Agenda Item C.9
CONSENT CALENDAR
Meeting Date: May 19, 2009

TO: Mayor and Councilmembers

FROM: Steve Chase, Planning & Environmental Services Director

CONTACT: Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager
Pat Saley, Contract Planner

SUBJECT: Final Action on 09-020-GPA, City-Initiated Track 2.5 General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendments

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolution 09-_ entitled "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California Accepting an Addendum, Dated May 19, 2009, to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR, Adoption of CEQA Findings, and Adoption of the Track 2.5 Amendments to the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (Case No. 09-020-GPA)".

BACKGROUND:

The City-initiated Track 2.5 amendments to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (General Plan) include changes to the building intensity standards in the Land Use Element. Track 2.5 underwent extensive review with both the Planning Commission and Design Review Board at the request of the City Council as a follow-up item to the Track 2 General Plan Amendments adopted in June 2008.

The Track 2.5 amendments were recommended to the City Council by the Planning Commission via Resolution 09-03. These recommendations were further altered by staff and presented to the City Council on April 21, 2009. The Council considered both the Planning Commission and staff recommended options, further modified staff's recommendation, and ultimately provided conceptual approval of the amendments.

DISCUSSION:

This item is presented for the purpose of adopting a resolution for General Plan Amendments and related CEQA actions. The adoptingresolution is provided in Attachment 1 and reflects the changes requested by the City Council at the April 21, 2009 public hearing. These changes are reviewed on the following page.

Building Height

The four land use tables all include "*Maximum* Structure Height" as one of the building intensity standards. The Zoning Ordinance, on the other hand, bases building height on the *average* height of a structure.[1] Testimony and discussion at the Planning Commission-Design Review Board workshops and April 21, 2009 City Council hearing focused on the inconsistency between these two definitions. The consensus was that the General Plan's use of "maximum" is not realistic and hampers good design as it effectively promotes flat-roofed buildings with little architectural variation, particularly in commercial areas. On April 21, 2009, the City Council unanimously voted (in concept) to remove the word "maximum" as a modifier of building height in the four land use tables. This change promotes more compatibility between the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and well-designed buildings in the community.

Building Height in Areas Designated Community Commercial

Another issue that was discussed at the Planning Commission-Design Review Board workshops and Council hearing was the General Plan standard of a maximum of 25 foot building height in the Community Commercial (C-C) designation and 35 feet (average) in the corresponding zone districts.[2] The Planning Commission, Design Review Board and staff recommended that the C-C maximum building height be increased to 35 feet to provide more conformity between the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and to reflect actual commercial buildings in the community. On April 21, 2009, a majority of the City Council agreed (in concept) with this change.

Good Cause Finding

In June 2008, the good cause finding was added to the four land use tables as part of the Track 2 Amendments. The "good cause" finding is defined in the Glossary of the General Plan. After working with this finding definition for several months, staff and the Planning Commission had recommended that "standards for analysis" be added to the definition to give more guidance about which projects merit relief from the building intensity standards in the General Plan. At the City Council meeting on April 21, 2009, there was concern that "major tax generators" should not be specifically identified as a reason to provide relief from the General Plan standards. The City Council unanimously directed staff to remove the reference to tax generators.

Zoning Ordinance Update

As part of the discussion of these issues with the Design Review Board, Planning Commission and Council, a list of possible future Zoning Ordinance amendments was compiled. On April 21, 2009, the Council agreed that the City should study using landscaping/open space and lot coverage ratios and building heights in lieu of Floor Area Ratios in evaluating projects. There is still concern that the City should provide

---

[1] Building Height definition (Coastal and Inland Zoning Ordinances): "The vertical distance from the average finished grade of the lot covered by the building to the highest points of the coping of a flat roof or to the mean height of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof."

[2] Zones that correspond to the Community Commercial or C-C General Plan designation are C-1 (Limited Commercial), C-2 (Retail Commercial), C-3 (General Commercial), C-N (Neighborhood Commercial), C-S (Service Commercial), and SC (Shopping Center).

three dimensional standards in its ordinance to help ensure that future development is appropriate to its setting and the community.

Environmental Analysis and Required Findings

An addendum to the 2006 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the General Plan was prepared to address the changes in environmental effects associated with the Track 2.5 Amendments. The addendum was updated to reflect the Council's conceptual motions of April 21, 2009, and is provided in Attachment 2 and concludes that the revised *project does not result in new Class I or Class II impacts, and does not result in an increase in the severity of previously identified Class I or Class II impacts*.

ALTERNATIVES:

None are recommended.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

The processing of City initiated Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments is funded in the FY 2007-2009 Budget under Program 4300 (Advance Planning) of the Planning & Environmental Services Department.

Legal Review By:	Reviewed by:	Approved By:
_____	_____	_____
Tim W. Giles	Michelle Greene, Director	Daniel Singer
City Attorney	Administrative Services	City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

1. A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California Accepting an Addendum, Dated May 19, 2009, to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR, Adoption of CEQA Findings, and Adoption of the Track 2.5 Amendments to the Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan (Case No. 09-020-GPA)
2. Track 2.5 Addendum to the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2005031151).

Attachment 1

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California Accepting an Addendum, Dated May 19, 2009, to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR, Adoption of CEQA Findings, and Adoption of the Track 2.5 Amendments to the Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan (Case No. 09-020-GPA)

RESOLUTION NO. 09-___

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA, CALIFORNIA ACCEPTING AN ADDENDUM, DATED MAY 19, 2009, TO THE GENERAL PLAN/COASTAL LAND USE PLAN FINAL EIR, ADOPTION OF CEQA FINDINGS, AND ADOPTION OF THE TRACK 2.5 AMENDMENTS TO THE GOLETA GENERAL PLAN / COASTAL LAND USE PLAN (CASE NO. 09-020-GPA)

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2005, the City of Goleta issued a Notice of Preparation for the *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan* Environmental Impact Report and caused the Notice of Preparation to be distributed to all responsible agencies, trustee agencies and interested parties for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, in recognition of the comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation, it was determined that the proposed project was subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, that one or more significant effects on the environment may occur, and that preparation of an Environmental Impact Report would be required; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Final Environmental Impact Report were prepared by Jones & Stokes, Inc. under contract to the City of Goleta and was published and released to the public on March 20, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Completion was filed with the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and distributed to responsible, trustee, and interested agencies and individuals on May 31, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Availability of, and Public Hearing on, the Draft Environmental Impact Report was noticed by publication in a newspaper of general circulation within the County of Santa Barbara on May 28, 2006, and by direct mailing to interested agencies and individuals in the manner prescribed by the State CEQA Guidelines and the City of Goleta CEQA Guidelines, and was distributed to the Office of the County Clerk of the County of Santa Barbara for posting for a period of at least 30 days; and

WHEREAS, the State Clearinghouse [SCH #2005031151] assigned a 45-day review period, extending from May 31, 2006 to July 18, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing to receive comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR was held on June 26, 2006; and

WHEREAS, a total of forty letters or written statements were received on the Draft EIR and, in response to written public comments received, responses to comments were prepared; and

WHEREAS, a proposed Final EIR, reflecting the changes made in the proposed final *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP)*, was released on September 1, 2006, pursuant to the requirements of the State and City CEQA Guidelines, including written responses to comments received on the draft document; and

WHEREAS, Jones & Stokes, under contract to the City of Goleta, prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to meet the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6, as included in the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the proposed final *GP/CLUP* was the subject of a final noticed joint public hearing by the Planning Agency and City Council held on September 13, 2006, at which time all interested persons were given an opportunity to provide testimony on the proposed final plan*;* and

WHEREAS, following receipt of all public comment at the final noticed public hearing held on October 2, 2006, the City Council adopted Resolution No. CC-06-38 certifying the Final EIR [SCH #2005031151] and adopted the *GP/CLUP*; and

WHEREAS, on March 5, 2007, the City Council authorized staff to conduct a process for reopening the *GP/CLUP* to consider suggested amendments by staff, the public-at-large, land owners, developers and special interest groups; and

WHEREAS, on April 16, 2007 the City Council conducted a public hearing to formally sponsor and initiate a first round of proposed *GP/CLUP* amendments; and

WHEREAS, on July 16, 2007, the City Council authorized a General Plan Amendment Work Program which included processing paths for five interrelated components or tracks including: Track 1 Housing Element Revisions; Track 2 Minor Revisions; Track 3 Substantive Revisions; Track 4 Project Specific Amendments; and Track 5 Sphere of Influence Revisions; and

WHEREAS, on August 6, 2007, the City Council conducted an additional public hearing to formally sponsor and initiate a second round of proposed amendments, and in September and October 2007, in support of the various tracks within the adopted work program, the City hosted a series of seven public meetings and workshops during September and October 2007 that addressed Sphere of Influence Public Workshop (Track 5), General Plan Amendments (Tracks 2 and 3), Affordable Housing Stakeholders and Public Tour (Track 1); and

WHEREAS, City staff, with the assistance of Jones & Stokes, engaged in an analysis of each of the individual City-initiated General Plan Amendments, which included a review of the considerable administrative record that emerged from the many public workshops held in September and October, including nearly 1500 work station comments, 75 oral testimonies and approximately 200 written comments; and

WHEREAS, on January 17 and 29, 2008 the City Council held special public hearings to review and act on staff's determinations and recommendations pertaining to the continued processing of the General Plan Amendments assigned to Tracks 2 and 3 and, in response to City Council direction received at the January 17 and 29, 2008 public hearings, environmental review of the Track 2 Minor Revisions to the *GP/CLUP* policies was conducted by Jones & Stokes, under contract to the City; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the environmental review, it was determined that the Track 2 Minor Revisions were subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, and an Addendum to the Final EIR was prepared; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted duly noticed public hearings on March 24, April 14, April 21, and May 12, 2008 at which time all interested persons were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, on June 17, 2008, the City Council considered the entire administrative record, including the Addendum to the Final EIR, CEQA Findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and oral and written testimony from interested persons and made the necessary findings to adopt the Track 2 Minor Amendments and gave further instruction to the Planning Commission and the Design Review Board to hold public meetings to jointly review the Land Use Element Building Intensity Standards as specified in Land Use Element Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, and 2-4 of the GP/CLUP; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission and the Design Review Board conducted duly noticed public meetings on August 1, August 18, September 15, and October 20, 2008 at which time all interested persons were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission and the Design Review Board made recommendations to the City Council as outlined in the *GP/CLUP* Addendum on the Track 2.5 Amendments; and

WHEREAS, environmental review of the Track 2.5 Revisions to the Land Use Element Building Intensity Standards and related policies was conducted by City staff; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the environmental review, it was determined that the Track 2.5 Revisions, as identified in Exhibit 1, are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, and an Addendum to the Final EIR was prepared; and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2009, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider proposed Track 2.5 amendments to the *GP/CLUP*, including an addendum to the Final EIR, resulting in recommendations to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing on April 21, 2009, at which time all interested persons were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the City Council continued the public hearing to May 19, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered the entire administrative record, including the Addendum to the Final EIR, CEQA Findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and oral and written testimony from interested persons.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Recitals

The City Council hereby finds and determines that the foregoing recitals, which are incorporated herein by reference, are true and correct.

SECTION 2. Acceptance of Addendum

The City Council has examined the proposed Addendum, dated May 19, 2009 to the City of Goleta *General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan* EIR relating to Track 2.5, and considered it with the previously certified City of Goleta *General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan* Final EIR, and finds that the Addendum has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA, including direct, indirect, and cumulatively significant effects and proposed mitigation measures; and hereby certifies that the Addendum constitutes a complete, accurate, adequate, and good faith effort at full disclosure, and reflects the City of Goleta's independent judgment and analysis pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines.

SECTION 3. Amendment to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan

This resolution amends the *General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan* Land Use Element Tables 2-1 through 2-4 building intensity standards and related policies as shown in Exhibit 1, subject to adoption of Resolution 09-_, "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California to Amend the City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Related to Case No. 07-102-GPA, Conservation Element Policy CE 2.2 and Housing Element Policy HE 11.5, and Case No. 09-020-GPA, City-Initiated Track 2.5 Amendments".

SECTION 4. Findings

The findings set forth in Exhibit 2 to this resolution are hereby adopted and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 5. Documents

The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the City Clerk, City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California, 93117.

SECTION 6. Certification

The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2009.

