieter.

The Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9.16 of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code) governs short-term or periodic noise, such as construction noise, operation of motorized equipment or amplified sound, or other sources of nuisance noise. The ordinance establishes limitations on hours of construction and motorized equipment operations, and provides criteria for defining nuisance noise in general.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A significant noise impact may result from:

- Siting of a project such that persons would be subject to long-term ambient noise levels in excess of the following:
  - Residential: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 70 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 45 dB(A).
- Substantial noise from grading and construction activity in close proximity to noise-sensitive receptors for an extensive duration.

Noise – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is vacant and is not currently used in any capacity (i.e. outdoor storage, or farming). The project site is not exposed to high noise levels as it is surrounding by residential uses. Noise generated by traffic on Hope Avenue is estimated to be less than 60 dB(A).

7.a-b) Increased Noise Level; Exposure to High Noise Levels

Long-Term Operational Noise: With the introduction of additional residential units, there would be a minor increase in the area noise level. Long-term noise for the project would be typical of residential use, such as cars exiting or entering the site, landscape maintenance activities and gatherings at the individual residences. The small increase in automotive traffic would not be likely to substantially increase noise levels on area roadways.

The project would result in the construction of nine new single-family residence in an area subject to estimated average ambient noise levels of less than 60 dB(A), based on the City's Master Environmental Assessment noise contour map. The project would therefore comply not only with the environmental noise level threshold of 70 dB(A), but also with the City's private exterior noise level compatibility criteria of 60 dBA CNEL.

Impacts would be *less than significant* because the project site would not be subject to high noise levels nor would the project cause high operational noise levels.

Temporary Construction Noise: The first phase of construction would be approximately three – four weeks for rough grading, with another two months to finish the road and other infrastructure improvements. Individual home construction is not proposed at this time, and could be highly variable both in terms of duration and commencement. For the purposes of environmental review, estimates of one year are used for construction duration on the individual homes, and it is assumed that construction on all homes would occur concurrently, and would begin immediately following completion of the subdivision improvements. These assumptions were made as a reasonable worst-case scenario under CEQA. Site preparation would involve equipment such as bulldozers, bottom scrapers, excavators, backhoes, loaders, dump trucks, graders, rollers, concrete trucks, water trucks, pavers and pick-up trucks. Construction activities would involve typical construction equipment including trenching equipment, concrete trucks, and semi trucks for material delivery.

Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic and, after completion of initial grading and site clearing activities, tends to be quieter. Individual lots would be constructed over time and could occur at the same time or spread out over several years. The project grading and construction processes would create temporary high noise levels that could adversely affect neighboring residents (which are designated as sensitive receptors). However, because noise generated during construction would be short-term, and generally intermittent and sporadic, construction impacts would be *less than significant*. However, in order to reduce short-term impacts on sensitive receptors to the extent feasible, several mitigation measures have been recommended for the site preparation/grading phase of construction. These mitigation measures would limit construction hours and material delivery timing, and would require the use of mufflers on engines and notice to neighbors prior to construction. Additionally, as individual houses are constructed, each would be subject to the City's

standard work hours. Implementation of these construction related noise mitigations would further reduce any less than significant impacts to sensitive receptors in the area.

Noise – Recommended Mitigation

N-1 **Neighborhood Notification Prior to Construction.** At least twenty (20) days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners, businesses, and residents within 300 feet of the project area. The notice shall contain a description of the project, the construction schedule, including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the Contractor, site rules and Conditions of Approval pertaining to construction activities, and any additional information that will assist the Building Inspectors, Police Officers and the public in addressing problems that may arise during construction.

N-2: **Construction Hours.** Construction (including preparation for construction work) shall only be permitted Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., excluding the following holidays: New Year's Day (January 1st); Martin Luther King Jr.'s Birthday (3rd Monday in January); President's Day (3rd Monday in February); Memorial Day (Last Monday in May); Independence Day (July 4th); Labor Day (1st Monday in September); Thanksgiving Day (4th Thursday in November); Day Following Thanksgiving Day (Friday following Thanksgiving); Christmas Day (December 25th). *When a holiday falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the preceding Friday or following Monday respectively shall be observed as a legal holiday.

