4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section analyzes the Project's land use compatibility with existing land uses and consistency with applicable City land use policies. Additional impacts that can affect the Project's compatibility with adjacent and nearby land uses are discussed in the following sections: Section 4.1, *Aesthetics;* Section 4.2, *Air Quality; Section 4.7, Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset;* Section 4.10, *Noise;* and Section 4.13*, Transportation and Circulation.* The purpose of this discussion is to identify whether or not the Project would conflict with City land use policies and thereby result in an environmental impact, policy inconsistency or prevent mitigation of environmental effects intended by the policy. This discussion is provided for environmental analysis and does not affect the City Council's determinations regarding the Project. Pursuant to CEQA, and for purposes of this analysis, an action, program or project is consistent with the General Plan if, considering all of its aspects, it will further the goals, objectives and policies of the overall Plan.

4.9.1 Setting

a. Regional Land Use. Goleta encompasses approximately eight square miles and is located in the South Coast of Santa Barbara County. The City is situated along U.S. 101, the major coastal highway linking northern and southern portions of the state. A portion of the City, including its two-mile Pacific shoreline, is within the California Coastal Zone. The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, which is within the corporate boundaries of the City of Santa Barbara, lies near the geographical center of Goleta. The land use pattern in Goleta today is primarily a result of a transition over many decades from rural and agricultural land uses to a suburban community (Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan FEIR, 2006). The predominant land use in Goleta is residential, though the City also includes a variety of commercial, industrial, and institutional land uses as well as agricultural land.

b. Site and Surrounding Land Uses. Historically, the Project site was used for grazing and agriculture (including row crops and orchards). The Project site is currently undeveloped and sparsely vegetated with weeds and shrubs. There are also a number of rock piles, pieces of construction machinery and storage containers that are stored on-site. The Project site is surrounded by existing development as described below.

To the north of the Project site, the Union Pacific Railroad tracks are located approximately 50 feet from the site's northern property line. The U.S. 101 southbound freeway on-ramp from S. Los Carneros Road is immediately north of the railroad tracks, which is approximately 160 feet from the sites' northern property line. U.S. 101 is located north of the on-ramp, approximately 250 feet from the northern property line. S. Los Carneros Road is located directly west of the Project site. A residential development with 465 residential units is currently under construction on a formerly vacant site west of S. Los Carneros Road. To the east of the Project site, industrial businesses are located along Aero Camino Road. Across Camino Vista Road to the south of the Project site are 335 multi-family residential units (Willow Springs I and II) previously constructed and currently managed by the Project applicant. Surrounding land uses are labeled on the aerial view of the Project site shown on Figures 2-3 and 2-4.

c. Regulatory Setting. Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan ("General Plan") is a comprehensive statement of goals, objectives, and policies relating to the development of the community, the management of potential hazards, and the protection of natural and cultural resources within its boundaries. The General Plan is the primary means for guiding future change in Goleta and provides a guide for decision-making. The General Plan was adopted in 2006 and amended and

republished in 2009. It includes the following elements: Land Use, Open Space, Conservation, Safety, Visual and Historic Resources, Transportation, Public Facilities, Noise, and Housing.

As discussed in Section 2.0, *Project Description,* the Project site has a General Plan land use designation of Medium-Density Residential (R-MD) and is located in the "Central Hollister Residential Development Area" with a corresponding designation as an Affordable Housing Opportunity Site. This designation requires a minimum residential density of 20 units per acre and a maximum density of 25 units per acre. The Inland Zoning Ordinance designation of Design Residential (DR-20) permits up to a maximum of 20 units per acre. Figure 2-3 identifies the General Plan land use designations for the Project site and surrounding properties. Figure 2-4 provides the zoning designations for the Project site and the surrounding properties. Table 2-1 provides site and surrounding land use information.

The Project site is also located within the City's Central Hollister Residential Development Area. According to the General Plan the objective of this area is to "promote coordinated planning and development of designated medium-density residential uses in the Central Hollister area in order to create quality, livable environment with appropriate design and amenities for future residents of this new residential neighborhood."

The Project includes an application for a General Plan Amendment involving a correction to Figure 4-1 of the Conservation Element and Figure 3-5 of the Open Space Element of the General Plan as amended. These figures indicate the existence of coastal sage scrub Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) on the property. Because no ESHA was found on-site during recent biological surveys, the current designation on the General Plan maps will be removed. This action is not considered a project pursuant to CEQA.

4.9.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. Land use impacts were assessed based upon the level of physical impact anticipated for the various issues that can affect compatibility (air quality, noise, human health and safety, aesthetics), as well as consistency with adopted plans, policies, and regulations.

Based on Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the effects of the Project on land use would be significant if the Project would:

1. *Physically divide an established community;*
2. *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, clean air plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or*
3. *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.*

As discussed above, the Project site is located within the City's Central Hollister Residential Development Area and development of the Project site would contribute to the objectives established for this area. The Project would not divide an established community and there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the Project site; therefore the Project would have no impact with respect to Threshold 1 or Threshold 3. These thresholds are

discussed in Section 4.15, *Effects Found Not to be Significant.* The Project's compatibility with applicable land use plans and policies is analyzed in Impact LU-1 and Table 4.9-1.

Although the City's *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* (1992) does not have "Land Use" thresholds of significance, it provides guidelines related to "Quality of Life." According to the Manual, Quality of Life is broadly defined as the aggregate effect of all impacts on individuals, families, communities, and other social groupings and on the way those groups function. Quality of Life issues, while difficult to quantify, are often primary concerns to the community affected by a project. Examples of such issues include the following:

- *Loss of privacy*
- *Neighborhood incompatibility*
- *Nuisance noise levels (not exceeding noise thresholds)*
- *Increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods (not exceeding traffic thresholds)*
- *Loss of sunlight/solar access*

The elements comprising "Quality of Life" are to be considered on a case-by-case basis. For this analysis, the Project would result in a significant impact if it would:

4. Result in a substantial physical impact to the quality of the human environment.

These elements are augmented by the information contained in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics;* Section 4.2, *Air Quality;* Section 4.7*, Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset;* Section 4.10, *Noise;* and Section 4.13*, Transportation and Circulation,* which are issues that relate directly to the Project's land use compatibility. Specifically, Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, discusses impacts to scenic views and the visual character of the site; Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, discusses impacts to local air quality; Section 4.7, *Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset*, addresses the impacts of placing the Project in an area subject to risks of upset; Section 4.10, *Noise*, addresses the impacts of new sources of noise on surrounding uses; and Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, discusses the impact of increased traffic in the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

The Project could also be considered a positive factor in "Quality of Life" as it would provide needed housing to assist in balancing the City's jobs/housing imbalance. Area employees may choose to live in the Project's residential units to reduce long commutes and thereby strengthen community and family ties. This aspect of Quality of Life is consistent with a Project objective to provide workforce housing.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact LU-1 The Project would be consistent with most applicable General Plan policies, but would be inconsistent with several policies related to preservation of views. Impacts would be Class I, *significant and unavoidable [Threshold 2].*

When the General Plan was adopted in 2006, the City considered the land use and zoning designations for vacant parcels and determined that residential land use/zoning designations, as well as an Affordable Housing Opportunity Site was appropriate for the Project site. The Project site has a General Plan land use designation of Medium-Density Residential (R-MD) (refer to Figure 2-3 in the Project Description for the Project site and the surrounding properties' land use designations). The R-MD land

use designation allows a maximum of 20 units per acre and a minimum of 15 units per acre. The site is also designated as Affordable Housing Opportunity Site within General Plan Housing Element, which allows for a maximum of 25 units per acre and a minimum of 20 units per acre.

The developable lot area is used to calculate residential density. The net developable acreage is defined pursuant to Land Use Element Policy LU 2.2 as gross acreage minus all acreage containing the following development constraints:

- *Environmentally sensitive habitat areas;*
- *Areas prone to flooding and geologic, slope instability, or other natural hazards;*
- *Areas with stormwater drainage problems;*
- *Presence of other significant hazards or hazardous materials;*
- *Protection of significant public and private views;*
- *Exposure to exterior noise levels that exceed a Community Noise Exposure Level (CNEL) of 60 dBA (see related NE 1.2);*
- *Areas with archaeological or cultural resources;*
- *Deficiencies in the type or level of services necessary for urban development, such as transportation facilities (roadway and pedestrian), sewer and water service, and emergency service response time; and*
- *Prevailing densities of adjacent developed residential areas.*

After removing the development constraints area of 3.12 acres from the 17.36-acre Project site pursuant to LU 2.2, the net developable acreage is 14.24 acres. With the proposed 360 housing units, the density would be 25.4 units per acre. At the 25 units per acre maximum specified by the General Plan for this Central Hollister Housing Opportunity Site, the site is restricted to 356 units and therefore the Project is four units over the density limit without a density bonus. Area A would be a housing development for seniors 55 years and older or 62 years and older, pursuant to California Civil Code section 51.3(a). The senior housing Project would have 132 units, four of which qualify for density bonus units as permitted under the provisions of Government Code sections 65915, which permits a density bonus for up to 20% of a proposed senior development. The Project would use four of the 26 permitted density bonus units. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the required density for an Affordable Housing Opportunity site pursuant to the Housing Element of the General Plan.

When the General Plan was adopted in 2006, the City Council considered the land use and zoning designations for all vacant parcels in the City and determined that a residential land use/zoning designations with an Affordable Housing Opportunity designation was appropriate for this site. The Project site is located within the City of Goleta's Central Hollister Residential Development Area. According to the General Plan, the objective of this area is to "promote coordinated planning and development of designated medium-density residential uses in the Central Hollister area in order to create quality, livable environment with appropriate design and amenities for future residents of this new residential neighborhood." The Project involves medium density residential uses consistent with the General Plan vision for the Central Hollister Residential Development Area. This area is close to such amenities as public transit, local and regional circulation routes, major employment centers, major shopping areas, restaurants, and other commercial services. One of the applicant's objectives for the Project is to provide workforce housing. Pursuant to the General Plan Housing Element, workforce housing is intended to be occupied by households whose head is in the workforce as well as housing affordable to people the community relies on to supply basic services such as teachers, police, nurses, etc.

Land Use Policies LU 8.5 and LU 8.6 guide development in the Central Hollister area. Consistency with applicable policies in the General Plan for the Central Hollister area and for residential development in general is shown in Table 4.9-1.

As indicated previously, the Project also proposes and amendment to the General Plan that would revise Figure 3-5 of the Open Space Element and Figure 4-1 of the Conservation Element to remove an ESHA designation of Coastal Sage Scrub that does not occur on the property.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
LAND USE ELEMENT	
LU 1.2: Residential Character. The Land Use Plan map shall ensure that Goleta's land use pattern remains predominately residential and open, with the majority of nonresidential development concentrated along the primary transportation corridor— east and west along Hollister Avenue and US-101. The intent of the Land Use Plan is to protect and preserve residential neighborhoods by preventing intrusion of nonresidential uses that would be detrimental to the preservation of the existing character of the neighborhoods.	**Consistent.** The Project is a residential development and is located between Hollister Avenue and U.S. 101. The Project does not involve nonresidential uses that would intrude in an existing residential neighborhood (see Impact LU-4 in this section).
LU 1.7: New Development and Protection of Environmental Resources. Approvals of all new development shall require adherence to high environmental standards and the preservation and protection of environmental resources, such as environmentally sensitive habitats, consistent with the standards set forth in the Conservation Element and the City's Zoning Code.	**Consistent.** Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the Project would not result in an impact to ESHAs or other environmental resources. Although the Project site contains a City of Goleta mapped ESHA, the habitat was not found within the Project boundary or immediately adjacent areas during the biological resources analysis and the Project includes an amendment to the General Plan to remove the ESHA designation of Coastal Sage Scrub. See additional discussion of consistency with Conservation Element policies below.
LU 1.8: New Development and Neighborhood Compatibility. Approvals of all new development shall require compatibility with the character of existing development in the immediate area, including size, bulk, scale, and height. New development shall not substantially impair or block important viewsheds and scenic vistas, as set forth in the Visual and Historical Resources Element.	**Inconsistent.** The size, bulk, scale, and height of the Project would fit with the surrounding development, most notably the adjacent Willow Springs Phases I and II residential developments. The proposed design of various project components is intended to blend with the existing Willow Springs Apartments. Additionally, Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain consistent with adjacent development. With regard to scenic views identified in the General Plan, including Figure 6-1, the Project development will be visible primarily from the Los Carneros Road Overpass, the U.S. 101 Los Carneros southbound on-ramp, and the Los Carneros Road scenic view corridor. As described in Impact AES-1, the three-story buildings in the southwest portion of the site would rise to a level just below the ridgeline of the Santa Ynez Mountains, obstructing scenic views of the bulk of mountains to the northeast from the perspective of northbound motorists on S. Los Carneros Road. Therefore, as discussed in