_____
ROGER ACEVES, MAYOR

ATTEST:

_____
DEBORAH CONSTANTINO
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
TIM W. GILES
CITY ATTORNEY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA) ss.
CITY OF GOLETA)

I, DEBORAH CONSTANTINO, City Clerk of the City of Goleta, California, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing City Council Resolution No. 09-__ was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Goleta at a regular meeting held on the ___ day of _____, 2009, by the following vote of the Council members:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

(SEAL)

_____
DEBORAH CONSTANTINO
CITY CLERK

Exhibit 1

Description of Project

EXHIBIT 1
Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments

1. **Residential Land Uses & related policies –** See proposed changes to Land Use Tables 2-1 through 2-4 following this narrative.

    a. **Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4** (p. 2-9, 2-13, 2-17 & 2-21) – Remove Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards from the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" *and change "Maximum Structure Height" to "Structure Height."*

    b. **Table 2-1, Residential Land Uses** (p. 2-9) - Remove Minimum Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size under "Standards for Density and Building Intensity".

    c. **Housing Element Policy Implementation Action IP-6E, Modify Multifamily Zoning Standards** (p. 10-22) – This strategy provides for zoning ordinance revisions that may include a number of standards, including floor area ratios (FARs). The revised language would read: "e. Incorporation of revised building intensity standards ~~the increased floor area ratios (FARs)~~ as set forth in the Land Use Element to encourage higher density housing in Old Town Commercial, Community Commercial, and Office and Institutional use categories where possible…."

    d. **Housing Element Policy HE 11.8, Additional Incentives for Onsite Production of Affordable Inclusionary Units** (p. 10-34) – This policy provides incentives for developers of a 5-acre or larger site designated Medium-Density Residential who agree to construct affordable inclusionary units pursuant to other Housing Element policies. The revised language would read: "….the City shall provide the following incentives or concessions:

        "a. ~~The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standard set forth in the Land Use Element shall be increased from 0.5 to 0.6.~~
        ~~b.~~ a. The Lot Coverage Ratio standard set forth in the Land Use Element shall be increased from 0.3 to 0.4…."

2. **Commercial Land Uses & related policies**

    a. Table 2-2, Commercial Land Uses (p. 2-13) – Change the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" as follows:

        - Increase Maximum Structure Height for C-C from 25 ft to 35ft. consistent with comparable Zoning Ordinance standards.
        - Remove Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size standards.

3. **Office & Industrial Uses & related policies**

    a. **Land Use Element Policy LU 4.1, General Purpose** (p. 2-16) – This policy refers in Table 2-3 in a general way and should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-3 shows the various office and industrial land use designations, including permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity in each category…."

b. **Table 2-3, Office & Industrial Uses** (p. 2-17) – Remove the Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size standards from the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity."

c. **Land Use Element Policy LU 4.2, Business Park (I-BP)** (p. 2-16) – This policy refers to the Business Park designation reading: "….In addition, lands designated with a Hotel Overlay may include transient lodging that emphasizes extended stays. ~~The maximum FAR set forth in Table 2-3 is increased from 0.4 to 0.5 for hotel uses.~~ Activities in business park areas shall be conducted….."

d. **Land Use Element Policy LU 4.3, Office and Institutional (I-OI)** (p. 2-18) – This policy addresses the I-OI designation, including the Hospital Overlay and appropriate FARs for hospital and medical office buildings. *The changes to the policy are:*

- Remove subsection 'a' that refers to FARs and retain subsections 'b' and 'c.'
- *Delete "maximum" as modifier of "structure height" in subsection 'b'.*

4. Other Land Uses & related policies

a. **Table 2-4, Other Land Uses** (p. 2-21) – Remove the Maximum Residential Density, Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size standards from the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity."

b. **Land Use Element Policy LU 6.1, General** (p. 2-20) – This policy refers to the Park and Open Space categories in Table 2-4. This policy should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-4 shows the Park and Open space use categories, including permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity for each category…."

c. **Land Use Element Policy LU 7.1, General** (p. 2-22) - This policy refers to the Agriculture category in Table 2-4. This policy should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-4 shows the permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity for the Agricultural land use category…."

5. Deferred Zoning Ordinance Updates – When the upcoming Zoning Ordinance Update is done, consideration should be given to the following:

a. Revising the definitions of building height, basement, and net and gross lot area to encourage flexibility in design while providing for compatibility within neighborhoods;

b. Reduce the Maximum Building Heights (Inland) for R-1/E-1 and R-2 Zones from 35 to 25 feet;

c. Increase the Max. Lot Coverage from 0.30 to 0.40 for the DR-25 and DR-30 Zones;

d. Reduce the Max. Building Height in OT-R/LC from 35 to 30 feet;

e. Reduce the Max. Building Height in the M-1 from 45 to 35 feet;

f. Review all standards removed through the Track 2.5 process to ensure they are included in the corresponding zone district where appropriate;

g. Amend the Hospital Overlay Zone to provide standards and requirements that facilitate the needs of the hospital and related medical services including, but not limited to, increased building heights;"

h. Study using landscape/open space and lot coverage ratios and building heights in lieu of Floor Area Ratios; and

i. After review of the effectiveness of the "standards for analysis" for projects seeking to use the good cause finding (see "Glossary" above), consider adding the finding to the Zoning Ordinance for relief from the development standards.

6. **Amended definition of "Good Cause Finding" in the GP/CLUP Glossary to indicate that it is a finding of public or community necessity based on the following "standards for analysis"**:

a. Conceptual drawings (basic site plan and elevations) of the proposal that meet the standards in the land use tables for review by the DRB and Planning Commission;

b. At the discretion of the DRB and/or Planning Commission, conceptual plans may be request for one (1) other version of the project that comes closer to meeting the standard(s) in the tables;

c. At the discretion of the DRB and/or Planning Commission, story poles and/or visual simulations may be requested, including those that reflect the proposal that meets the standards; and

d. The use proposed should meet a public or community need or goal, e.g., senior affordable or other affordable housing, recreational facilities open to the public, non-profit facilities that serve the public, preservation or restoration of a historic structure or resource, and/or projects that have negligible impacts and do not require significant use of public and/or natural resources.

TABLE 2-1
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Residential Use Categories				
	R-SF	R-P	R-MD	R-HD	R-MHP
Residential Uses					
One Single-Family Detached Dwelling per Lot	X	X	-	-	-
Single-Family Attached and Detached Dwellings	X	X	X	X	-
Multiunit Apartment Dwellings	-	X	X	X	-
Mobile Home Parks	-	-	-	-	X
Second (Accessory) Residential Units	X	X	-	-	-
Assisted-Living Residential Units	-	-	X	X	-
Other Uses					
Religious Institutions	X	X	X	X	-
Small-Scale Residential Care Facility	X	X	-	-	-
Small-Scale Day Care Center	X	X	X	X	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X	-
Accessory Uses					
Home Occupations	X	X	X	X	X
Standards for Density and Building Intensity					
Recommended Standards for Permitted Density					
Maximum Permitted Density (units/acres)	5 or less	5.01–13	20	30	15
Minimum Permitted Density (units/acres)	N/A	N/A	15	15	N/A
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity					
~~Maximum Floor Area Ratios (FAR)~~	~~N/A~~	~~0.30~~	~~0.50~~	~~1.10~~	~~N/A~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height (Inland Area)	25 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	25 feet
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height (Coastal Zone)	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	0.30	0.30	0.40	N/A
~~Minimum Open Space Ratio~~	~~N/A~~	~~0.40~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~
~~Minimum Lot Size~~	~~7,000 s.f.~~	~~4,500 s.f.~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~2,500 s.f.~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: R-SF– Single-Family Residential; R-P – Planned Residential; R-MD – Medium-Density Residential; R-HD – High-Density Residential; R-MHP – Mobile Home Park.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

TABLE 2-2
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Commercial Use Categories					
	C-R	C-C	C-OT	C-VS	C-I	C-G
Retail Trade						
Large-Scale Retail Establishments	X	X	–	–	–	–
General Merchandise	X	X	X	–	–	X
Food and Drug Stores	X	X	X	–	X	X
Apparel and Specialty Stores	X	X	X	–	–	X
Building/Landscape Materials and Equipment	X	X	X	–	–	X
Eating and Drinking Establishments	X	X	X	X	X	X
Other Retail Trade Establishments	X	X	X	X	–	X
Coastal-Related Commercial	X	X	X	X	–	–
Services (Including Offices)						
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	X	X	X	–	–	X
Personal Services	X	X	X	–	–	X
Business Services	–	X	X	–	–	X
Information Technology Services	–	–	–	–	–	X
Professional Services	–	X	X	–	–	X
Medical and Health-Related Services	X	X	X	–	–	–
Educational Services	–	–	X	–	–	X
Entertainment and Recreation Services	X	X	X	X	–	–
Building and Construction Services	–	–	–	–	–	X
Other Services	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transient Lodging and Services						
Resorts	–	–	–	X	–	–
Hotels, Motels, Bed and Breakfast Inns	X	X	X	X	–	–
RV Parks	–	–	X	X	–	X
Other Visitor Services and Attractions	–	–	–	X	–	X
Auto-Related Uses						
Retail – Automotive Sales and Rentals	–	–	X	–	–	X
Auto Repair and Painting	–	–	–	–	–	X
Auto Wrecking Yard/Junk Yard	–	–	–	–	–	X
Auto Service (Gas) Station	X	–	X	–	X	X
Car Wash	–	X	X	–	X	X
Wholesale Trade and Storage						
General Wholesale Trade	–	–	–	–	–	X
Warehousing – General	–	–	–	–	–	X
Warehousing – Self-Storage	–	–	–	–	–	X
Outdoor Storage	–	–	–	–	–	X
Residential Uses						
Residential Units	–	X	X	–	–	–
One Caretaker Unit	X	X	X	X	–	X
Assisted-Living Residential Units	–	–	–	–	–	X
Other Uses						
Religious Institutions	–	X	X	–	–	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	–	X	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	X	X	X	X	X
Standards for Density and Building Intensity						
Recommended Standards for Density						
Maximum Residential Density	N/A	12/acre	20/acre	N/A	N/A	20/acre
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity						
~~Maximum FAR~~	~~0.35~~	~~0.40~~	~~0.60~~	~~0.25~~	~~0.40~~	~~0.40~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height	35 feet	~~25~~35 feet	30 feet	35 feet	25 feet	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
~~Minimum Open Space Ratio~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~0.40~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~
~~Minimum Lot Size~~	~~size in 2005~~	~~size in 2005~~	~~size in 2005~~	~~size in 2005~~	~~size in 2005~~	~~10,000 s.f.~~

Notes:
1. Use Categories: C-R – Regional Commercial; C-C – Community Commercial; C-OT – Old Town Commercial; C-VS – Visitor Commercial; C-I – Intersection; Commercial; C-G – General Commercial.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; – indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are as set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. Wholesale trade is permitted within the C-R use category, provided that it is an integral part of a retail trade use.
5. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
6. N/A = Not applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

TABLE 2-3
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR OFFICE AND INDUSTRIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Office and Industrial Use Categories			
	I-BP	I-OI	I-S	I-G
Industrial (Manufacturing)				
General Manufacturing – No Noxious Impacts	X	–	X	X
General Manufacturing – Potential Noxious Impacts	–	–	–	X
Research and Development	X	X	–	X
Scientific and Similar Instruments	X	X	–	X
Bio-Medical Technology	X	X	–	X
Other Advanced Technology	X	X	–	X
Transportation and Utilities				
Transportation (other than right-of-way)	–	–	X	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	X	X	X
Utilities	X	X	–	–
Retail Trade				
Building/Landscape Materials and Equipment	–	X	–	X
Eating and Drinking Establishments	X	X	–	–
Other Retail Trade Establishments	X	X	–	–
Services (Including Offices)				
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	X	X	–	–
Personal Services	X	X	–	–
Business Services	X	X	–	–
Information Technology Services	X	X	–	–
Professional Services	–	X	–	–
Medical and Health-Related Services	–	X	–	–
Educational Services	–	X	–	–
Entertainment and Recreation Services	–	X	–	–
Building and Construction Services	–	–	X	X
Other Services	–	–	X	X
Auto-Related Uses				
Automotive Sales and Rentals	–	–	X	X
Auto Repair and Painting	–	–	X	X
Auto Wrecking Yard/Junk Yard	–	–	X	X
Auto Service (Gas) Station	–	–	–	X
Wholesale Trade and Storage				
General Wholesale Trade	–	–	X	X
Warehousing – General	X*	–	X	X
Warehousing – Self-Storage	–	–	X	X
Outdoor Storage	–	–	X	X
Residential Uses				
Residential Units	–	X	–	–
One Caretaker Unit Per Parcel	X	X	X	X
Assisted-Living Residential Units	–	X	–	–
Other Uses				
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X
Religious Institutions	–	X	–	–
Standards for Density and Building Intensity				
Recommended Standards for Density				
Maximum Residential Density	N/A	20units/acre	N/A	N/A
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity				
~~Maximum FAR~~	~~0.40~~	~~0.40~~	~~0.60~~	~~0.30~~
~~Maximum FAR for Hotels (with Hotel Overlay)~~	~~0.50~~	~~0.50~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Heights	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	0.35	0.40	N/A	N/A
~~Minimum Open Space/Landscaping Ratio~~	~~0.30~~	~~0.10~~	~~0.10~~	~~0.10~~
~~Minimum Lot Size~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~

Notes:
1. Use Categories: I-BP – Business Park; I-OI – Office and Institutional; I-S – Service Industrial; I-G – General Industrial.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not applicable.