When, based on required construction type or other appropriate reasons, it is necessary to do work outside the allowed construction hours, contractor shall contact the Chief of Building and Safety to request a waiver from the above construction hours, using the procedure outlined in Santa Barbara Municipal Code §9.16.015 Construction Work at Night. Contractor shall notify all residents within 300 feet of the lots of intent to carry out said construction a minimum of 48 hours prior to said construction. Said notification shall include what the work includes, the reason for the work, the duration of the proposed work and a contact number.

N-3: **Construction Equipment Sound Control.** All construction equipment, including trucks, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers' muffler and silencing devices.

See also recommended Transportation Mitigation Measures T-1 and T-2.

Noise – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

8. POPULATION AND HOUSING Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** **Level of Significance**
a)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?		Less Than Significant
b)	Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	✓	

Population and Housing - Discussion

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Issues of potentially significant population and housing impacts may involve:

- Growth inducement, such as provision of substantial population or employment growth or creation of substantial housing demand; development in an undeveloped area, or extension/ expansion of major infrastructure that could support additional future growth.
- Loss of a substantial number of housing units, especially loss of more affordable housing.

Population and Housing – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is located within an urban area that is developed with single family homes on all sides. All utility services are available at the project site. Hope Avenue is an improved public road that provides access to the site.

8.a) Growth-Inducing Impacts

The project would not involve a substantial growth in population or housing in the area. Based upon American Community Survey data for 2005-2009, there are an estimated 2.35 residents per household in the City of Santa Barbara.

Using that figure, the nine new residential units would generate approximately 21 new residents. This would amount to less than 0.1% of the City's 2009 population of 86,353. Infrastructure at the site already serves the previously existing uses and is adequate to serve the proposed expansion. Growth-inducing impacts would be *less than significant* because the project would not require extension of major infrastructure and would result in just a small increase in population and housing that would be insufficient to substantially increase demand for goods and services.

8.b) Housing Displacement

The project would result in nine new single-family residents and would not involve any housing displacement. *No impact* would result from the project.

Population and Housing – Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Population and Housing – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

9. PUBLIC SERVICES Could the project have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered services in any of the following areas:	NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a) Fire protection?		Less Than Significant
b) Police protection?		Less Than Significant
c) Schools?		Less Than Significant
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		Less Than Significant
e) Other governmental services?		Less Than Significant
f) Electrical power or natural gas?		Less Than Significant
g) Water treatment or distribution facilities?		Less Than Significant
h) Sewer or septic tanks?		Less Than Significant
i) Water distribution/demand?		Less Than Significant
j) Solid waste disposal?		Less Than Significant

Public Services - Discussion

Issues: This section evaluates project effects on fire and police protection services, schools, road maintenance and other governmental services, utilities, including electric and natural gas, water and sewer service, and solid waste disposal.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: The following may be identified as significant public services and facilities impacts:

- Creation of a substantial need for increased police department, fire department, road maintenance, or government services staff or equipment.
- Generation of substantial numbers of students exceeding public school capacity where schools have been designated as overcrowded.
- Inadequate water, sewage disposal, or utility facilities.
- Substantial increase in solid waste disposal to area sanitary landfills.

Public Services – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is within the County of Santa Barbara and is currently undeveloped. The site is surrounded by the City of Santa Barbara on all sides. City Police and Fire would respond to any incidents on the site, such as trespassing. Hope Avenue is a public road that is within the City of Santa Barbara jurisdiction. The project site is served by the City waste

water treatment plant and City water service. An easement for a City water main to serve the subdivision to west is located along the northern side of the project site. The remaining services are provided by regional utility companies, such as Southern California Gas and Southern California Edison.

Facilities and Services: The project site is located in an urban area where all public services are available. In 2010, the City certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) on the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update. The FEIR concluded that under the projected planned development and all studied alternatives, all public services could accommodate additional growth. The project site is within the City's sphere of influence and is included in the analysis of determining services for future growth.

Water: The City of Santa Barbara's water supply comes primarily from the following sources, with the actual share of each determined by availability and level of customer demand: Lake Cachuma and Tecolote Tunnel; Gibraltar Reservoir, Devils Canyon and Mission Tunnel; groundwater; State Water Project Table A allotment; desalination; and recycled water. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by offsetting demand that would otherwise have to be supplied by additional sources. On June 14, 2011, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply, the City Council approved the Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP) for the planning period 2011-2030. The LTWSP outlines a strategy to use the above sources to meet the City's estimated system demand (potable plus recycled water) of 14,000 AFY, plus a 10% safety margin equal to 1,400 AFY, for a total water supply target of 15,400 AFY. The LTWSP concludes that the City's water supply is adequate to serve the anticipated demand plus safety margin during the planning period.

