



**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
LONG RANGE PLANNING
MEMORANDUM**

Date: November 13, 2013

To: Peter Lawson, City of Santa Barbara

From: Rosie Dyste, Long Range Planning

Subject: City's Comments on the Mission Canyon Community Plan Documents

Thank you for your comments from City Departments on the Mission Canyon Community Plan (MCCP) and associated documents. We appreciate working with the City on addressing Plan Area issues and concerns. Following is a record of the County's response to the comments.

#	City Planning Department Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
1	MCCP Action BIO-MC-1.1	The track changes version made it difficult to discern the change. Action was renumbered to Action BIO-MC-3.1. The Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) was amended to include the ESH overlay.
2	MCCP Action BIO-MC-1.3	Same comment as above; edits were for brevity and consistency and did not fundamentally change ESH buffers. Renumbered to DevStd BIO-MC-3.3.
3	MCCP DevStd BIO-MC-1.6, 1.7, and 1.8	Development standards renumbered to 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8. Standard not changed to specifically call out utility trenching because the term "Development" in the County is interpreted to include any change, including utility trenching. Utility trenching and other similar types of development would not be exempt from permits in ESH.
4	MCCP Action BIO-MC-4.2	The LUDC amendments (35.28.100 D.3.) address fuel modification for defensible space in ESH.
5	MCCP DevStd BIO-MC-8.3	"Habitable" is defined in the LUDC and includes space within a building that is suitable for living, sleeping, eating, and cooking.
6	LUDC ESH Overlay	The additional requirements for the Toro Canyon Plan (TCP) state that the biological resource policies and development standards apply to ESH-TCP unless it is determined that the project is not located in or within 100 feet of ESH. The MCCP has biological resource policies

#	City Planning Department Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
		that apply to areas outside of the ESH-MC overlay and they would apply whether or not the project is in or within 100 feet of ESH.
7	LUDC ESH Overlay	Sentence was clarified to linear feet.
8	<p><i>This comment was included in the email of 11/12/13.</i></p> <p>Is there a net reduction in parcels compared to the 1984 Specific Plan due to better analysis? Is there a number comparison from the Specific Plan to M CCP?</p>	<p>Page 13 of the Specific Plan summarizes potential buildout. Development potential was eliminated on a number of vacant parcels that are utility easements, County flood control debris basins on Mission Creek, or very small, fraction lots. The buildout numbers were complicated following the Jesusita Fire because some residences that would have been “existing” before May 2009 are now counted as “vacant”. Following is a summary of the totals:</p> <p>Specific Plan: 960 existing units, 120 vacant parcels, 199 potential units</p> <p>M CCP: 977 existing units, 112 vacant parcels, 195 potential units.</p>
9	<p><i>This comment was included in the email of 11/12/13.</i></p> <p>Impact PF-3 in the FEIR is clear that the JPA will not be affected by the M CCP, but this statement is not carried over in the M CCP. The M CCP should paraphrase the statement from Impact PF-3.</p>	The M CCP is in a final draft form. It will not be modified prior to the Planning Commission hearing but we can incorporate the comment before it goes to the Board of Supervisors for adoption.

#	City Public Works Transportation Department Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
1	The City is considering adopting new project specific traffic thresholds and the EIR uses the current thresholds which have not been updated.	Not necessary to change threshold at this time.

#	City Creeks Division Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
1	Creek buffers should be a minimum of 100 feet.	Creek buffers remain at a minimum of 50 feet consistent with the other unincorporated areas inland urban creek buffer policy. Buffers can be adjusted upward where

