



**CITY OF SANTA BARBARA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION – ENV2002-00214**

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 Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the following project:

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The subject property is located at 1837 ½ El Camino de la Luz, between Oliver Road and Meigs Road, in the West Mesa neighborhood of the City. The site encompasses approximately 23,885 square feet.

**PROJECT PROPONENT:** L&P Consultants, 3 West Carrillo Street, Suite 205, Santa Barbara, CA 93101

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The project consists of the construction of a 1,499 square foot, 2-story single family residence with an attached 443 square foot garage, on a 23,885 square foot vacant bluff-top lot. Access to the site would be provided by private easements extending south from the terminus of the paved public road (El Camino de la Luz).

---

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Environmental Analyst

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

[F:\USERS\PLAN\Environ. Review\Neg Decs\1837.5 El Camino de la Luz Draft ND Cover Sheet.doc

Revised 5/18/1998

**CITY OF SANTA BARBARA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION**

**INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST MST2002-00214**

**PROJECT: 1837½ El Camino de la Luz**

April 4, 2005

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/Owner: Dr. Herb Barthels, 1851 Cliff Drive, Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Agent: Brent Daniels, L&P Consultants, 3 West Carrillo Street, Suite 205, Santa Barbara, CA 93101

**PROJECT ADDRESS/LOCATION** (See Exhibit A-Vicinity Map)

The subject property is located at 1837 ½ El Camino de la Luz, an ocean bluff-top property located approximately 370 feet south of the terminus of the public street, in the West Mesa neighborhood of the City. Lighthouse Creek borders the property to the east and La Mesa Park is located to the northeast. The site is 23,885 square feet (0.55 acres) in size and approximately 95 feet above sea level.

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

The project consists of the construction of a 1,499 square foot, 2-story single family residence with an attached 443 square foot garage, on a 23,885 square foot vacant bluff-top lot. Access to the site would be provided by private easements extending south from the terminus of the paved public road (El Camino de la Luz). The proposed development would require the following discretionary applications:

1. A Coastal Development Permit to allow construction of a new residence in the appealable jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.45.090); and
2. A Modification to allow construction of the new residence on a lot without the required 60-foot frontage on a public street (SBMC §28.15.080).

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**Existing Site Characteristics**

Topography: The project site is a bluff-top lot bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the south and Lighthouse Creek to the east. The bluff-top area is characterized by an average slope of approximately 25%. The seacliff portion of the property includes several sections with varying slopes, ranging from approximately 65-94%. The eastern portion of the site includes slopes of approximately 25% to the top of the bank of Lighthouse Creek, which is deeply incised.

Seismic/Geologic Conditions: The project site is subject to low level hazards associated with seismic activity and minimal liquefaction potential. The project site is located in an area of historically active landslides with high potential for erosion.

Biological Resources: The project site is currently vacant. There is evidence of past improvements including an asphalt parking area, and brick planter and concrete drainage swales near the bluff edge. Vegetation is primarily comprised of non-native species typical of disturbed areas. Native plants include California blackberry, poison oak, California sage brush and California fuchsia. Wildlife observed or expected on this site includes those species typical of urbanized areas. Trees on-site and in the area are used for roosting and nesting by native raptors.

Archaeological Resources: The project site is located in the Prehistoric Sites and Watercourses area of potential archaeological sensitivity as identified on the City's Master Environmental Assessment map. A Phase I archaeological investigation was performed in February 1996 by Larry Wilcoxon. No resources were identified on the site.

**Existing Land Use**

Existing Facilities and Uses: The project site is currently vacant. Past improvements to the site include an asphalt parking area, concrete drainage swales, and a brick planter. Access to the site is via private easements extending south from the El Camino de la Luz cul-de-sac.

**PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS**

<b>Assessor's Parcel Number:</b> 045-100-065	<b>General Plan Designation:</b> Residential, 5 units per acre
<b>Zoning:</b> E-3/SD-3	<b>Parcel Size:</b> 23,885 square feet
<b>Existing Land Use:</b> Vacant	<b>Proposed Land Use:</b> Residential
<b>Slope:</b> 25% in upland area to the south and east; 65-94% on bluff faces to the south	
<b>SURROUNDING LAND USES:</b>	
<b>North:</b> Residential	
<b>South:</b> Pacific Ocean	
<b>East:</b> Lighthouse Creek, La Mesa Park, Coast Guard Station	
<b>West:</b> Residential	

**PLANS AND POLICY DISCUSSION**

**Land Use and Zoning Designations:** The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Residential, 5 units per acre. The site is in the E-3 (One-Family Residence) Zone and SD-3 (Coastal Overlay) Zone. The project site conforms to the minimum parcel size requirement of 7,500 square feet per lot, but does not meet the requirement for provision of a minimum of 60 feet of frontage on a public street. The applicant has requested approval of a modification to the frontage requirement. Development of a single family residence as proposed generally conforms to Zoning Ordinance requirements and would be consistent with the site’s residential land use designation.

**Local Coastal Plan (LCP) Policies:** The project site is located in the West Mesa neighborhood, which is primarily developed with single family residences. The major coastal issues in this area are hazards of sea cliff retreat and flooding; maintaining and providing access, both vertically and laterally, along the bluffs; protection of archaeological resources; and maintenance of existing coastal views and open space. The following LCP policies are applicable to this project:

*Policy 2.1 – Public access in the coastal bluff areas of the City shall be maximized consistent with the protection of natural resources, public safety, and private property rights.*

*Policy 2.5 - Vista points shall be provided and maintained in areas where such use by the public has been established.*

*Policy 5.3 - New development in and/or adjacent to existing residential neighborhoods must be compatible in terms of scale, size, and design with the prevailing character of the established neighborhood. New development which would result in an overburdening of public circulation and/or on-street parking resources of existing residential neighborhoods shall not be permitted.*

*Policy 6.8 – The riparian resources, biological productivity, and water quality of the City’s coastal zone creeks shall be maintained, preserved, enhanced, and, where feasible, restored.*

*Policy 6.10 – The City shall require a setback buffer for native vegetation between the top of the bank and any proposed project. This setback will vary depending upon the conditions of the site and the environmental impact of the proposed project.*