* Warehousing is allowed on parcels designated Business Park (I-BP) if it is in association with a permitted use.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

TABLE 2-4
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR OTHER LAND USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Other Land Use Categories			
	AG	**OS-PR**	**OS-AR**	**P-S**
Residential Uses				
One Single-Family Detached Dwelling per Lot	X	–	–	–
Farmworker Residential Units	X	–	–	–
Second Residential Dwelling Unit	X	–	–	–
Caretaker Residential Unit	–	–	X	X
Agricultural Uses				
Orchards and Vineyards	X	–	–	–
Row Crop Production	X	–	–	–
Specialty Agriculture and Floriculture	X	–	–	–
Livestock Grazing	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Confined Animal Operations	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Agricultural Processing	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Greenhouses	X	–	–	–
Sale of On-Site Agricultural Products	X	–	–	–
Other	X	–	–	–
Open Space and Outdoor Recreation				
Active Recreation	–	–	X	X
Open Space and Passive Recreation	–	X	X	X
Golf Course, including customary ancillary uses and structures	–	–	X	X
Nature Preserve	–	X	X	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses				
General Government Administration	–	–	–	X
Fire Stations	X	–	–	X
Schools (Public and Private)	–	–	–	X
Other Government Facilities	–	–	–	X
Other Uses				
Religious Institutions	–	–	–	X
Small-Scale Residential Care Facility	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Day Care Center	–	–	–	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	–	–	X
Recommended Standards for ~~Density and~~ Building Intensity				
~~***Recommended Standards for Density***~~				
~~Maximum Permitted Density (Units/Acres)~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~	~~N/A~~
~~***Recommended Standards for Building Intensity***~~				
~~**Maximum FAR**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space Ratio**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**2005 lot size**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: AG: Agriculture; OS-PR: Open Space/Passive Recreation; OS-AR: Open Space/Active Recreation; P-S: Public and Quasi-public Uses.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not Applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

Exhibit 2

CEQA and Administrative Findings

EXHIBIT 2
CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 09-__

A. CEQA FINDINGS ADDRESSING TRACK 2.5 ADDENDUM ISSUE AREAS

The Track 2.5 Addendum, dated May 19, 2009, documents minor revisions and technical changes to the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan EIR (SCH #2005031151) associated with the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Track 2.5 Amendments. It addresses the following issue areas as summarized below and in these findings:

Aesthetics and Visual Resources
Agriculture and Farmland
Air Quality
Biological Resources
Cultural Resources
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources
Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Population and Housing
Water Resources
Land Use and Recreation
Noise
Public Services and Utilities
Transportation and Circulation
Overall Findings

A.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources

There are no new significant Aesthetics and Visual Resources impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.2. Agriculture and Farmland

There are no new significant Agriculture and Farmland impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.3 Air Quality

There are no new significant Air Quality impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.4 Biological Resources

There are no new significant Biological Resources impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.5 Cultural Resources

There are no new significant Cultural Resources impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.6 Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources

There are no new significant Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

There are no new significant Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts associated with the relevant Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments.

A.8 Population and Housing

There are no new significant Population and Housing impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.9 Water Resources

There are no new significant Water Resources impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.10 Land Use and Recreation

There are no new significant Land Use and Recreation impacts associated with the Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments.

A.11 Noise

There are no new significant Noise impacts associated with the General Plan Track 2.5 Amendments.

A.12 Public Services and Utilities

There are no new significant Public Services and Utilities impacts associated with the Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments.

A.13 Transportation and Circulation

There are no new significant Transportation and Circulation impacts associated with the relevant Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments.

A.14 Overall Findings

The above information in subsections A.1 through A.13 describes the effect of the Track 2.5 Amendments on issue areas discussed in the Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR. No new significant environmental impacts would occur.

B. GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65358 THAT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

B.1 Findings Regarding Amendments

Land Use Element

LU Tables 2-1 through 2-4
LU 4.1 General Purpose
LU 4.2 Business Park
LU 4.3 Office and Institutional
IP-6E subpart e

Housing Element

HE 11.8

Finding. These amendments remove building intensity standards shown in Tables 2-1 through 2-4 and supporting policy text for two reasons: (1) building intensity standards are typically placed in a

zoning ordinance; and (2) Government Code Section 65302(a) requires the designation of allowed uses and densities, not intensities, for various land use designations in General Plans. Removal of the building intensity standards does not alter land use designations within the City. It allows for more specific building intensity standards in the zoning ordinance that could be specific to the needs of a neighborhood, for example. The City Council finds that these Land Use Element and Housing Element Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments would ultimately provide for more detailed building intensity standards that are tailored to a specific location rather than citywide standards. The amendment is therefore in the public interest.

B.2 Overall Finding

The City Council further finds that the following benefits resulting from the Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments are in the public interest:

1. The Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments would provide clarification, substitute language, and/or alternate direction to policies and figures in the General Plan, that provide for greater clarity and flexibility in implementing the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan goals and objectives. The amendments would promote the intention of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan to preserve and enhance the quality of the community through appropriate use of the land that provides continuity with past and present uses. Land use patterns would remain primarily residential and open, with the majority of nonresidential development concentrated along the primary transportation corridor ---- east and west along Hollister Avenue and US Highway 101.

2. The Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments would continue to allow development and implementation of programs to revitalize the Old Town area.

3. The Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments would encourage sustained economic growth.

4. The Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments would continue to allow focus on the preservation and enhancement of scenic views, ocean and island views, mountain and foothill views, open space views, preservation of natural landforms, scenic corridors, and community character.

5. The Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments would continue to reflect the community's goals and aspirations for Goleta by contributing to the creation of a coherent vision for the City's future, building upon the individual and sometimes conflicting visions of a diverse population.

6. The Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments would facilitate the guidance of future physical changes and public decision making in a lawful manner that is comprehensive, long range, and internally consistent.

7. The Track 2.5 General Plan Amendments facilitate the four core goals and objectives of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan:

    a. The provision of a unified and coherent framework and vision for the future of Goleta.
    b. The provision of a basis for future decisions by the City on implementing ordinances such as zoning and subdivision codes, individual development project applications, and public investments in infrastructure and services.
    c. Informing the public of the City's policies and provision of a means to invite public participation in the decision-making process.
    d. Guidance for private landowners, developers, and other public agencies in formulating projects and designs that are consistent with City policies.

Attachment 2

Addendum, dated May 19, 2009, to the
Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2005031151)

(Final EIR provided at Goleta City Hall for purchase or provided free of charge at www.cityofgoleta.org. The Final EIR is available for onsite review, free of charge at both the Goleta City Hall and at the Goleta Public Library)

CEQA Addendum for
Track 2.5
Changes to Building Intensity Standards

(09-020-GPA)

Goleta General Plan/
Coastal Land Use Plan
Final Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for:

Planning and Environmental Services Department
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117

Prepared by:

City of Goleta
Planning and Environmental Services Department

May 19, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.0
INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

This addendum to the final environmental impact report (EIR) for the City of Goleta (City) General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP, or Plan) was prepared to address any new or modified environmental impacts associated with minor revisions to the GP/CLUP associated with the proposed Track 2.5, Building Intensity Standards changes. This document has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) and CEQA Statutes provided in California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.

The GP/CLUP was adopted in October 2006 and is the primary means for guiding future change in Goleta as the City faces decisions about growth, housing, environmental protection, neighborhood compatibility/ preservation, public facilities/services, and transportation. The final EIR addressing the potential environmental impacts of the GP/CLUP was certified in October 2006.

In March 2007, the City Council initiated a process for reopening the GP/CLUP to consider the emergence of suggested amendments by City staff, the public-at-large, landowners, developers, and special groups. Those City-initiated amendments were subsequently grouped into five categories: *Track 1* for Housing Element revisions to respond to State Department of Housing and Community Development Department comments; *Track 2* for minor technical or editorial revisions presenting no new significant environmental impacts; *Track 3* for revisions meriting more detailed review as to their potential impacts; *Track 4* for project-sponsored amendments; and *Track 5* for Sphere of Influence. An addendum (dated March 2008) to the FEIR prepared on the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan was prepared to address the Track 2 changes. The FEIR and Track 2 Addendum are incorporated by reference into this Addendum document.

Upon adoption of the Track 2 General Plan Amendments on June 17, 2008, the City Council directed that staff work with the Planning Commission and Design Review Board on possible revisions to the Building Intensity Standards included in the General Plan. As they are a result a follow-up to the Track 2 process, these proposed changes are called “Track 2.5” of the General Plan revision process.

The purpose of this Addendum to the final EIR is to document the CEQA review for those proposed amendments categorized as Track 2.5 revisions to the GP/CLUP. The CEQA lead agency for this Addendum is the City of Goleta.

<u>Note: Minor updates have been made to this Addendum to reflect the City Council’s conceptual action of April 21 and adoption on May 19, 2009. These updates are underlined.</u>

1.2 CEQA GUIDELINES – ADDENDUMS TO EIRS AND SUBSEQUENT EIRS

According to Section 15164(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency or the responsible agency will prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have

occurred. Section 15164(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires substantial evidence that a subsequent EIR is not necessary.

Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that, for a project covered by a certified EIR, preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR *rather* than an addendum is required only if one or more of the following conditions occur:

1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

    a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
    b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
    c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
    d) Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

1.3 SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

This addendum includes the certified final EIR by reference, the Track 2 Addendum and addresses new or modified environmental impacts associated with minor revisions to the GP/CLUP as a consequence of the proposed Track 2.5 amendments. The scope of analysis contained within this addendum addresses each of the environmental resource areas that were previously analyzed in the certified final EIR. The addendum addresses the following environmental issues:

- aesthetics and visual resources;
- agriculture and farmland;
- air quality;
- biological resources;
- cultural resources;
- geology, soils, and mineral resources;
- hazards and hazardous materials;

- population and housing;
- water resources;
- land use and recreation;
- noise;
- public services and utilities; and
- transportation and circulation.

Chapter 3 of this addendum includes a table that presents the proposed amendment to the GP/CLUP, and CEQA review. The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this addendum are the same as those contained within the certified Final EIR and Track 2 Addendum.

1.4 ADDENDUM ORGANIZATION

The content and organization of this addendum are designed to meet the current requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The addendum is organized as described below:

- **Chapter 1.0, "Introduction and Overview,"** describes background and introductory information for the proposed amendments; the background of the GP/CLUP; and the purpose, scope, and content of the addendum.
- **Chapter 2.0, "Project Description,"** describes the project location, project details, and the City's objectives for the proposed project. This section also provides a summary rationale for selecting an addendum as the appropriate form of CEQA documentation.
- **Chapter 3.0, "Environmental Analysis,"** identifies those policies proposed for 'Track 2' amendment. The environmental analysis is presented in a table format, listing the policy text in the current GP/CLUP, the proposed amendment, and the proposed final amendment with CEQA review.
- **Chapter 4.0, "List of Preparers,"** lists the individuals involved in preparing this addendum.
- **Chapter 5.0, "References,"** identifies the documents (printed references) and individuals (personal communications) consulted during preparation of this addendum. This chapter includes the agencies and people consulted to ascertain information for the analysis of impacts and support for the conclusions made from the analysis.