Solid Waste: Most of the waste generated in the City is transported on a daily basis to seven landfills located around the County. The County of Santa Barbara, which operates the landfills, has developed impact significance thresholds related to the impacts of development on remaining landfill capacity. The County thresholds are based on the projected average solid waste generation for Santa Barbara County from 1990-2005. The County assumes a 1.2% annual increase (approximately 4000 tons per year) in solid waste generation over the 15-year period. The County's threshold for project specific operational impacts to the solid waste system is 196 tons per year (this figure represents 5% of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 tons/year]). Source reduction, recycling, and composting can reduce a project's waste stream by as much as 50%. If a proposed project generates 196 or more tons per year after reduction and recycling efforts, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable. Proposed projects with a project specific impact as identified above (196 tons/year or more) would also be considered cumulatively significant, as the project specific threshold of significance is based on a cumulative growth scenario. However, as landfill space is already extremely limited, any increase in solid waste of 1% or more of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 tons/year], which equates to 40 tons per year, is considered an adverse cumulative impact.

9.a) Fire Protection

The proposed project would introduce nine new residential units to the site. A new public road ending in a cul-de-sac would be constructed consistent with City engineering standards, and the new residences would each have a driveway accessed from the new public road. The Fire Department has reviewed the site plan for the proposed project and determined that the proposed road, including the radius of the bulb at the end of the cul-de-sac, and the location of the fire hydrant is adequate. Additionally, as each individual lot building permit is reviewed, the proposed structures would be evaluated to determine consistency with appropriate fire code standards. The project site has adequate water pressure for the fire hydrants and this area of the City is considered a low wildfire risk due to the urban environment. Current building and fire codes would require fire sprinklers in all of the units. Impacts would be *less than significant.*

9.b) Police Protection

As discussed in the Plan Santa Barbara FEIR, the City maintains good response times for emergency calls. More than 90 percent of emergency calls have response times of less than four minutes, and 95 percent of medium- and low-priority calls have response times of less than eight minutes. In addition, the City is currently well under the national average for number of emergency calls for service per 100,000 population (City of Santa Barbara 2005). The City presently experiences substantially fewer emergency calls for service than the national average; therefore, although current service ratios are less than the national average, fewer services per citizen are required. Impacts to police protection would be *less than significant*. The proposed net new 9 new residential units would generate approximately 21 new residents, based upon a U.S. Census estimate of 2.35 residents per household, which would be an increase of less than 0.1% of the City's population, a very minor increase that the existing police service can address.

9.c) Schools

The project site is served by the Hope Elementary and Santa Barbara Unified School District for elementary and high school respectively. With the annexation of the project site to the City, there would be no change in school service. The project would provide an increase of nine residential units to the site. The residential uses could generate additional students in the districts, but not enough to substantially impact school enrollment. None of the school districts in the South Coast have been designated "overcrowded" as defined by California State law. School impact fees would be applied to the project in accordance with State law to offset the cost to the school district of providing additional infrastructure to accommodate new students generated by the development. Therefore, impacts to schools from the additional residential units would be *less than significant*.

9.d) Maintenance of Public Facilities & Public Road

The proposed project would include the construction of a new public road on the project site, located approximately 10 feet south of the northern property line. The new public road would be constructed by the applicant and then dedicated to the City of Santa Barbara. The City of Santa Barbara would maintain the road once it is accepted. The proposed public road would be less than 550 feet in length and would represent a small addition to the overall City Streets Maintenance program. There are no other public facilities that would be affected by the project. The 10-foot wide area between the public road and the northern property line would be maintained collectively by the nine homeowners. Impacts to public facilities, including roads, would be *less than significant*.

9.e) Other Government Facilities

The proposed project would be an incremental addition to City services, but would cause an increase of less than 0.1% to the overall City population. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact on other government facilities.

9.f) Electrical power, cable, telephone, or natural gas services

The proposed development would result in the future development of nine residential units. The project would connect to existing gas, electricity, cable, and telephone services located adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be *less than significant* because utilities are adequate for the proposed development and are currently available at the property line.

