

3.10 LAND USE AND RECREATION

This section presents:

- changes to land use and recreation existing conditions and applicable regulations since adoption of the GP/CLUP and certification of the Final EIR in 2006; and
- an analysis of the potential land use and recreation effects of proposed amendments to the existing GP/CLUP.

3.10.1 Existing Conditions

3.10.1.1 Land Use

Existing land uses in the City are shown in Figure 3.10-1, Existing Land Uses. These uses are observed to be substantially the same as existed at the time of preparation of the 2006 Final EIR. Existing land uses were mapped by the City of Goleta as part of the GP/CLUP studies and are based on 2005 tax assessor data followed by field verification. The categories for existing land uses are described in the Final EIR, and include:

- Agriculture;
- Churches;
- Clubs;
- Commercial;
- Golf Courses;
- Industrial;
- Institutional;
- Mobile Home Parks;
- Mortuaries;
- Multiple Family;
- Office;
- Open Space;
- Parking;
- Parks;
- Public and Utility;
- Public or Utility Building;
- Schools;
- Single Family Residence;
- Vacant; and
- Warehousing.

As part of the studies conducted during the development of the GP/CLUP, the City conducted a land use inventory in 2003 that classified 6,600 parcels in the City by current use. The study

was updated in 2005. The percentages of each land use, total acreages of each, and comparison of uses are summarized in Table 3.10-1, Existing Land Use Category (same as Table 3.10-1 in the Final EIR). Land use totals were assigned rankings according to the percentage of use relative to other land uses, and the percentage of use relative to total areas of land use.

**TABLE 3.10-1
EXISTING LAND USE CATEGORY (2008)**

Existing Land Use Category	Acres	Percent of Total Area	Rank by Total Area
Agriculture	392.51	7.7%	4
Church	40.75	0.8%	16
Clubs	18.94	0.4%	18
Commercial	302.05	6.0%	6
Golf Courses	199.62	3.9%	11
Industrial	305.21	6.0%	5
Institutional	37.11	0.7%	17
Mobile Home Parks	77.11	1.5%	14
Mortuaries	1.99	0.1%	20
Multiple-Family Residence	301.70	5.9%	7
Office	203.01	4.0%	9
Open Space	411.53	8.1%	3
Parking Lots	17.61	0.4%	19
Parks	133.86	2.6%	13
Public and/or Utility Building	200.46	4.0%	10
Schools	142.57	2.8%	12
Single-Family Residence	1,050.11	20.7%	1
Vacant ¹	234.75	4.7%	8
Warehousing	42.72	0.8%	15
City Streets and Highway 101	910.90	18.9%	2
Total Area	5,075	100.0%	
Total Residential Uses	1,386.78	27.3%	

¹ Total vacant lands in the City are presented in Figure 3.10-1 and total 288.75 acres. Note that 27 of these acres are designated as agricultural lands and an additional 27 acres are designated as single-family residence, considered vacant for the purposes of the land use inventory (see definition of vacant lands in Section 3.10.1.1 of 2006 Final GP/CLUP). In order to not double count acreage, vacant lands were reduced from 288.75 to 234.75 acres.

Table 3.10-1 indicates that 20.7 percent of the City is actively used for single-family structures; when combined with the other residential use categories, 27.1 percent of the City is used for residential uses. Open space and agriculture uses comprise another 22.0 percent. About 21.4 percent of the total area of the City supports commerce of various types. Approximately 18.9 percent of the City is used for Highway and street right of ways, and approximately 5 percent of the total area is vacant. Figure 3.10-2 shows the current distribution of vacant sites throughout the City.

3.10.1.2 Built Environment

The general physical character of the City may be defined in terms of the intensity of buildings, while the character of the City's residential areas may be defined in terms of dwelling densities. The built character of the City largely consists of compact single family residential areas of moderate density, a central area with larger but lower intensity commercial and industrial uses, and more intensely developed areas in Old Town and around Entrance Drive in the southwestern area of the City. Most of the northwest, southwest, and northeast areas of the City are dominated by an organized and compact pattern of smaller, single-family dwellings interspersed with larger structures, mainly churches or schools. The development pattern in the Old Town area in the southeast portion of the City is somewhat more compact. The south-central part of the City consists of larger commercial structures, sharply contrasting with surrounding development patterns. Large open areas are found in the north-central area (Bishop Ranch and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve) and the most southwestern part of the City (Sperling Preserve/Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sandpiper Golf Course).

The results of the Housing Units Survey and Density Study, conducted in 2003 by the City, indicated that the average population density for the entire City is 5.7 people per acre, or 3,665 people per square mile. Densities in this range are generally considered "moderate," "urban," or even "high density" for broad areas. Population densities vary from 64 people per acre in a few smaller blocks located in Old Town to zero persons in some areas. Specific density variations as they occur throughout the City are also identified in the study. The northeastern area has single-family neighborhoods densities under six units per acre, while single-family densities higher than six units per acre are more common in other parts of the City. Multiple-family densities in Old Town and off Entrance Drive are in the 16- to 47-unit per acre range. Moderately high densities are found near the higher densities areas in Old Town and near Calle Real in the northeast.

Neighborhoods and Community Subareas

The GP/CLUP has identified eight individual subareas characterized by their respective geography and land use. These subareas include:

- Old Town;
- Central Area;
- Southwest Residential Community;
- Coastal Resource Area;
- Northwest Residential Community;
- Central Resource Area;
- Northeast Residential Community; and
- Northeast Community Center.