1.5 ADOPTION AND AVAILABILITY OF ADDENDUM

The Track 2.5 amendments to the Building Intensity Standards were the subject of three public workshops with the Planning Commission and Design Review Board held on August 18, 2008, September 15, 2008 and October 20, 2008 to collect input from the Commission and Board and feedback from the public. Public comment was also received at public hearings held by the Planning Commission and City Council on the Track 2 amendments including on March 24, 2008, May 12, 2008, June 3, 2008 and June 17, 2008. After considering public comment from these various workshops and hearings, the City Council directed that the Planning Commission and Design Review Board study the Building Intensity Standards and report back to them with proposed amendments as discussed in this Addendum. The Planning Commission reviewed the Addendum at a

public hearing on February 23, 2009, followed by City Council consideration of the Addendum at public hearings held on April 21 and May 19, 2009.

The Track 2.5 Addendum will be considered for acceptance by the City of Goleta Planning Commission and the City Council. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(c), an addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR. The decision-making body considers the addendum with the final EIR prior to making a decision on the project.

The addendum is available for general public reference at the following locations:

City of Goleta
Planning and Environmental Services Dept
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117

Goleta Valley Public Library
500 North Fairview Avenue
Goleta, California 93117

CHAPTER 2.0
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The City of Goleta adopted the GP/CLUP in October 2006. The GP/CLUP is the primary means for guiding future changes in Goleta. Through the GP/CLUP, the City addresses decisions about growth, housing, environmental protection, neighborhood compatibility, and preservation, public facilities and services, and transportation. Prior to the adoption of the GP/CLUP, the City of Goleta, acting as the lead agency, determined that the proposed GP/CLUP could result in significant adverse environmental effects, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064. Therefore, the City required the preparation of a program-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project, or the implementation of the GP/CLUP. A Final Environmental Impact Report was adopted by the City Council prior to approving the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan in October 2006. The Final EIR is incorporated by reference into this Addendum.

In March 2007, the City Council initiated a process for reopening the GP/CLUP to consider the emergence of suggested amendments by City staff, the public-at-large, landowners, developers, and special groups. Those City-initiated amendments were subsequently grouped into five categories, one of which was Track 2 for minor technical or editorial revisions presenting no new significant environmental impacts.

Upon adoption of the Track 2 amendments on June 17, 2008, the City Council directed that the Building Intensity Standards included in the GP/CLUP be studied. Proposed changes to these standards are referred to as "Track 2.5." These changes are analyzed in this addendum to the Final EIR, the purpose of which is to document the CEQA review for those proposed amendments to the GP/CLUP. The CEQA lead agency for this addendum is the City of Goleta.

The Addendum will be considered for acceptance by the City of Goleta Planning Commission and the City Council. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(c), an addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR. The decision-making body considers the addendum with the final EIR prior to making a decision on the project.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND

2.2.1 Location

The City of Goleta is located in southern Santa Barbara County, California, west of the City of Santa Barbara between the foothills of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Pacific Ocean as shown in Figure 2-1 of the Final EIR. The City of Goleta and surrounding area is generally referred to as the *Goleta Valley*. Goleta is bisected by U.S. Highway 101 (US-101), which extends in an east-west alignment across the City. State Route 217 (SR-217) connects US-101 with the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) to the south. Portions of the City are bordered by UCSB and by the City of Santa Barbara, including the Santa Barbara Airport. The southern portions of Goleta are within the California Coastal

Zone subject to the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission (see Final EIR, Figure 2-2, Coastal Zone Boundary).

Access into and through the City of Goleta is provided primarily through US-101. Other major east-west arterials include Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road. Major north-south arterials are Patterson Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Los Carneros Road, and Storke-Glen Annie Road.

The project location includes the entire territory within the geographic area of the incorporated city limits, and includes a population of approximately 30,000 people. This area encompasses approximately 7.9 square miles, containing a total of 5,075 acres. In developing the Draft GP/CLUP, the City studied an area of approximately 95 square miles where future development might impact the City or where City plans and policies might have effects outside the city boundaries. Potential future City service areas, filling the probable ultimate physical boundaries and service area of the City, are shown in Figure 2-2 of the Final EIR.

2.2.2 Background

California state planning law, at Section 65300 of the California Government Code, requires that cities adopt a general plan as a guide to their physical development. The role of the general plan is to act as the City's constitution for the physical use of resources, to express the community's preservation and development goals, and to establish public policy relative to the distribution of future public and private land use. The plan must contain the seven elements mandated by state law and may include other optional elements.

In October 2006, the City adopted its current GP/CLUP which, as amended, establishes goals, policies, and objectives for guiding future change in the City. The subject project comprises amendments to selected policies of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

The California Coastal Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 30000 et seq) was enacted by the State legislature in 1976 to provide long-term protection of California's 1,100-mile coastline. The California Coastal Commission, in partnership with coastal cities and counties, plans and regulates the use of land and water in the coastal zone. The Coastal Act requires local governments in the California Coastal Zone to create and implement Local Coastal Programs (LCPs). The City of Goleta's adopted GP/CLUP serves as the CLUP for coastal zone areas within the City boundaries however the CLUP has not been submitted to the Coastal Commission for certification. The City's certified GP/CLUP EIR, the Track 2 Addendum and this Addendum comprise the environmental review for policies presented in the GP/CLUP, as amended.

2.3 GOLETA'S GENERAL PLAN/COASTAL LAND USE PLAN

The fundamental goals of the GP/CLUP are to: (1) ensure a high quality environment by protecting and conserving the community's cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources; (2) provide a sustainable economy that is not solely dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for current and future residents; (3) maintains adequate service standards, including level of service (LOS) on area highways; and (4) enables income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs. These goals are retained as part of the addendum and were used

as a guide during the identification of the Track 2 and Track 2.5 General Plan Amendment processes.

Proposed amendments categorized as Track 2.5 revisions to the GP/CLUP are summarized in Section 2.5.

2.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Final GP/CLUP and the Track 2 Addendum are available for review at City Hall and is posted on the City's website (www.cityofgoleta.org). Opportunities for public participation in the GP/CLUP process have been many and varied over the past four years and are outlined in the Track 2 Addendum. Activities relating to the Track 2.5 amendments included:

- Planning Commission public hearings on March 24, 2008 and May 12, 2008.
- City Council public hearings on June 3, 2008 and June 17, 2008.
- Planning Commission and Design Review Board (DRB) public workshops held on August 18, 2008, September 15, 2008 and October 20, 2008
- Planning Commission public hearing on February 23, 2009
- City Council public hearing on April 21
- City Council public meeting on May 19, 2009

2.5 PROPOSED TRACK 2.5 CHANGES TO THE GP/CLUP

As noted in Section 2.1, the Goleta City Council authorized review of the General Plan land use tables to be more compatible with recent case law and the State's General Plan Guidelines and to provide more consistency between the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance standards that relate to building intensity. The proposed changes to the four land use tables recommended by the Planning Commission and Design Review Board are shown in Tables 2-1 through 2-4.

The proposed revisions to the four tables also necessitate some revisions to certain policies in the General Plan that correspond to the land use tables. The proposed changes to the tables and related policies evaluated in this Addendum incorporate minor technical or editorial changes in wording, present no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involve no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and require no new or modified mitigation measures. Accordingly, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (e), the appropriate form of CEQA documentation for these Track 2.5 revisions is an Addendum, rather than a Subsequent EIR.

In addition to the changes in Building Intensity Standards shown in Tables 2-1 through 2-4, the proposed policy amendments affect the existing Land Use Element and Housing Element of the General Plan as shown below. These policy amendments are recommended by the Planning Commission and Design Review Board. Staff concurs with the Commission's and DRB's recommendations with some minor revisions that are also addressed in this Addendum. The project recommended by the City Council at their April 21, 2009 meeting is the "Alternate Proposed Project" addressed in this Addendum.

2.5.1 Proposed Project (recommended by Planning Commission and Design Review Board, October 20, 2008)

1. **Residential Land Uses & related policies –** See Attachment 1 for proposed changes to Land Use Tables 2-1 through 2-4.
    a. **Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4** (p. 2-9, 2-13, 2-17 & 2-21) – Remove Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards.

    b. **Table 2-1, Residential Land Uses** (p. 2-9) - Remove Minimum Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size under "Standards for Density and Building Intensity".

    c. **Housing Element Policy Implementation Action IP-6E, Modify Multifamily Zoning Standards** (p. 10-22) – This strategy provides for zoning ordinance revisions that may include a number of standards, including floor area ratios (FARs). The revised language would read: "e. Incorporation of revised building intensity standards ~~the increased floor area ratios (FARs)~~ as set forth in the Land Use Element to encourage higher density housing in Old Town Commercial, Community Commercial, and Office and Institutional use categories where possible…."

    d. **Housing Element Policy HE 11.8, Additional Incentives for Onsite Production of Affordable Inclusionary Units** (p. 10-34) – This policy provides incentives for developers of a 5-acre or larger site designated Medium-Density Residential who agree to construct affordable inclusionary units pursuant to other Housing Element policies. The revised language would read: "….the City shall provide the following incentives or concessions:

        "a. ~~The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standard set forth in the Land Use Element shall be increased from 0.5 to 0.6.~~
        ~~b.~~ a. The Lot Coverage Ratio standard set forth in the Land Use Element shall be increased from 0.3 to 0.4…."

2. **Commercial Land Uses & related policies**

    a. Table 2-2, Commercial Land Uses (p. 2-13) – Change the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" as follows:

        - Increase Maximum Structure Height for C-C from 25 ft to 35ft. consistent with comparable Zoning Ordinance standards.
        - Add 0.40 Maximum Lot Coverage for C-I (from Zoning Ordinance)
        - Remove Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size standards.
        - Change Maximum Residential Density from 20 units/acre to "TBD" for C-OT designation. The Maximum Residential Density is to be determined during the upcoming Zoning Ordinance Update which should include Form-Based Code for the entire Redevelopment area.

3. **Office & Industrial Uses & related policies**

    a. **Land Use Element Policy LU 4.1, General Purpose** (p. 2-16) – This policy refers in Table 2-3 in a general way and should be amended to reflect the

June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-3 shows the various office and industrial land use designations, including permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity in each category…."

b. Table 2-3, Office & Industrial Uses (p. 2-17) – Change the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" as follows:

- Increase I-OI height from 35 ft to 40ft if Mixed-Use, i.e., residential and commercial/office uses together.
- Remove Open Space Ratio, and Minimum Lot Size standards.

c. **Land Use Element Policy LU 4.2, Business Park (I-BP)** (p. 2-16) – This policy refers to the Business Park designation including FARs which are proposed for removal from the table. The revised language should read: "….In addition, lands designated with a Hotel Overlay may include transient lodging that emphasizes extended stays. ~~The maximum FAR set forth in Table 2-3 is increased from 0.4 to 0.5 for hotel uses.~~ Activities in business park areas shall be conducted….."

d. **Land Use Element Policy LU 4.3, Office and Institutional (I-OI)** (p. 2-18) – This policy addresses the I-OI designation, including the Hospital Overlay and appropriate FARs for hospital and medical office buildings. Remove subsection 'a' that refers to FARs and retain subsections 'b' and 'c.'

4. Other Land Uses & related policies

a. Table 2-4, Other Land Uses (p. 2-21) – Change the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" as follows:

- Add 25 feet Maximum Building Height for AG, OS-PR, and OS-AR designations (higher heights are allowed in corresponding zones).
- Add 35 feet Maximum Building Height for P-S designation.
- Add Maximum Lot Coverage of 0.20 for OS-PR and OS-AR designations to be consistent with corresponding Zoning Ordinance standards.
- Remove Maximum Residential Densities, Open Space Ratios and Minimum Lot Size standards (all are "N/A" except minimum lot size in Agricultural designation which is "size in 2005).

b. Land Use Element Policy LU 6.1, General (p. 2-20) – This policy refers to the Park and Open Space categories in Table 2-4. This policy should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-4 shows the Park and Open space use categories, including permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity for each category…."

c. **Land Use Element Policy LU 7.1, General** (p. 2-22) - This policy refers to the Agriculture category in Table 2-4. This policy should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated

that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-4 shows the permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity for the Agricultural land use category…."