9.g) Sewer

The project site is surrounded by residential properties within the City of Santa Barbara city limits, which are currently served by the El Estero Treatment Plant. Increased sewage treatment associated with the project's future build-out of nine new residences can be accommodated by the existing City sewer system and sewage treatment plant, and would represent a *less than significant* impact. The maximum capacity of the El Estero Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day (MGD), with current average daily flow of 8.5 MGD. The Treatment Plant is designed to treat the wastewater from a population of 104,000, which is more than the City's current population. The proposed project's estimated net new sewer demand is 4.40 AFY (Exhibit H), which can be accommodated by the existing City sewer system and sewage treatment plant. Since no development is being proposed at this time, estimated sewer demand was based upon future residential development of up to 3,750 square feet (includes garages) per lot, which was calculated using the City's floor area ratio (FAR) for a 10,000 square foot lot. The project would be subject to the current plumbing code, which could include low flow toilets, and other water conserving fixtures to further reduce impacts to the treatment plant.

9.g & i) Water Treatment Facilities & Water Service

The proposed project water use demand is estimated to be 4.59 AFY (based on the City's Water Demand Factor and Conservation Study "User's Guide" Document No. 2) (Exhibit H), based upon the assumption of future residential development of up to 3,750 square feet (includes garages) and approximately 1,000 square feet of drought tolerant landscaping. The potential increase in demand from the proposed project would constitute a *less than significant* impact to the City water supply, treatment, and distribution facilities. The proposed project is within the anticipated growth rate for the City and therefore, the City's long-term water supply and existing water treatment and distribution facilities would adequately serve the proposed project. The project would be subject to the most current plumbing code, which increases conservation, and it is anticipated that the actual water usage would be lower than that estimated above. Therefore, with implementation of all water saving measures, water use impacts would be further reduced.

9.j) Solid Waste Generation/ Disposal

Long-Term (Operational). The proposed project's long term residential use is estimated to generate 26 tons per year (TPY) of solid waste, a *less than significant* impact when compared to the 196 TPY threshold. With application of source reduction, reuse, and recycling, landfill disposal of solid waste could be reduced to 13 TPY, resulting in further reduction of impacts.

Short-Term (Demolition & Construction) The project site is vacant. Grading for the infrastructure is approximately 2,400 cubic yards of cut and 1,800 cubic yards of fill with approximately 600 cubic yards of import. The solid waste generation/disposal thresholds adopted by the City do not apply to short-term construction projects. However, new construction, especially remodeling and demolition, represents the greatest challenge to maintaining existing landfill diversion rates. The County of Santa Barbara has developed solid waste generation guidelines. Based on these guidelines, it is anticipated that the project would generate 253 tons of waste from construction of nine new residential structures of up to 3,750 square feet. Under the County's significance thresholds, any project that is projected to create more than 350 tons of construction and demolition debris is considered to have a significant impact on solid waste generation. Once a project exceeds 350 tons of debris a solid waste management plan is required. Therefore, applying these thresholds of significance, the short term solid waste demolition impacts would be considered *less than significant*. Application of City requirements (SBMC Ch. 7.18) for construction waste recycling will minimize any impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

Public Services –Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Public Services – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

10. RECREATION Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?		Less than significant
b)	Affect existing parks or other public recreational facilities?	✓	

Recreation - Discussion

Issues: Recreational issues are associated with increased demand for recreational facilities, or loss or impacts to existing recreational facilities.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Recreation impacts may be significant if they result in:

- Substantial increase in demand for park and recreation facilities in an area under-served by existing public park and recreation facilities.
- Substantial loss or interference with existing park space or other public recreational facilities such as hiking, cycling, or horse trails.

Recreation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is approximately 2.96 acres in size and is undeveloped. There is a public sidewalk along the eastern edge of the property that serves pedestrians along Hope Avenue. There are no other public or private recreational facilities on or adjacent to the project site.

Currently within the City, there are more than 1,800 acres of natural open space, park land and other recreational facilities. In addition, there are 28 tennis courts, 2 public outdoor swimming pools, beach volleyball courts, sport fields, lawn bowling greens, a golf course, 13 community buildings and a major skateboard facility. The City also offers a wide variety of recreational programs for people of all ages and abilities in sports, various classes, tennis, aquatics and cultural arts. In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues (CTI) Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with recreation and parks. Population characteristics including income,

age, population growth, education and ethnicity affect recreation interests and participation levels. Additionally, the National Recreation and Park Association has established park service area standards for various types of parks. The NRPA standards have not been adopted by the City; however, the standards do provide a useful tool for assessing park space needs. The CTI Report determined that, based on NRPA standards, there is an uneven distribution of parkland in the City, such that some areas of the City, not including the project area, may currently be underserved with neighborhood and community parks, but overall the City has adequate passive, community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks.