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
	Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the Project would have a significant and unavoidable (Class I) impact on scenic views from northbound S. Los Carneros Road. See additional discussion of consistency with Land Use Policy LU 1.2, and Visual and Historic Resources policies.
LU 1.9: Quality Design in the Built Environment. The City shall encourage quality site, architectural, and landscape design in all new development proposals. Development proposals shall include coordinated site planning, circulation, and design. Public and/or common open spaces with quality visual environments shall be included to create attractive community gathering areas with a sense of place and scale.	**Consistent.** The Project would provide an activity trail, benches, barbecue area, picnic tables, bicycle parking, and a level turf play area. See additional discussion for Policies LU 1.7 and LU 1.8.
LU 1.10: Multifamily Residential Development. The Medium- and High-Density Multifamily designations shall provide appropriate locations for multifamily dwellings as well as allow development standards that enable creativity and diversity in design while protecting health and safety. The use categories differ in terms of maximum permitted densities allowed, but each designation shall permit a range of housing types, including detached units, attached townhouses, and garden apartments. All multifamily developments shall be required to provide or ensure: a. Adequate open space and recreational facilities, such as parks, open spaces, or bike paths as an integral part of the development; community garden areas are encouraged. b. Appropriate amounts of outdoor space for the exclusive use of individual residential units. c. Appropriate pedestrian and bicyclist access to commercial or other activity centers and appropriate facilities to encourage use of public transit. d. Adequate services and facilities (such as sewer, water, and roadway capacity) concurrent with development. e. Adequate off-street parking. f. Appropriate access by emergency vehicles.	**Consistent.** The Project is a multifamily residential Project within the Medium-Density designation. The Project density is consistent with the R-MD/ Affordable Housing Opportunity designation, with the permitted senior density bonus, while health and safety would be protected through noise and air quality mitigation. The Project includes a range of unit sizes (one to three bedrooms). The Project includes private recreational facilities accessible to residents of the Project, including: a activity trail, benches, barbecue area, picnic tables, bicycle parking, and a level turf play area. As stated in this section and in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation,* the Project would provide pedestrian and bicycle access as well as bicycle parking, adequate parking, and emergency vehicle access. As discussed in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems,* the Project would have adequate utility services and facilities. Mitigation to require a Solid Waste Management Plan is proposed to reduce impacts from solid waste generation.
LU 1.13: Adequate Infrastructure and Services. For health, safety, and general welfare reasons, approvals of new development shall be subject to a finding that adequate infrastructure and services will be available to serve the proposed development in accordance with the Public Facilities and Transportation Elements.	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems,* the Project would have adequate on-site utility infrastructure and public water and sewer services are available. The Project includes the development of all necessary infrastructure to serve the Project.
LU 2.2: Residential Use Densities. All proposed residential projects shall be consistent with the recommended standards for density and building intensity set forth in this plan. The recommended densities described in the policies for the residential use categories and in Table 2-1 are maximum permitted densities but are not guaranteed. Density of development allowed on any site shall reflect site constraints, including: a. Environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA). b. Areas prone to flooding and geologic, slope instability, or other natural hazards.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project meets the General Plan and zoning designations for medium density residential development with a density of 25.4 units per acre, which includes a permitted density bonus over the maximum 25 units per acre. The Project has been designed to primarily avoid disturbance of the on-site archeological resource by adding fill to cover the site and avoid grading at the site. In addition, implementation of required mitigation measures would reduce potential archaeological resource impacts to below a level of significance. See Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*, for further discussion. Therefore, the Project

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
c. Areas with stormwater drainage problems. d. Presence of other significant hazards or hazardous materials. e. Protection of significant public and private views. f. Exposure to exterior noise levels that exceed a Community Noise Exposure Level (CNEL) of 60 dBA (see related NE 1.2). g. Areas with archaeological or cultural resources. h. Deficiencies in the type or level of services necessary for urban development, such as transportation facilities (roadway and pedestrian), sewer and water service, and emergency service response time.	would be consistent with the required density of 20-25 units/acre, with the permitted senior density bonus, for an AHO site pursuant to the Housing Element of the General Plan. The biological assessment prepared for the Project found no ESHA on site. The General Plan maps that show ESHA on this property will be amended to remove the designation. Density is not affected by ESHA. The Project would be subject to noise from U.S. 101 and the UPRR. Noise levels would potentially exceed City standards; required outdoor mitigation (installation of sound attenuation barriers along the perimeter of outdoor living spaces) and indoor mitigation, would reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level. See Section 4.10, *Noise*, for further discussion.
LU 2.3: Residential Development Standards. The following standards or criteria shall be applicable to residential development proposals: a. The privacy of existing residential uses in the immediate area shall be protected in the design of new or expanded structures. b. Solar access of residential uses shall be protected in the design of new or expanded structures. c. Proposals for construction of new or expanded homes shall be required to have a size, bulk, scale, and height that are compatible with the character of the immediate existing neighborhood.	**Consistent.** As discussed under consistency with Policy LU 1.8, the Project would be compatible with the character of the existing development in the immediate area, including the bulk, scale, and height. Additionally, the Project would not block solar access to neighboring units.
LU 2.6: Medium-Density Residential (R-MD). This use category permits multifamily housing and accessory uses customarily associated with residences. Development may also include attached and detached single-family dwellings and duplex structures. Medium-density areas may also function as a transition between business uses and single-family residential neighborhoods. This designation is intended to provide for development of residential units at densities of up to 20.0 units per acre. In order to achieve efficient use of a limited supply of land designated in this use category, the minimum density permitted shall be 15.0 units per acre, except where site-specific constraints are determined to limit development to fewer units. Central Hollister Housing Opportunity Sites as identified in Housing Element Subpolicy HE 11.6 shall provide for development of residential units at densities ranging from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 25 units per acre in support of the achievement of affordable housing goals. Assuming an average household size of 2.0 to 3.0 persons, the range of population densities allowed in this use category is between 26.0 persons per acre and 60.0 persons per acre. (See related Policy LU 8 and Subpolicy HE 11.6).	**Consistent.** The Project site is designated as Medium-Density Residential by the General Plan. On August 18, 2009, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 09-44 (Housing Element Amendments), which increased the density for the Medium Density Residential (R-MD) Central Hollister Affordable Housing Opportunity Sites. The minimum density was increased to 20 units per acre (except where there are site constraints) and the maximum density was increased to 25 units per acres, to ensure the most efficient use of the property. As noted in the Project description, the Project's density is 25.4 units per acre. This density can be accommodated on-site taking into account site constraints and the permitted senior density bonus. Therefore, the Project density is consistent with the above policies. As described in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, the service population for the workforce housing was determined based on CalEEMod defaults (2.72 persons per dwelling unit), and the service population for the senior housing was determined based on the Heritage Ridge Occupant/Unit Ratio Analysis study conducted by The Towbes Group, Inc. (2014) (1.11 persons per senior dwelling unit). The service population for the workforce housing is estimated to be 620 persons, and the service population for the senior housing is assumed to be 145 persons for a total of 765 residents. The expected

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
	population density of the Project would be 53.7 persons per acre which is within the range.
Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area Objective: To promote coordinated planning and development of designated medium-density residential sites in the Central Hollister area in order to create a quality, livable environment with appropriate design and amenities for future residents of this new residential neighborhood. **LU 8.2: Purpose.** The intent for this area is to enable new residential development on scale commercial uses that will serve the needs of existing employees and future residents in the immediate area. The nonresidential development should be clustered at a single site or a small number of individual sites west of Los Carneros Way. A related intent is to enable transit-oriented development along the city's primary transportation corridor so as to efficiently utilize existing infrastructure, reduce future increases in automobile travel, and support use of alternative, less polluting modes of travel.	**Consistent.** The Central Hollister Residential Development Area promotes coordinated planning and development of residential sites. The Project is a multi-family residential development with 360 units on infill land. The Project residents would have close and easy access to Hollister Avenue, Los Carneros Road, U.S. 101, public transportation, jobs, and shopping. The Project would create a quality, livable environment with appropriate design and amenities for future residents on the site, which meets a goal of the Central Hollister Development Area. On-site amenities would provide residents with passive and active recreation opportunities including an activity trail, benches, barbecue area, picnic tables bicycle parking, level turf play area, and native landscaping. In addition, the Project includes a wide variety of residential unit types, sizes, configurations, and bedroom count, which maximizes the potential for affordability and the ability to appeal to a wider market.
LU 8.5: Coordinated Development Plan and Quality Design. In considering proposed projects within the Central Hollister Residential Development Area, emphasis shall be given to coordinated planning and design for the mixed-use area as a whole, including the parcels designated for Business Park uses. This may be accomplished by amendment of the Raytheon Specific Plan for lands within its boundaries and by preparation of a second Specific Plan encompassing lands within the North Willow Springs area. The provisions of the specific plans shall: a. Ensure that the various uses are blended in a manner so that each use is compatible with the others on an individual site, as well as uses on adjacent sites. b. Ensure that any future residential development will not threaten the continued viability of the existing Business Park uses. c. Require that design and location of internal roadways and circulation be integrated with external circulation in a manner that improves overall safety and traffic flow. d. Provide for appropriate internal street, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation systems. e. Provide an adequate supply of parking within each development, with consideration of shared (or joint) parking between uses where peak parking demand is in the daytime and uses where peak demand is typically in the evening hours. f. Require that any future housing development create a living environment that is attractive, with high-quality architectural and landscape design. g. Provide for a mix of unit sizes (number of bedrooms) in residential projects. h. Ensure that future development will include ample	**Consistent.** The Project site is not encompassed within a Specific Plan. Compatibility issues are discussed throughout this section. The Project would be located adjacent to existing residential development with similar size, bulk, scale, and height. The Project would be located in the vicinity of existing Business Parks and industrial uses, and would not affect the viability of those uses. The Project provides for a mix of unit sizes, provides an adequate supply of parking, and is integrated with the existing circulation system. According to the Project traffic study (see Appendix I) the three proposed driveways providing site access are expected to operate sufficiently. The Project would provide adequate site access and circulation for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians and would not cause any conflicts with traffic flow. Further, the Project would provide adequate parking as required by the City Code (see traffic study in Appendix I). As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the visual character of proposed buildings and landscaping would be compatible with that of adjacent multi-family residential development. The proposed landscape design is intended to blend with the existing Willow Springs Apartments by using a similar plant palette and two-rail fence along Camino Vista. Additionally, Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain consistent with adjacent development. The size, bulk, scale, and height of the Project would fit with the surrounding development, most notably the adjacent Willow Springs Phases I and II residential developments. The Project provides a mix of unit sizes. It would provide a

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
open space, recreational facilities, and other amenities for employees and residents of the new housing.	mixture of senior and workforce housing through one -, two, and three-bedroom units with a total of 360 units. The Project includes a preliminary landscaping plan, and the massing and architectural style of the proposed apartment buildings would be compatible with surrounding development. The Project also includes on-site amenities would provide residents with passive and active recreation opportunities including an activity trail, benches, barbecue area, picnic tables, 14 bicycle parking pads throughout the property, level turf play area, and native landscaping. These facilities would be available to Project residents.
LU 8.6: Performance Standards. Performance standards applicable to development within this area shall ensure that: a. The scale and design of uses are compatible with each other and reinforce the character and functions of other uses in the area and surrounding areas. b. The timing of new development will ensure a balance of housing and commercial uses. c. Lighting, noise, odors, and air pollutant emissions from commercial and Business Park uses will not interfere or conflict with residential uses. d. Signage will be controlled and limited to maintain an attractive living environment. e. Curb cuts for driveway access to individual properties will be minimized and sharing of access encouraged. f. Efficient and attractive pedestrian and bicycle connectivity will be provided between uses. g. Pedestrian-oriented outdoor spaces will be provided at strategic locations in the development. h. Adequate and safe motorized and nonmotorized access to each site is provided.	**Consistent.** As discussed in LU 1.8, the Project would not conflict with the character of existing development in the neighborhood, including size, bulk, scale, and height. Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain consistent with adjacent development. The Project has been designed with features that enable a choice of various alternative modes of travel, such as transit, biking, and walking. Internal pedestrian walkways and bicycle access is provided within the site and to other developments. Collectively, these features facilitate alternative modes of transportation to jobs, shopping, and other activity centers as well as for recreation.
OPEN SPACE ELEMENT	
OS 7.2: Open Space for Preservation of Natural Resources. Figure 3.5 designates all ESHAs as protected open space.	**Consistent if the General Plan Amendment is approved.** The Project includes an amendment to the General Plan that would revise Figure 3-5 of the Open Space Element and Figure 4-1 of the Conservation Element to remove an ESHA designation of Coastal Sage Scrub that does not occur on the Project site. The Project would not impact ESHA. If the proposed General Plan Amendment is not approved, then the project is inconsistent.
OS 7.8: Provision of Open Space in New Development. A minimum open space area shall be required in new development situated in certain land use categories, as set forth in the applicable policies of the Land Use Element. These private open space areas shall be in addition to any public park and open space land that may be required to be dedicated pursuant to the Quimby Act or other state or local statutes. Although private open space areas may be reserved to protect resources or avoid development in areas subject to hazards, such reservations shall include lands usable for outdoor recreation activities, where feasible.	**Consistent.** Based on the authority vested in the City by the Quimby Act, Chapter 16.14 of the Goleta Municipal Code requires new development and subdivisions within the City to mitigate their park and recreation facility impacts by constructing, or financing the construction of, the park and recreation facilities needed to serve their projects. Section 16.14.010 of the Goleta Municipal Code requires dedication of 0.0128 acres of property per dwelling unit to neighborhood and community park and recreational purposes, exclusive of and in addition to school lands used cooperatively for recreational purposes. In lieu of dedicating parkland, a developer may pay a fee for the purpose of developing new