5. **Deferred Zoning Ordinance Updates** – When the upcoming Zoning Ordinance Update is done, consideration should be given to the following:
    1. Reduce the Maximum Building Heights (Inland) for R-1/E-1 and R-2 Zones from 35 to 25 feet;
    2. Increase the Max. Lot Coverage from 0.30 to 0.40 for the DR-25 and DR-30 Zones;
    3. Reduce the Max. Building Height in OT-R/LC from 35 to 30 feet;
    4. Reduce the Max. Building Height in the M-1 from 45 to 35 feet;
    5. Review all standards removed through the Track 2.5 process to ensure they are included in the corresponding zone district where appropriate;
    6. Amend the Hospital Overlay Zone to provide standards and requirements that facilitate the needs of the hospital and related medical services including, but not limited to, increased building heights;" and
    7. After review of the effectiveness of the "standards for analysis" for projects seeking to use the good cause finding (see "Glossary" above), consider adding the finding to the Zoning Ordinance for relief from the development standards.

2.5.2 Alternate Proposed Project (recommended by the City Council, April 21, 2009)

Through the environmental review process, staff identified an alternative set of amendments that, we believe, better clarify or express the intent of the General Plan. Refer to Attachment 3 for proposed amendments to Tables 2-1 through 2-4 that reflect the Alternative Proposed Project. Table 1 of this staff report summarizes the alternative proposed project in comparison to the proposed project.

Staff is proposing the following Alternative Proposed Project which is the same as the Planning Commission/DRB recommendation with the following changes and additions:

1. **Amendments to General Plan Land Use Tables and related policy –** See Attachment 2:

    a. Table 2-1, Residential Land Uses – As recommended by the Commission and DRB except:

    - Change "Maximum Structure Height" to "Structure Height"

    b. Table 2-2, Commercial Land Uses – As recommended by the Commission and DRB except:

    - Retain the "20/acre" density for the C-OT designation
    - Retain the "N/A" for Maximum Lot Coverage in the C-I designation
    - Change "Maximum Structure Height" to "Structure Height"

    c. Table 2-3, Office and Industrial Land Uses – As recommended by the Commission and DRB except:

- Remove the double asterisk and footnote saying Maximum Structure Height is 40 feet if a mixed use project in the I-OI designation
- Change "Maximum Structure Height" to "Structure Height"

d. Table 2-4, Other Land Uses – As recommended by the Commission and DRB except:
   - Change "Maximum Structure Height" to "Structure Height"
   - The Structure Height and Lot Coverage should remain "N/A" for these designations.

e. Amend Land Use Policy 4.3, subpart 'b' (p. 2-18) to change "maximum structure height" to "structure height."

2. **Amended definition of "Good Cause Finding" in the GP/CLUP Glossary to include "standards for analysis"** – Recommended standards include:

   a. Conceptual drawings (basic site plan and elevations) of the proposal that meet the standards in the land use tables for review by the DRB and Planning Commission;

   b. At the discretion of the DRB and/or Planning Commission, conceptual plans may be request of one (1) other version of the project that comes closer to meeting the standard in the tables;

   c. At the discretion of the DRB and/or Planning Commission, story poles may be requested, including poles that reflect the proposal that meets the standards; and

   d. The use proposed should meet a community need or goal, e.g., senior or affordable housing, recreational facilities open to the public, non-profit facilities that serve the public, preservation or restoration of a historic structure or resource, and/or projects that have negligible impacts and do not require significant use of public and/or natural resources.

CHAPTER 3.0
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The City's current GP/CLUP was adopted and the EIR was certified in October 2006. In March 2007, the City Council initiated a process for reopening the GP/CLUP to consider the emergence of suggested amendments by City staff, the public-at-large, landowners, developers, and special groups. Minor technical or editorial revisions presenting no new significant environmental impacts were identified as Track 2 which was approved by the City Council on June 17, 2008. Possible changes to the Building Intensity Standards discussed during the Track 2 process were referred to the Planning Commission and Design Review Board for more discussion and analysis. The possible changes are identified as Track 2.5.

The Track 2.5 amendments were the subject of three public workshops on August 18, September 15 and October 20, 2008. After considering public comment at the workshops, the Commission and Board recommended certain changes to the Building Intensity Standards that are discussed in this Addendum to the Final EIR on the GP/CLUP. In general, these revisions were made to be more compatible with recent case law and the State's General Plan Guidelines and to provide more consistency between the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance standards that relate to building intensity.

3.2 ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Addendum includes the certified final EIR and the Track 2 Addendum by reference and addresses new or modified environmental impacts associated with minor revisions to the GP/CLUP. The environmental analysis is presented in Table 3-1, listing the proposed GP/CLUP amendment and the CEQA review.

3.3 SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATION

The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this addendum are the same as those contained within the certified final EIR. While the criteria for determining significant impacts are unique to each issue area, the analysis applies a uniform classification of the impacts based on the following definitions:

- A designation of ***no impact*** is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- A ***less-than-significant impact*** would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
- An impact that is ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated*** avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
- A ***significant and unavoidable*** impact would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and no feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Based on the above criteria, the environmental impact analysis assesses each issue area to determine the significance level. These impacts are categorized using the City's guidance for classifying project-related impacts, as follows:

- ***Class I*** impacts are significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated, reduced, or avoided. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City adopted a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Section 15093, explaining why project benefits outweigh the disturbance caused by these significant environmental impact or impacts.
- ***Class II*** impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly reduced or avoided through the implementation of GP/CLUP policies, or by other recommended mitigation. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City made findings pursuant to CEQA Section 15091, that impacts have been mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementing the recommended mitigation measures.
- ***Class III*** impacts are adverse impacts that are less than significant. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City was not required to make CEQA findings regarding these impacts.
- ***Class IV*** impacts include changes to the environment as a result of GP/CLUP implementation that would be beneficial.

The policies evaluated in this Addendum incorporate minor technical or editorial changes in wording, present no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involve no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and require no new or modified mitigation measures. Accordingly, the environmental impacts of all proposed amendments evaluated herein are considered to have less-than-significant impacts (Class III) or no impacts (Class IV).

3.4 REQUIREMENTS FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130) require a reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impacts are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355).

Potential cumulative impacts are further described as follows:

> (a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355[a]).
>
> (b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355[b]).

Furthermore, according to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130(a)(1):

> As defined in Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.

In addition, as stated in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064(i)(5), it should be noted that:

> The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable.

3.4.1 Evaluation

The cumulative impact analysis evaluated in the GP/CLUP EIR comprises: (1) the citywide impact analysis from full buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP; and (2) outside the City boundary, the cumulative impacts analysis is based on known or foreseeable projects in the unincorporated Santa Barbara County, City of Santa Barbara, and UCSB. The City's prior adoption of the GP/CLUP involved no immediate physical environmental impact. Rather, the Plan set the stage for future development within the City, and as such, the EIR analysis focused on the "indirect" impacts of adoption of the GP/CLUP. These impacts would result primarily from development associated with:

- development of existing vacant lands consistent with the land use plan map;
- redevelopment of existing developed lands to more intensive or different uses;
- major planned street and highway and infrastructure improvements, consistent with the transportation improvement map; and
- future development consistent with the proposed land use map and General Plan goals, objectives, and policies.

The cumulative environment on which this future City development was assumed to occur included future growth within the region including the City of Santa Barbara Airport, Santa Barbara County from Highway 154 to the eastern City boundary and from Gaviota to the western City boundary, and UCSB. The City of Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County, and UCSB growth projections for the region were added to growth assumed for the City, which is already factored into the GP/CLUP to arrive at the cumulative environment.

Because these impacts would occur over time as part of individual residential and commercial/industrial development projects, a project horizon year (2030) was established for purposes of analysis in the EIR. The growth and changes in land use that were analyzed as impacts of the project throughout the EIR were projected to the year 2030, employing a cumulative analysis methodology.

No revisions to the cumulative impact analysis presented in the adopted GP/CLUP EIR are necessary as part of this Addendum.