10.a) Recreational Demand

The project would result in the build out of nine new residential units. Recreational demand from these additional units would result in a *less than significant* impact. Within a one mile radius are five parks that provide both passive and active recreational opportunities. Also within this radius is access to the front country trail system of the Los Padres National Forest, and some streets with shared bike lanes. Therefore, there are a number of facilities within a short distance to provide a number of recreational opportunities for the new development.

10.b) Existing Recreational Facilities

The project site is nearby but not adjacent to existing park facilities. The proposed project would not impact or interfere with parks or public trails. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to existing recreational facilities.

Recreation – Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Recreation – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

11. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Could the project result in:		**NO**	**YES** *Level of Significance*
a)	Increased vehicle trips?		Less Than significant
b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves, inadequate sight distance or dangerous intersections)?		Less Than significant
c)	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?		Less Than Significant
d)	Decreased performance or safety of pedestrian, bicycle, or public transit facilities?		Less Than Significant
e)	Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, programs, or ordinances regarding congestion management and the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation.	✓	

Transportation - Discussion

Issues: Transportation issues include traffic, access, circulation, safety, and parking. Vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit modes of transportation are all considered, as well as emergency vehicle access. The City General Plan Circulation Element contains policies addressing circulation, traffic, and parking in the City.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A proposed project may have a significant impact on traffic/ circulation/ parking if it would:

Vehicle Traffic

- Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and street system capacity (see traffic thresholds below).
- Cause insufficiency in the transit system.
- Conflict with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) or Circulation Element or other adopted plan or policy pertaining to vehicle or transit systems.

Circulation and Traffic Safety

- Create potential hazards due to addition of traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or that supports uses that would be incompatible with substantial increases in traffic.
- Diminish or reduce safe pedestrian, bicycle, or public transit circulation.
- Result in inadequate emergency access on-site or to nearby uses.
- Conflict with regional and local plans, policies, or ordinances regarding the circulation system, including all modes of transportation (vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation).

Traffic Thresholds of Significance: The City uses Levels of Service (LOS) "A" through "F" to describe operating conditions at signalized intersections in terms of volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios, with LOS A (0.50-0.60 V/C) representing free flowing conditions and LOS F (0.90+ V/C) describing conditions of substantial delay. The City General Plan Circulation Element establishes the goal for City intersections to not exceed LOS C (0.70-0.80 V/C).

For purposes of environmental assessment, LOS C at 0.77 V/C is the threshold Level of Service against which impacts are measured. An intersection is considered "impacted" if the volume to capacity ratio is .77 V/C or greater.

Project-Specific Significant Impact: A project-specific significant impact results when:

(a) Project peak-hour traffic would cause a signalized intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or

(b) The V/C of an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C would be increased by 0.01 (1%) or more as a result of project peak-hour traffic.

For non-signalized intersections, delay-time methodology is utilized in evaluating impacts.

Significant Cumulative Contribution: A project would result in a significant contribution to cumulative traffic impacts when:

(a) Project peak-hour traffic together with other cumulative traffic from existing and reasonably foreseeable pending projects would cause an intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or

(b) Project would contribute traffic to an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C.

Transportation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The project site is located on Hope Avenue, which provides a north-south connection from State Street to the south to Foothill Road to the north. Access to the site is directly from Hope Avenue. A traffic study, dated September 16, 2010 was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) and is incorporated by referenced and summarized herein (Exhibit E). The State Street/Hope Avenue intersection operates at LOS A during the a.m. peak hour and LOS B during the p.m. peak hour. Public transit is approximately one-half mile south at State Street and Hope Avenue.

11.a) Traffic

Long-Term Traffic: The proposed project would eventually result in the construction of nine new single family residences. The ATE traffic study determined that the project would generate a net traffic increase of 86 average daily trips (ADT) and approximately 8 peak-hour trips (PHT). When distributed to the surrounding street system, such as the intersection of State Street and Hope Avenue, which operates below capacity, impacts would be *less than significant.*

Short-Term Construction Traffic: The project would generate construction-related traffic that would occur over a nine to twelve-month period and would vary depending on how many lots have construction activity concurrently. The first phase of the overall project construction process would be the grading and installation of the infrastructure for the future development, and is estimated to last approximately three to four weeks. Construction of the homes on each of the lots would take place individually, although some lots may be developed at roughly the same time. Staging, equipment, materials storage, and temporary construction worker parking would occur on the project site. Temporary construction traffic is generally considered an adverse but not significant impact. In this case, given traffic levels in the area and the relatively short duration of the construction process, short-term construction-related traffic would be a *less than significant* impact. Recommended mitigation measures would be applied as appropriate, including restrictions on the hours permitted for construction trips and approval of routes for construction traffic to further reduce impacts.