City of Santa Barbara Noncontiguous Lands

At the geographical center of Goleta lies a noncontiguous portion of the territory of the City of Santa Barbara. These lands are owned by Santa Barbara and encompass the regional airport, including a passenger terminal for air carrier service, general aviation facilities, and vacant and developed lands north of Hollister Avenue for nonairport uses. The Santa Barbara Airport completed a Runway Safety and Runway Relocation Project in February 2008. As a part of this

project, the western-most Approach Zone boundary was extended 800 feet westward (Bermond pers. comm.).

3.10.1.3 Recreation and Open Space

The GP/CLUP Open Space Element provides a detailed inventory of existing parks as of 2005. Currently, Goleta's 16 public parks, four private parks and open space areas, and 18 public open space areas contain a total of 526 acres, which equates to about 17 acres per 1,000 residents. The three larger City-owned regional open space preserves—the Sperlberg Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve—collectively account for 363 acres of these 526 acres. Approximately 40 percent of the City's 2.0 miles of Pacific shoreline is in City ownership. City parks are listed below in Table 3.10-2 and identified in Figure 3.10-3, Existing and Planned Parks.

3.10.2 Changes in Regulatory Framework

3.10.2.1 Federal and State

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP in 2006, there have been no changes to the following regulations that are relevant to the proposed amendments categorized as Track 3 revisions to the GP/CLUP:

- Federal Coastal Zone Management Act
- California Environmental Quality Act
- State of California General Plan Law and General Plan Guidelines
- California Coastal Act

3.10.2.2 Local

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP and certification of the Final EIR, the City adopted three General Plan amendments. First, the City adopted an amendment to Subpolicy CE 10.3 as part of the approval of the Village at Los Carneros. The amendment changed prohibitions against post-development stormwater discharge rates and was adopted on February 19, 2008. Second, the City adopted various clarifying amendments as part of the City-sponsored Track 2 amendments. The Track 2 amendments were adopted and the related CEQA Addendum was certified by the City Council on June 17, 2008. Third, the City adopted a land use designation re-classification (General Industrial to General Commercial) as part of the approval of the Harwin Family Trust project. All amendments are reflected in the text of the GP/CLUP cited in the Supplemental EIR.

The City has also established a new ordinance to the municipal code, Chapter 25b, titled "Change of Owner, Operator, or Guarantor for Certain Oil and Gas Facilities." No other changes to the GP/CLUP and no new ordinances relative to land use designations and densities have been enacted by the City since October 2006. There have been modifications to enabling ordinances and resolutions related to the Design Review Board's review of projects and process. Moreover, in fall 2008, the City modified the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance to exempt from its consideration the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital Replacement Projects, along with associated medical office space and parking.

**TABLE 3.10-2
EXISTING PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AREAS**

Map# ¹	Name	Park Type	Acres	Description
1	San Miguel	Neighborhood Park	2.71	0.52-acre lawn; timber play structure; picnic areas
1	San Miguel Open Space	Neighborhood Open Space	3.07	Creek with bridge crossing; picnic areas
2	Winchester II	Neighborhood Park	1.20	0.7-acre lawn; swing set; softball backstop; play field; 2 picnic tables
3	Winchester I	Neighborhood Park	1.14	0.20-acre lawn; playground; merry-go-round; 2 picnic tables; footbridge
4	Winchester I Open Space	Neighborhood Open Space	2.22	Undeveloped
5	Brandon	Neighborhood Open Space	2.22	Undeveloped field
6	Evergreen Acres	Community Park	28.72	3.47-acre lawn; 2 tennis courts; 18-hole disc golf course; 1 bench; 3 foot- bridges; playing field; softball backstop; walkways; playground; 2 picnic tables; 1 portable restroom
7	Koarts Apartments	Neighborhood Open Space	6.60	Open field
8	Koarts Apartments	Neighborhood Open Space	0.34	Undeveloped sloping hillside
9	Bella Vista III	Neighborhood Park	0.77	Undeveloped road shoulder
10	Bella Vista I & II	Neighborhood Park	3.50	2.87-acre lawn; playground; 2-foot- bridges; 8 picnic tables; walkway; bench
11	Glen Annie at Del Norte	Neighborhood Open Space	0.99	Undeveloped
12	Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve	Regional Open Space	139.99	22-acre lake; hiking paths; elevated boardwalk over lake; 3 benches; 2 portable toilets; George Adams picnic area with 3 tables; 1 bench, earth dam; Stow House Museum; Goleta Train Depot Railroad Museum
13	Stow Grove Park	Community Park	11.10	0.45-acre lawn; soccer field; ball diamond, volleyball courts; horseshoe pits; swing sets; reservation group BBQ areas; children's picnic tables; redwood groves
14	Stonebridge	Neighborhood Open Space	2.60	Parallels San Pedro Creek; undeveloped; hiking trail
15	Stow Tennis Courts	Community Park	2.68	0.74-acre lawn; 2 tennis courts; 1 bench
16	La Goleta	Neighborhood Open Space	6.13	Parallels Las Vegas Creek; undeveloped
17	Oro Verde	Neighborhood Open Space	2.65	Undeveloped
18	Oro Verde	Neighborhood Open Space	4.70	Undeveloped
19	Andamar	Neighborhood Park	2.45	1.0-acre lawn; play equipment; 1 picnic table

(continued on next page)