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
	or rehabilitating existing park or recreation facilities. For the Project, the applicant would be required to pay in-lieu parks and recreation fees upon the approval of the final subdivision map and development project and prior to the issuance of land use permits, which would be used to fund public park and recreational facilities. With payment of these fees, the Project would comply with City requirements related to provision of park facilities. In addition, the Project exceeds the minimum R-MD open space and landscaped area of 40% by providing 42%.
OS 8.3: Preservation. The City shall protect and preserve cultural resources from destruction. The preferred method for preserving a recorded archeological site shall be by preservation in place to maintain the relationship between the artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation in place may be accomplished by deed restriction as a permanent conservation easement, avoidance through site planning and design, or incorporation of sites into other open spaces to prevent any future development or use that might otherwise adversely impact these resources.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** As discussed in Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources,* there is a previously recorded intact archaeological resource on the Project site. This resource is proposed to be preserved in place through a Phase 3 Data Recovery Program and design of the Project to avoid disturbance of any intact deposits by adding fill over the deposits and avoiding grading the area. Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) through (f) would ensure that cultural resources are protected.
OS 8.4: Evaluation of Significance. For any development proposal identified as being located in an area of archaeological sensitivity, a Phase I cultural resources inventory shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist or other qualified expert. All sites determined through a Phase 1 investigation to potentially include cultural resources must undergo subsurface investigation to determine the extent, integrity, and significance of the site. Where Native American artifacts have been found or where oral traditions indicate the site was used by Native Americans in the past, research shall be conducted to determine the extent of the archaeological significance of the site.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** An Archaeological Resources Assessment was prepared for the Project site by Dudek in 2014. This report considers a series of previous cultural resources investigations conducted for the Project site and adjacent properties: an original excavation in 1929, subsequent excavations in 1982, an intensive ground surface collection of artifacts in 1990, Extended Phase 1 excavations in 1996, a Supplemental Phase 2 investigation in 1999, and a Phase 3 Data Recovery Mitigation program in 2014. This report was peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants, Inc. in 2015 as part of this EIR. The reports found a potentially significant impact with respect to archaeological resources and suggest mitigation to reduce impacts. Refer to Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*.
OS 8.5: Mitigation. If research and surface reconnaissance shows that the project area contains a resource of cultural significance that would be adversely impacted by proposed development and avoidance is infeasible, mitigation measures sensitive to the cultural beliefs of the affected population shall be required. Reasonable efforts to leave these resources in an undisturbed state through capping or covering resources with a soil layer prior to development shall be required. If data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, the City shall confer with the affected Native American nation or most-likely descendants, as well as agencies charged with the responsibility of preserving these resources and organizations having a professional or cultural interest, prior to the removal and disposition of any artifacts.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** See discussion of OS 8.3 and 8.4.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
OS 8.6: Monitoring and Discovery. Onsite monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and appropriate Native American observer shall be required for all grading, excavation, and site preparation that involves earth moving operations on sites identified as archaeologically sensitive. If cultural resources of potential importance are uncovered during construction, the following shall occur: a. The grading or excavation shall cease and the City shall be notified. b. A qualified archeologist shall prepare a report assessing the significance of the find and provide recommendations regarding appropriate disposition. c. Disposition will be determined by the City in conjunction with the affected Native American nation.	**Consistent.** See discussion of OS 8.3.
OS 8.7: Protection of Paleontological Resources. Should substantial paleontological resources be encountered during construction activities, all work that could further disturb the find shall be stopped and the City of Goleta shall be notified within 24 hours. The applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to prepare a report to the City that evaluates the significance of the find and, if warranted, identifies recovery measures. Upon review and approval of the report by the City, construction may continue after implementation of any identified recovery measures.	**Consistent.** There is no evidence of paleontological resources on-site. Per the requirements of this policy, all work would stop in the event that unforeseen resources are encountered during site grading.
OS 9.2: Mitigation of Impacts of New Development on Parks and Recreation Facilities. The following shall apply to approvals of new development projects: a. To ensure new development pays a proportionate share of the cost of acquisition and improvement of parks, recreation facilities, and open space, the City shall require a one-time impact fee to offset costs necessary to accommodate the development. These fees shall be used for acquiring and/or developing new or improving/rehabilitating existing park, recreation, or open space facilities. b. At its discretion, the City may allow any appropriate park and recreational facilities provided within a development to meet all or part of the mitigation requirement in lieu of payment of a portion of the impact fee only if they are open and accessible to the public. c. Within new subdivisions, where the City may allow dedications of land in lieu of payment of fees pursuant to California Government Code Section 66477 (Quimby Act), the land area to be dedicated shall be usable space for active recreation purposes.	**Consistent.** The Project includes more open space than the minimum open space and landscaped area requirement of 40%. The City's General Plan Open Space Element Figure 3-2 indicates the location of existing and planned public parks, including a two-acre park (denoted as planned future park site "C") proposed for the Project. The applicant would also be required to pay park and recreation development impact fees to the City that will be used for the acquisition and improvement of public parks, recreation facilities, and open space.
CONSERVATION ELEMENT	
CE 1.2: Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. ESHAs are shown in Figure 4-1.	**Consistent if the General Plan Amendment is approved.** The Project includes an amendment to the General Plan that would revise Figure 3-5 of the Open Space Element and Figure 4-1 of the Conservation Element to remove an ESHA designation of Coastal Sage Scrub that does not occur on the property. The Project would not impact ESHA. If the proposed

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
	General Plan Amendment is not approved, then the Project would be inconsistent.
CE 1.5: Corrections to Map of ESHAs. If a site-specific biological study contains substantial evidence that an area previously shown as an ESHA on Figure 4-1 does not contain habitat that meets the definition of an ESHA for reasons other than that set forth in CE 1.4, the City biologist and the Planning Commission shall review all available information and determine if the area in question should no longer be considered an ESHA and therefore not be subject to the ESHA protection policies of this plan. If the final decision-making body determines that the area is not an ESHA, a map modification shall be included in the next General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan amendment; however, Local Coastal Program policies and standards for protection of ESHAs shall not apply, and approval of development consistent with all other requirements of this plan may be considered prior to the map revision.	**Consistent.** Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the Project would not result in an impact to ESHAs. Although the Project site contains a City of Goleta mapped Coastal Sage Scrub ESHA, the habitat is not present within the Project site boundary or immediately adjacent areas. Project site habitat includes 4.74 acres of Bromus grassland, 4.17 acres of quailbush scrub, 3.29 acres of coyote brush scrub, and 4.06 acres of upland mustards that likely provide limited low-quality foraging habitat for raptors. Additionally, there is 8.80 acres of non-native grassland. None of these habitats qualify as ESHA.
CE 1.6: Protection of ESHAs. ESHAs shall be protected against significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses or development dependent on and compatible with maintaining such resources shall be allowed within ESHAs or their buffers. The following shall apply: a. No development, except as otherwise allowed by this element, shall be allowed within ESHAs and/or ESHA buffers. b. A setback or buffer separating all permitted development from an adjacent ESHA shall be required and shall have a minimum width as set forth in subsequent policies of this element. The purpose of such setbacks shall be to prevent any degradation of the ecological functions provided by the habitat area. c. Public accessways and trails are considered resource-dependent uses and may be located within or adjacent to ESHAs. These uses shall be sited to avoid or minimize impacts on the resource to the maximum extent feasible. Measures—such as signage, placement of boardwalks, and limited fencing or other barriers—shall be implemented as necessary to protect ESHAs. d. The following uses and development may be allowed in ESHAs or ESHA buffers only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives and will be subject to requirements for mitigation measures to avoid or lessen impacts to the maximum extent feasible: 1) public road crossings, 2) utility lines, 3) resource restoration and enhancement projects, 4) nature education, 5) biological research, and 6) Public Works projects as identified in the Capital Improvement Plan, only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives. e. If the provisions herein would result in any legal parcel created prior to the date of this plan being made unusable in its entirety for any purpose allowed by the	**Consistent.** Site-specific biological analysis indicates that the Project would not result in an impact to ESHAs. Although the Project site contains a City of Goleta mapped ESHA, the habitat is no longer present within the Project boundary or immediately adjacent areas.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
land use plan, exceptions to the foregoing may be made to allow a reasonable economic use of the parcel. Alternatively, the City may establish a program to allow transfer of development rights for such parcels to receiving parcels that have areas suitable for and are designated on the Land Use Plan map for the appropriate type of use and development.	
CE 1.7: Mitigation of Impacts to EHSAs. New development shall be sited and designed to avoid impacts to ESHAs. If there is no feasible alternative that can eliminate all impacts, then the alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant impacts shall be selected. Any impacts that cannot be avoided shall be fully mitigated, with priority given to onsite mitigation. Offsite mitigation measures shall only be approved when it is not feasible to fully mitigate impacts on site. If impacts to onsite ESHAs occur in the Coastal Zone, any offsite mitigation area shall also be located within the Coastal Zone. All mitigation sites shall be monitored for a minimum period of 5 years following completion, with changes made as necessary based on annual monitoring reports. Where appropriate, mitigation sites shall be subject to deed restrictions. Mitigation sites shall be subject to the protections set forth in this plan for the habitat type unless the City has made a specific determination that the mitigation is unsuccessful and is to be discontinued.	**Consistent.** See discussion under policy CE 1.6.
CE 1.9: Standards Applicable to Development Projects. The following standards shall apply to consideration of developments within or adjacent to ESHAs: a. Site designs shall preserve wildlife corridors or habitat networks. Corridors shall be of sufficient width to protect habitat and dispersal zones for small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and birds. b. Land divisions for parcels within or adjacent to an ESHA shall only be allowed if each new lot being created, except for open space lots, is capable of being developed without building in any ESHA or ESHA buffer and without any need for impacts to ESHAs related to fuel modification for fire safety purposes. c. Site plans and landscaping shall be designed to protect ESHAs. Landscaping, screening, or vegetated buffers shall retain, salvage, and/or reestablish vegetation that supports wildlife habitat whenever feasible. Development within or adjacent to wildlife habitat networks shall incorporate design techniques that protect, support, and enhance wildlife habitat values. Planting of nonnative, invasive species shall not be allowed in ESHAs and buffer areas adjacent to ESHAs. d. All new development shall be sited and designed so as to minimize grading, alteration of natural landforms and physical features, and vegetation clearance in order to reduce or avoid soil erosion, creek siltation, increased runoff, and reduced infiltration of stormwater and to prevent net increases in baseline	**Consistent.** See discussion under policy CE 1.6.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
flows for any receiving water body. e. Light and glare from new development shall be controlled and directed away from wildlife habitats. Exterior night lighting shall be minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures, shielded, and directed away from ESHAs. f. All new development should minimize potentially significant noise impacts on special-status species in adjacent ESHAs. g. All new development shall be sited and designed to minimize the need for fuel modification, or weed abatement, for fire safety in order to preserve native and/or nonnative supporting habitats. Development shall use fire-resistant materials and incorporate alternative measures, such as firewalls and landscaping techniques, that will reduce or avoid fuel modification activities. h. The timing of grading and construction activities shall be controlled to minimize potential disruption of wildlife during critical time periods such as nesting or breeding seasons. i. Grading, earthmoving, and vegetation clearance adjacent to an ESHA shall be prohibited during the rainy season, generally from November 1 to March 31, except as follows: 1) where erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, or installation of geofabrics have been incorporated into the project and approved in advance by the City; 2) where necessary to protect or enhance the ESHA itself; or 3) where necessary to remediate hazardous flooding or geologic conditions that endanger public health and safety. j. In areas that are not adjacent to ESHAs, where grading may be allowed during the rainy season, erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, and installation of geofabrics shall be implemented prior to and concurrent with all grading operations.	
CE 3.3: Site-Specific Wetland Delineations. In considering development proposals where an initial site inventory or reconnaissance indicates the presence or potential for wetland species or indicators, the City shall require the submittal of a detailed biological study of the site, with the addition of a delineation of all wetland areas on the project site. Wetland delineations shall be based on the definitions contained in Section 13577(b) of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. A preponderance of hydric soils or a preponderance of wetland indicator species will be considered presumptive evidence of wetland conditions. At a minimum, the delineation report shall contain: a. A map at a scale of 1":200' or larger showing topographic contours. b. An aerial photo base map. c. A map at a scale of 1":200' or larger with polygons	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, no wetlands are located on site. Rincon Consultants completed a biological evaluation in 2015 and no wetlands were identified on the site.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
delineating all wetland areas, polygons delineating all areas of vegetation with a preponderance of wetland indicator species, and the locations of sampling points. d. A description of the survey methods and surface indicators used for delineating the wetland polygons. e. A statement of the qualifications of the person preparing the wetland delineation.	
CE 5.2: Protection of Native Grasslands. In addition to the provisions of Policy CE 1, the following standards shall apply: a. For purposes of this policy, existing native grasslands are defined as an area where native grassland species comprise 10 percent or more of the total relative plant cover. Native grasslands that are dominated by perennial bunch grasses tend to be patchy. Where a high density of separate small patches occurs in an area, the whole area shall be delineated as native grasslands. b. To the maximum extent feasible, development shall avoid impacts to native grasslands that would destroy, isolate, interrupt, or cause a break in continuous habitat that would (1) disrupt associated animal movement patterns and seed dispersal, or (2) increase vulnerability to weed invasions. c. Removal or disturbance to a patch of native grasses less than 0.25 acre that is clearly isolated and is not part of a significant native grassland or an integral component of a larger ecosystem may be allowed. Removal or disturbance to restoration areas shall not be allowed. d. Impacts to protected native grasslands shall be minimized by providing at least a 10-foot buffer that is restored with native species around the perimeter of the delineated native grassland area. e. Removal of nonnative and invasive exotic species shall be allowed; revegetation shall be with plants or seeds collected within the same watershed whenever feasible.	**Consistent.** Vegetation at the Project site consists of coyote brush scrub or ruderal/disturbed areas that consist overwhelmingly of non-native grasses and forbs. Evidence demonstrating that the coyote brush scrub at the site does not meet the definition of an ESHA is provided above under Section 4.3.1.b. The purple needle grass observed within the upland mustard area on-site does not constitute sensitive native grassland pursuant to the City's General Plan and Environmental Review Guidelines and Environmental Thresholds Manual, since it was required to be planted for erosion control following approved 2013 grading. No plant communities within the Project site are considered sensitive. The Project would not affect native grasses.
CE 8.1: ESHA Designation. Requisite habitats for individual occurrences of special-status plants and animals, including candidate species for listing under the state and federal endangered species acts, California species of special concern, California Native Plant Society List 1B plants, and other species protected under provisions of the California Fish and Game Code shall be preserved and protected, and their occurrences, including habitat requirements, shall be designated as ESHAs. These habitats include, but are not limited to, the following: a. Special-status plant species such as Santa Barbara honeysuckle (*Lonicera subspicata var. subspicata*), southern tarplant (*Centromadia parryi ssp. australis*) and blackflowered figwort (*Scrophularia atrata*). b. Nesting and roosting areas for various species of	**Consistent with Mitigation.** Based on survey results (Rincon 2015), special status plant and wildlife species have a low potential to occur on-site and a low probability of being impacted by the Project. Mitigation would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, wildlife movement and off-site sensitive communities. See discussion in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources.*