*Policy 8.1 – All new development of bluff top land shall be required to have drainage systems carrying run-off away from the bluff to the nearest public street or, in areas where the landform makes landward conveyance of drainage impossible, and where additional fill or grading is inappropriate or cannot accomplish landward drainage, private bluff drainage systems are permitted if they are: 1) sized to accommodate run-off from all similarly drained parcels bordering the subject parcel’s property lines; 2) the owner of the subject property allows for the permanent drainage of those parcels through his/her property, and; 3) the drainage system is designed to be minimally visible on the bluff face.*

*Policy 8.2 – With the exception of drainage systems identified in Policy 8.1, no development shall be permitted on the bluff face except for engineered staircases or accessways to provide public beach access...*

*Policy 9.1 – The existing views to, from, and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas shall be protected, preserved, and enhanced.*

For purposes of CEQA review, the project may be found consistent with applicable policies of the LCP through adherence to the identified project design and mitigation measures, such that potential significant adverse impacts to the City's environmental resources are avoided and minimized to the maximum extent feasible. A complete analysis of the project's consistency with the LCP and other applicable City policies will be provided in the Planning Commission Staff Report for the project for final consistency determination by decision-makers.

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)**

A draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for the project in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6. The draft MMRP is attached here as *Exhibit C*.

**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.

<b>1. AESTHETICS</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b> <i>Level of Significance</i>
Could the project: a) Affect a public scenic vista or designated scenic highway or highway/roadway eligible for designation as a scenic highway?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
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. 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, and the extent and scenic quality of the views. 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**

### **1.a,b) Scenic Views and On-Site Aesthetics**

Existing Conditions: The project site is located on a bluff-top property. There is existing single family residential development directly to the north and west of the project site. Lighthouse Creek borders the site to the east and La Mesa Park is located to the north and east of the site. La Mesa Park and the foot bridge over Lighthouse Creek (connecting El Camino de la Luz to La Mesa Park) offer public views across the project site to the Pacific Ocean. Views from the park itself include green space in the foreground with a view of the ocean and Santa Cruz Island over the creek canyon, framed by dense tree growth on the east and less dense vegetation screening residences on the west. Views from the eastbound lane of Shoreline Drive include the public parking lot, green space, and an ocean view framed by vegetation. However, bicyclists and motorists experience a fleeting view of the ocean in this area due to vehicle speeds and the approaching curve in the road. Pedestrians have the opportunity to experience a more significant ocean view from this area. Ocean views from the footbridge are more open and residences on the west side of Lighthouse Creek are more plainly visible. Views of the project site from the sandy beach below are of rocky cliff and vegetated bluff. The neighboring residence to the west of the site is partially visible against the skyline from the beach below. Otherwise, bluff top development is not visible from the beach at this section of the coast. The height of the bluffs precludes mountain views from this portion of the beach.

Ocean views from La Mesa Park and the foot bridge are considered a significant visual resource as they afford scenic public views of the ocean and Santa Cruz Island. Much of the existing development in the area is screened by vegetation, which helps to frame the ocean view from the northern portion of the park. This particular view is also the only view corridor from the park to the ocean.

Project Impacts: The proposed project would result in the construction of a 1,932 square foot, two-story structure. The proposed residence would intrude into ocean views from Shoreline Drive, La Mesa Park and the Lighthouse Creek foot bridge, as demonstrated by the visual simulations prepared by interacta and dated June 11, 2004 (see Exhibit D for selected views). The view from the La Mesa Park parking lot and the lawn area would change from a view of green space, the ocean and Santa Cruz Island, to a view that includes a significant portion of the first floor of the proposed residence (Exhibit D, MP2). Thus, the project's impact on scenic views from the La Mesa Park lawn area is considered a *potentially significant, mitigable impact*. The loss of ocean view from Shoreline Drive would result in an adverse impact to visual resources (Exhibit D, MP1). A larger portion of the scenic view from this location, not already blocked by vegetation, would be blocked by the development, resulting in a *potentially significant, mitigable impact*. Although the view is fleeting for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians have the opportunity to stop and view the ocean from this location.

The ocean view from the footbridge over Lighthouse Creek would be diminished the most by development of the site as proposed (Exhibit D, WB1). Existing residential development on the west side of Lighthouse Creek can be seen from the footbridge and the proposed residence would be highly visible from this location. Although visibility of residential development, in and of itself, is not necessarily an adverse impact, the location of the proposed residence would block a substantial portion of a significant public scenic view, which represents a *potentially significant, mitigable impact*. While installation of vegetation could soften the view of the residence, this portion of the ocean view would be lost indefinitely. Mitigation Measure A-1 requires that the residence be redesigned to minimize intrusion into public views of the ocean as seen from Shoreline Drive and the Lighthouse Creek foot bridge.

The proposed development would also be visible on the bluff-top as viewed from the sandy beach below (Exhibit D, B1 and B2). This view is currently comprised of natural bluff faces, but includes some development on the property

immediately west of the site. While the proposed residence would be partially visible from the beach below, other development is currently visible from the beach in this area, so it would not result in a significant change to a public view. Thus, the impact to visual resources from the beach is considered *less than significant*.

The scale and design of the proposed development is generally compatible with existing single family residential development in the immediate area. The design concept for the house has been considered by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) on several occasions. The ABR expressed concerns regarding the visual prominence of the structure and its effect on public views. Final architectural plans would be subject to review and approval by ABR. With the exception of adverse effects on public views, the proposed design would be compatible with and would not adversely affect surrounding land uses or structures.

**Cumulative Impacts:** The proposed project would result in infill development of an existing legal lot adjacent to existing residences. Although site development would adversely affect public views of the ocean, substantial additional development that would further degrade ocean views in the immediate area is not anticipated. Cumulative visual impacts are considered *less than significant*.

**1.c) Lighting**

Development of the proposed residence would result in additional lighting. Any exterior lighting would be subject to compliance with the requirements of SBMC §22.75, the City’s Outdoor Lighting and Design Ordinance, and reviewed by the ABR. The ordinance provides that exterior lighting be shielded and directed to the site such that no undue lighting or glare would affect surrounding residents, roads or habitat areas. Project impacts on lighting and glare would be *less than significant*.