TABLE 3.10-2 CONTINUED

Map# ¹	Name	Park Type	Acres	Description
20	Emerald Terrace Tennis Courts	Community Park	4.20	1.49-acre lawn; 2 handicap-accessible tennis courts; swings; 2 picnic tables; 4 benches
21	San Jose Creek	Neighborhood Open Space	4.87	Parallels San Jose Creek; undeveloped
22	Armitos Park	Neighborhood Park	1.63	Parallels San Jose Creek; undeveloped
23	Community Center	Community Center	9.84	Various adult and children's classes, Headstart, Rainbow Preschool, Boys & Girls Club, lawn with gazebo
24	Nectarine	Mini Park	0.13	Sandlot with toddler playground equipment and bench
25	Willow Springs Open Space ² (private)	Neighborhood Open Space	2.37	For protection of cultural resources
26	Girsh Park ² (private)	Community Park	24.90	Softball, soccer, and basketball facilities, grassy open space, community meeting room, play equipment, barbecue-picnic areas
27	Armstrong	Mini Park	0.46	0.2-acre lawn; swing set; 1 toddler picnic table; 1 picnic table; 2 benches
28	University Village	Neighborhood Park	3.16	1.74-acre lawn; footbridge over drainage ditch.
29	Mathilda	Mini Park	0.20	Play equipment; picnic table
30	Sperling Preserve	Regional Open Space	136.60	136.6 acres of open space; monarch butterfly habitat sites; extensive trails w/ beach access to Ellwood Beach
31	Campus Glen	Regional Open Space	6.31	Eucalyptus groves
32	Coronado Preserve ² (private)	Regional Open Space	6.83	Monarch butterfly informational markers; small circular theatre sitting area
33	Santa Barbara Shores (Small)	Neighborhood Open Space	4.83	0.15-acre lawn; playground; 1 picnic table
33	Santa Barbara Shores Open Space (Small)	Neighborhood Open Space	1.24	Eucalyptus groves
34	Santa Barbara Shores Park	Regional Open Space	91.7	91.7 acres of open space; coastal vista, trails; bluff top, shoreline, and public parking lot
35	Haskell's Beach	Regional Open Space	NA	Pacific shoreline and beach
36	Haskell's Beach Access (private)	Regional Open Space	0.89	50 space public parking lot with beach access walkway
37	Doty Property	Neighborhood Open Space	1.04	1.04-acre open space adjacent to Sperling Preserve

¹ Map number corresponds with park identification numbers of Figure 3.10-3.
² Private parks are owned and maintained by nonprofit, private entities.

3.10.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

As in the Final EIR, the evaluation in this Supplemental EIR concerns the potential effects on land use and recreation that would result from implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and, in this case, from alternate versions of those policies in the form of GP/CLUP amendments.

3.10.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The thresholds of significance applied in this Supplemental EIR are the same as those in the 2006 Final EIR.

City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds Manual

The City's adopted *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* does not provide environmental thresholds specific to land use and recreation; however, the Thresholds Manual does observe that quality of life should be considered when evaluating land uses proposed by a given project. Quality of life can be broadly defined as the aggregate effect of all impacts on individuals, families, communities, and other social groupings and on the way in which those groups function. Where a substantial physical impact to the quality of the human environment is demonstrated, the project's effect on quality of life shall be considered significant. Quality of life issues, while difficult to quantify, are often primary concerns to the community affected by a project. Examples of such issues that directly involve land use and planning include the loss of privacy and/or neighborhood incompatibility.

CEQA Thresholds

The City of Goleta also assesses impacts based on the State CEQA Guidelines. As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), the proposed project may have a significant impact on *land use and planning* if it would:

- a) physically divide an established community;
- b) conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- c) conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

As suggested by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact related to *recreation* if it would:

- a) increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; and
- b) include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

3.10.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies

The action under consideration by the City is to amend the existing GP/CLUP to approve the changes in Alternatives 2a, 2b, or 3; combine or eliminate changes proposed in Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3; or choose not to change the GP/CLUP at this time (Alternative 1).

The Land Use, Open Space, Conservation, Housing, Visual and Historic Resources, Transportation, Safety, Noise, and Public Facilities Elements of the GP/CLUP contain policies that define Goleta's planned long-range development pattern and physical character, as well as the extent and distribution of future growth in the City, while attempting to balance the various concerns and needs of the City and its residents and protect the environment. The following GP/CLUP policies are relevant to land use and planning, and recreation.

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element establishes a planned land use pattern and policies to govern development within the City. The land use designations and policies, together with the land use plan map, guide the general distribution, location, and extent of future land uses and development. The following policies of the Land Use Element are designed to balance the various concerns and needs of the City and its residents and will guide future change to fit the desired character of Goleta:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses
- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses
- Policy LU 5: Public and Quasi-Public Land Uses
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 7: Agriculture
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs

Open Space Element

Parks and open space provide a highly valued and important component of the existing and future environment of Goleta. The Open Space Element provides the following policies intended to achieve the City's vision for open space, parks, and recreation facilities that are accessible to all members of the community:

- Policy OS 1: Lateral Shoreline Access
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map
- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
- Policy OS 9: Financing Public Parks, Open Space, and Recreational Facilities

Conservation Element

The following policies of the Conservation Element are designed to preserve and protect Goleta's environmental resources, including valuable habitat areas, to the maximum extent feasible, while allowing reasonable development in conformance with the provisions of the Land Use Element:

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
- Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
- Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands
- Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality
- Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands
- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
- Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest

Housing Element

The Housing Element addresses Goleta's housing needs for a planning period extending to June 30, 2009 and beyond. It contains the following policies to help meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community, with a focus on housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households:

- Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships
- Policy HE 3: Linkage of Housing and Jobs
- Policy HE 4: Variety of Housing Choices and Affordable Housing Opportunities
- Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs
- Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA
- Policy HE 7: Opportunities for Mixed-Use Housing
- Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design
- Policy HE 11: Inclusion of Very Low-, Low-, and Moderate-Income Housing in New Development
- Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing

Safety Element

The Safety Element includes measures to avoid or mitigate the effects of hazards inherent in the physical environment, such as earthquakes, fires, floods, and certain industrial activities that

represent potential risks to the community. It contains policies regarding emergency preparedness and response:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy SE 4: Seismic and Seismically Induced Hazards
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards
- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
- Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities

Visual and Historic Resources Element

The Visual and Historic Resources Element identifies means to preserve scenic coastal and mountain views, design criteria to achieve compatibility of new and expanded development with community character, and measures to protect the City's historic and architectural heritages:

- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors
- Policy VH 3: Community Character
- Policy VH 4: Design Review
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources

Transportation Element

The Transportation Element establishes policies to create and maintain a balanced multimodal transportation system, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and rail transportation. It also includes proposed improvement projects needed to accommodate future use and development allowed by the Land Use Element and maintain adequate levels of service on City streets:

- Policy TE 1: Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Policy TE 3: Streets and Highways Plan and Standards
- Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character
- Policy TE 9: Parking
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development

Public Facilities Element

The Public Facilities Element addresses the planning, development, and financing of various capital facilities that are needed to support the development and uses allowed by the Land Use Element, including activity hall or civic center:

- Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
- Policy PF 5: School Facilities
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Noise Element

The Noise Element establishes goals and policies to ensure that land use, development, and transportation activities do not create unacceptable noise impacts. It also includes measures to protect sensitive noise receptors:

- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards
- Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

3.10.3.3 Project Impacts

In this Supplemental EIR, the evaluation of the potential land use and recreation impacts of proposed amendments considers the potential effects of individual changes on land use and recreation in the City and on the mitigation provided by the Conservation Element, Open Space Element, and Land Use Element policies for the impacts of GP/CLUP implementation.

For purposes of the analysis, the sources of direct and indirect impacts remain as identified in the Final EIR. Identified impacts were evaluated in terms of their potential significance based on the thresholds indicated in Subsection 3.3.3.1 and the classes of impacts (I through IV) used by the City for CEQA analyses. Cumulative impacts were examined in terms of the combined effects of the impacts associated with GP/CLUP implementation and foreseeable projects in areas adjacent to the City. Residual impacts were examined in terms of the potential for significant effects to occur after mitigation of any Class I, Class II, or significant cumulative impacts.

Methodology

The analysis in this Supplemental EIR is intended to determine how impacts of GP/CLUP implementation and the mitigating effect of the policies in the GP/CLUP would change if some or all of the proposed amendments were adopted. To determine this, each policy change proposed in Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3 was evaluated in terms of three questions:

1. Is the change to a policy cited as mitigation for a Class II impact of the existing GP/CLUP?
2. If the change were accepted, would implementation of the amended GP/CLUP result in greater or different impacts than those analyzed in the Final EIR?
3. Does the change have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts? If yes, is there feasible mitigation to reduce the effects?

In response to Question 1, Table 3.10-3 provides a tabular summary of those policies cited as mitigation for a Class II land use and recreation impact identified in the existing GP/CLUP. Responses to Questions 2 and 3 are addressed in the analyses for each impact, as follows. A tabular summary of this analysis is presented in the alternative screening tables in Appendix B.

**TABLE 3.10-3
POLICIES PROPOSED FOR AMENDMENT THAT ARE CITED
AS MITIGATION FOR CLASS II LAND USE AND RECREATION IMPACTS IN FINAL EIR**

Proposed Policy Change (ID #)	Potential Impact Identified with One or More Action Alternative
CE 1	Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities
CE 2	Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities
CE 3	Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities
CE 5	Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities
CE 8	Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities
CE 9	Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities
CE 10	Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities
LU 3	Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses
OS 7	Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due to Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due to Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

The following land use and recreation impact analysis considers issues related to proposed amendments to the City of Goleta GP/CLUP. Those issues include land use and recreation impacts resulting from changes in the locations of large regional development, revisions to growth management directives, access to open space, protection of biological resources, and traffic mitigation options. The analysis also includes review of cumulative land use and recreation impacts associated with development within, and adjacent to, the City of Goleta.

Class I Impacts—None

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short- or long-term significant and unavoidable impacts to land use and recreation associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Class II Impacts

Short-Term

Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, construction-related activities associated with buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP land uses, transportation improvements, and public facilities have potential to result in temporary impacts due to conflicts with applicable land use policies and/or regulations that apply to construction-related effects such as, but not limited to, impacts on biological and cultural/archaeological resources, noise, traffic, and air quality. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-1. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP are designed and intended for the purpose of guiding development and avoiding or reducing potential environmental impacts resulting from construction activities. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- **Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy**
- **Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas**
- **Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands**
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- **Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas**
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- **Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species**