11.b) Hazards to safety from design features

The proposed project includes the construction of public street that ends with a cul de sac, and would be dedicated to the

City once construction is completed. The new public road would be located approximately ten feet from the northern property line and would follow the length of the northern lot line. Safety impacts from the new public road would be *less than significant.* City Transportation staff along with the Fire Department reviewed the location of the road and found that access along the northern side of the lot was a superior location. Further, the slight rise of the road from Hope Avenue to the center of the project site, then the descent to the western side of the lot does not pose a visibility hazard since the road serves nine lots and is not a through road. Final design of the road would be reviewed by the Public Works Department to ensure compliance with applicable road design standards. Development of the individual lots will be reviewed to ensure driveways and aprons provide adequate grades and sight distances.

11.c) Emergency Access

The proposed public road would serve nine lots and would not be a through road. Impacts for emergency access would be *less than significant.* The design of the road was reviewed by both the Public Works and Fire Departments and both departments found the design adequate for emergency access and that the turn around area at the terminus of the road is sized correctly for emergency vehicles.

11.d) Bicycle /Pedestrian/Public Transit

The proposed project impacts to bicycle hazards would be *less than significant.* The proposed subdivision for the residential development is designed to be consistent with all regulations, including setbacks. By designing lots consistent with required setbacks, the line of site necessary for motorists to view approaching cyclists will be preserved.

The proposed project impacts to pedestrian hazards would be *less than significant.* Since the new street will have a slight rise in the middle visibility from a car will be hampered by the rise in the road. The design of the proposed on-street parking was determined to allow motorists to park closest to the proposed lots without needing to cross the street. Additionally, a sidewalk and parkway would be provided along the south side of the proposed cul-de-sac road and connect all nine lots to the existing sidewalk at Hope Avenue. The sidewalk along Hope Avenue, fronting the project site, would be improved consistent with Pedestrian Master Plan, providing better pedestrian access.

The proposed project impacts to transit services would be *less than significant*. There are no bus stops within the immediate vicinity that would be affected by the proposed public road, either by needing to move an existing bus stop or affecting the line of sight of the bus driver. The nearest bus stop is at State Street/Hope Avenue, approximately ½-mile from the project site. The additional lots would generate an average of 2.35 persons per household, which would represent a very minor increase of population being served.

11.e) Congestion Management

The project site would have direct access from a public street and would not conflict with or impede implementation of any policies, plans, programs, or ordinances regarding congestion management and the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to congestion management or the circulation system.

Transportation – Recommended Mitigation

T-1 **Haul Routes Require Separate Permit.** Apply for a Public Works permit to establish the haul route(s) for all construction-related trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating of three tons or more entering or exiting the site. The Haul Routes shall be approved by the Transportation Manager.

T-2 **Construction-Related Truck Trips.** Construction-related truck trips for trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating of three tons or more shall not be scheduled during peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) in order to help reduce truck traffic on adjacent streets and roadways.

T-3 **Construction Parking.** During construction, free parking spaces for construction workers shall be provided on-site or off-site in a location subject to the approval of the Transportation Manager.

T-4 **Construction Storage/Staging.** Construction vehicle/ equipment/ materials storage and staging shall be done on-site. No parking or storage shall be permitted within the public right-of-way, unless specifically permitted by the Transportation Manager with a Public Works permit.

Transportation – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

12. WATER ENVIRONMENT Could the project result in:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		Less Than Significant
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	✓	
c)	Discharge into surface waters?		Less Than Significant
d)	Change in the quantity, quality, direction or rate of flow of ground waters?		Less Than Significant
e)	Increased storm water drainage?		Less Than Significant

Water – Discussion

Issues: Water resources issues include changes in offsite drainage and infiltration/groundwater recharge; storm water runoff and flooding; and water quality.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A significant impact would result from:

Water Resources and Drainage

- Substantially changing the amount of surface water in any water body or the quantity of groundwater recharge.
- Substantially changing the drainage pattern or creating a substantially increased amount or rate of surface water runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage and storm water systems.