**Visual Aesthetics – Required Mitigation**

**A-1 House Design.** Prior to final review and approval by the Architectural Board of Review, the residence shall be redesigned to minimize intrusion into public views of the ocean as seen from La Mesa Park, Shoreline Drive and the Lighthouse Creek foot bridge. The redesign shall consider lowering the profile of the residence by cutting the first floor into the existing grade, reducing the massing of the second story by limiting building height and locating development further to the west. Landscaping shall be provided to soften views of the residence from public viewing areas while minimizing intrusion into existing ocean views.

**Visual Aesthetics - Residual Impacts**

With implementation of Mitigation Measure A-1, project effects on public scenic views would be *less than significant*.

<b>2. AIR QUALITY</b> Could the project:	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b> <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?		Less Than Significant
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?		Less Than Significant
c) Create objectionable odors?		Less Than Significant
Is the project consistent with the County of Santa Barbara Air Quality Attainment Plan? Yes		

**Air Quality - Discussion**

**Issues.** Air quality issues involve pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and industrial or other stationary sources that contribute to smog, particulates and nuisance dust associated with grading and construction processes, and nuisance odors.

Smog, or ozone, is formed in the atmosphere through a series of photochemical reactions involving interaction of oxides of nitrogen [NO<sub>x</sub>] 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<sub>10</sub>) include demolition, grading, road dust, and vehicle exhaust, as well as agricultural tilling and mineral quarries.

The City of Santa Barbara is part of the South Coast Air Basin. The City is subject to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are more stringent than the national standards, for 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. Presently, the County of Santa Barbara is in non-attainment with the CAAQS for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). An area is in nonattainment for a pollutant if the applicable CAAQS for that pollutant has been exceeded more than once in three years. There are also heavily congested intersections within the City that may approach the California 1-hour standard of 20 parts per million for carbon monoxide (CO) during peak traffic hours.

**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<sub>x</sub>, and 80 pounds per day for PM<sub>10</sub>;
- Emit less than 25 pounds per day of ROC or NO<sub>x</sub> from motor vehicle trips only;
- For CO, contribute less than 800 peak hour trips to an individual intersection;
- Not cause a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone); and 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.

**Short-Term (Construction) Impacts Guidelines:** Projects involving grading, paving, construction, and landscaping activities may cause localized nuisance dust impacts and increased particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). 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. As a guideline, SBCAPCD Rule 202.F.3 identifies a substantial effect associated with projects having combined emissions from all construction equipment that exceed 25 tons of any pollutant except carbon monoxide) within a 12-month period.

**Cumulative Impacts and Consistency with Clean Air Plan:** If the project-specific impact exceeds the 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.

## **Air Quality – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

### **2.a-b) Air Pollutant Emissions**

**Long-Term (Operational) Emissions:** Emissions associated with the generation of 10 average daily trips and the ongoing use of one new single family residence would not exceed established thresholds for long-term impacts. These impacts are considered *less than significant*.

**Short-Term (Construction) Emissions:** The proposed project would involve grading, paving and landscaping activities which could cause localized fugitive dust and an increase in particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). Dust related impacts are considered *less than significant*. Recommended dust control mitigation measures include sprinkling the site during earth moving activities to control dust, covering of trucks transporting soil/building materials, and stabilization of disturbed

areas with seeding and watering, soil binders, etc. Mitigation Measure AQ-6 is also recommended to reduce NOx and particulate emissions from construction equipment:

Sensitive Receptors: Sensitive receptors are defined as children, elderly, or ill people that can be more adversely affected by air quality problems. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics. Stationary sources are of particular concern to sensitive receptors, as is construction dust and particulate matter. Nuisance dust and particulates would be reduced to a *less than significant* level through application of dust control mitigation measures. The insignificant amounts of these pollutants would result in an insignificant exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants.

## 2.c) Odors

The project is limited to residential use, and would not include land uses involving odors. Smoke emitted from the proposed fireplace would result in a *less than significant impact*; however, to minimize emissions, Mitigation Measure AQ-7 is recommended.

Consistency with the Clean Air Plan: Direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for in the CAP emissions growth assumptions. Appropriate air quality mitigation measures, including construction dust suppression, would be applied to the project, consistent with CAP and City policies. The project could be found consistent with the Clean Air Plan.

## Air Quality – Recommended Mitigation

**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 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 in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. 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.

**AQ-3 Construction Dust Control – Gravel Pads.** Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads.

**AQ-4 Construction Dust Control – Disturbed Area Treatment.** After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated to prevent wind pickup of soil. This may be accomplished by:

1. Seeding and watering until grass cover is grown;
2. Spreading soil binders;
3. 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;
4. Other methods approved in advance by the Air Pollution Control District.

**AQ-5 Construction Dust Control – Paving.** All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., should be paved as soon as possible. Additionally, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

**AQ-6 Construction Equipment Requirements.** The following shall be adhered to during project grading and construction to reduce NOx and particulate emissions from construction equipment:

1. Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) shall be utilized wherever feasible.
2. Clean diesel fuel (Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel) fuel shall be used.
3. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.



4. 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.
5. Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer specifications.
6. Construction equipment operating onsite shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or precombustion chamber engines.
7. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
8. Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed, if available.
9. Diesel powered equipment shall be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
10. Construction worker trips shall be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

**AQ-7 Fireplaces.** Wood-burning fireplaces and wood stoves shall be prohibited.

**Air Quality - Residual Impacts**

Short-term construction related impacts and long-term operational impacts would be *less than significant*. Short-term construction related impacts would be further minimized by recommended mitigation measures for dust control and equipment maintenance.