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
raptors such as Cooper's hawks (*Accipiter cooperii*), red-tailed hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*), white-tailed kites (*Elanus leucurus*), and turkey vultures (*Cathartes aura*).	
CE 8.2: Protection of Habitat Areas. All development shall be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance of, or adverse impacts to, special-status species and their habitats, including spawning, nesting, rearing, roosting, foraging, and other elements of the required habitats.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** See discussion under policy CE 8.1.
CE 8.3: Site-Specific Biological Resources Study. Any areas not designated on Figure 4-1 that meet the ESHA criteria for the resources specified in CE 8.1 shall be accorded the same protections as if the area were shown on the figure. Proposals for development on sites where ESHAs are shown on the figure, or where there is probable cause to believe that an ESHA may exist, shall be required to provide the City with a site-specific biological study that includes the following information: a. A base map that delineates topographic lines, parcel boundaries, and adjacent roads. b. A vegetation map that 1) identifies trees or other sites that are existing or historical nests for the species of concern and 2) delineates other elements of the habitat such as roosting sites and foraging areas. c. A detailed map that shows the conclusions regarding the boundary, precise location and extent, or current status of the ESHA based on substantial evidence provided in the biological studies. d. A written report that summarizes the survey methods, data, observations, findings, and recommendations.	**Consistent.** Biological Resources Assessments were conducted for the Project site by Dudek in 2014 and Rincon Consultants, Inc. in 2015. No ESHAs were found on-site.
CE 8.4: Buffer Areas for Special-Status Species. Development shall be designed to provide a 100-foot buffer around active and historical nest sites for protected species of raptors when feasible. In existing developed areas, the width of the buffer may be reduced to correspond to the actual width of the buffer for adjacent development. If the biological study described in Subpolicy CE 8.3 determines that an active raptor nest site exists on the subject property, whenever feasible no vegetation clearing, grading, construction, or other development activity shall be allowed within a 300-foot radius of the nest site during the nesting and fledging season.	**Consistent.** See discussions under Policies CE 8.1, CE 8.2, and CE 8.3.
CE 9.1: Definition of Protected Trees. New development shall be sited and designed to preserve the following species of native trees: oaks (Quercus spp.), walnut (Juglans californica), sycamore (Platanus racemosa), cottonwood (Populus spp.), willows (Salix spp.), or other native trees that are not otherwise protected in ESHAs, unless as otherwise allowed in CE 9.	**Consistent.** No trees are present on the site.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
CE 9.2: Tree Protection Plan. Applications for new development on sites containing protected native trees shall include a report by a certified arborist or other qualified expert. The report shall include an inventory of native trees and a Tree Protection Plan.	**Consistent.** No trees are present on the site. No Tree Protection Plan would be required.
CE 9.4: Tree Protection Standards. The following impacts to native trees and woodlands should be avoided in the design of projects: 1) removal of native trees; 2) fragmentation of habitat; 3) removal of understory; 4) disruption of the canopy, and 5) alteration of drainage patterns. Structures, including roads and driveways, should be sited to prevent any encroachment into the protection zone of any protected tree and to provide an adequate buffer outside of the protection zone of individual native trees in order to allow for future growth. Tree protection standards shall be detailed in the Tree Protection Ordinance called for in CE-IA-4.	**Consistent.** No trees are present on the site.
CE 9.5: Mitigation of Impacts to Native Trees. Where the removal of mature native trees cannot be avoided through the implementation of project alternatives or where development encroaches into the protected zone and could threaten the continued viability of the tree(s), mitigation measures shall include, at a minimum, the planting of replacement trees on site, if suitable area exists on the subject site, or offsite if suitable onsite area is unavailable, consistent with the Tree Protection Ordinance (see also CE-IA-4). The Tree Protection Ordinance shall establish the mitigation ratios for replacement trees for every tree removed. Where onsite mitigation is not feasible, offsite mitigation shall be provided by planting of replacement trees at a site within the same watershed. If the tree removal occurs at a site within the Coastal Zone, any offsite mitigation area shall also be located within the Coastal Zone. Minimum sizes for various species of replacement trees shall be established in the Tree Protection Ordinance. Mitigation sites shall be monitored for a period of 5 years. The City may require replanting of trees that do not survive.	**Consistent.** No significant native trees are present on the site.
CE 10.1: New Development and Water Quality. New development shall not result in the degradation of the water quality of groundwater basins or surface waters; surface waters include the ocean, lagoons, creeks, ponds, and wetlands. Urban runoff pollutants shall not be discharged or deposited such that they adversely affect these resources.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** Implementation of the existing U.S. Army Corps or Engineers permit and NPDES requirements and mitigation for post-construction monitoring would ensure that the Project would not adversely affect surface waters. As described in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, the Project would not result in a reduction in runoff that would result in any hydrological interruption to in Los Carneros Wetland or affect the existing hydrological process. Also refer to Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.
CE 10.2: Siting and Design of New Development. New development shall be sited and designed to protect water quality and minimize impacts to coastal waters by incorporating measures designed to ensure the following: a. Protection of areas that provide important water quality benefits, areas necessary to maintain riparian	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The site does not contain riparian or aquatic resources. Mitigation for post-construction monitoring would ensure that the Project would not adversely affect surface waters. See Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
and aquatic biota, and areas susceptible to erosion and sediment loss. b. Limiting increases in areas covered by impervious surfaces. c. Limiting the area where land disturbances occur, such as clearing of vegetation, cut-and-fill, and grading, to reduce erosion and sediment loss. d. Limiting disturbance of natural drainage features and vegetation.	
CE 10.3: Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management. New development shall be designed to minimize impacts to water quality from increased runoff volumes and discharges of pollutants from nonpoint sources to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the City's Storm Water Management Plan or a subsequent Storm Water Management Plan approved by the City and the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. Post construction structural BMPs shall be designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter stormwater runoff in accordance with applicable standards as required by law. Examples of BMPs include, but are not limited to, the following: a. Retention and detention basins. b. Vegetated swales. c. Infiltration galleries or injection wells. d. Use of permeable paving materials. e. Mechanical devices such as oil-water separators and filters. f. Revegetation of graded or disturbed areas. g. Other measures as identified in the City's adopted Storm Water Management Plan and other City-approved regulations.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project includes construction of drainage infrastructure. Mitigation is required to ensure the infrastructure is maintained over the life of the Project and minimize impacts to water quality and site drainage. See Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.
CE 10.4: New Facilities. New bridges, roads, culverts, and outfalls shall not cause or contribute to creek bank erosion or creek or wetland siltation and shall include BMPs to minimize impacts to water quality. BMPs shall include construction phase erosion control, polluted runoff control plans, and soil stabilization techniques. Where space is available, dispersal of sheet flow from roads into vegetated areas, or other onsite infiltration practices, shall be incorporated into the project design.	**Consistent.** See discussion under CE 10.3 and Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.
CE 10.6: Stormwater Management Requirements. The following requirements shall apply to specific types of development: a. Commercial and multiple-family development shall use BMPs to control polluted runoff from structures, parking, and loading areas. b. Restaurants shall incorporate BMPs designed to minimize runoff of oil and grease, solvents, phosphates, and suspended solids to the storm drain system. c. Gasoline stations, car washes, and automobile repair facilities shall incorporate BMPs designed to minimize runoff of oil and grease, solvents, car battery acid,	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project would incorporate appropriate BMPs for structures and parking areas. Mitigation is proposed for a Maintenance Agreement to maintain new storm water infrastructure. See Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
engine coolants, and gasoline to the stormwater system. d. Outdoor materials storage areas shall be designed to incorporate BMPs to prevent stormwater contamination from stored materials. e. Trash storage areas shall be designed using BMPs to prevent stormwater contamination by loose trash and debris.	
CE 10.7: Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans. New development shall protect the absorption, purifying, and retentive functions of natural systems that exist on the site. Drainage Plans shall be designed to complement and use existing drainage patterns and systems, where feasible, conveying drainage from the site in a nonerosive manner. Disturbed or degraded natural drainage systems shall be restored where feasible, except where there are geologic or public safety concerns. Proposals for new development shall include the following: a. A Construction-Phase Erosion Control and Stormwater Management Plan that specifies the BMPs that will be implemented to minimize erosion and sedimentation; provide adequate sanitary and waste disposal facilities; and prevent contamination of runoff by construction practices, materials, and chemicals. b. A Post-Development-Phase Drainage and Stormwater Management Plan that specifies the BMPs—including site design methods, source controls, and treatment controls—that will be implemented to minimize polluted runoff after construction. This plan shall include monitoring and maintenance plans for the BMP measures.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project would comply with the requirements of approved drainage and stormwater management plans. Mitigation is proposed for a Maintenance Agreement to maintain new storm water infrastructure. See Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.
CE 10.8: Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities. New development shall be required to provide ongoing maintenance of BMP measures where maintenance is necessary for their effective operation. The applicant and/or owner, including successors in interest, shall be responsible for all structural treatment controls and devices as follows: a. All structural BMPs shall be inspected, cleaned, and repaired when necessary prior to September 30th of each year. b. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance should be performed after storms as needed throughout the rainy season, with any major repairs completed prior to the beginning of the next rainy season. c. Public streets and parking lots shall be swept as needed and financially feasible to remove debris and contaminated residue. d. The homeowners association, or other private owner, shall be responsible for sweeping of private streets and parking lots.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The applicant would be responsible for maintenance of BMPs in accordance with an approved stormwater management plan. Mitigation is proposed for a Maintenance Agreement to maintain new storm water infrastructure. See Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
CE 12.1: Land Use Compatibility. The designation of land uses on the Land Use Plan Map (Figure 2-1) and the review of new development shall ensure that siting of any new sensitive receptors provides for adequate buffers from existing sources of emissions of air pollutants or odors. Sensitive receptors are a facility or land use that includes members of the population sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Sensitive receptors may include children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. If a development that is a sensitive receptor is proposed within 500 feet of U.S. 101 an analysis of mobile source emissions and associated health risks shall be required. Such developments shall be required to provide an adequate setback from the highway and, if necessary, identify design mitigation measures to reduce health risks to acceptable levels.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project would place sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the U.S. 101 corridor. A Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was conducted by Rincon Consultants, Inc. to study the potential long-term health risks associated with exposure of site residents to diesel particulates from U.S. 101 and the UPRR (refer to Appendix C). The HRA found that site residents would not be exposed to acute (short-term) and chronic health risks due to exposure to air pollutants from U.S. 101 and UPRR. However, the HRA found that health (cancer) risks would be above applicable thresholds. Mitigation Measure AQ-4 would provide for the removal of particulates before they enter the indoor environment, thereby reducing the overall exposure of individual residents to below applicable cancer risk thresholds. With this reduction in exposure, health risks to future residents would be below significance thresholds.
CE 12.2: Control of Air Emissions from New Development. The following shall apply to reduction of air emissions from new development: a. Any development proposal that has the potential to increase emissions of air pollutants shall be referred to the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District for comments and recommended conditions prior to final action by the City. b. All new commercial and industrial sources shall be required to use the best-available air pollution control technology. Emissions control equipment shall be properly maintained to ensure efficient and effective operation. c. Wood-burning fireplace installations in new residential development shall be limited to low- emitting State- and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-certified fireplace inserts and woodstoves, pellet stoves, or natural gas fireplaces. In locations near monarch butterfly ESHAs, fireplaces shall be limited to natural gas. d. Adequate buffers between new sources and sensitive receptors shall be required. e. Any permit required by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District shall be obtained prior to issuance of final development clearance by the City.	**Consistent.** The Project was referred to the ACPD for comments. The Project would generate long-term Project emissions primarily associated with Project-generated traffic; however, impacts would be below APCD thresholds. The Project does not involve any commercial or industrial uses or any wood-burning fireplace installations.
CE 12.3: Control of Emissions during Grading and Construction. Construction site emissions shall be controlled by using the following measures: a. Watering active construction areas to reduce windborne emissions. b. Covering trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials. c. Paving or applying nontoxic solid stabilizers on unpaved access roads and temporary parking areas. d. Hydroseeding inactive construction areas. e. Enclosing or covering open material stockpiles. f. Revegetating graded areas immediately upon	**Consistent.** Construction of the Project is expected to occur over 36 months, including the required pre-construction soil export. Estimated preliminary Project grading would include approximately 178,700 cubic yards of cut and 15,500 cubic yards of fill and approximately 115,000 cubic yards of soil would be exported off-site before construction of the Project. Ozone precursors NO_X and ROC, as well as CO and diesel exhaust PM, would be emitted by the operation of construction equipment such as graders, backhoes, and generators, while fugitive dust (PM_{10}) would be emitted by activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation, road construction and building construction. The pre-