Flooding

- Locating development within 100-year flood hazard areas; substantially altering the course or flow of flood waters or otherwise exposing people or property to substantial flood hazard

Water Quality

- Substantial discharge of sediment or pollutants into surface water or groundwater, or otherwise degrading water quality, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity.

Water Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The approximately 2.96 acre project site is currently undeveloped with undulating topography that rises in the center then slopes to the east and west. The area topography is uneven, but generally, the area north of the project site is at a higher elevation and the development east and south of the project site is at a lower elevation. The project site is within the Cieneguitas watershed, but is not within a mapped flood plain. The closest watercourse to the project site is Arroyo Burro Creek, which is approximately 800 feet to the east and eventually crosses Hope Avenue approximately one half-mile to the south. Hope Avenue is on the western side of the project site and rises uphill from State Street, located to the south, along a north-south axis. Runoff flows on site from the north in a sheet flow manner. Runoff from the site is generally split in half. Hope Avenue accepts drainage from the eastern half of the project site, which transports runoff through a series of storm drains and the western half drains through an adjacent subdivision.

The City of Santa Barbara began implementing the Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) in January of 2009. The purpose of the SWMP is to implement and enforce a program designed to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the "maximum extent practicable" (MEP) to protect water quality. The SWMP addresses discharge of pollutants both during construction and after construction. The main goals of the SWMP as it applies to this project are to retain and treat the 1-inch, 24-hr storm; the peak runoff discharge rate shall not exceed the predevelopment rate up to the 25 year storm; and to retain on site the volume difference between pre and post conditions for the 25-yr, 24-hr storm or the 1" storm (whichever is larger).

A preliminary drainage report dated October 10, 2010 and prepared by MAC Design Associates (Exhibit F), is incorporated by reference herein and summarized below. The report evaluated the current site conditions and the proposed project impacts. The report examined construction of infrastructure (roads, and utility lines), and the future

development of the lots assuming approximately 4,000 square feet of development (structure and hardscape such as driveways and walkways) per lot.

12.a) Drainage

The western half of the project site would comprise of half of the proposed public road and four of the nine proposed lots. Drainage would be directed to detention basins for each lot and a dedicated drainage basin would be provided for the half of the proposed public road that would drain in the westerly direction. The detention basins reduce the runoff to pre-construction levels. Any additional runoff would then be directed to a private concrete "V" ditch off site within the adjacent subdivision. A drainage easement was obtained allowing the runoff to flow through the V ditch. As each lot is developed there would be adequate room to refine the size of the required detention basins based upon the size of the future residences. Impacts to drainage would be *less than significant* because the proposed project would be consistent with the requirements of the SWMP.

The eastern half of the project site would comprise of the other half of the proposed public road and five of the nine lots. Drainage would flow west toward Hope Avenue. Similar to the western half of the proposed project, each lot would include a detention basin and a detention basin would be provided for the eastern half of the proposed road. Impacts to drainage would be *less than significant*. The detention basins would reduce the runoff from the project to pre-construction levels.

12.b) Flooding

Given the sloping topography of the site, drainage is adequate and would not expose future development to flooding due to the distance from the nearest natural water course. Therefore, there would be *no impacts* from flooding.

12.c) Discharge into surface waters

Runoff from the project site would not directly enter any natural drainage courses. . Impacts to surface waters from the proposed development would be *less than significant*. The proposed project is subject to the City's Storm Water Management Program (SWMP), which requires retention of post construction runoff to pre-construction levels and retention of water on the site. The pollutants from the project site, including the public road, would be captured by detention basins and planter areas prior to entering the City's storm pipe system.

During construction, the entire site would be graded for the installation of infrastructure and preparation for future development. Impacts from erosion during construction would be *less than significant* Because the project would be subject to standard requirements for grading during the wet season that would include erosion control devices around the excavated areas, maintenance of the erosion control devices on a regular basis, and sediment traps around the existing storm drain inlets.

12.d) Change in ground waters

The project would add approximately 4,000 square feet of impermeable surface area per each of the nine lots and 16,850 square feet of new road area to the site. As part of the soils analysis, seven auger borings were drilled to a depth of 30 feet and no ground water was found. There are no wells on the site and water service for the project would be provided by the City of Santa Barbara, similar to existing development in the surrounding neighborhood. Excavation of the site would be approximately three to four feet below the surface, for the building foundations. Impacts to ground water would be *less than significant*. The proposed project is subject to SWMP requirements which require detention of storm water on the project site. Runoff from roofs and roads would be directed to garden and landscaped median areas that would allow for run off to soak into the ground rather than be directed off site.