Table 3-1
Track 2.5 Amendments and Related CEQA Review

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4 (p. 2-9, 2-13,2 -17 & 2-21)	**Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4** - Remove Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards.	Discussion This amendment would remove all FAR standards from the Building Intensity Standards provided in these four tables. This is consistent with recent case law and the state General Plan Guidelines. FARs are one tool to define compatibility with an area though they can be uninformative or misleading depending on the siting of the structure, its overall height, etc. This was demonstrated at the workshops by photos and site plans of buildings that, depending on the size of the parcel upon which they were located, had widely varying FARs whereas the buildings appeared to be of a similar size and scale. As a part of the design and discretionary review processes, building mass, bulk and scale may be defined in many ways, particularly through building setbacks, lot coverage and height requirements, all of which are typically provided for in the zoning ordinance. The deletion of the FARs from the tables does not preclude the analysis of the mass, bulk and scale of a building through the design review and planning processes. In terms of single family residences, the City Council has relocated the R-1 FAR Guidelines to an appendix of the Zoning Ordinance and directed that any proposal that exceeds those guidelines must have design review approval. Also, staff will be submitting story pole guidelines to the Council in the near future which will help to ensure that future projects are compatible with their neighborhood. The impact analysis would still be required by law for a particular proposal and GP standards would still apply, CEQA thresholds would still apply, and any project must be considered by the decision makers during deliberation and action on the associated permit. Therefore, no new significant CEQA impacts are expected as a result of this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: See discussion above. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.	Same as proposed project.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	
Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4 (p. 2-9, 2-13,2 -17 & 2-21)	**Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4** – Change "Maximum Structure Height" to "Structure Height".	N/A	Discussion This amendment would remove the word "Maximum" that modifies "Structure Height" because the definition in the General Plan conflicts with the Zoning Ordinance definition which is "average" structure height. A strict interpretation of "maximum" results in most projects needing to get relief from this standard while they meet the Zoning Ordinance standards. The General Plan use of "maximum" is not realistic and hampers good design. The deletion of "maximum" as modifier of structure height does not preclude the analysis of the mass, bulk and scale of a building through the design review and planning processes. The impact analysis would still be required by law for a particular proposal and GP/CLUP standards would still apply, CEQA thresholds would still apply, and any project must be considered by the decision makers during deliberation and action on the associated permit. Therefore, no new significant CEQA impacts are expected as a result of this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
			Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.
Table 2-1 (p. 2-9 of GP/CLUP)	**Table 2-1, Residential Land Uses** - Remove Minimum Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size under "Standards for Density and Building Intensity".	Discussion This amendment would remove the minimum open space ratio and minimum lot size standards for residential uses. The Zoning Ordinance provides for maximum building coverage, building height, separation between buildings & setbacks which effectively dictate the amount of development on a site with the remaining area dedicated to land-scaping and open space. The Zoning Ordinance provides the mini-mum lot size for various residential zones in the City so this removal does not change what ultimately might be constructed on a site. The deletion of these standards from the tables does not preclude the analysis of the mass, bulk and scale of a building through the design review and planning processes. The impact analysis would still be required by law for a particular proposal and GP/CLUP standards would still apply, CEQA thresholds would still apply, and any project must be considered by the decision makers during deliberation and action on the associated permit. Therefore, no new significant CEQA impacts are expected as a result of this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: See discussion above. Noise: N/A.	Same as proposed project.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	
Housing Element Policy Implement-ation Action IP-6E (p. 10-22)	**Housing Element Policy Implementation Action IP-6E, Modify Multifamily Zoning Standards** – This strategy provides for Zoning Ordinance revisions that may include a number of standards, including floor area ratios (FARs). The revised language would read: "e. Incorporation of revised building intensity standards ~~the increased floor area ratios (FARs)~~ as set forth in the Land Use Element to encourage higher density housing in Old Town Commercial, Community Commercial, and Office and Institutional use categories where possible…."	Discussion This amendment would remove specific reference to FARs and substitute reference to the recommended revised building intensity standards. These standards and those in the various zone districts would apply to new development, along with Housing Element policies that promote higher density to increase the number of affordable units. The change in the language would not appreciably change future development of affordable units and no new significant CEQA impacts are expected as a result of this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	Same as proposed project.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
Housing Element Policy HE 11.8 (p. 10-34)	**Housing Element Policy HE 11.8, Additional Incentives for Onsite Production of Affordable Inclusionary Units** – This policy provides incentives for developers of a 5-acre or larger site designated Medium-Density Residential who agree to construct affordable inclusionary units pursuant to other Housing Element policies. The revised language would read: "….the City shall provide the following incentives or concessions: "a. ~~The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standard set forth in the Land Use Element shall be increased from 0.5 to 0.6.~~ b. The Lot Coverage Ratio standard set forth in the Land Use Element shall be increased from 0.3 to 0.4…."	Discussion This amendment would remove the specific reference to FARs for projects on parcels of 5 acres or larger that include affordable inclusionary units. The other General Plan and Zoning Ordinance development standards included in Table 2-1 would still apply. These standards and those in the various zone districts would apply to new development, along with Housing Element policies that promote higher density to increase the number of inclusionary affordable units. There are several vacant parcels of five acres & more that are designated medium-density residential that may be affected by this proposed amendment, some of which are already in the review process and may be approved before the Track 2.5 amendments are reviewed and possibly adopted by the Council: • Site 20 – Willow Springs II (19 acres) – Application pending • Sites 21, 24 & 25 – Village at Los Carneros II (24 acres total) – Application pending • Site 26 – 9 acres (owned by John Price) – No application pending • Sites 22 & 23 – Village at Los Carneros I (15 acres) - Approved. • Site 28 – Westar (22 acres) – GPA initiated by City Council in December 2008 • Site 34 – Goleta Union SD (9 acres) – No application pending • Site 39 – Haskell's Landing (14 acre) – No action by Planning Commission; pending before Council for initiation State law provides that housing projects over a certain number must include inclusionary units with the number of those units basically prescribed. The size of these units is usually small to keep the price low and in the affordable range. Removing FARs from the table would not be expected to increase the number of inclusionary units or their size. The change in the language would not appreciably change future development of affordable inclusionary units in the City, No new significant CEQA impacts are expected as a result of this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: See discussion above. Noise: N/A.	Same as proposed project.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	
Table 2-2 (p. 2-13)	**Table 2-2, Commercial Land Uses** (p. 2-13) – Change the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" as follows: a. Increase Maximum Structure Height for C-C from 25 ft to 35ft. consistent with comparable Zoning Ordinance standards. b. Add 0.40 Maximum Lot Coverage for C-I (from Zoning Ordinance) c. Remove Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size standards. d. Change Maximum Residential Density from 20 units/acre to "TBD" for C-OT designation. The Maximum Residential Density is to be determined during the upcoming Zoning Ordinance Update which should include Form-Based Code for the entire Redevelopment area.	Discussion This amendment would modify several standards included in this table relating to commercial land uses. Each is discussed below: ***a.*** The C-C designation corresponds to numerous zone districts: C-1 (Limited Commercial), C-2 (General Commercial), C-3 (General Commercial), C-N (Neighborhood Commercial), C-S (Service Commercial), and SC (Shopping Center). All of those zones have a maximum structure height of 35 ft, the same as is proposed for Table 2-2 for the C-C designation. Using the Fairview Center as an example, while the average height is approximately 24 feet (as calculated by the County's height definition at the time of approval in 2002), there are towers and other architectural elements that extend to 37 feet. This shopping center has already received a parking modification of some 300 spaces, so adding another story to some buildings on the parcel would be difficult under any circumstances. The Commission and DRB heard testimony that the typical grocery store is 28 to 30 feet in height, the typical drug store is 29 to 36 feet and small retail is in the 28 to 30 foot range, all of these uses that might be in a C-C designated shopping center. Increasing the building height in the C-C designations to conform to the maximum building height in the corresponding zone districts of 35 feet should not result in any more construction on existing parcels so designated. There are many other considerations that enter into the analysis, the first of which is parking requirements and adding a new story with residential or office uses would require additional parking. There are also aesthetic and design considerations that might make adding a story difficult. There is one 6.2 acre parcel (on Calle Real west of Storke Rd) designated C-C that is vacant. Given that the Zoning Ordinance already allows 35 foot tall buildings in the zone and the GP standards are recommended, any future development on this site	Discussion The staff recommendation retains the "N/A" for the C-I designation ('b' at left) and the "20/acre" density for the C-OT designation ('d'), therefore any potential impacts associated with changing these standards would be eliminated. The discussion relating to 'a' and 'c' would pertain to this alternative. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		if this change in maximum height is adopted would be negligible, if any. b. Table 2-2 does not include a maximum lot coverage ratio for the C-I or Industrial designation. This proposal uses the maximum lot coverage ratio of 0.40 from the corresponding zone district of CH or Highway Commercial and N-C (Neighborhood Commercial) for consistency purposes. No significant environmental effects are expected as this is simply providing consistency between the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. c. This amendment would remove the minimum open space ratio and minimum lot size standards for commercial uses. The Zoning Ordinance typically provides for maximum building coverage, minimum lot size & setbacks which dictate the amount of a site that can be covered by buildings with the remaining area dedicated to landscaping and open space. No significant environmental impacts are expected due to this proposed amendment. d. This amendment temporarily removes the maximum residential density of 20 units/acre for C-OT projects located in Old Town until the Zoning Ordinance is updated in the near future. There are many Housing Element policies, General Plan development standards and Zoning Ordinance requirements that relate to and prescribe future residential projects that would guide the appropriate density and mass, scale and bulk of a mixed use project in the C-OT designated areas. The change to "TBD" is not excepted to significantly impact future buildout. <u>Applicability by Environmental Topic</u> Aesthetics/Visual: See discussion above. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: See discussion above. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. <u>Summary</u> The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no	

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	
Policy LU 4.1 (p. 2-16)	**Policy LU 4.1, General Purpose** – This policy refers in Table 2-3 in a general way and should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Reso. 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-3 shows the various office and industrial land use designations, including permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity in each category…."	Discussion & Summary This amendment involves the insertion of the word "recommended" to reflect case law and the State's General Plan Guidelines that indicate tha building intensity standards are recommended. This is consistent with th City Council's action on June 17, 2008 approving the Track 2 amendments that inserted this language. No significant environmental impacts are likely with the insertion of this word. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.	Same as proposed project.
Table 2-3 (p. 2-17)	**Table 2-3, Office & Industrial Uses** – Change the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" as follows: a. Increase I-OI height from 35 ft to 40ft if Mixed-Use, i.e., residential and commercial/office uses together. b. Remove Open Space Ratio, and Minimum Lot Size standards.	Discussion This amendment would modify two sections of this table relating to industrial land uses. Each is discussed below: a. The I-OI designation corresponds to the PI or Public & Institutional zone district. This district has a 35 ft height limit, the same as for the I-OI land use designation. The Commission & DRB wanted to encourage more mixed use projects & affordable units so they increased the height limit by 5 ft. There is a small vacant area at the southeast corner of Hollister and Patterson that could be developed at forty (40) feet if this proposed change is adopted. This height could also be achieved through the use of the "good cause" finding that staff is proposing be strengthened as a part of the Track 2.5 process. There are many Housing Element policies, General Plan development standards and Zoning Ordinance requirements that relate to and prescribe future mixed use projects that would guide the appropriate height, mass, bulk and scale of a mixed use	Discussion The staff recommendation retains the 35 foot height limit for mixed use projects in I-OI zones ('a' at left), therefore any potential impacts associated with changing this standard would be eliminated. The discussion relating to 'b' would pertain to this alternative. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		project in I-OI designated areas. The possible additional five feet of height is not expected to significantly impact future buildout. b. This amendment would remove the minimum open space ratio and minimum lot size standards for office and industrial projects. The Zoning Ordinance typically provides for maximum building coverage, minimum lot size & setbacks which dictate the amount of a site that can be covered by buildings with the remaining area dedicated to landscaping and open space. No significant environmental impacts are expected due to this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: The only vacant I-OI designated parcels are on the southeast side of Hollister and Patterson. The possible increase in building height for mixed use projects may raise visual issues, although the design review and discretionary review processes, as well as existing GP and zoning standards, would serve to address these concerns. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: See discussion above. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental docu-mentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circum-stances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.
Policy LU 4.2 (p. 2-16)	**Policy LU 4.2, Business Park (I-BP)** – This policy refers to the Business Park designation including FARs which are proposed for removal from the table. The revised language should read: "….In addition, lands designated with a Hotel Overlay may include transient lodging that emphasizes extended stays. ~~The maximum FAR set forth in Table 2-3 is increased from 0.4 to 0.5~~	Discussion This amendment would remove the specific reference to FARs for projects in I-BP or Business Park designated areas. The MRP Zone, which corresponds to the Business Park designation, provides for maximum building coverage, building height & setbacks which dictate the amount of a site that can be covered by buildings with the remaining area dedicated to landscaping and open space. Therefore	Same as proposed project.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
	~~for hotel uses.~~ Activities in business park areas shall be conducted….."	this removal would not change what ultimately might be constructed on a site. The deletion of this standard from the table does not mean that the overall mass, bulk and scale of a building would not be analyzed through the design review and planning processes. The impact analysis would still be required by law for a particular proposal and GP/CLUP standards would still apply, CEQA thresholds would still apply, and any project must be considered by the decision makers during deliberation and action on the associated permit. Therefore, no new significant CEQA impacts are expected as a result of this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: See discussion above. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: See discussion above. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	
Policy LU 4.3 (p. 2-18)	**Policy LU 4.3, Office and Institutional (I-OI)** – This policy addresses the I-OI designation, including the Hospital Overlay and appropriate FARs for hospital and medical office buildings. Subsection 'a' that refers to FARs should be removed with 'b' and 'c' retained.	Discussion This amendment would remove the specific reference to FARs for projects on designated I-OI or Office and Institutional. The PI or Public & Institutional Zone, which corresponds to the I-OI designation, provides for maximum building coverage, building height & setbacks which dictate the amount of a site that can be covered by buildings with the remaining area dedicated to landscaping and open space. Therefore this removal would not change what ultimately might be constructed on a site. The deletion of this standard from the table does not mean that the overall mass, bulk and scale of a building would not be analyzed	Same as proposed project with one additional change to delete the word "Maximum" before "Structure Height" for consistency between the four land use tables and policies in the General Plan. See discussion on pages 16 and 17.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		through the design review and planning processes. The impact analysis would still be required by law for a particular proposal and GP/CLUP standards would still apply, CEQA thresholds would still apply, and any project must be considered by the decision makers during deliberation and action on the associated permit. Therefore, no new significant CEQA impacts are expected as a result of this proposed amendment. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: See discussion above. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: See discussion above. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	
Table 2-4 (p. 2-21)	**Table 2-4, Other Land Uses** – Change the "Standards for Density & Building Intensity" as follows: a. Add 25 feet Maximum Building Height for AG, OS-PR, and OS-AR designations (higher heights are allowed in corresponding zones). b. Add 35 feet Maximum Building Height for P-S designation. c. Add Maximum Lot Coverage of 0.20 for OS-PR and OS-AR designations to be consistent with corresponding Zoning Ordinance standards. d. Remove Maximum Residential Densities, Open Space Ratios and Minimum Lot Size standards (all are "N/A" except minimum lot size in Agricultural designation which is "size in 2005).	Discussion This amendment would modify two sections of this table relating to industrial land uses. Each is discussed below: a. This amendment would reduce the potential building height of structures in Agricultural areas to 25 ft. from that which is allowed in the corresponding zone district (35 ft). The maximum allowed height in the two open space zones is 25 ft so the proposed change is consistent with zoning. Therefore, the potential build out on these parcels would be reduced from that assumed in the GP/CLUP and no significant environmental impacts would occur with this change. b/c. The PS designation does not include any development standards in Table 2-4. The proposal is to include the maximum building height of 35 ft from the corresponding zone district and the maximum lot coverage of 0.20 for the two open space	Discussion The staff recommendation is the same as the Commission's and DRB's except that the Maximum Structure Height ('a' & 'b') & Lot Coverage ('c') should remain "N/A", therefore any potential impacts associated with changing these standards would be eliminated. The discussion relating to 'd'' would pertain to this alternative. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		designations from the corresponding zones, therefore no impacts would occur with this change. d Maximum residential densities and minimum lot coverage ratios are not provided in Table 2-4 for these four designations, therefore removing the category from the table will not result in any impacts. None of the designations have minimum lot size except that the Agricultural designation is "size in 2005." Since minimum lot sizes are not provided for 3 of 4 designations, removing them does not result in impacts. For the Agricultural designation, the corresponding agricultural zones all provide for minimum lot size, so removing "size in 2005" (which is vague) does not result in impacts. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circumstances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.	Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A. Summary The appropriate form of environmental documentation for this proposed amendment is a CEQA addendum. The amendment presents no new significant environmental effects nor a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, involves no substantial change in circum-stances under which the project is undertaken, and requires no new or modified mitigation measures.
Policy LU 6.1 (p. 2-20)	**Policy LU 6.1, General** – This policy refers to the Park and Open Space categories in Table 2-4. This policy should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-4 shows the Park and Open space use categories, including permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity for each category…."	Discussion & Summary This amendment involves the insertion of the word "recommended" to reflect case law and the State's General Plan Guidelines that indicate that building intensity standards are recommended. This is consistent with the City Council's action on June 17, 2008 approving the Track 2 amendments that inserted this language. No significant environmental impacts are likely with the insertion of this word.	Same as proposed project.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
		Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.	
Policy LU 7.1 p. 2-22	**Policy LU 7.1, General** (p. 2-22) - This policy refers to the Agriculture category in Table 2-4. This policy should be amended to reflect the June 17, 2008 City Council action (Resolution 08-30) that indicated that the standards are "recommended". The revised language should read: "Table 2-4 shows the permitted uses and recommended standards for building intensity for the Agricultural land use category…."	Discussion & Summary This amendment involves the insertion of the word "recommended" to reflect case law and the State's General Plan Guidelines that indicate that building intensity standards are recommended. This is consistent with the City Council's action on June 17, 2008 approving the Track 2 amendments that inserted this language. No significant environmental impacts are likely with the insertion of this word. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A. Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A. Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.	Same as proposed project.
Glossary	Propose "standards of analysis" including: a. Conceptual drawings that meet the standard (to compare to proposal that exceeds standard;	Not part of recommendation therefore no environmental effects.	Discussion & Summary Same as proposed project with one change to the fourth standard:

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
	b. Possibly one other conceptual plan that comes closer to the standard; c. Story poles may be requested, including poles that meet the standard for comparison; and d. The use proposed should meet a community need or goal, e.g., senior or affordable housing, recreational facilities open to the public, non-profit facilities that serve the public, presservation or restoration of a historic structure or resource, and/or major tax generators that have minimal impacts and do not require significant use of resources.		a. The use proposed should meet a community need or goal, e.g., senior or affordable housing, recreational facilities open to the public, non-profit facilities that serve the public, preservation or restoration of a historic structure or resource, and/or projects that have negligible ~~major tax generators that have minimal~~ impacts and do not require significant use of public and/or natural resources. The proposed standards are intended to strengthen the review process where relief from the recommended building intensity standards in the land use tables is sought through a good cause finding. Because the finding would be strengthened, no impacts should occur. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.
Upcoming Zoning Ord. Update	Consider the following Zoning Ordinance amendments: a. Update building height and net and gross building area and other terms. b. Amend zoning ordinance standards for consistency with GP land use tables including: Reducing building height in residential zones, Increase lot coverage in DR-25 & -30 Zones to 0.40, Reduce building height in OT-R/LC and M-1 Zones, Amend Hospital Overlay to provide standards that facilitates the needs of the hospital and related medical services; and Review "standards for analysis" relating to "good cause" finding and incorporate into Zoning Ordinance if appropriate. c. Consider Form-Based Code for Old Town	Discussion & Summary These amendments are speculative at this time and, if adopted, would be consistent with the GP standards discussed in this Addendum, therefore no impacts should occur. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A. Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A	Discussion & Summary Same as proposed project with one additional item to study as part of Zoning Ordinance Update: "Study using landscape/open space and lot coverage ratios and building heights in lieu of Floor Area Ratios. These amendments, while speculative at this time, are intended to be consistent with the GP standards discussed in this Addendum, therefore no impacts should occur. Applicability by Environmental Topic Aesthetics/Visual: N/A Agriculture: N/A. Air Quality: N/A. Biology: N/A.

Policy ID #	Proposed Amendment	CEQA Review	
		Proposed Project (PC & DRB Recommendation – 10/20/08)	**Proposed Alternate Project (CC Action, 5/19/09)**
	Goleta.	Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.	Cultural: N/A. Geology: N/A. Hazards: N/A. Pop & Housing: N/A. Water: N/A. Land Use and Rec: N/A Noise: N/A. Pub Svcs & Utilities: N/A. Transportation: N/A.

CHAPTER 4.0
LIST OF PREPARERS

4.1 CITY OF GOLETA

Steve Chase	Planning and Environmental Services Director
Anne Wells	Advance Planning Division Manager
Patricia Miller	Current Planning Division Manager
Dan Nemechek	Senior Planner
Scott Kolwitz	Senior Planner
Margaret Duncan	Assistant Planner

4.2 PAT SALEY & ASSOCIATES

Pat Saley	President

4.3 JDL MAPPING

Dennis Loyst	President
Kristen Hart	GIS Specialist

CHAPTER 5.0
REFERENCES

5.1 PRINTED REFERENCES

County of Santa Barbara. 1980. *Goleta Community Plan.* Prepared by County of Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara, California.

City of Goleta. 2006. *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.* September. Planning and Environmental Services Department Goleta, CA.

City of Goleta. 2006. *Final Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Report.* September. Prepared by Jones and Stokes. Irvine, CA.

City of Goleta. 2008. *Addendum to Final Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Report.* March. Prepared by Jones & Stokes, Irvine, CA.

University of California, Santa Barbara. 2008. *Draft Long Range Development Plan*

University of California, Santa Barbara. 2008. *Draft Long Range Development Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report.*

APPENDIX 1

PROPOSED PROJECT – LAND USE TABLES

Proposed Track 2.5 General Plan Amendment (PC/DRB Recommendation 10/20/08)

TABLE 2-1

ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Residential Use Categories				
	R-SF	R-P	R-MD	R-HD	R-MHP
Residential Uses					
One Single-Family Detached Dwelling per Lot	X	X	-	-	-
Single-Family Attached and Detached Dwellings	X	X	X	X	-
Multiunit Apartment Dwellings	-	X	X	X	-
Mobile Home Parks	-	-	-	-	X
Second (Accessory) Residential Units	X	X	-	-	-
Assisted-Living Residential Units	-	-	X	X	-
Other Uses					
Religious Institutions	X	X	X	X	-
Small-Scale Residential Care Facility	X	X	-	-	-
Small-Scale Day Care Center	X	X	X	X	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X	-
Accessory Uses					
Home Occupations	X	X	X	X	X
Standards for Density and Building Intensity					
Recommended Standards for Permitted Density					
Maximum Permitted Density (units/acres)	5 or less	5.01–13	20	30	15
Minimum Permitted Density (units/acres)	N/A	N/A	15	15	N/A
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity					
~~**Maximum Floor Area Ratios (FAR)**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**0.30**~~	~~**0.50**~~	~~**1.10**~~	~~**N/A**~~
Maximum Structure Height (Inland Area)	25 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	25 feet
Maximum Structure Height (Coastal Zone)	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	0.30	0.30	0.40	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space Ratio**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**7,000 s.f.**~~	~~**4,500 s.f.**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**2,500 s.f.**~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: R-SF– Single-Family Residential; R-P – Planned Residential; R-MD – Medium-Density Residential; R-HD – High-Density Residential; R-MHP – Mobile Home Park.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

Proposed Track 2.5 General Plan Amendment (PC/DRB Recommendation 10/20/08)

TABLE 2-2

ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Commercial Use Categories					
	C-R	C-C	C-OT	C-VS	C-I	C-G
Retail Trade						
Large-Scale Retail Establishments	X	X	–	–	–	–
General Merchandise	X	X	X	–	–	X
Food and Drug Stores	X	X	X	–	X	X
Apparel and Specialty Stores	X	X	X	–	–	X
Building/Landscape Materials and Equipment	X	X	X	–	–	X
Eating and Drinking Establishments	X	X	X	X	X	X
Other Retail Trade Establishments	X	X	X	X	–	X
Coastal-Related Commercial	X	X	X	X	–	–
Services (Including Offices)						
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	X	X	X	–	–	X
Personal Services	X	X	X	–	–	X
Business Services	–	X	X	–	–	X
Information Technology Services	–	–	–	–	–	X
Professional Services	–	X	X	–	–	X
Medical and Health-Related Services	X	X	X	–	–	–
Educational Services	–	–	X	–	–	X
Entertainment and Recreation Services	X	X	X	X	–	–
Building and Construction Services	–	–	–	–	–	X
Other Services	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transient Lodging and Services						
Resorts	–	–	–	X	–	–
Hotels, Motels, Bed and Breakfast Inns	X	X	X	X	–	–
RV Parks	–	–	X	X	–	X
Other Visitor Services and Attractions	–	–	–	X	–	X
Auto-Related Uses						
Retail – Automotive Sales and Rentals	–	–	X	–	–	X
Auto Repair and Painting	–	–	–	–	–	X
Auto Wrecking Yard/Junk Yard	–	–	–	–	–	X
Auto Service (Gas) Station	X	–	X	–	X	X
Car Wash	–	X	X	–	X	X
Wholesale Trade and Storage						
General Wholesale Trade	–	–	–	–	–	X
Warehousing – General	–	–	–	–	–	X
Warehousing – Self-Storage	–	–	–	–	–	X
Outdoor Storage	–	–	–	–	–	X
Residential Uses						
Residential Units	–	X	X	–	–	–
One Caretaker Unit	X	X	X	X	–	X
Assisted-Living Residential Units	–	–	–	–	–	X
Other Uses						
Religious Institutions	–	X	X	–	–	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	–	X	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	X	X	X	X	X
Standards for Density and Building Intensity						
Recommended Standards for Density						
Maximum Residential Density	N/A	12/acre	~~**20/acre**~~ **TBD**	N/A	N/A	20/acre
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity						
~~**Maximum FAR**~~	~~**0.35**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.60**~~	~~**0.25**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.40**~~
Maximum Structure Height	35 feet	~~**25**~~ **35 feet**	30 feet	35 feet	25 feet	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	~~**N/A**~~ **0.40**	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space Ratio**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**10,000 s.f.**~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: C-R – Regional Commercial; C-C – Community Commercial; C-OT – Old Town Commercial; C-VS – Visitor Commercial; C-I – Intersection; Commercial; C-G – General Commercial.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; – indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are as set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. Wholesale trade is permitted within the C-R use category, provided that it is an integral part of a retail trade use.
5. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
6. N/A = Not applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

TABLE 2-3
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR OFFICE AND INDUSTRIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Office and Industrial Use Categories			
	I-BP	I-OI	I-S	I-G
Industrial (Manufacturing)				
General Manufacturing – No Noxious Impacts	X	–	X	X
General Manufacturing – Potential Noxious Impacts	–	–	–	X
Research and Development	X	X	–	X
Scientific and Similar Instruments	X	X	–	X
Bio-Medical Technology	X	X	–	X
Other Advanced Technology	X	X	–	X
Transportation and Utilities				
Transportation (other than right-of-way)	–	–	X	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	X	X	X
Utilities	X	X	–	–
Retail Trade				
Building/Landscape Materials and Equipment	–	X	–	X
Eating and Drinking Establishments	X	X	–	–
Other Retail Trade Establishments	X	X	–	–
Services (Including Offices)				
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	X	X	–	–
Personal Services	X	X	–	–
Business Services	X	X	–	–
Information Technology Services	X	X	–	–
Professional Services	–	X	–	–
Medical and Health-Related Services	–	X	–	–
Educational Services	–	X	–	–
Entertainment and Recreation Services	–	X	–	–
Building and Construction Services	–	–	X	X
Other Services	–	–	X	X
Auto-Related Uses				
Automotive Sales and Rentals	–	–	X	X
Auto Repair and Painting	–	–	X	X
Auto Wrecking Yard/Junk Yard	–	–	X	X
Auto Service (Gas) Station	–	–	–	X
Wholesale Trade and Storage				
General Wholesale Trade	–	–	X	X
Warehousing – General	X*	–	X	X
Warehousing – Self-Storage	–	–	X	X
Outdoor Storage	–	–	X	X
Residential Uses				
Residential Units	–	X	–	–
One Caretaker Unit Per Parcel	X	X	X	X
Assisted-Living Residential Units	–	X	–	–
Other Uses				
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X
Religious Institutions	–	X	–	–
Standards for Density and Building Intensity				
Recommended Standards for Density				
Maximum Residential Density	N/A	20units/acre	N/A	N/A
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity				
~~**Maximum FAR**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.60**~~	~~**0.30**~~
~~**Maximum FAR for Hotels (with Hotel Overlay)**~~	~~**0.50**~~	~~**0.50**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
Maximum Structure Heights	35 feet	35 feet ****	35 feet	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	0.35	0.40	N/A	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space/Landscaping Ratio**~~	~~**0.30**~~	~~**0.10**~~	~~**0.10**~~	~~**0.10**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~

Notes:
1. Use Categories: I-BP – Business Park; I-OI – Office and Institutional; I-S – Service Industrial; I-G – General Industrial.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not applicable.