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

**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**

### **3.a,c,d,e) Native Wildlife and Habitat**

A Biological Assessment was prepared for the project applicant by Rachel Tierney (Exhibit E). On-site vegetation is generally characterized by non-native species in the upland areas and on the upper reaches of the slope down to Lighthouse Creek, and the lower portion of the ocean bluff face. Vegetation on the ocean bluff face includes species typical to coastal bluffs, such as lemonadeberry, salt bush and coast goldenbush. Native vegetation along the slope down to the creek includes California blackberry, poison oak, saltbush, and California fuchsia. The riparian area includes willow woodland. The lowest portion of the creek slope is exposed, steeply sloping Monterey shale. According to the biological assessment, Lighthouse Creek is considered to have limited habitat value due to the absence of sediment and the steepness of the rocky creek banks. The creek's steep drop to the beach is considered to preclude steelhead use. Wildlife expected on-site and in the adjacent creek is limited to species typical of urban settings and appears to support rich bird life. The biological assessment did not identify any endangered, threatened or rare species or habitats that would be impacted by the proposed project. Lighthouse Creek is not considered to provide an important wildlife corridor for the reasons state above. Tierney concludes that the proposed project would not adversely affect wildlife use of the creek due to the distance of the building site from the creek channel and that the steepness of the slopes and creek bank would limit human intrusion into the creek. Long-term impacts to biological resources are considered *less than significant*.

The project site is located approximately 600 feet from La Mesa monarch butterfly roost. The project would not impact this roost due to the distance from the roost and because no removal of roost or adjacent vegetation is proposed.

The proposed drainage design involves collection of site runoff in two catch basins, where it would be conveyed via underground pipes, to Lighthouse Creek. Drain pipes would be located across the steep slope down to the creek in two locations, converging above the creek bed. A rip rapped dissipater would be constructed in the creek bed at the terminus of the drainage pipe. Construction of these facilities would result in disturbance and vegetation removal on the hillside and within the creek bed. Impacts to native vegetation and creek habitat associated with installation of the drainage system are considered *potentially significant, mitigable*. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 are required to reduce the biological impacts associated with construction activities and vegetation removal and installation to a *less than significant level*.

Project construction could result in the introduction of sediment and pollutants such as oil, paint or concrete into the creek or down the bluff face. The incorporation of erosion control measures and designation of concrete washing locations to preclude runoff into the creek would ensure that impacts remain less than significant.

### **3.b) Specimen Trees**

The project would have *no impact* on any locally designated historic, Landmark or specimen trees because none are located in the project construction area.

## **Biological Resources – Required Mitigation**

**BIO-1 Habitat Restoration.** Areas on the creek slope, bank and channel disturbed by project grading and construction of the drainage system shall be replanted with native plants appropriate to coastal riparian and upland areas. The replanting plan shall be developed by a qualified botanist or landscape architect and shall include provisions for installation and maintenance until plantings are established. This plan shall be provided to the Community Development Department Staff and the Architectural Board of Review for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits. The plan shall be implemented prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy and plantings maintained for the life of the project.

**BIO-2 Appropriate Plants/Hardscape on Bluff.** Special attention shall be paid to the appropriateness of the existing and proposed plant material, and to the sloped areas. All existing succulent plants that add weight to the bluff and/or contribute to erosion shall be removed in a manner that does not disturb the root system and replaced with appropriate plant material in a manner that does not increase the rate of erosion. Plant material to be removed shall be replaced with native, drought tolerant, low water using vegetation that requires only a temporary irrigation system to establish the plantings. Replacement vegetation shall be consistent with the recommendations of the biologist's report, dated December 12, 2002, and include: 1) Addition of native trees and shrubs along the mid point of the slope to improve habitat value; 2) Removal of iceplant, oleander, yucca, castor bean, English and German ivy; 3) Replacement with natives such as western sycamore, coast live oaks, encelia, California blackberry, California sage, California fuchsia, saltbush, coast goldenbush, elderberry, and lemonadeberry; and 4)

Use of erosion control blankets and seeding on bare slopes to prevent short-term erosion. The landscape plan shall be provided to the Community Development Department Staff and the Architectural Board of Review for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits. The plan shall be implemented prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy and plantings maintained for the life of the project.

**BIO-3 Irrigation System.** The irrigation system shall be designed and maintained with the most current technology to prevent a system failure, and watering of vegetation on the bluff edge shall be kept to the minimum necessary for plant survival. The drip system along the bluff edge shall be removed after two full seasons of plant growth.

**BIO-4 Erosion Control/Water Quality Plan.** An Erosion Control/Water Quality Plan shall be developed for construction activities to maintain all sediment on-site and out of the drainage system. The plan shall include Best Management Practices approved by the City and Regional Water Quality Control Board, and shall include, at a minimum, the following:

1. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
2. Install silt fence, sand bag, hay bale or silt devices where necessary around the project site to prevent offsite transport of sediment.
3. Bare soils shall be protected from erosion by applying heavy seeding, within five days of clearing or inactivity in construction.
4. Construction entrances should be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.
5. During construction of the homes, the contractor and/or property owner shall protect the storm drain inlets from sediment-laden runoff.
6. Erosion control materials (i.e. sandbags, strawbales, and silt fencing) shall be used to trap and filter sediment before entering the storm drain.
7. Establish fuel and vehicle maintenance staging areas located away from all drainage courses, and design these areas to control runoff.
8. Maintain and wash equipment and machinery in confined areas specifically designed to control runoff. Thinners or solvents should not be discharged into sanitary or storm sewer systems. Washout from concrete trucks should be disposed of at a location not subject to runoff and more than 50 feet away from a storm drain, open ditch or surface water.

**Biological Resources - Residual Impacts**

Potentially significant impacts to biological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures.

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES Could the project:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
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 Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

#### **4.a) Archaeological Resources**

The project site is located in the Prehistoric Sites and Watercourses area of potential archaeological sensitivity as identified on the City's Master Environmental Assessment map. A Phase I archaeological investigation was performed in February 1996 by Larry Wilcoxon to determine whether cultural resources were present on site. The survey did not locate any cultural resources and thus, impacts are considered *less than significant*. However, in the unlikely event that cultural resources are found during site preparation or construction, a recommended mitigation measure has been included for resources evaluation and impact mitigation per the Master Environmental Assessment.

#### **4.b) Historic Resources**

There are no historic resources on the project site. Development of a single family residence would have *no impact* on any historic resources in the project vicinity.