12.e) Increase storm water

The proposed development would add approximately 4,000 square feet of impermeable surface per lot and approximately 16,850 square feet of new public road, which would increase storm water runoff. Impacts would be *less than significant*. The development is proposed to be consistent with the SWMP requirements that require that post construction runoff should not exceed preconstruction runoff during a 25 year storm. The proposed drainage plans include a number of features to comply with the SWMP, including retention facilities, and given the size of the lots, the option of using below grade filtration facilities. Implementation of these features, it would further reduce project impacts on storm water. The drainage study concluded that with the use of detention basins, the additional runoff can be reduced to post construction levels on the project site. Finally, as each lot is developed, additional options are provided in the drainage report to addressed increased runoff.

Water Resources –Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Water Resources – Residual Impact

Less than significant.

13. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:		YES	NO
a)	Physically divide an established community?		X
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		X

Land Use and Planning – Discussion

13.a) The project does not involve a cross-town freeway, storm channel, utility transmission lines or any other improvements that have the potential to physically divide the community. The project would not close any existing bridges or roadways. The project will connect, via a new public road, to the existing street system and will not create any physical barriers that will divide the community.

13.b) While completing each section of this Initial Study, an analysis was undertaken of the potential conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (a complete list of said plans, policies, and regulation is available at the City Planning Division). Based on this analysis, it was determined that the project would not be inconsistent with plans policies or regulations.

While the project was determined to either have no impacts or less than significant impacts, recommended mitigations were provided that augmented existing City regulations specific to grading and development.

Land Use and Planning – Recommended Mitigation

See AQ-1 through AQ-19, G-. N-1 through N-3, and T-1 through T-4,

Land Use and Planning – Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.		YES	NO
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildfire population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?		X
c)	Does the project have potential impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X
d)	Does the project have potential environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

a) Biological and Cultural Resources.

As discussed in Section 3 (Biological Resources), the project would not reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildfire population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. As discussed in Section 4 (Cultural Resources), the project would not eliminate or impact important prehistoric or historic resources.

b) Short-Term vs. Long-Term Environmental Goals.

As discussed in Sections 1 through 12 of this Initial Study, the project would not result in significant short- or long-term environmental impacts.

c) Cumulative Impacts.

Sections 1 through 12 of this Initial Study consider potential cumulative impacts to environmental resources. As discussed in these sections, the project would not result in any significant, cumulative impacts on the environment because the project contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considerable.

d) **Other Environmental Effects.**

As discussed in Sections 1 through 12 of this Initial Study, no significant effects on humans (direct or indirect) would occur as a result of this project. Mitigation measures are recommended to further reduce adverse but less than significant impacts associated with Air Quality, Noise and Transportation (Short Term).

INITIAL STUDY CONCLUSION

On the basis of this initial evaluation it has been determined that project impacts on the environment would be less than significant. A Negative Declaration will be prepared.

7/13/11

Initial Study Preparer — Date

Ali DeBuck — 7-13-11

Environmental Analyst — Date

EXHIBITS:

A. Project Plans

B. Coast Valley Testing Foundation Report dated 08-21-09

C. Westree Arborist Report dated 06-17-10

D. Ronald Nye Historic Structures Report dated 09-03-09

E. ATE Traffic Report dated 09-16-10

F. MAC Design Drainage Report dated 07-03-10

G. Single Family Design Board (SFDB) Minutes dated 10-11-10

H. Utility Demand Calculation

LIST OF SOURCES USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

The following sources used in the preparation of this Initial Study are located at the Community Development Department, Planning Division, 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara and are available for review upon request.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) & CEQA Guidelines

General Plan Circulation Element

General Plan Conservation Element

2004 Housing Element

General Plan Land Use Element

General Plan Noise Element w/appendices

General Plan Map

General Plan Seismic Safety/Safety Element

Geology Assessment for the City of Santa Barbara

Institute of Traffic Engineers Parking Generation Manual

Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual

Master Environmental Assessment

Parking Design Standards

Santa Barbara Municipal Code & City Charter

Special District Map

California Building Code as adopted by City

Zoning Ordinance & Zoning Map