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
completion of work.	construction soil export would proceed according to one of two potential scenarios – one based on smaller (9 cubic yard) haul trucks and another based on larger (20 cubic yard) haul trucks. Scenario 1 includes 25,556 one-way haul truck trips, worker trips, and operation of on-site equipment and Scenario 2 includes 11,500 one-way haul truck trips, worker trips, and operation of on-site equipment. The Project would include standard dust control measures in accordance with APCD requirements and emissions would not exceed APCD thresholds.
CE 12.4: Minimizing Air Pollution from Transportation Sources. The following measures are designed to reduce air pollution from transportation sources: a. Hollister Corridor Mixed Use. The Land Use Plan for the Hollister Corridor is designed to: 1) Provide new housing near existing workplaces and commercial services to encourage short trips by foot and bicycle. 2) Provide new housing near existing bus routes with convenient and high frequency service. 3) Provide new housing near the US-101 ramps so as to minimize the length of auto trips on streets within the community. 4) Provide new housing at locations near the existing Amtrak line, which could be considered for commuter rail service in the future. b. Other Land Use Policies: The following land use policies are designed to reduce demand for auto travel and promote less polluting modes such as bus transit, walking, and bicycling: 1) Clustering of moderate density housing and incorporation of residential apartments on upper floors of buildings, particularly in Goleta Old Town. 2) Integration of new housing into existing neighborhood commercial centers. 3) Emphasis on moderate density residential development rather than low density sprawl. 4) Integrating pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities into new development. 5) Establishment of a fixed urban boundary to reduce sprawl outward from the existing urbanized area. c. Transportation Policies: The following transportation measures are designed to lower emissions of air pollutants by promoting efficient use of the street system: 1) Fine-tuning of intersections and their operations to minimize delays. 2) Coordinated signal timing to improve traffic flow. 3) Promotion of improved transit services. Creation of a linked pedestrian circulation system. 4) Provision of a bikeway system. 5) Encouragement of employer-based trip reduction measures such as subsidized bus fares, flexible work hours, vanpools, and similar measures.	**Consistent.** The Project is on an infill site located in the Central Hollister Residential Development Area as specified in the General Plan. This area is designated by the General Plan and zoning regulations for medium density residential development in an area that enables a choice of alternative modes of travel, such as biking, walking, and public transit. The site is located near retail/commercial centers and job opportunities, thus potentially reducing the distance that residents have to drive to work and for other activities. The Project site is located close to bus lines along Hollister Avenue, approximately 0.5 miles to the south, thus providing convenient access to transit. Additionally, the site is located in proximity to the U S 101 on- and off-ramps at Los Carneros Road, and the Amtrak Station located 0.3 mile east of the site. Although direct access to the Amtrak Station is not currently available, access would be available via Hollister Avenue to La Patera Lane. Further, emissions from Project-generated traffic would not exceed APCD thresholds.
CE 13.1: Energy Efficiency in Existing and New Residential development. The City shall promote the following practices in existing and new residential construction: a. Retrofitting of existing residential structures to reduce energy consumption and costs to owners and tenants	**Consistent.** All new residential buildings must comply with Chapter 15.13 of the Goleta Municipal Code, "Energy Efficiency Standards," which require energy savings measures that exceed the 2010 California Energy Code by 15%. The Project is required to meet these standards for building