* Warehousing is allowed on parcels designated Business Park (I-BP) if it is in association with a permitted use.

**** If the project includes mixed-use (residential and commercial/office uses) then the Maximum Structure Height IS 40 feet.**

*(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 **and Reso. 09-__, _____**)*

TABLE 2-4
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR OTHER LAND USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Other Land Use Categories			
	AG	OS-PR	OS-AR	P-S
Residential Uses				
One Single-Family Detached Dwelling per Lot	X	–	–	–
Farmworker Residential Units	X	–	–	–
Second Residential Dwelling Unit	X	–	–	–
Caretaker Residential Unit	–	–	X	X
Agricultural Uses				
Orchards and Vineyards	X	–	–	–
Row Crop Production	X	–	–	–
Specialty Agriculture and Floriculture	X	–	–	–
Livestock Grazing	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Confined Animal Operations	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Agricultural Processing	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Greenhouses	X	–	–	–
Sale of On-Site Agricultural Products	X	–	–	–
Other	X	–	–	–
Open Space and Outdoor Recreation				
Active Recreation	–	–	X	X
Open Space and Passive Recreation	–	X	X	X
Golf Course, including customary ancillary uses and structures	–	–	X	X
Nature Preserve	–	X	X	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses				
General Government Administration	–	–	–	X
Fire Stations	X	–	–	X
Schools (Public and Private)	–	–	–	X
Other Government Facilities	–	–	–	X
Other Uses				
Religious Institutions	–	–	–	X
Small-Scale Residential Care Facility	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Day Care Center	–	–	–	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	–	–	X
Recommended Standards for ~~Density and~~ Building Intensity				
~~***Recommended Standards for Density***~~				
~~**Maximum Permitted Density (Units/Acres)**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~***Recommended Standards for Building Intensity***~~				
~~**Maximum FAR**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
Maximum Structure Height	~~**N/A**~~ **25 ft**	~~**N/A**~~ **25 ft**	~~**N/A**~~ **25 ft**	~~**N/A**~~ **35 ft**
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	~~**N/A**~~ **0.20**	~~**N/A**~~ **0.20**	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space Ratio**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**2005 lot size**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: AG: Agriculture; OS-PR: Open Space/Passive Recreation; OS-AR: Open Space/Active Recreation; P-S: Public and Quasi-public Uses.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not Applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

APPENDIX 2

ALTERNATIVE PROJECT – LAND USE TABLES

TABLE 2-1
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Residential Use Categories				
	R-SF	R-P	R-MD	R-HD	R-MHP
Residential Uses					
One Single-Family Detached Dwelling per Lot	X	X	-	-	-
Single-Family Attached and Detached Dwellings	X	X	X	X	-
Multiunit Apartment Dwellings	-	X	X	X	-
Mobile Home Parks	-	-	-	-	X
Second (Accessory) Residential Units	X	X	-	-	-
Assisted-Living Residential Units	-	-	X	X	-
Other Uses					
Religious Institutions	X	X	X	X	-
Small-Scale Residential Care Facility	X	X	-	-	-
Small-Scale Day Care Center	X	X	X	X	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X	-
Accessory Uses					
Home Occupations	X	X	X	X	X
Standards for Density and Building Intensity					
Recommended Standards for Permitted Density					
Maximum Permitted Density (units/acres)	5 or less	5.01–13	20	30	15
Minimum Permitted Density (units/acres)	N/A	N/A	15	15	N/A
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity					
~~**Maximum Floor Area Ratios (FAR)**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**0.30**~~	~~**0.50**~~	~~**1.10**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height (Inland Area)	25 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	25 feet
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height (Coastal Zone)	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	0.30	0.30	0.40	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space Ratio**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**7,000 s.f.**~~	~~**4,500 s.f.**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**2,500 s.f.**~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: R-SF– Single-Family Residential; R-P – Planned Residential; R-MD – Medium-Density Residential; R-HD – High-Density Residential; R-MHP – Mobile Home Park.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

TABLE 2-2

ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Commercial Use Categories					
	C-R	C-C	C-OT	C-VS	C-I	C-G
Retail Trade						
Large-Scale Retail Establishments	X	X	–	–	–	–
General Merchandise	X	X	X	–	–	X
Food and Drug Stores	X	X	X	–	X	X
Apparel and Specialty Stores	X	X	X	–	–	X
Building/Landscape Materials and Equipment	X	X	X	–	–	X
Eating and Drinking Establishments	X	X	X	X	X	X
Other Retail Trade Establishments	X	X	X	X	–	X
Coastal-Related Commercial	X	X	X	X	–	–
Services (Including Offices)						
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	X	X	X	–	–	X
Personal Services	X	X	X	–	–	X
Business Services	–	X	X	–	–	X
Information Technology Services	–	–	–	–	–	X
Professional Services	–	X	X	–	–	X
Medical and Health-Related Services	X	X	X	–	–	–
Educational Services	–	–	X	–	–	X
Entertainment and Recreation Services	X	X	X	X	–	–
Building and Construction Services	–	–	–	–	–	X
Other Services	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transient Lodging and Services						
Resorts	–	–	–	X	–	–
Hotels, Motels, Bed and Breakfast Inns	X	X	X	X	–	–
RV Parks	–	–	X	X	–	X
Other Visitor Services and Attractions	–	–	–	X	–	X
Auto-Related Uses						
Retail – Automotive Sales and Rentals	–	–	X	–	–	X
Auto Repair and Painting	–	–	–	–	–	X
Auto Wrecking Yard/Junk Yard	–	–	–	–	–	X
Auto Service (Gas) Station	X	–	X	–	X	X
Car Wash	–	X	X	–	X	X
Wholesale Trade and Storage						
General Wholesale Trade	–	–	–	–	–	X
Warehousing – General	–	–	–	–	–	X
Warehousing – Self-Storage	–	–	–	–	–	X
Outdoor Storage	–	–	–	–	–	X
Residential Uses						
Residential Units	–	X	X	–	–	–
One Caretaker Unit	X	X	X	X	–	X
Assisted-Living Residential Units	–	–	–	–	–	X
Other Uses						
Religious Institutions	–	X	X	–	–	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	–	X	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	X	X	X	X	X
Standards for Density and Building Intensity						
Recommended Standards for Density						
Maximum Residential Density	N/A	12/acre	20/acre	N/A	N/A	20/acre
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity						
~~**Maximum FAR**~~	~~**0.35**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.60**~~	~~**0.25**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.40**~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height	35 feet	~~**25**~~ **35 feet**	30 feet	35 feet	25 feet	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space Ratio**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**size in 2005**~~	~~**10,000 s.f.**~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: C-R – Regional Commercial; C-C – Community Commercial; C-OT – Old Town Commercial; C-VS – Visitor Commercial; C-I – Intersection; Commercial; C-G – General Commercial.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; – indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are as set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. Wholesale trade is permitted within the C-R use category, provided that it is an integral part of a retail trade use.
5. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
6. N/A = Not applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

TABLE 2-3
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR OFFICE AND INDUSTRIAL USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Office and Industrial Use Categories			
	I-BP	I-OI	I-S	I-G
Industrial (Manufacturing)				
General Manufacturing – No Noxious Impacts	X	–	X	X
General Manufacturing – Potential Noxious Impacts	–	–	–	X
Research and Development	X	X	–	X
Scientific and Similar Instruments	X	X	–	X
Bio-Medical Technology	X	X	–	X
Other Advanced Technology	X	X	–	X
Transportation and Utilities				
Transportation (other than right-of-way)	–	–	X	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	X	X	X
Utilities	X	X	–	–
Retail Trade				
Building/Landscape Materials and Equipment	–	X	–	X
Eating and Drinking Establishments	X	X	–	–
Other Retail Trade Establishments	X	X	–	–
Services (Including Offices)				
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	X	X	–	–
Personal Services	X	X	–	–
Business Services	X	X	–	–
Information Technology Services	X	X	–	–
Professional Services	–	X	–	–
Medical and Health-Related Services	–	X	–	–
Educational Services	–	X	–	–
Entertainment and Recreation Services	–	X	–	–
Building and Construction Services	–	–	X	X
Other Services	–	–	X	X
Auto-Related Uses				
Automotive Sales and Rentals	–	–	X	X
Auto Repair and Painting	–	–	X	X
Auto Wrecking Yard/Junk Yard	–	–	X	X
Auto Service (Gas) Station	–	–	–	X
Wholesale Trade and Storage				
General Wholesale Trade	–	–	X	X
Warehousing – General	X*	–	X	X
Warehousing – Self-Storage	–	–	X	X
Outdoor Storage	–	–	X	X
Residential Uses				
Residential Units	–	X	–	–
One Caretaker Unit Per Parcel	X	X	X	X
Assisted-Living Residential Units	–	X	–	–
Other Uses				
Public and Quasi-public Uses	X	X	X	X
Religious Institutions	–	X	–	–
Standards for Density and Building Intensity				
Recommended Standards for Density				
Maximum Residential Density	N/A	20units/acre	N/A	N/A
Recommended Standards for Building Intensity				
~~**Maximum FAR**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.40**~~	~~**0.60**~~	~~**0.30**~~
~~**Maximum FAR for Hotels (with Hotel Overlay)**~~	~~**0.50**~~	~~**0.50**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Heights	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	0.35	0.40	N/A	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space/Landscaping Ratio**~~	~~**0.30**~~	~~**0.10**~~	~~**0.10**~~	~~**0.10**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~

Notes:
1. Use Categories: I-BP – Business Park; I-OI – Office and Institutional; I-S – Service Industrial; I-G – General Industrial.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not applicable.

* Warehousing is allowed on parcels designated Business Park (I-BP) if it is in association with a permitted use.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***

TABLE 2-4
ALLOWABLE USES AND STANDARDS FOR OTHER LAND USE CATEGORIES

Allowed Uses and Standards	Other Land Use Categories			
	AG	**OS-PR**	**OS-AR**	**P-S**
Residential Uses				
One Single-Family Detached Dwelling per Lot	X	–	–	–
Farmworker Residential Units	X	–	–	–
Second Residential Dwelling Unit	X	–	–	–
Caretaker Residential Unit	–	–	X	X
Agricultural Uses				
Orchards and Vineyards	X	–	–	–
Row Crop Production	X	–	–	–
Specialty Agriculture and Floriculture	X	–	–	–
Livestock Grazing	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Confined Animal Operations	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Agricultural Processing	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Greenhouses	X	–	–	–
Sale of On-Site Agricultural Products	X	–	–	–
Other	X	–	–	–
Open Space and Outdoor Recreation				
Active Recreation	–	–	X	X
Open Space and Passive Recreation	–	X	X	X
Golf Course, including customary ancillary uses and structures	–	–	X	X
Nature Preserve	–	X	X	X
Public and Quasi-public Uses				
General Government Administration	–	–	–	X
Fire Stations	X	–	–	X
Schools (Public and Private)	–	–	–	X
Other Government Facilities	–	–	–	X
Other Uses				
Religious Institutions	–	–	–	X
Small-Scale Residential Care Facility	X	–	–	–
Small-Scale Day Care Center	–	–	–	X
Wireless Communications/Telecommunications	X	–	–	X
Recommended Standards for ~~Density and~~ Building Intensity				
~~***Recommended Standards for Density***~~				
~~**Maximum Permitted Density (Units/Acres)**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~***Recommended Standards for Building Intensity***~~				
~~**Maximum FAR**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~*Maximum*~~ Structure Height	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
~~**Minimum Open Space Ratio**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~
~~**Minimum Lot Size**~~	~~**2005 lot size**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~	~~**N/A**~~

Notes:

1. Use Categories: AG: Agriculture; OS-PR: Open Space/Passive Recreation; OS-AR: Open Space/Active Recreation; P-S: Public and Quasi-public Uses.
2. X indicates use is allowed in the use category; - indicates use not allowed.
3. General Note: Some uses requiring approval of a conditional use permit are set forth in text policies, and others are specified in the zoning code.
4. The standards for building intensity recommended by this General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(a) may be revised by a Resolution of the decision-making body of the City for specific projects based upon a finding of good cause.
5. N/A = Not Applicable.

(Amended by Reso. 08-30, 6/17/08 ***and Reso. 09-__, _____)***