- **Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands**
- **Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality**
- Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands
- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
- Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for short-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. As can be seen from the list above, all of the policy amendments applicable to this impact are related to the Conservation Element. Because Alternative 2a includes policy changes that would reduce the minimum width of certain buffers and provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in areas that would have been protected by buffer areas under the existing GP/CLUP. Further, because Alternative 2a changes how ESHAs are formally designated within the City, it is possible that the number of acres and types of ESHA protected from temporary impacts would be fewer than under Alternative 1 and consequently more acres and types would be subject to short-term impacts. However, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2a would amend the GP/CLUP in ways that eliminate or substantially change the requirements to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potentially significant impacts to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has substantially the same potential for short-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. Alternative 2b differs from Alternative 1 and 2a in that it calls for the City to replace the measures included in ESHA-related policies in the existing GP/CLUP with a comprehensive habitat management plan and comprehensive guidelines for biological assessments and ESHA determinations within the City. Because Alternative 2b defers to a plan and guidelines not yet developed, it creates an interim scenario in which special-status habitat and species are potentially more at risk from short-term impacts than would occur under Alternative 1 or 2a. However, as with Alternative 2a, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2b would eliminate or substantially change the City policies that apply to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for short-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. Because Alternative 3 includes policy changes that provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, remove the specific noise limit, reduce the minimum width of buffer areas, and add protection for coastal bluff scrub, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1,

especially in terms of temporary habitat disturbance or degradation from adjacent activities. However, as with Alternative 2a, the policy changes under Alternative 3 would not eliminate or change requirements under other City policies regarding mitigation for significant impacts to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified short-term impacts to land use and recreation.

Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities, parks, and open spaces listed in Table 3.10-4, expansion and enhancement of existing vertical public coastal access (Policy OS 2), and the planned conversion of a shoreline parcel currently occupied by the Venoco Ellwood Oil & Gas Processing Facility (EOF) to Open Space/Active Recreation uses (Policy LU 9) have potential to result in potentially significant physical effects on the environment due to short-term construction activities.

**TABLE 3.10-4
PLANNED RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, PARKS, AND OPEN SPACES**

Map ID ¹	Name	Park Type	Acres	Description
A	Expansion of Armitos Park	Neighborhood Park	4.0	Parallels San Jose Creek; undeveloped
B	Potential Active Recreation	Community Park	4.0 – 5.0	Active recreation park by SR-217 & Old Drive-In Theater.
C	Willow Springs Park	Neighborhood Park	2.0 – 3.0	Camino Vista by Willow Springs Phase II Apartments
D	Village at Los Carneros Park	Neighborhood Park	3.0 – 5.0	Castilian Drive by proposed Village at Los Carneros MFD project adjacent to creek
E	Cabrillo Business Park Open Space	Neighborhood Open Space	15.8	Los Carneros Road (by SE corner of parcel)
	Total		30.8 – 35.8	

¹ = Map ID refers to the corresponding map identification code located on Figure 3.10-3 Existing and Planned Parks.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-2. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP would ensure that impacts involving the construction of planned recreation facilities are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
- **Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy**
- **Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas**
- **Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands**
- Policy CE 4: Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas
- **Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas**
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- **Policy CE 8: Protection of Special-Status Species**
- Policy CE 9: Protection of Native Woodlands

- **Policy CE 10: Watershed Management and Water Quality**
- Policy CE 11: Preservation of Agricultural Lands
- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
- Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest
- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 5: Soil and Slope Stability Hazards
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy NE 6: Single-Event and Nuisance Noise

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for short-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. As can be seen from the list above, all of the policy amendments applicable to this impact are related to the Conservation Element. Because Alternative 2a includes policy changes that would reduce the minimum width of certain buffers and provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in areas that would have been protected by buffer areas under the existing GP/CLUP. Further, because Alternative 2a changes how ESHAs are formally designated within the City, it is possible that the number of acres and types of ESHA protected from temporary impacts would be fewer than under Alternative 1 and consequently more acres and types would be subject to short-term impacts. However, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2a would amend the GP/CLUP in ways that eliminate or substantially change the requirements to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potentially significant impacts to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has substantially the same potential for short-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. Alternative 2b differs from Alternative 1 and 2a in that it calls for the City to replace the measures included in ESHA-related policies in the existing GP/CLUP with a comprehensive habitat management plan and comprehensive guidelines for biological assessments and ESHA determinations within the City. Because Alternative 2b defers to a plan and guidelines not yet developed, it creates an interim scenario in which special-status habitat and species are potentially more at risk from short-term impacts than would occur under Alternative 1 or 2a. However, as with Alternative 2a, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2b would eliminate or substantially change the City policies that apply to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for short-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. Because Alternative 3 includes policy changes that provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, remove the specific noise limit, reduce the minimum width of buffer areas, and add protection for coastal bluff scrub, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1,

especially in terms of temporary habitat disturbance or degradation from adjacent activities. However, as with Alternative 2a, the policy changes under Alternative 3 would not eliminate or change requirements under other City policies regarding mitigation for significant impacts to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified short-term impacts to land use and recreation.

Long-Term

Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). The City of Goleta Planning Area includes lands within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara Municipal Airport; lands within the UCSB campus subject to the jurisdiction of the University of California Board of Regents; and others), the California Coastal Commission, and a variety of special districts (Goleta Water District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Embarcadero Community Services District, Isla Vista Recreation and Park District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, Santa Barbara County Flood Control District, Metropolitan Transit District, and others). In addition to local agency jurisdictional requirements, certain activities conducted within the City are subject to State and Federal agency regulations.

As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses have potential to conflict with the applicable environmental impact mitigation policies and/or regulations of the other agencies that maintain full or partial jurisdictions within the City planning area. These impacts would be considered potentially significant. The proposed elements of the GP/CLUP include goals, policies, implementation actions, and implementation programs that are designed to consider the requirements of the various jurisdictional agencies.