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
is encouraged. These retrofits may include: increased insulation, weather stripping, caulking of windows and doors, low-flow showerheads, and other similar improvements. Master metering is discouraged, and conversions to individual metering where practicable is preferred. b. The City shall enforce the State's residential energy conservation building standards set forth in Title 24 through its plan check and building permit issuance processes. c. New residential development and additions to existing homes shall be designed to provide a maximum solar orientation when appropriate, and shall not adversely affect the solar access of adjacent residential structures. Use of solar water heating systems, operational skylights, passive solar heating, and waste heat recovery systems is encouraged.	permits.
CE 13.3: Use of Renewable Energy Sources. For new projects, the City encourages the incorporation of renewable energy sources. Consideration shall be given to incorporation of renewable energy sources that do not have adverse effects on the environment or on any adjacent residential uses. The following considerations shall apply: a. Solar access shall be protected in accordance with the state Solar Rights Act (AB 2473). South wall and rooftop access should be achievable in low-density residential areas, while rooftop access should be possible in other areas. b. New development shall not impair the performance of existing solar energy systems. Compensatory or mitigation measures may be considered in instances where there is no reasonable alternative. c. Alternative energy sources are encouraged, provided that the technology does not contribute to noise, visual, air quality, or other potential impacts on nearby uses and neighborhoods.	**Consistent.** The Project does not incorporate renewable energy sources at this time. However, this policy is not a requirement and the Project design does not preclude future use of renewable energy sources, such as solar.
CE 15.3: Water Conservation for New Development. In order to minimize water use, all new development shall use low water use plumbing fixtures, water-conserving landscaping, low flow irrigation, and reclaimed water for exterior landscaping, where appropriate.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** As described in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, the Project would receive water service from the Goleta Water District (GWD). In accordance with GWD's Water Conservation Plan from 2010, the Project also would be required to incorporate feasible Best Management Practices (BMPs) into its water system design. Such practices include the use of water conserving fixtures and water efficient landscape and irrigation.
SAFETY ELEMENT	
SE 1.3: Site-Specific Hazards Studies. Applications for new development shall consider exposure of the new development to coastal and other hazards. Where appropriate, an application for new development shall include a geologic/soils/geotechnical study and any other studies that identify geologic hazards affecting the proposed project site and any necessary mitigation	**Consistent.** A Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared for the site by Earth Systems Pacific in 2014. As described in Section 4.5, *Geology and Soils*, the soils on the site are prone to liquefaction and expansion. Mitigation has been identified to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
measures. The study report shall contain a statement certifying that the project site is suitable for the proposed development and that the development will be safe from geologic hazards. The report shall be prepared and signed by a licensed certified engineering geologist or geotechnical engineer and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the City.	
SE 1.9: Reduction of Radon Hazards. The City shall require the consideration of radon hazards for all new construction and require testing of radon levels for construction of homes and buildings located in areas subject to moderate or high potential for radon gas levels exceeding 4.0 picocuries as shown on maps produced by the California Division of Mines and Geology. The City shall require new homes to use radon-resistant construction where needed based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidelines.	**Consistent.** According to the California Division of Mines and Geology radon mapping, the Project site is located in an area with low potential for indoor radon levels above 4.0 picocuries per liter (Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties Radon Mapping, 1997).
SE 4.4: Setback from Faults. New development shall not be located closer than 50 feet to any active or potentially active fault line to reduce potential damage from surface rupture. Nonstructural development may be allowed in such areas, depending on how such nonstructural development would withstand or respond to fault rupture or other seismic damage	**Consistent.** The closest Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake fault is over 20 miles to the southeast (Pitas Point/Red Mountain Faults). The More Ranch Fault is located approximately 1 mile south of the Project site, and is characterized as active in the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan Seismic Safety and Safety Element. Therefore, there are no active or potentially active faults on or within 50 feet of the Project site.
SE 4.11: Geotechnical Report Required. The City shall require geotechnical and/or geologic reports as part of the application for construction of habitable structures and essential services buildings (as defined by the building code) sited in areas having a medium-to-high potential for liquefaction and seismic settlement. The geotechnical study shall evaluate the potential for liquefaction and/or seismic-related settlement to impact the development, and identify appropriate structural-design parameters to mitigate potential hazards.	**Consistent.** See discussion under policy SE 1.3.
SE 5.2: Evaluation of Soil-Related Hazards. The City shall require structural evaluation reports with appropriate mitigation measures to be provided for all new subdivisions, and for discretionary projects proposing new nonresidential buildings or substantial additions. Depending on the conclusions of the structural evaluation report, soil and geological reports may also be required. Such studies shall evaluate the potential for soil expansion, compression, and collapse to impact the development; they shall also identify mitigation to reduce these potential impacts, if needed.	**Consistent.** See discussion under policy SE 1.3.
SE 6.4: Avoidance of Flood Hazard Areas. The City shall discourage any new intensive development in any flood hazard area. Similarly, the City shall require appropriate flood mitigation for intensification of existing development in any flood-prone area. The City shall not approve development within areas designated as the 100-year floodplain that would obstruct flood flow (such as construction in the designated floodway), displace floodwaters onto other property, or be subject to flood	**Consistent.** The Project site is not located in the 100-year floodplain.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
damage. The City shall not allow development that will create or worsen drainage problems.	
SE 7.1: Fire Prevention and Response Measures for New Development. New development and redevelopment projects shall be designed and constructed in accordance with National Fire Protection Association standards to minimize fire hazards, with special attention given to fuel management and improved access in areas with higher fire risk, with access or water supply deficiencies, or beyond a 5-minute response time.	**Consistent.** The Project would be built in accordance with all fire protection standards and is within the 5-minute response zone. The nearest fire station, which serves the Project site, is Fire Station 14, located at 320 N. Los Carneros Road, approximately ½ mile north of the Project site.
SE 7.2: Review of New Development. Applications for new or expanded development shall be reviewed by appropriate Santa Barbara County Fire Department personnel to ensure they are designed in a manner that reduces the risk of loss due to fire. Such review shall include consideration of the adequacy of "defensible space" around structures at risk; access for fire suppression equipment, water supplies, construction standards; and vegetation clearance. Secondary access may be required and shall be considered on a case-by case basis. The City shall encourage built-in fire suppression systems such as sprinklers, particularly in high-risk or high-value areas.	**Consistent.** The Project has been reviewed by the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District. The Fire District provided specifications for elevators, driveways, street signs, fire hydrants, a new fire lane, fire extinguishers, automatic sprinkler system, automatic fire or emergency alarm system, access way entrance gates, requirement for a Knox Box at entry, and payment of development impact fees. The Project would be consistent with the Fire Departments comments.
SE 7.5: Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems. The City shall require the installation of automatic fire sprinklers for; a) all new buildings that have a total floor area of 5,000 square feet or more and b) any existing building proposed for remodeling or an addition, which, upon completion of the remodel or addition, will have a total floor area of 5,000 square feet or more. The 5,000-square-foot threshold cited in criteria a) and b), above, shall be reduced to 1,000 square feet for any building zoned or used for commercial or industrial purposes if such building is within 100 feet of any residentially zoned parcel.	**Consistent.** The Project has been reviewed by the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and would be subject to standard Department requirements mandating installation of fire sprinklers.
SE 10.5: Restriction on Residential Development near Hazardous Facilities. The City shall consider the exposure of new development to risk of hazardous materials accidents and exposure as a part of its project and environmental review processes and require any appropriate mitigation measures. The City shall not allow any new residential development near hazardous facilities if these residences would be exposed to unacceptable and unmitigable risk.	**Consistent.** Upon adoption of the General Plan, the City determined that a residential land use/zoning designation was appropriate for the Project site. As discussed in Section 4.7*, Hazards/Risk of Upset*, residents at the Project site may be exposed to a low -to extremely low risk of upset due to the potential release of hazardous materials from nearby businesses, truck accidents on U.S. 101, train derailments on the UPRR rail line, and a high-pressure natural gas pipeline on Hollister Avenue (as discussed in Section 4.7, the estimated risk of upset from the various potential hazards is substantially less than once in 1,000 years). Federal, state and local regulations place strict requirements on the users of hazardous materials to ensure that the risk of upset is extremely low. Therefore, although this EIR conservatively identifies the risk of upset impact as Class I, significant and unavoidable, the various upset hazards present in the site vicinity do not constitute an unacceptable risk for residences to be placed on the Project site.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
VISUAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT	
VH 1.1: Scenic Resources. An essential aspect of Goleta's character is derived from the various scenic resources within and around the city. Views of these resources from public and private areas contribute to the overall attractiveness of the city and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents, visitors, and workforce. The City shall support the protection and preservation of the following scenic resources: a. The open waters of the Pacific Ocean/Santa Barbara Channel, with the Channel Islands visible in the distance. b. Goleta's Pacific shoreline, including beaches, dunes, lagoons, coastal bluffs, and open costal mesas. c. Goleta and Devereux Sloughs. d. Creeks and the vegetation associated with their riparian corridors. e. Agricultural areas, including orchards, lands in vegetable or other crop production, and fallow agricultural lands. f. Lake Los Carneros and the surrounding woodlands. g. Prominent natural landforms, such as the foothills and the Santa Ynez Mountains.	**Inconsistent.** As described in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, The Project site does not include scenic resources identified in Policy VH 1.1. The Project would not obstruct southward scenic views of the Pacific Ocean from the Los Carneros Road overpass. However, the Project would partially obstruct a designated view corridor of the Santa Ynez Mountains northward from S. Los Carneros Road at Calle Koral. As described in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the simulated three-story buildings in the southwest portion of the site would rise to a level just below the ridgeline of the Santa Ynez Mountains, obstructing scenic views of the bulk of mountains to the northeast from the perspective of northbound motorists on S. Los Carneros Road. This has been identified as a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact.
VH 1.4: Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views. Views of mountains and foothills from public areas shall be protected. View protection associated with development that may affect views of mountains or foothills should be accomplished first through site selection and then by use of design alternatives that enhance, rather than obstruct or degrade, such views. To minimize structural intrusion into the skyline, the following development practices shall be used where appropriate: a. Limitations on the height and size of structures. b. Limitations on the height of exterior walls (including retaining walls) and fences. c. Stepping of buildings so that the heights of building elements are lower near the street and increase with distance from the public viewing area. Increased setbacks along major roadways to preserve views and create an attractive visual corridor. d. Downcast, fully shielded, full cut off lighting of the minimum intensity needed for the purpose. e. Limitations on removal of native vegetation. f. Use of landscaping for screening purposes and/or minimizing view blockage as applicable. g. Revegetation of disturbed areas. h. Limitations on the use of reflective materials and colors for roofs, walls (including retaining walls), and fences. i. Selection of colors and materials that harmonize with the surrounding landscape. j. Clustering of building sites and structures.	**Inconsistent.** As described in VH 1.1, above, and Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the Project, which changing the existing view, would not obstruct southward scenic views of the Pacific Ocean from the Los Carneros Road overpass. However, the Project would partially obstruct a designated view corridor of the Santa Ynez Mounts northward from S. Los Carneros Road at Calle Koral. This has been identified as a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
VH 2.2: Preservation of Scenic Corridors. The aesthetic qualities of scenic corridors shall be preserved through retention of the general character of significant natural features; views of the ocean, foothills, and mountainous areas; and open space associated with recreational and agricultural areas including orchards, prominent vegetation, and historic structures. If landscaping is used to add visual interest or for screening, care should be taken to prevent a wall-like appearance. Bridges, culverts, drainage ditches and other roadway ancillary elements should be appropriately designed; side slopes and earthen berms adjacent to roadways should be natural in appearance.	**Inconsistent.** With regard to scenic views identified in the General Plan, including Figure 6-1, the Project development will be visible primarily from the Los Carneros Road Overpass, the U.S. 101 Los Carneros southbound on-ramp, and the Los Carneros Road scenic view corridor. Due to the elevation change between the Project site and the overpass/ramp, scenic and coastal views from these viewpoints, while changed, would not be obstructed by the Project. As described in Impact AES-1, the Project would not obstruct southward scenic views of the Pacific Ocean from the Los Carneros Road overpass. However, the Project would partially obstruct a designated view corridor of the Santa Ynez Mounts northward from S. Los Carneros Road at Calle Koral. This has been identified as a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact. See discussions under Policies VH 1.1, VH 1.4, and Section 4.1, *Aesthetics.* As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the massing and architectural style of the proposed apartment buildings would be largely compatible with surrounding development. The Project also includes a preliminary landscaping plan, as well as on-site amenities would provide residents with passive and active recreation opportunities including an activity trail, benches, barbecue area, picnic tables, 14 bicycle parking pads throughout the property, level turf play area, and native landscaping.
VH 2.3: Development Projects Along Scenic Corridors. Development adjacent to scenic corridors should not degrade or obstruct views of scenic areas. To ensure visual compatibility with the scenic qualities, the following practices shall be used, where appropriate: a. Incorporate natural features in design. b. Use landscaping for screening purposes and/or for minimizing view blockage as applicable. c. Minimize vegetation removal. d. Limit the height and size of structures. e. Cluster building sites and structures. f. Limit grading for development including structures, access roads, and driveways. Minimize the length of access roads and driveways and follow the natural contour of the land. g. Preserve historical structures or sites. h. Plant and preserve trees. i. Minimize use of signage. j. Provide site-specific visual assessments, including use of story poles. k. Provide a similar level of architectural detail on all elevations visible from scenic corridors. l. Place existing overhead utilities and all new utilities underground. m. Establish setbacks along major roadways to help protect views and create an attractive scenic corridor. On flat sites, step the heights of buildings so that the height of building elements is lower close to the street	**Inconsistent.** See discussion under policy VH 2.2.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
and increases with distance from the street.	
VH 3.1: Community Design Character. The visual character of Goleta is derived from the natural landscape and the built environment. The city's agricultural heritage, open spaces, views of natural features, established low-density residential neighborhoods, and small-scale development with few visually prominent buildings contribute to this character. Residential, commercial, and industrial development should acknowledge and respect the desired aspects of Goleta's visual character and make a positive contribution to the city through exemplary design.	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics,* landscaping and building design would respect Goleta's visual character and the surrounding residential development. The proposed landscape design is intended to blend with the existing Willow Springs Apartments by using a similar plant palette and two-rail fence along Camino Vista. Additionally, Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain consistent with adjacent development. The massing and architectural style of the proposed apartment buildings would be compatible with surrounding development. The Project design would enhance Goleta's overall visual character using building forms that are typical of the neighborhood and adding distinction with architectural elements. See the discussion of Policy LU 1.8, Policy VH 1.4 and EIR Section 4.1 *Aesthetics*.
VH 3.2: Neighborhood Identity. The unique qualities and character of each neighborhood shall be preserved and strengthened. Neighborhood context and scale shall be maintained. New development shall be compatible with existing architectural styles of adjacent development, except where poor quality design exists.	**Consistent.** The proposed apartment buildings would be compatible with adjacent residential buildings. Both the Project and adjacent residential development are multi-family housing made up of buildings two and three stories tall. The Project site plan corresponds with the neighborhood context and the structures are not out of scale with the area. Additionally, architectural elements in the building design, such as the proposed severe, rectangular appearance, provide a distinction for the on-site development. See Section 4.1, *Aesthetics,* and Policies LU 1.8, VH 1.4. and VH3.1
VH 3.3: Site Design. The City's visual character shall be enhanced through appropriate site design. Site plans shall provide for buildings, structures, and uses that are subordinate to the natural topography, existing vegetation, and drainage courses; adequate landscaping; adequate vehicular circulation and parking; adequate pedestrian circulation; and provision and/or maintenance of solar access.	**Consistent.** The Project would remove 115,000 cubic yards of fill soil from the site, restoring the natural topography of the site. See Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, for further details. The Project would provide parking as required by the City Code and site access would be sufficient (see traffic study in Appendix I).
VH 3.4: Building Design. The city's visual character shall be enhanced through development of structures that are appropriate in scale and orientation and that use high-quality, durable materials. Structures shall incorporate architectural styles, landscaping, and amenities that are compatible with and complement surrounding development.	**Consistent.** See discussions under Policies LU 1.8, VH 1.4, VH 3.1 and VH 3.2, and in section 4.1, *Aesthetics.*
VH 4.4: Multifamily Residential Areas. In addition to the items listed in Subpolicy VH 4.3, the following standards shall be applicable to multifamily residential development (see related Subpolicies LU 1.9 and LU 2.3): a. Roof lines should be varied to create visual interest. b. Large building masses should be avoided, and where feasible, several smaller buildings are encouraged rather than one large structure. Multiple structures should be clustered to maximize open space. c. Multifamily residential developments shall include common open space that is appropriately located, is	**Consistent.** The Project includes 8 residential buildings with varied rooflines (flat and gabled) and architectural details including balconies. Based on the preliminary landscaping plan, extensive landscaping also would soften the development's mass and scale. The proposed landscape design is intended to blend with the existing Willow Springs Apartments by using a similar plant palette and two-rail fence along Camino Vista. Additionally, Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
functional, and provides amenities for different age groups. c. Where multifamily developments are located next to less dense existing residential development, open space should provide a buffer along the perimeter. d. Individual units shall be distinguishable from each other. Long continuous wall planes and parking corridors shall be avoided. Three dimensional façades are encouraged. e. Extensive landscaping is encouraged to soften building edges and provide a transition between adjacent properties. f. Storage areas for recycling and trash shall be covered and conveniently located for all residents and screened with landscaping or walls. g. Safe and aesthetically pleasing pedestrian access that is physically separated from vehicular access shall be provided in all new residential developments whenever feasible. Transitional spaces, including landscape or hardscape elements, should be provided from the pedestrian access to the main entrance. Main entrances should not open directly onto driveways or streets. Safe bicycle access should be considered in all residential developments.	consistent with adjacent development. Pedestrian access would also be provided throughout the site and landscaping would be provided along site boundaries to screen the site from nearby roadways. Storage areas for trash and recycling bins would be screened.
VH 4.9: Landscape Design. Landscaping shall be considered and designed as an integral part of development, not relegated to remaining portions of a site following placement of buildings, parking, or vehicular access. Landscaping shall conform to the following standards: a. Landscaping that conforms to the natural topography and protects existing specimen trees is encouraged. b. Any specimen trees removed shall be replaced with a similar size tree or with a tree deemed appropriate by the City. c. Landscaping shall emphasize the use of native and drought-tolerant vegetation and should include a range and density of plantings including trees, shrubs, groundcover, and vines of various heights and species. d. The use of invasive plants shall be prohibited. e. Landscaping shall be incorporated into the design to soften building masses, reinforce pedestrian scale, and provide screening along public streets and off-street parking areas.	**Consistent.** As described in Section2.0, *Project Description*, and Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the Project includes native landscaping throughout the Project and landscape screening on the perimeter of the site.
VH 4.12: Lighting. Outdoor lighting fixtures shall be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent overlighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. The following standards shall apply: a. Outdoor lighting shall be the minimum number of fixtures and intensity needed for the intended purpose. Fixtures shall be fully shielded and have full cut off lights to minimize visibility from public viewing areas and prevent light pollution into residential areas or other sensitive uses such as wildlife habitats or	**Consistent.** Outdoor lighting fixtures would be of the minimum number necessary for safety and would be properly shielded. See Section 4.1, *Aesthetics, in*cludes mitigation for outdoor lighting specification ensuring the Project is consistent with this policy.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
migration routes. b. Direct upward light emission shall be avoided to protect views of the night sky. c. Light fixtures used in new development shall be appropriate to the architectural style and scale and compatible with the surrounding area.	
VH 4.15: Site-Specific Visual Assessments. The use of story poles, physical or software-based models, photo-realistic visual simulations, perspectives, photographs, or other tools shall be required, when appropriate, to evaluate the visual effects of proposed development and demonstrate visual compatibility and impacts on scenic views.	**Inconsistent.** As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, photo-realistic visual simulations show that the Project would create a Class I impact on views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from S. Los Carneros Road.
VH 5.4: Preservation of Historic Resources. Historic resources and the heritage they represent shall be protected, preserved, and enhanced to the fullest extent feasible. The City shall recognize, preserve and rehabilitate publicly owned historic resources and provide incentive programs to encourage the designation, protection, and preservation of privately owned historic resources. Various incentives or benefits to the property owner shall be considered, such as direct financial assistance, reduced permitting fees to upgrade structures, flexibility with regard to allowed uses, compliance with the State Historic Building Code rather than the Uniform Building Code, façade conservation easements, identification of grant sources, provision of information regarding rehabilitation loan financing, and tax advantages.	**Consistent.** The Project site does not include known historic structures.
TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT	
TE 1.6: Development Review. As a condition of approval of new non-residential projects, the City may require developers to provide improvements that will reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles. These improvements may include, but are not limited to, the following: a. Preferential parking spaces for carpools. b. Bicycle storage, parking spaces, and shower facilities for employees. c. Bus turnouts and shelters at bus stops. d. Other improvements as may be appropriate to the site.	**Consistent.** The Project includes 14 bicycle parking pads placed throughout the property. Additionally, the public transportation located along Hollister Ave is accessible from the Project site.
TE 7.12: Transit Amenities in New Development. The City shall require new or substantially renovated development to incorporate appropriate measures to facilitate transit use, such as integrating bus stop design with the design of the development. Bus turnouts, comfortable and attractive all-weather shelters, lighting, benches, secure bicycle parking, and other appropriate amenities shall be incorporated into development, when appropriate, along Hollister Avenue and along other bus routes within the city. Existing facilities that are inadequate or deteriorated shall be improved or upgraded where appropriate and feasible.	**Consistent.** The Project would result in approximately 11 new transit users during the peak periods (7:00 to 9:00 A.M. and 4:00 to 6:00 P.M.) (refer to Appendix I). There are currently 22 buses that serve the site during the weekday peak hour periods. Thus, the Project would add fewer than 1 rider per bus on average. New bus riders generated by the Project would not measurably impact the operations of the transit routes that serve the site. Bus stops are located in close proximity to the Project site on Hollister Avenue at the Aero Camino intersection (approximately 0.3 miles south of the Project site) and would be easily accessible from the site. .