#### **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**

**CR-1 Discovery Procedures and Mitigation.** Standard discovery measures shall be implemented per the City Master Environmental Assessment throughout grading and construction:

Prior to the start of any vegetation or paving removal, demolition, trenching or grading, contractors and construction personnel shall be alerted to the possibility of uncovering unanticipated subsurface archaeological features or artifacts.

If during any grading or construction on the site such archaeological resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted immediately, the City Environmental Analyst shall be notified and a City-approved archaeologist shall be employed to assess the nature, extent and significance of any discoveries and to develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment, including but not limited to redirection of grading and/or excavation activities. If the findings are potentially significant, further analysis and/or other mitigation shall be prepared and accepted by the Environmental Analyst and the Historic Landmarks Commission, and implemented by the project. Work in the area may only proceed after the Environmental Analyst grants authorization.

If prehistoric or other Native American remains are encountered, a Native American representative shall be consulted, and the archaeologist and Native American representative shall monitor all further subsurface disturbances in the area of the find.

If the discovery consists of potentially human remains, the Santa Barbara County Coroner and the California Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted.

A final report on the results of the archaeological monitoring shall be submitted by the City-approved archaeologist to the Environmental Analyst within 180 days of completion of the monitoring and prior to the issuance of final City permits.

**Residual Impacts:**

Impacts to cultural resources would be *less than significant*.

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

**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, groundshaking, liquefaction (a condition in which saturated soil loses 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, groundshaking, 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**

**5.a-c) Seismic and Ground Shaking/Liquefaction Hazards**

The property is not subject to fault rupture, seiche, or tsunami, and has minimal liquefaction potential because there are no known faults on the project site, the site is not near an enclosed body of water that could subject it to a seiche, soils at the site are not saturated sand (necessary prerequisites for liquefaction) and the site is well above the tsunami run-up area. Therefore, there would be no impacts from seiche, fault rupture, tsunami, or liquefaction. Future development on the site would be subject to requirements of the Uniform Building Code, which includes provisions to ensure that proposed structures withstand the effects of ground shaking, resulting in a *less than significant impact*.

**5.d-f) Geologic or Soil Instability**

Landslides:

The peer review of prior geological studies of the site by Dr. William Anikouchine (Exhibit F), included an analysis of the potential for landslides on the project site. The report concludes that the project site is stable in the short term and that there could be stability problems on the site in the long term. The City requires that geological information be provided to verify that the portion of the site including any primary structures would not erode in a 75-year period. The peer review indicates that the project development would not be susceptible to slope failure during the life of the structure, provided

that surface runoff is captured and conveyed away from the bluff face and use of irrigation in this area is minimized. The proposed project could result in increased runoff being directed onto the bluff face and this could cause slope failure, a *potentially significant, mitigable* impact. A mitigation measure to minimize the amount of water in the underlying soils would reduce the impact of landslides to a *less than significant level*.

**Subsidence:**

The Buena Engineers (1971) report found that the project site is subject to some settlement based on laboratory testing of soils from the site. The report indicates that the subsidence can be adequately addressed using a properly engineered foundation design. The potentially significant impact can be reduced to a *less than significant level* using an appropriate foundation design, included in Mitigation Measure G-2.

**Expansive Soils:**

According to Smith (1980) soils at the site are expansive and can be addressed by use of a caisson foundation rather than footings. Expansive soils could cause a *potentially significant, mitigable impact*. This impact can be reduced to a *less than significant level* by having the structural foundation designed by an engineering geologist.

**5.g) Topography; Grading/ Erosion**

As proposed, the topography of the site would be slightly modified to direct the runoff from the driveway and garage back-out area to a catch basin. Project grading is proposed to be balanced on site, resulting in a *less than significant impact*.

**Geophysical Conditions – Required Mitigation**

- G-1** All surface drainage from the site shall be intercepted as soon as possible, collected, and conveyed (using impervious facilities designed to minimize infiltration into site soils) to the ravine east of the parcel or the beach. Landscaping shall be designed to use native species that do not require irrigation except for their probogation. Limited areas of non-native plants may be used if long-term irrigation is not required.
- G-2** The location and design of structural foundations on the site shall be approved by a licensed Engineering Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer.

**Geophysical Conditions – Residual Impacts**

Potentially significant impacts to geophysical conditions would be reduced to a *less than significant level* with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures.

<b>6. HAZARDS</b> Could the project involve:	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b> <i>Level of Significance</i>
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?	✓	
c) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	✓	
d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable

**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**

### **6.a,b,c) Public Health and Safety**

The project site has no known contamination and is not listed on the County Fire Department Hazardous Materials parcel listings. The project site is not located close to sources of public safety or health hazards, such as pipelines. Hazardous materials use and storage would be limited to small amounts of common household, automotive, and gardening supplies, such as cleansers, paint, motor oil, and pesticides. *Less than significant impacts* due to the use of oils, paint, and cleaners during construction activities would be present during development of a single family residence on this property. Mitigation required in the Biological Resources section of this study would further reduce this impact.

### **6.d) Fire Hazard**

The project site is located outside of the High Fire Hazard area but is located upslope from a brush covered creek channel. The development of a single family residence would not increase fire hazards in the area; however, emergency access to the site does not meet Fire Department standards. Four existing residences are accessed from the existing private driveway proposed to access the new residence at 1837½ El Camino de la Luz. Three of these residences would receive emergency access from the private driveway and conform to current fire protection standards. A fire hydrant is located within 500 feet of the rear of the proposed residence.

The vehicle access easements to the subject site from the cul-de-sac of El Camino de la Luz vary in width from 10 to 15 feet over a distance of approximately 370 feet. Fire Department standards require provision of a 20 foot wide access to within 150 feet of the furthest exterior wall of any building when that access serves four or more residences. As proposed, the development would not meet these requirements. The inability to achieve standards for the provision of emergency fire services is considered a *potentially significant impact*. Substandard access width can be compensated by installing fire sprinklers if the closest fire engine can gain adequate access to within 250 feet of the exterior of all structures. The Fire Department has stated that the northernmost portion of the existing driveway, which provides a 15-foot wide access to within 250 feet of the furthest exterior wall of the proposed building, would serve as adequate access to the subject site if the mitigation measures identified below were implemented. These measures would reduce the impact to a *less than significant level* (see the Transportation/Circulation section of this study for more information about vehicle access).