#	City Creeks Division Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
		determined necessary by a qualified biologist. Finally, some creeks may have buffers greater than 50 feet where the riparian canopy extends outward from the creek bank because the buffer is 50 feet from <u>edge</u> of riparian canopy.
2	Vegetation clearance plans for fuel management adjacent to creeks should require a Land Use Permit (LUP) and be approved by a qualified biologist.	The County does not support requiring an LUP for the required annual fuel management conducted for existing residences. The LUDC amendments clearly indicate the types of activities that require an LUP versus those that are exempt. New residences and additions over 50% in ESH will require biologist and Fire Department review and approval of fuel modification plans.
3	Native vegetation removal over 5,000 square feet should require an LUP, including removal for fire clearance.	The removal of native vegetation in the stream or creek buffer will require an LUP. See the LUDC amendments for Minor Conditional Use Permit requirements relating to vegetation removal (35.28.100 D.2.).
4	Vegetation Management Plans in ESH should require LUPs.	See answer to #2 above.
5	Hard bank stabilization should be prohibited.	County Public Works Flood Control Division does not support fully prohibiting hard bank stabilization. However, this type of stabilization is only allowed where it is demonstrated that no other method to protect existing habitable structures is feasible and such protection is necessary for public safety.
6	The County should explore a fee based mitigation to collect impact fees from projects that impact sensitive species and use the fees to study and reduce barriers to fish passage in the project area.	Although the County supports the concept of removing the fish passage barriers, the Plan Area is nearly built out and development potential in areas that could impact sensitive species, especially near creeks, is very limited. Therefore, there would be no way to raise enough fees to prepare such a study. Instead, the MCCP supports coordinating with the City to seek grants or other funds to complete fish passage barrier removal studies (Action BIO-MC-9.4).

#	City Water Resources Division Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
1	The 1912 Water Services Agreement agreement is mentioned in the 1984 Specific Plan but has not been located to confirm the City's obligations. Please see revised language attached.	Revision incorporated into the MCCP and FEIR.
2	Actions and Development Standards related to Water Conservation:	Action changed to a policy and development standards amended in response (see November 2013 MCCP).

#	City Water Resources Division Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
	Action PS-MC-2.1 DevStd PS-MC-2.2 DevStd PS-MC-2.3	
3	Revise LUDC chapter 35.34 (Landscaping Standards) so that Mission Canyon is subject to the City's landscape design standards, and include the City in the landscape design review process.	Amending the LUDC is not appropriate or necessary to implement the requested changes. The request will be accomplished via the application submittal process, including an approved Application for Water Service Commitment from the City.
4	City's long-term available supply information is incorrect in the FEIR.	Revised language incorporated into FEIR.
3	State Water Project/Delta Issues in the FEIR, see revisions attached, which elaborates that while the City doesn't use imported water regularly, it is an important resource.	Revised language incorporated into FEIR.
4	Additional water demand of 93 AFY in the FEIR.	Revised language incorporated into FEIR.
5	Why wouldn't the process for requesting City water service be included in the MCCP. Also, what is the "Mission Canyon Area Supplement"?	The Mission Canyon Area Supplement is a form that accompanies all County applications for projects in the Plan Area. The MCCP Public Services Section and the FEIR was amended to briefly describe that new or expanded water service connections require an approved application from the City.
6	The characterization of City's existing supplies and planned demands is incorrect in the FEIR. See attached revisions.	Revised language incorporated into FEIR.
8	Additional water demand only shows planned demands within the City limits. See revised language discussing planned demands outside the City.	Revised language incorporated into FEIR.
9	<i>This comment was included in the email of 11/12/13.</i> What water resources	The 2009 hydraulic evaluation funded by the City and County identified two deficiencies: (1) one fire hydrant had water pressure below the minimum criteria and (2) the Tunnel Road Pump Station should increase overall

#	City Water Resources Division Comment	County Planning and Development Department Response
	upgrades are being considered in Action FIRE-MC-1.1, would this impact the City's water supply assumption, and how would the City be involved in any proposals to upgrade facilities?	pumping capacity and evaluate the existing emergency back-up power in conjunction with pump improvements. These are the only identified upgrades being considered at this time. These upgrades should not impact the City's water supply assumption. The County is responsible for costs relating to fire hydrants and upgrades to the Tunnel Road pump station.