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
TE 9.3: Parking in Residential Neighborhoods. Any proposed new or expanded use in residential areas shall provide adequate onsite parking to support the use. Adequate parking shall be provided to minimize the need for parking in public rights-of-way and to avoid spillover of parking onto adjacent uses and into other areas. The existing supply of onstreet parking spaces shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Off-street parking for proposed new single-family dwellings in all residential use categories shall be provided in enclosed garages. Driveway aprons in single-family residential neighborhoods shall have sufficient widths and depths to allow parking of two standard-sized vehicles in front of the garage.	**Consistent.** The Project provides adequate on-site parking to serve future uses (see Section 4.13, *Transportation/Traffic*, and Impact LU-5).
TE 10.4: Pedestrian Facilities in New Development. Proposals for new development or substantial alterations of existing development shall be required to include pedestrian linkages and standard frontage improvements. These improvements may include construction of sidewalks and other pedestrian paths, provision of benches, public art, informational signage, appropriate landscaping, and lighting. In planning new subdivisions or large-scale development, pedestrian connections should be provided through subdivisions and cul-de-sacs to interconnect with adjacent areas. Dedications of public access easements shall be required where appropriate.	**Consistent.** The Project includes internal sidewalks and pedestrian paths and connections to Calle Koral, which has sidewalks to Los Carneros.
TE 11.4: Facilities in New Development. Bicycle facilities such as lockers, secure enclosed parking, and lighting shall be incorporated into the design of all new development to encourage bicycle travel and facilitate and encourage bicycle commuting. Showers and changing rooms should be incorporated into the design of all new development where feasible. Transportation improvements necessitated by new development should provide onsite connections to existing and proposed bikeways.	**Consistent.** The Project includes 14 bicycle parking pad placed throughout the property and would provide on-site security lighting. The Project is a residential development; therefore, items such as bike lockers, showers, and changing rooms do not apply.
TE 13.1: Traffic Studies for Development Proposals. Future development in Goleta will cause added burdens on the transportation system. Traffic analyses and reports shall be required for development proposals which the City Engineer and Planning Director determine may have effects on the local street system, including but not limited to possible degradation of service levels, potential creation of safety hazards, potential adverse effects on local neighborhood streets, or other substantial transportation concerns. When required by the City, traffic studies shall be performed by a qualified transportation engineer under a contract with the City. The costs of the traffic study, including costs of City staff time, shall be the responsibility of the project applicant.	**Consistent.** A traffic study was prepared for the Project by Associated Transportation Engineers and peer reviewed by Linscott, Law & Greenspan.
TE 13.3: Maintenance of LOS Standards. New development shall only be allowed when and where such development can be adequately (as defined by the LOS standards in Policy TE 4) served by existing and/or planned transportation facilities. Transportation facilities are	**Consistent.** The traffic study concludes that all traffic impacts would be less than significant.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
considered adequate if, at the time of development: a. Existing transportation facilities serving the development, including those to be constructed by the developer as part of the project, will result in meeting the adopted LOS standards set in Policy TE 4; or b. A binding financial commitment and agreement is in place to complete the necessary transportation system improvements (except for the planned new grade-separated freeway crossings), or to implement other strategies which will mitigate the project-specific impacts to an acceptable level, within 6 or fewer years; and c. Any additional offsite traffic mitigation measures are incorporated into the impact fee system for addressing cumulative transportation impacts of future development.	
PUBLIC FACILITIES ELEMENT	
PF 3.4: Fire Safety in New Development. The following fire safety standards shall be met, where applicable, in new development within the city: a. Two routes of ingress and egress shall be required for any new development or subdivision of land requiring approval of a discretionary action. This requirement may be waived by the City when secondary access cannot be provided and maintenance of fire safety standards are ensured by other means. b. All private roads that provide access to structures served by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department shall be constructed at a minimum to the department's standards. c. All nonagricultural development in the foothills area shall include provisions for connection to the GWD or another public water purveyor. d. Emergency access shall be a consideration in the siting and design of all new development within the city.	**Consistent.** The Project would have two routes of ingress and egress. Additionally, the Fire Protection District reviewed the Project and found it to be acceptable. The Department provided a number of conditions that would be required to obtain the required Fire Protection Certificate. With implementation of these conditions the Project would be consistent.
PF 3.8: Impact Fee for Police Facilities. The City shall continue to require a development impact fee to provide revenue to assist with funding capital facilities for police services.	**Consistent.** The applicant would be required to pay development impact fees for police protection services.
PF 3.9: Safety Considerations in New Development. All proposals for new or substantially remodeled development shall be reviewed for potential demand for and impacts on safety and demand for police services. The design of streets and buildings should reinforce secure, safe, and crime-free environments. Safety and crime reduction or prevention, as well as ease of policing, shall be a consideration in the siting and design of all new development within the city.	**Consistent.** The Project's impacts on police protection services was evaluated in Section 4.11, *Public Services*, and found to be less than significant. The Project involves the construction of walls along the north, east, and west boundaries that would reduce trespassing.
PF 5.2: Assessment of School Impacts of Large Development Projects. Applications for residential development within the city shall be referred to the school districts for their review and comments. The City shall require the assessment of impacts of large development projects on school facility needs through the	**Consistent.** Impacts of the Project on schools were evaluated Section 4.11, Public Services, and found to be less than significant. The Project applicant would be required to pay school impact mitigation fees.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
preparation of environmental documents pursuant to CEQA.	
PF 9.2: Phasing of New Development. Development shall be allowed only when and where it is demonstrated that all public facilities are adequate and only when and where such development can be adequately served by essential public services without reducing levels of service elsewhere.	**Consistent.** Adequate public facilities are available to serve the Project. See also discussions for Policies PF 3.4, PF 3.8, PF 3.9, and PF 5.2.
PF 9.3: Responsibilities of Developers. Construction permits shall not be granted until the developer provides for the installation and/or financing of needed public facilities. If adequate facilities are currently unavailable and public funds are not committed to provide such facilities, the burden shall be on the developer to arrange appropriate financing or provide such facilities in order to develop. Developers shall provide or pay for the costs of generating technical information as to impacts the proposed development will have on public facilities and services. The City shall require new development to finance the facilities needed to support the development wherever a direct connection or nexus of benefit or impact can be demonstrated.	**Consistent.** See discussions for Policies PF 3.4, PF 3.8, PF 3.9, PF 5.2, and PF 9.2.
PF 9.7: Essential Services for New Development. Development shall be allowed only when and where all essential utility services are adequate in accord with the service standards of their providers and only when and where such development can be adequately served by essential utilities without reducing levels of service below the level of service guidelines elsewhere. a. Domestic water service, sanitary sewer service, stormwater management facilities, streets, fire services, schools, and parks shall be considered essential for supporting new development. b. A development shall not be approved if it causes the level of service of an essential utility service to decline below the standards referenced above unless improvements to mitigate the impacts are made concurrent with the development for the purposes of this policy. "Concurrent with the development" shall mean that improvements are in place at the time of the development or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements. c. If adequate essential utility services are currently unavailable and public funds are not committed to provide such facilities, developers must provide such facilities at their own expense in order to develop.	**Consistent.** Based upon the Judgement Upon Arbitration Award, Case Number 232281 filed in Santa Barbara Superior Court on February 26, 2002, the combined Willow Springs properties (Willow Springs I, Willow Springs II, and the Project) have been granted allocation of a total of 100.9 AFY of potable water from the GWD. The total estimated water demand for the three properties is 100.8 AFY. As discussed in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems,* the Project would be adequately served by water, sewer, and stormwater services. See discussion for Policies PF 3.4, PF 3.8, PF 3.9, PF 5.2, PF 9.2, and PF 9.3.
NOISE ELEMENT	
NE 1.1: Land Use Compatibility Standards. The City shall use the standards and criteria of Table 9-2 to establish compatibility of land use and noise exposure. The City shall require appropriate mitigation, if feasible, or prohibit development that would subject proposed or existing land uses to noise levels that exceed acceptable levels as	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project could expose future residents to noise above the standards and criteria of the City's General Plan Noise Element Table 9-2, *Noise and Land Use Compatibility Criteria* due to noise from the adjacent U.S. 101, UPRR and existing business park development. However, Mitigation Measure N-5 in Section 4.10, *Noise*, would reduce

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
indicated in this table. Proposals for new development that would cause standards to be exceeded shall only be approved if the project would provide a substantial benefit to the City (including but not limited to provision of affordable housing units or as part of a redevelopment project), and if adequate mitigation measures are employed to reduce interior noise levels to acceptable levels.	indoor and outdoor noise exposure levels for the proposed housing Project to within City standards. Noise associated with Project construction was found to not exceed thresholds. Project generated traffic noise would not exceed thresholds. This residential apartment Project would provide 228 workforce housing units to assist the City in addressing its jobs/housing balance.
NE 1.2: Location of New Residential Development. Where sites, or portions of sites, designated by the land use element for residential use exceed 60 dBA CNEL, the City shall require measures to be incorporated into the design of projects that will mitigate interior noise levels and noise levels for exterior living and play areas to an acceptable level. In the event that a proposed residential or mixed-use project exceeds these standards, the project may be approved only if it would provide a substantial benefit to the City, including but not limited to, provision of affordable residential units. Mitigation measures shall reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA CNEL or less, while noise levels at exterior living areas and play areas should in general not exceed 60 dBA CNEL and 65 dBA CNEL, respectively.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** See discussion for policy NE 1.1.
NE 1.4: Acoustical Studies. An acoustical study that includes field measurement of noise levels may be required for any proposed project that would: a) locate a potentially intrusive noise source near an existing sensitive receptor, or b) locate a noise sensitive land use near an existing known or potentially intrusive noise source such as a freeway, arterial roadway, railroad, industrial facility, or airport traffic pattern. Acoustical studies should identify noise sources, magnitudes, and potential noise mitigation measures and describe existing and future noise exposure. The acoustical study shall be funded by the applicant and conducted by a qualified person or firm that is experienced in the fields of environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics. The determination of applicability of this requirement shall be made by the Planning and Environmental Services Department by applying the standards and criteria of Table 9-2.	**Consistent.** An acoustical study was conducted as part of this EIR. Noise sources, magnitudes, and mitigation are described in Section 4.10, *Noise.*
NE 1.5: Acceptable Noise Levels. New construction and substantial alterations of existing construction shall include appropriate noise insulation measures (such as insulation, glazing, and other sound attenuation measures) so that such construction or renovations comply with state and building code standards for allowable interior noise levels. The intent of this policy is to require improved soundproofing for both noise receivers and sources.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** See discussion for Policy NE 1.1.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
NE 4.1: Consideration of Exposure to Railway Noise. The City shall consider current and projected exposure to noise levels for any proposed development or use on land adjacent to the UPRR. The City should not approve any development that would result in unacceptable levels of noise exposure in accordance with the standards of Policy NE 1 above.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project is adjacent to the UPRR. Section 4.10, *Noise*, includes a discussion of noise levels associated with the rail line. With mitigation, noise exposure would be reduced to a less than significant level.
NE 6.4: Restrictions on Construction Hours. The City shall require, as a condition of approval for any land use permit or other planning permit, restrictions on construction hours. Noise-generating construction activities for projects near or adjacent to residential buildings and neighborhoods or other sensitive receptors shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Construction in nonresidential areas away from sensitive receivers shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Construction shall generally not be allowed on weekends and state holidays. Exceptions to these restrictions may be made in extenuating circumstances (in the event of an emergency, for example) on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Environmental Services. All construction sites subject to such restrictions shall post the allowed hours of operation near the entrance to the site, so that workers on site are aware of this limitation. City staff shall closely monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours, and shall promptly investigate and respond to all noncompliance complaints.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project site is located adjacent (within 50 feet) to existing residential uses that are considered sensitive receptors and would be affected by construction at the Project site. Therefore, Mitigation Measure N-1(a) restricts construction activity hours to between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.
NE 6.5: Other Measures to Reduce Construction Noise. The following measures shall be incorporated into grading and building plan specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise: a. All construction equipment shall have properly maintained sound-control devices, and no equipment shall have an unmuffled exhaust system. b. Contractors shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including but not limited to changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, and installing acoustic barriers around significant sources of stationary construction noise. c. To the extent practicable, adequate buffers shall be maintained between noise-generating machinery or equipment and any sensitive receivers. The buffer should ensure that noise at the receiver site does not exceed 65 dBA CNEL. For equipment that produces a noise level of 95 dBA at 50 feet, a buffer of 1600 feet is required for attenuation of sound levels to 65 dBA.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** Mitigation Measures N-1(b) – N-1(e) include additional measures beyond the requirements of this policy to reduce the impacts of construction noise.
NE 7.2: Site-Design Techniques. The City encourages the inclusion of site-design techniques for new construction that will minimize noise exposure impacts. These techniques shall include building placement, landscaped setbacks, and siting of more noise-tolerant components (parking, utility areas, and maintenance facilities) between noise sources and sensitive receptor areas.	**Consistent with Mitigation.** The Project includes construction of eight-foot high sound wall along the northern site boundary to reduce noise from U.S. 101 and UPRR. Mitigation Measure N-5 would further reduce noise exposure impacts.