## **Hazards – Required Mitigation**

- H-1 Automatic Fire Sprinklers.** New structures shall be equipped with an automatic fire sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13D. The automatic fire sprinkler system shall be submitted to the City Fire Department for review and approval under separate permit.
- H-2 Monitored Fire Alarm System.** A monitored fire alarm system shall be designed and installed throughout the new structure as approved by the Fire Department. The fire alarm system shall be submitted under separate permit.
- H-3 Compliance with High Fire Construction Requirements.** The new residence shall be build in accordance with the City’s High Fire Construction requirements.
- H-4 Fire Protection System Maintenance.** The property owner shall enter into a written agreement, binding on the owner and all successors, that requires continual maintenance of the automatic fire sprinkler system and monitoring of the fire alarm system.

## **Hazards – Residual Impacts**

Potentially significant, mitigable impacts associated with fire hazards due to substandard access for emergency vehicles can be reduced to a *less than significant* level with the provision automatic fire sprinklers, a monitored fire alarm system, compliance with high fire construction requirements, and appropriate maintenance of fire protection systems.

7. NOISE Could the project result in:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Increases in existing noise levels?		Less than Significant
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	✓	

**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 Noise Element land use compatibility guidelines as follows:
  - Residential: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 60 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**

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

Long-Term Operational Noise: The City’s Master Environmental Assessment maps indicate the property is located in an area where noise levels are 60 dBA or less. The Noise Element establishes 60 dBA as the acceptable exterior noise level



for residential uses. No substantial noise generation is anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed residential use. Therefore, the project site would not be subject to high noise levels, nor would the project cause high operational noise levels.

**Temporary Construction Noise:** Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic, and after completion of initial grading and site clearing activities, tends to be quieter. Noise generated during project grading activities would result in a short-term adverse construction impact to residential receptors in the area. Construction of the residence is anticipated to result in use of heavy equipment. Construction noise is limited by City ordinance to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. daily for noise generating activities that would increase noise levels at the nearest residential property line by 5 decibels. The project is limited in scope and the potential impact due to construction noise would be *less than significant*. However, the level of potential adverse effect would be further reduced through recommended measures below, including careful construction scheduling, further limiting construction activities to daytime hours on weekdays, and use of equipment mufflers.

**Noise - Mitigation**

**N-1 Construction Notice.** At least 20 days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners and residents within 450 feet of the project area. The notice shall contain a description of the proposed project, a construction schedule including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC) who can answer questions, and provide additional information or address problems that may arise during construction. A 24-hour construction hot line shall be provided. Informational signs with the PEC’s name and telephone number shall also be posted at the site.

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

Occasional night work may be approved for the hours between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. by the Chief of Building and Zoning (per Section 9.16.015 of the Municipal Code) between the hours of 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. weekdays. In the event of such night work approval, the applicant shall provide written notice to all property owners and residents within 450 feet of the project property boundary and the City Planning and Building Divisions at least 48 hours prior to commencement of any. Night work shall not be permitted on weekends and holidays.

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

**Noise – Residual Impact**

Impacts associated with long and short term noise sources are considered *less than significant*. Recommended mitigation measures would minimize the nuisance associated with construction noise.

<b>8. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>		<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
Could the project:			<b>Level of Significance</b>
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**

**8.a) Growth-Inducing Impacts**

The project would not involve a substantial increase in major public facilities such as extension of water or sewer lines or roads that would facilitate other growth in the area. The project would not involve substantial employment growth that would increase population and housing demand. Growth-inducing impacts would be *less than significant*.

**8.b) Housing Displacement**

The project 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**

Project effects on population and housing would be *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 <i>Level of Significance</i>
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**

### **9.a,b) Fire and Police Protection**

The property is served by City Fire and Police Departments. Project development would result in construction and habitation of a residence that would not generate a substantial demand for increased police services, but is in a location that does not have adequate access for emergency services. In order to compensate for inadequacies in emergency services access, the installation of a monitored fire alarm system would be required. The increased service demand associated with monitoring the alarm system for this project alone is considered *less than significant*.

### **9.c) Schools**

The project site is served by the Santa Barbara Elementary and High School Districts. The project would provide a net increase of one residential unit, which could generate additional students. 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. Project impacts to schools would be *less than significant*.

### **9.d,e,f) Public Facilities/Roads/Governmental Service/ Utilities**

The proposed project would not significantly impact public facilities, roads, government services or utilities as these services are adequate to accommodate an additional single family residence. Project impacts would be *less than significant*.

### **9.g,h,i) Water and Sewer**

#### Water

The City of Santa Barbara's water supply comes from the following sources, with the actual share of each determined by availability and level of customer demand: Cachuma Reservoir and Tecolote Tunnel, Gibraltar Reservoir and Mission Tunnel, 300 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) of contractual transfer from Montecito Water District, groundwater, State Water Project entitlement, desalination, and recycled water. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by displacing demand that would otherwise have to be supplied by additional sources. In 1994, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply in the Long Term Water Supply Alternatives Analysis (LTWSAA), the City Council approved the Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP). The LTWSP outlines a strategy to use the above sources to meet the projected demand of 17,900 AFY (including 1,500 AFY of demand projected to be met with conservation) plus a 10 percent safety margin for a total of 19,700 AFY. Therefore, the target for the amount of water the system will actually have to supply, including the safety margin, is 18,200 AFY. The 2003 Water Supply Management Report documents an actual system demand of 13,460 AFY and a theoretical commitment of 16,170 AFY. Of the total system production, 95% was potable water and 5% was reclaimed water.

The existing development on the site receives water service from the City of Santa Barbara water supply, treatment, and distribution system. The proposed project is estimated to demand 0.74 AFY of potable water. The City's long-term water supply and existing water treatment and distribution facilities with proposed facility hook-ups for the new structures and landscaping would adequately serve the project. The potential increase in demand would constitute a *less than significant* impact to the City water supply.