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
NE 7.6: Noise-Insulation Standards for Multi- Family Dwellings. In compliance with state law, the City shall require all multi-family residential developments that are proposed within the 60-dBA CNEL noise contour to include appropriate noise insulation measures.	**Consistent with Mitigation**. See discussion for policy NE 7.2.
HOUSING ELEMENT	
HE 6.3: Vacant Sites Designated for Rezoning to Residential or Higher Density. Vacant sites designated by the Land Use Element for residential use, as identified in Technical Appendix Table 10A-24, shall be rezoned to higher density residential as identified in Technical Appendix Table 10A-28 following adoption of this updated element. Additionally, vacant nonresidential sites, as identified in Technical Appendix Table 10A-27, shall be rezoned to allow for residential use, consistent with the Land Use Element, following adoption of this updated element.	**Consistent.** The Project site is zoned for residential use consistent with the Land Use Element. The Project is consistent with the current residential land use designation and zoning.
HE 9.3: Housing Design Principles for Multifamily and Affordable Housing. The intent in the design of new multifamily and affordable housing is to provide stable, safe, and attractive neighborhoods through high-quality architecture, site planning, and amenities that address the following principles (see related Policy VH 4): a. Reduce the Appearance of Building Bulk— Require designs that break up the perceived bulk and minimize the apparent height and size of new buildings, including the use of upperstory step-backs, variations in wall and roof planes, and landscaping. Application of exterior finish materials and trim, and windows and doors, for example, are important elements of building design and an indicator of overall building quality. b. Recognize Existing Street Patterns— Incorporate transitions in height and setbacks from adjacent properties to respect adjacent development character and privacy. Design new housing so that it relates to the existing street pattern, creates a sense of neighborliness with surrounding buildings, and integrates pedestrian and bicycle systems. c. Enhance the "Sense of Place" by Incorporating Focal Areas—Design new housing around natural and/or designed focal points that are emphasized through direct pedestrian and bicycle pathway connections. Site design and placement of structures shall include the maximum amount of usable, contiguous open space. d. Minimize the Visual Impact of Parking and Garages—Discourage residential designs in which garages dominate the public façade of the residential building. e. Provide Buffers between Housing and Nonresidential Uses—Ensure compatibility of residential and nonresidential uses by addressing parking and driveway patterns, transitions between uses, entries, site planning, and the provision of appropriate buffers	**Consistent.** The multi-family Project would have overall mass, bulk and scale similar to that of adjacent multi-family residential developments. The Project includes a mixture of two and three story buildings and would break up the overall bulk of the development by providing eight buildings clustered on the site with open space common areas between the buildings. The placement of windows and balconies provides privacy for the residential units and metal window canopies are designed using decorative metal. Focal points are provided on-site including a two acre public park in the center of the development. In addition, Mitigation Measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain consistent with adjacent development. The continuity of building architecture and landscaping provide a sense of place. Pedestrian pathways are designed throughout the site and connect to the sidewalk on Calle Koral. Extensive landscaping would be provided along the sites eastern and western boundaries as well as eight-foot high privacy wall to the north provide buffers between site development and adjacent UPRR and U.S. 101. Carports and open parking spaces with landscape screening are located along the side and rear edges of the site. The Project is consistent with housing design principles for multifamily and affordable housing. See discussions under Policies LU 1.8, VH 3.1, VH 3.2, VH 3.3, VH 3.4, VH 4.4, VH 4.9, VH 4.12, VH 4.15 and section 4.1, *Aesthetics.*

Table 4.9-1
Consistency with Policies in the Goleta General Plan

Policy	Discussion
to minimize noise, lighting, or use impacts. f. Maximize Privacy for Individual Units—Site design, including placement of structures, pedestrian circulation, and common areas, as well as elements of architectural design such as, but not limited to, placement of windows, shall achieve a maximum degree of privacy for individual dwelling units within multifamily projects, including privacy for individual exterior spaces. g. Maximize Security and Safety—Site and architectural design of multifamily residential projects shall emphasize principles of "defensible space," security for residents, and public safety and shall facilitate policing and observation by the City's police department from public streets and rights-of-way to the extent feasible.	

As described in Table 4.9-1, the Project would be consistent with most applicable City land use policies, and would be inconsistent with Policies VH 1.1, VH 1.4, VH 2.2, VH 2.3, and VH 4.15. As described in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the Project would partially obstruct a designated view corridor of the Santa Ynez Mounts northward from S. Los Carneros Road at Calle Koral. This has been identified as a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact.

Mitigation Measures. As described in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, mitigation is not available to reduce the obstruction of scenic views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from the vantage point of motorist on S. Los Carneros Road near Calle Koral. These buildings would unavoidably obstruct scenic views.

Residual Impact. As described in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, impacts to scenic view corridors would be significant and unavoidable because no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the obstruction of scenic views from S. Los Carneros Road. Therefore there will be a significant residual impact on Impact LU-1 as well.

Impact LU-2 The Project would be consistent with the Inland Zoning Ordinance, as adopted by the Goleta Municipal Code, with approval of the requested modification to the required side-yard setback. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant* [*Threshold 2*].

The Project site is zoned Design Residential (DR-20) in the Inland Zoning Ordinance (Article III, Chapter 35 of the Goleta Municipal Code). Pursuant to the zoning regulations (Section 35-222.1), the purpose of the DR zone district is to "provide standards for traditional multiple residences as well as allowing flexibility and encouraging innovation and diversity in the design of residential developments by allowing a wide range of densities and housing types while requiring the provision of a substantial amount of open space within new residential developments. The intent is to ensure comprehensively planned, well designed projects." Permitted uses in this zone include multi-family dwelling units, including community apartment projects. Accessory use buildings that are incidental to the permitted uses are also allowed. The Project involves multi-family housing that would be permitted in the DR zone.

The DR-20 zoning designation allows for a maximum of 20 units per acre. As stated in Impact LU-1, the Project site is an Affordable Housing Opportunity Site within the General Plan, which requires a minimum density of 20 units/acre. The Project would have a density of 25.4 units/acre.
Table 4.9-2 shows consistency with other DR zone and General Regulation requirements in the City's zone code, based on the proposed site plan shown on Figure 2-5 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*:

Table 4.9-2
Consistency with Zoning Ordinance Requirements

Zoning Requirements	Project
Front Yard Setback: Twenty (20) feet from right-of-way line	**Consistent** The front setback would be more than 20 feet from the property line along Camino Vista and 20 feet from the property line along Calle Koral.
Side Yard Setback: Ten (10) feet from any side or rear property line	**Consistent with Modification Approval** Carports would be located 10 feet from the eastern property line.
Rear Yard Structure Setback: The DR zone requires a 10-foot rear yard setback, however General Regulations permit an accessory structure to be located in the rear yard setback.	**Consistent** Carports (accessory structures) would be located 10-feet from the rear property line.
Parking Design: Arranged to prevent through traffic to other parking areas; uncovered parking shall be screened from the street and adjacent residences to a height of at least four feet with hedges, dense plantings, solid fences or walls.	**Consistent** The proposed parking areas would only connect to Camino Vista and would not connect to other parking areas. Parking areas would be screened from adjacent uses with perimeter property walls.
Distance between buildings: Minimum of 5 feet	**Consistent** There would be a minimum of 5 feet between all proposed buildings.
Building Coverage: Not to exceed 30% of the net area of the property	**Consistent** Building footprints are 17% of the total site area
Height limit: 35 feet The zoning ordinance defines building height as the vertical distance from the average finished grade of the lot covered by the building to the **mean height** of the highest gable or pitch of a hip roof. For buildings on stepped pads, building height is an **average height** as determined by measurements around the entire building footprint which are then averaged from the finished grade to mean roof heights.	**Consistent** The Project includes buildings with a maximum building height of 35 feet.
Open Space: Minimum of 40% of the net area of the property dedicated to common and/or public open space	**Consistent** Approximately 7.2 acre of common open space, or 42.0% of total site area would be provided.
Landscaping: Uncovered parking area separated from property lines by a landscaped strip not less than 5 feet in width.	**Consistent** No uncovered parking spaces are proposed to be located along property lines.

Table 4.9-2
Consistency with Zoning Ordinance Requirements

Zoning Requirements	Project
Density: Minimum 20 du/acre Maximum 25 du/acre	**Consistent.** The Project's density would be 25.4 acres (360 units/14.24 developable acres). The Project includes a permitted senior density bonus making the Project consistent with this requirement.

The Project would be consistent with the front and rear yard setbacks, parking design, distance between buildings, building coverage, height limit, open space and landscaping requirements of the City's zoning regulations. The Project includes a parking modification from the parking standards of the City's zoning regulations to reduce the parking requirement from 550 to 510 spaces. This is discussed in Impact LU-5, below.

Mitigation Measures. Mitigation would not be required as this impact would be less than significant.

Residual Impact. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact LU-3 **Temporary construction activities associated with development of the Project would potentially generate short-term compatibility effects on surrounding uses. However, temporary impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures included in Section 4.10, *Noise*. This would be a Class II, *significant but mitigable*, impact with mitigation measures for construction noise *[Threshold 2].***

Project construction would occur over approximately 36 months, including the required pre-construction soil hauling. Construction activities would include site preparation, grading, building construction, paving and architectural coating phases. Construction compatibility issues with surrounding development include air quality and noise impacts. The Project site is surrounded by general industrial uses to the east, UPRR and U.S. 101 transportation corridors to the north, business park to the west, and residential (Willow Springs I and II) to the south. Potential temporary compatibility issues on existing surrounding uses during construction are summarized below.

Air Quality. Temporary compatibility effects on surrounding land uses would occur during grading and construction of the Project from dust generation and construction equipment emissions. The closest sensitive receptors to the Project site are the residential uses (Willow Springs I and II) located 50 feet south of the Project site. As discussed in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be below adopted thresholds and impacts would be less than significant.

Noise. Construction activity would impact residential uses (Willow Springs I and II) south of the Project site resulting in a potentially significant short-term impact. Mitigation measures designed to address short-term noise impacts during the construction period are presented in Section 4.10, *Noise*. These include construction hours limited to 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday, haul routes that avoid residential neighborhoods, requirement for electrical power to run air compressors and similar power tools, a noise compliant line, distancing of vehicles and equipment, avoidance of operating equipment simultaneously, sound control curtains, and use of newest power equipment.

Mitigation Measures. Mitigation Measure N-1 in Section 4.10, *Noise,* would reduce construction noise impacts to levels that would avoid significant land use compatibility impacts during construction.

Residual Impact. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1, compatibility conflicts relating to Project construction would be less than significant.

Impact LU-4 Quality of life issues identified in the City's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual include loss of privacy, neighborhood incompatibility, nuisance noise, not exceeding noise thresholds, increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods, and loss of sunlight/solar access. Impacts related to privacy, incompatibility, noise, sunlight/solar access, and neighborhood traffic would be Class II, *significant but mitigable [Threshold 4]*.

Project impacts related to loss of privacy, neighborhood incompatibility, nuisance noise, not exceeding noise thresholds, increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods, and loss of sunlight/solar access are discussed below.

Loss of Privacy. The Project site is located between existing residential development and the U.S. 101 Freeway. Project tenants would be able to see onto portions of adjacent properties. Landscape screening is proposed along property lines that would partially shield the adjacent properties from view. In addition, the areas that could be visible to site tenants are mainly limited to driveways, parking lots, and other areas where privacy is not typically a major concern. Site tenants would have no visual access to business operations on either adjacent site.

Neighborhood Incompatibility. The Project site is surrounded by general industrial uses to the east, UPRR and U.S. 101 transportation corridors to the north, business park to the west, and residential (Willow Springs I and II) to the south and west.

The residential uses to the south are comprised of multi-family residential that is of similar height, bulk, and scale as the Project. The residential neighborhood to the west (currently under construction) contains a mixture of multi-family residential and single family units. The Project would be made up of eight rectangular buildings, with similar heights to neighborhood developments. The proposed buildings would be grouped together, creating an overall character on the site that would provide some variation from the neighborhood development. The industrial uses to the east are bordered by Willow Springs I and II further south of the site. The Project would provide a boundary between the residential uses and industrial uses consistent with Willow Springs I and II. The business park buildings located to the west of the Project site on the far side of Los Carneros Road are setback from the road with parking areas providing a buffer between the proposed residential uses and commercial uses. No compatibility issues exist. As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthet*ics, the Project would not adversely affect the visual character of the site or neighborhood with incorporation of mitigation to ensure that the proposed buildings have compatible massing, architectural style, and height with adjacent development.

Nuisance Noise Levels. As discussed in Section 4.10, *Noise*, the increase in ambient noise on neighboring land uses due to Project operation, including increased traffic levels, would be less than significant. Increased noise levels would not be in conflict with surrounding uses. Traffic noise generated by the Project would not result in significant land use incompatibility with respect to the neighborhood.

Increased Traffic in Quiet Neighborhood. As discussed in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, Project traffic would incrementally increase traffic at study-area intersections. However, the Project would not generate traffic exceeding any City-adopted neighborhood thresholds and would not disrupt access to adjacent properties or otherwise reach levels where the proposed land use would conflict with surrounding uses.

Loss of Sunlight/Solar Access. Proposed structures would cast shadows. However, based on the height of the proposed structures and distance to structures on adjacent properties, the Project would have no impact upon solar access on adjacent sites.

Overall quality of life impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation to achieve aesthetic compatibility with surrounding development.

Mitigation Measures. Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b) would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts from the Project's massing and architectural style and to ensure that building heights remain consistent with adjacent development.

Residual Impacts. With implementation of Mitigation measures AES-4(a) and AES-4(b), quality of life impacts would be less than significant..

c. Cumulative Impacts. As discussed in Section 3.0, *Related Projects*, planned, pending and recently approved development in and around Goleta consists of 1,511 residential units and more than 1.8 million square feet of non-residential development. Conflicts regarding land use compatibility between the Project and surrounding uses have been found to be less than significant. These impacts are localized to the Project site and its surrounding area and as such would not involve any significant cumulative impacts. Potential land use conflicts for cumulative development would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and potential quality of life impacts would be reduced through Project design review. The Project's contribution to cumulative land use impacts would be less than significant.