#### Sewer

The project site is currently served by City sewer system. The project would include one new residence, which is estimated to demand 571 gallons/day or 0.64 AFY (87% of water demand). The maximum capacity of the El Estero Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day, with average daily flow millions of gallons per day less than the capacity. Increased sewage treatment associated by the project can be accommodated by the existing City sewer system and sewage treatment plant, and would represent a *less than significant* impact.

### **9.j) Solid Waste Generation/ Disposal**

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 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.

Long-Term (Operational). The proposed project use is estimated to generate 2.38 TPY of solid waste (2.51 persons/household<sup>1</sup> x 1 unit x 0.95 TPY), which is a *less than significant impact*. With application of source reduction, reuse, and recycling, landfill disposal of solid waste could be reduced to 1.2 TPY.

Short-Term (Demolition and Construction). Project grading is proposed to be balanced on site. Construction-related waste generation would be short-term and *less than significant*. Application of recommended standard mitigation to reduce, re-use, and recycle construction waste to the extent feasible would minimize this effect.

**Public Services - Mitigation**

**PS-1 Construction Materials Recycling.** Construction-related solid waste shall be minimized through source reduction, re-use and recycling. Collection bins for these materials shall be provided on the site.

**Public Services – Residual Impacts**

Project effects on public services would be *less than significant*. A recommended mitigation measure would further reduce less than significant impacts associated with solid waste generation during construction.

10. RECREATION Could the project:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
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?		Less Than Significant

**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**

**10.a) Recreational Demand**

The development of one additional single family residence would not significantly affect demand for recreational facilities. Impacts are *less than significant*.

**10.b) Existing Recreational Facilities**

The project, as proposed, could significantly impact existing public views of the ocean from La Mesa Park. These adverse visual effects would diminish the public’s recreational experience from the park; however, these facilities would still remain available for public use and this impact is considered to be *less than significant*. Please refer to the Visual Aesthetics section of this document for further discussion of this issue.

<sup>1</sup> Based on data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau (Census 2000), the average household size of owner-occupied units in the City of Santa Barbara is 2.51 persons per household.

**Recreation - Mitigation**

Please refer to the Visual Aesthetics section for proposed mitigation measures to reduce visual impacts from public viewing areas.

**Recreation – Residual Impacts**

Implementation of proposed mitigation measures requiring a redesign of the house to minimize intrusion into public views from La Mesa Park would further reduce this *less than significant impact*.

11. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Could the project result in:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Increased vehicle trips?		Less Than Significant
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves, inadequate sight distance or dangerous intersections)?	✓	
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	✓	
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	✓	

**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 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 and/or bicycle circulation.
- Result in inadequate emergency access on-site or to nearby uses.

Parking

- Result in insufficient parking capacity for the projected amount of automobiles and bicycles.

**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**

### **11.a) Traffic**

#### Long-Term Traffic

The project site is located in the West Mesa neighborhood and is accessed from local roads, El Camino de la Luz and Oliver Road. Cliff Drive, located to the north of the site, is the closest arterial and provides access to Meigs Road/Carrillo Boulevard to the east and Las Positas Road to the west. With the exception of the Cliff Drive/Las Positas Road intersection, which operates at LOS F, all the nearby intersections operate at LOS A or B. The project is expected to generate approximately one p.m. peak hour trip and ten average daily trips. When these trips are added to the existing street network they would not result in significant traffic impacts.

#### Short-Term Construction Traffic

Based on the limited scope of the project, potential temporary construction related traffic impacts would be *less than significant*. Standard mitigation measures are recommended to minimize adverse impacts to the neighborhood. These include restrictions on the hours permitted for construction trips and approval of routes for construction traffic.

### **11.c) Access**

The subject parcel was part of a 2-lot subdivision approved by the City in 1958. The conditions of that approval have created much confusion over the years, the most significant of which is the width of the vehicle access easement serving the property.

On May 29, 1958, the City Council approved a request for a two-lot subdivision of the property at 1837 El Camino de la Luz, resulting in the creation of the subject property and the lot directly to the north. The minutes of that Council meeting (Exhibit G) state that the subdivision was approved as submitted by the applicant. It is not clear, based on City records, what plan was submitted by the applicant and approved by the Council. The minutes of the City Council meeting and two previous Planning Commission hearings consistently refer to a proposed 15-foot easement serving the subject property. Yet, the plan attached as Exhibit H of this study represents our best understanding of what was approved, given that a Planning Commission receipt date stamp is on it, as well as a City Council approval stamp, although this stamp is not signed and dated. This plan indicates that the existing parcel (Parcel 1) was served by a 15-foot wide private easement from the end of El Camino de la Luz and the proposed parcel (Parcel 2) would be served by a 10-foot wide easement for vehicular access purposes.

In 1958, the City required the recordation of a written instrument within one year of approval to validate a lot split. This never occurred in this case. In 1963, a Grant Deed conveyed the subject parcel from Gertrude E. Eaton to Ed. R. and Joanne F. Brewer, which was illegal since the second parcel created by the lot split was never validated. Per an allowance by the Subdivision Map Act, the City issued a Conditional Certificate of Compliance (CCC) for the subject parcel, which was recorded in December 1999. The CCC allows for the property to be legally sold, leased, or financed, pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act; however, development proposed of the real property must meet the following condition of the CCC (Gov't Code §66410):

*“Provide evidence, satisfactory to the City Engineer that the owner of the parcel described herein substantially possesses the required amount of legal access that formed the basis of the original lot split.”*

The outstanding question is “the required amount of legal access that formed the basis of the original lot split.” Based on the City Attorney’s review of applicable materials, the required access to the subject parcel is not clearly and definitely established from a legal standpoint. Thus, any development of the subject parcel without adequate legal access to satisfy

the requirement of the CCC is a *potentially significant impact*. The condition of the CCC, included as Mitigation Measure T-1, must be satisfied in order to reduce this impact to a *less than significant level*.

**11.b,d,e) Circulation/Parking/Safety**

No sharp curves, inadequate sight distance or dangerous intersections are present in this area. Parking for the proposed residence would be accommodated in a proposed two-car garage on-site. *No significant impacts* to the street network or parking supply would occur.

**Transportation – Required Mitigation**

**T-1 Evidence of Adequate Access.** Provide evidence, satisfactory to the City Engineer and City Attorney, that the owner of the subject parcel substantially possesses the required amount of legal access that formed the basis of the original lot split.

**Transportation – Recommended Mitigation**

**T-2 Construction Traffic.** The haul routes for all construction-related trucks, three tons or more, entering or exiting the site, shall be approved by the Transportation Engineer. Construction-related truck trips 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.) to help reduce truck traffic and noise on adjacent streets and roadways. The route of construction-related traffic shall be established to minimize trips through surrounding residential neighborhoods.

**T-3 Construction Parking.** Construction parking and vehicle/equipment/materials storage shall be provided as follows:

1. 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 and Parking Manager.
2. On-site or off-site storage shall be provided for construction materials, equipment, and vehicles. Storage of construction materials within the public right-of-way is prohibited.

**Transportation – Residual Impact**

Residual circulation impacts would be *less than significant*.

12. WATER ENVIRONMENT Could the project result in:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
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**

### **12.a,d,e) Drainage**

The majority of the upland portion of the site is currently covered by asphalt. The project site currently drains by sheet flow across the asphalt area, to the south over the ocean bluff face and to the east into Lighthouse Creek. Off-site drainage from the property to the west is conveyed in a concrete drainage swale across a portion of the subject site to the top of the ocean bluff. Off-site drainage from the private road area to the north flows across the site to the ocean bluff.

Development of the project would result in a negligible difference in impervious surface coverage, so the change in quantity of water is considered *less than significant*. The proposed drainage design would collect some flows from off-site to the north, and from the proposed residence and paved areas. This drainage would be filtered in catch basins and conveyed by underground pipes to Lighthouse Creek. This would result in a change to the direction and flow of runoff water, but would be considered an improvement to current conditions since the site is located on a sensitive bluff-top. While the changes to existing drainage patterns would be substantial, they are considered a *less than significant* environmental effect because the proposed drainage system would adequately control runoff water and reduce erosion of the sea cliff. A rip rap dissipater would be constructed in the creek channel to minimize erosion. This conceptual drainage design has been reviewed by the Building & Safety Division and generally meets City standards. Development of a final engineered design would be required prior to issuance of building permits. Mitigation Measure W-2 is recommended to ensure that the proposed drainage system continues to be maintained and functional.

### **12.b) Flooding**

According to the FEMA Federal Flood Insurance Program Flood Insurance Rate Map for the City of Santa Barbara, the project site is not located within the 100-year floodplain or an area otherwise subject to flooding. Flooding impacts are considered *less than significant*.

### **12.c,d) Water Quality**

Long-Term (Operational) Impacts. Site drainage would be collected, filtered and conveyed to Lighthouse Creek. The use of an appropriate filtration system coupled with a maintenance program would provide treatment of drainage waters before they reach the creek or ocean. Therefore, with adequate maintenance of the filtration system, impacts from discharge into surface waters would be *less than significant*.

Short-Term (Construction) Impacts. Grading activities and construction of the residence would result in a *potentially significant, mitigable impact* to water quality. With the implementation of an Erosion Control/Water Quality Plan (Mitigation Measure BIO-4), the potential for short-term water quality impacts due to erosion and sedimentation during grading and construction would be reduced to a *less than significant level*.

## **Water Resources – Required Mitigation**

**W-1 Drainage and Water Quality.** Project plans for grading, drainage, stormwater facilities, and project development shall be subject to review and approval by City Building Division and Public Works Department per City regulations. Sufficient engineered design and adequate measures shall be employed to ensure that no significant construction-related or long-term effects from increased runoff, erosion and sedimentation, urban water quality pollutants, or groundwater pollutants would result from the project.

See also **Bio-4** for additional mitigation measures.

## **Water Resources – Recommended Mitigation**

**W-2 Drainage System Maintenance.** The Owner shall maintain the drainage system consistent with an approved maintenance plan. The maintenance plan shall include periodic clean-out of inlets and filters and filter replacement as necessary. This plan shall be provided with the building plan submittal for review and approval by Community Development prior to approval of building permits.



**Water Resources – Residual Impact**

Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce water resource impacts to a *less than significant level*.

<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
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 wildlife 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?		✓
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?		✓
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)?		✓
d)	Does the project have potential environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		✓

**INITIAL STUDY CONCLUSION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation it has been determined that with identified mitigation measures agreed-to by the applicant, potentially significant impacts would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared.

Initial Study Preparer: Renee Brooke, AICP, Associate Planner

---

Environmental Analyst

Date

**EXHIBITS:**

- A. Vicinity Map**
- B. Project Plans**
- C. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**
- D. Visual Simulations prepared by interacta, dated June 11, 2004**
- E. Biological Assessment prepared by Rachel Tierney, dated December 12, 2002**
- F. Peer Review of Geologic Analysis prepared by Dr. William Anikouchine, dated March 16, 2005**
- G. City Council Minutes dated May 29, 1958**
- H. Plan showing Proposed Division of the Property of Fred D. Eaton**

**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.

“Biological Assessment,” prepared by Rachel Tierney (December 12, 2002)  
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) & CEQA Guidelines  
General Plan Circulation Element  
General Plan Conservation Element  
1995 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  
Local Coastal Plan (*Main or Airport*)  
Master Environmental Assessment  
Parking Design Standards  
“Peer Review of Geologic Analysis for a Project at 1837 1/2 El Camino de la Luz,” prepared by Dr. William Anikouchine (March 16, 2005)  
“Phase I Archaeological Investigation,” prepared by Larry Wilcoxon (February 1996)  
Santa Barbara Municipal Code & City Charter  
Special District Map  
Uniform Building Code as adopted by City  
Visual Simulations, prepared by interacta, dated June 11, 2004  
Zoning Ordinance & Zoning Map

F:\USERS\PLAN\Environ. Review\Initial Studies\1837.5 El Camino de la Luz Initial Study.doc