The 2008 CEQA Addendum to the 2006 Final EIR included a revision to the GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1, Land Use Plan Map (also Figure 3.10-4 in this Supplemental EIR), which revised the land use category from Open Space/Passive Recreation to Planned Residential for 18 selected parcels, and applied an Open Space Overlay to those parcels. The purpose of the amendment was to retain a land use that is consistent with existing zoning. The 18 parcels are almost entirely located within ESHA and within the 100-year floodplain. Changing the land use designation from open space to residential type uses did not remove the protection for ESHA and flood hazard zones. As such, it was determined that development on these parcels may be limited and would not create additional impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout that were not otherwise analyzed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Amendments categorized as *Track 2* revisions involved minor technical or editorial revisions presenting no new significant environmental impacts, and were addressed in a CEQA Addendum adopted in March 2008

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-3. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP would ensure that impacts involving land use conflicts are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- **Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses**
- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses

- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy CE 12: Protection of Air Quality
- Policy HE 5: Special Needs Housing and Support Programs
- Policy HE 6: Adequate Sites to Meet Goleta's RHNA
- Policy HE 12: Funding for Affordable Housing
- Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities
- Policy PF 7: Coordinating Facilities and Services with Other Agencies
- Policy PF 9: Coordination of Facilities with Future Development

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. Alternative 2a includes proposed policy amendment LU 3.2 that would allow consideration of new areas for regional commercial development as appropriate through project review. Although this policy amendment could potentially lead to the conversion of land previously designated residential, such impacts are highly project-specific and would be addressed through the project review required under the amended policy. That review would include considering the project's consistency with overall GP/CLUP goals and policies, as well as the permitting requirements of applicable jurisdictional agencies. The necessity for agency permit compliance would not be affected. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policy LU 3.2 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policy LU 3.2 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, the California Coastal Act requires that Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) be protected; therefore, any land uses proposed within the Coastal Zone must comply with the Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs. Buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses have potential to conflict with Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs. These impacts would be considered potentially significant. Existing ESHAs are identified at certain locations within the City and Coastal Zone, as shown in Figure 3.4-3. Some of the ESHAs also fall within the boundary of the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Habitat Management Plan area.

As discussed above under Impact 3.10-3, the 2008 CEQA Addendum to the 2006 Final EIR included a revision to the GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1, Land Use Plan Map, which revised the land use category from Open Space/Passive Recreation to Planned Residential for 18 selected parcels, and applied an Open Space Overlay to those parcels. The purpose of the amendment was to retain a land use that is consistent with existing zoning. It was determined that development on these parcels may be limited and would not create additional impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout that were not otherwise analyzed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-4. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP are designed to protect ESHAs from land use conflicts or other indirect effects from development and specify appropriate development procedures to ensure the protection of ESHAs within the Coastal Zone. The GP/CLUP policies also address consistency with the goals and policy provisions of the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Habitat Management Plan. Therefore, the potential for conflict with Coastal Zone policies that protect ESHAs due to buildout are less than significant with implementation of the following GP/CLUP policies. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- **Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map**
- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
- **Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy**
- **Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas**
- **Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands**
- **Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas**
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 3: Community Character
- Policy TE 9: Parking

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. As can be seen from the list above, four of the policy amendments applicable to this impact are related to the Conservation Element, and one amendment is related to the Open Space Element. Because Alternative 2a includes policy changes that would reduce the minimum width of certain buffers and provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for long-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in areas that would have been protected by buffer areas under the existing GP/CLUP. Further, because Alternative 2a changes how ESHAs are formally designated within the City, it is possible that the number of acres and types of ESHA protected from temporary impacts would be fewer than under Alternative 1 and consequently more acres and types would be subject to long term impacts. However, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2a would amend the GP/CLUP in ways that eliminate or substantially change the requirements to avoid, minimize, and mitigate long-term potentially significant impacts to land use and recreation.

The proposed amendment to Policy OS 7.3 would designate areas as ESHAs based upon site-specific biological studies. With this change, certain biological resources potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing GP/CLUP. However, the site-specific studies would identify and continue to protect those resources deemed suitable for ESHA designation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element and Open Space Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has substantially the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. Alternative 2b differs from Alternative 1 and 2a in that it calls for the City to replace the measures included in ESHA-related policies in the existing GP/CLUP with a comprehensive habitat management plan and comprehensive guidelines for biological assessments and ESHA determinations within the City. Because Alternative 2b defers to a plan and guidelines not yet developed, it creates an interim scenario in which special status habitat and species are potentially more at risk from long-term impacts than would occur under Alternative 1 or 2a. However, as with Alternative 2a, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2b would eliminate or substantially change the City policies that apply to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element and Open Space Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. Because Alternative 3 includes policy changes that provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, remove the specific noise limit, reduce the minimum width of buffer areas, and add protection for coastal bluff scrub, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in terms of temporary habitat disturbance or degradation from adjacent activities. However, as with Alternative 2a, the policy changes under Alternative 3 would not eliminate or change requirements under other City policies regarding mitigation for significant impacts to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element and Open Space Element policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified long-term impacts to land use and recreation.

Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses, including the development of some existing vacant sites, would have the potential to impact the quality of life of City residents by introducing new or modified land uses that would cause or contribute to the loss of privacy or would otherwise cause or contribute to conditions that are incompatible with existing neighborhoods. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

As discussed above under Impact 3.10-3, the 2008 CEQA Addendum to the 2006 Final EIR included a revision to the GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1, Land Use Plan Map, which revised the land use category from Open Space/Passive Recreation to Planned Residential for 18 selected parcels, and applied an Open Space Overlay to those parcels. The purpose of the amendment was to retain a land use that is consistent with existing zoning. It was determined that development on these parcels may be limited and would not create additional impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout that were not otherwise analyzed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-5. Loss of privacy due to buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses is addressed by Policies LU 2 of the Land Use Element and VH 4 of the Visual and Historic Resources Element. Both policies provide for the protection of privacy in residential settings. The existing GP/CLUP land use designations remain generally consistent with existing land uses, with the exception of selected vacant parcels (principally located south of US-101, in the vicinity of Los Carneros Road and Storke Road). The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP ensure that potential impacts associated with changes in land use that may result in neighborhood incompatibility would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- **Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses**
- Policy LU 4: Office and Industrial Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy HE 2: Effective Implementation and Housing Partnerships
- Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 3: Community Character
- Policy VH 4: Design Review
- Policy TE 13: Mitigating Traffic Impacts of Development
- Policy PF 5: School Facilities
- Policy PF 8: General Standards for Public Facilities
- Policy NE 1: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. Alternative 2a includes proposed policy amendment LU 3.2, which would allow consideration of new areas for regional commercial development as appropriate through project review. Although this policy amendment could potentially lead to the conversion of land previously designated residential, such impacts are highly project-specific and would be addressed through the project review required under the amended policy. That review would include considering the project's consistency with overall GP/CLUP goals and policies, as well as the permitting requirements of applicable jurisdictional agencies. The necessity for agency permit compliance would not be affected. In addition, Policies LU 2 of the Land Use Element and VH 4 of the Visual and Historic Resources Element would address loss of privacy due to buildout of adopted GP/CLUP land uses. Accordingly, revisions to the LU policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policy LU 3.2 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policy LU 3.2 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, the GP/CLUP includes new and expanded recreational facilities, parks, and open space (see Table 3.10-3), new trail segments, expansion and enhancement of existing public vertical coastal access facilities (Policy OS 2), and the planned conversion of a shoreline parcel currently occupied by the Venoco EOF to Open Space/Active Recreation uses (Policy LU 9). The new and expanded recreational facilities have the potential to result in adverse physical effects on the environment due to overuse and/or lack of adequate maintenance. These impacts would be considered potentially significant.

As discussed above under Impact 3.10-3, the 2008 CEQA Addendum to the 2006 Final EIR included a revision to the GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1, Land Use Plan Map, which revised the land use category from Open Space/Passive Recreation to Planned Residential for 18 selected parcels, and applied an Open Space Overlay to those parcels. The purpose of the amendment was to retain a land use that is consistent with existing zoning. It was determined that development on these parcels may be limited and would not create additional impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout that were not otherwise analyzed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-6. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP ensure that potential impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses

- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 3: Coastal Access Routes, Parking, and Signage
- Policy OS 4: Trails and Bikeways
- Policy OS 5: Ellwood-Devereux Open Space Area
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- **Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map**
- Policy OS 8: Protection of Native American Cultural Sites
- **Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy**
- **Policy CE 2: Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas**
- **Policy CE 3: Protection of Wetlands**
- **Policy CE 5: Protection of Other Terrestrial Habitat Areas**
- Policy CE 6: Protection of Marine Habitat Areas
- Policy CE 7: Protection of Beach and Shoreline Habitats
- Policy SE 2: Bluff Erosion and Retreat
- Policy SE 3: Beach Erosion and Shoreline Hazards
- Policy SE 6: Flood Hazards
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy TE 9: Parking
- Policy NE 7: Design Criteria to Attenuate Noise

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. As can be seen from the list above, four of the policy amendments applicable to this impact are related to the Conservation Element, and one amendment is related to the Open Space Element. Because Alternative 2a includes policy changes that would reduce the minimum width of certain buffers and provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for long-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in areas that would have been protected by buffer areas under the existing GP/CLUP. Further, because Alternative 2a changes how ESHAs are formally designated within the City, it is possible that the number of acres and types of ESHA protected from temporary impacts would be fewer than under Alternative 1 and consequently more acres and types would be subject to long term impacts. However, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2a would amend the GP/CLUP in ways that eliminate or substantially change the requirements to avoid, minimize, and mitigate long-term potentially significant impacts to land use and recreation. The proposed amendment to Policy OS 7.3 would protect open space through site-specific biological studies. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element and

Open Space Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has substantially the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. Alternative 2b differs from Alternative 1 and 2a in that it calls for the City to replace the measures included in ESHA-related policies in the existing GP/CLUP with a comprehensive habitat management plan and comprehensive guidelines for biological assessments and ESHA determinations within the City. Because Alternative 2b defers to a plan and guidelines not yet developed, it creates an interim scenario in which special status habitat and species are potentially more at risk from short-term impacts than would occur under Alternative 1 or 2a. However, as with Alternative 2a, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2b would eliminate or substantially change the City policies that apply to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element and Open Space Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. Because Alternative 3 includes policy changes that provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, remove the specific noise limit, reduce the minimum width of buffer areas, and add protection for coastal bluff scrub, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in terms of temporary habitat disturbance or degradation from adjacent activities. However, as with Alternative 2a, the policy changes under Alternative 3 would not eliminate or change requirements under other City policies regarding mitigation for significant impacts to land use and recreation. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element and Open Space Element policies under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified long-term impacts to land use and recreation.

Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, buildout of the adopted GP/CLUP land uses have potential to lead to greater wear and tear of existing recreational facilities due the introduction of new development. The City currently has a low level of service for active-use parks and recreational services. This level of service will be degraded further if additional parks and other recreational facilities (i.e. trails, open space, and recreation-oriented community centers) are not provided to support both new and existing development. The quality of existing facilities will also be degraded (deteriorated) due to overuse from new and existing development if additional recreational facilities are not provided. Adequate financial sources and staffing are also needed to protect and maintain existing facilities. Located within the Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve, the Stow House is recognized by the City as an historic resource, and is thus subject to specific requirements for its protection. Increased use of Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve from new development under the GP/CLUP has potential to cause degradation to the Stow House. Note that new park development will offset increased demand associated with increased population allowed by the Plan.

The potential for impacts involving the substantial physical deterioration or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational facilities due to buildout of GP/CLUP land uses would be considered a potentially significant impact.

As discussed above under Impact 3.10-3, the 2008 CEQA Addendum to the 2006 Final EIR included a revision to the GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1, Land Use Plan Map, which revised the land use category from Open Space/Passive Recreation to Planned Residential for 18 selected parcels, and applied an Open Space Overlay to those parcels. The purpose of the amendment was to retain a land use that is consistent with existing zoning. It was determined that development on these parcels may be limited and would not create additional impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout that were not otherwise analyzed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-7. The GP/CLUP provides for the protection of existing open space areas and set-aside park sites in the capacity analysis of designated housing sites (Housing Element Technical Appendix); however, additional facilities will also be needed in order to provide adequate active-use recreation opportunities (e.g. sports fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, and trails) for existing and future residents and to maintain the quality and service of existing facilities. Future planned recreation facilities, in addition to policies and implementation actions supporting the maintenance of existing and provision of new facilities, will contribute to a reduced potential for impacts to existing recreational facilities. GP/CLUP Policy VH 5 includes the provision that the City shall preserve and rehabilitate publicly owned historic resources.

GP/CLUP policies from the Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Elements also address potential impacts to existing recreation facilities. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- **Policy LU 3: Commercial Land Uses**
- Policy LU 6: Park and Open Space Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 9: Coastal-Dependent and -Related Uses (Key Pacific Shoreline Sites)
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy OS 2: Vertical Access to the Shoreline
- Policy OS 6: Public Park System Plan
- **Policy OS 7: Adoption of Open Space Plan Map**
- Policy OS 9: Financing Public Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Facilities
- Policy CE 14: Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Forest
- Policy VH 1: Scenic Views
- Policy VH 2: Local Scenic Corridors
- Policy VH 5: Historic Resources
- Policy PF 2: Other Facilities of the City of Goleta
- Policy PF 5: School Facilities

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1)

and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those is the existing GP/CLUP. Alternative 2a includes proposed policy amendment LU 3.2 that would allow consideration of new areas for regional commercial development as appropriate through project review. Although this policy amendment could potentially lead to the conversion of land previously designated residential, such impacts are highly project-specific and would be addressed through the project review required under the amended policy. That review would include considering the project's consistency with overall GP/CLUP goals and policies, as well as the permitting requirements of applicable jurisdictional agencies. The necessity for agency permit compliance would not be affected.

The proposed amendment to Policy OS 7.3 would designate areas as ESHAs based upon site-specific biological studies. With this change, certain biological resources potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing GP/CLUP. However, the site-specific studies would identify and continue to protect those resources deemed suitable for ESHA designation.

Based on the above, revisions to the Land Use Element and Open Space Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts affecting the deterioration of recreational facilities.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policies LU 3.2 and OS 7.3 are identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to the Land Use Element and Open Space Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts affecting the deterioration of recreational facilities.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. For the proposed amendment to Policy LU 3.2, Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. The text of the proposed amendment to Policy LU 3.2 is identical among these alternatives. Accordingly, revisions to Policy LU 3.2 under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts affecting the deterioration of recreational facilities.

For the proposed amendment to Policy OS 7.3, Alternative 3 has the same potential for short-term significant adverse impacts to special status habitats and species as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those is the existing GP/CLUP. Because Alternative 3 includes policy changes that provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in terms of temporary habitat disturbance or degradation from adjacent activities. However, as with Alternative 2a, the policy changes under Alternative 3 would not eliminate or change requirements under other City policies and under Federal and State regulations regarding mitigation for significant impacts to special status biological resources. Accordingly, the revision to Policy OS 7.3 under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts affecting the deterioration of recreational facilities.

Class III Impacts

Short-Term Impacts

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short-term less-than-significant impacts to land use and recreation associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Long-Term Impacts

Impact 3.10-8. Physical Division of an Established Community Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, implementation of the proposed GP/CLUP would generally result in more efficient growth and development. Most of the new development associated with buildout is expected to occur on vacant sites along US-101, Hollister Avenue, and near SR-217; refer to Figure 3.10-2, Vacant Sites and Proposed Land Use Designations. The proposed designations would be similar to existing land uses surrounding the sites. The GP/CLUP also includes transportation improvements identified in Figure 3.13-6. Most of the transportation improvements would occur within existing transportation routes and right-of-ways; therefore, the proposed transportation improvements would not result in the physical division of an established community. Impacts are considered less than significant. Some planned transportation improvements are intended to achieve improved connectivity of parts of the existing community separated by US-101.

As discussed above under Impact 3.10-3, the 2008 CEQA Addendum to the 2006 Final EIR included a revision to the GP/CLUP Land Use Element Figure 2-1, Land Use Plan Map, which revised the land use category from Open Space/Passive Recreation to Planned Residential for 18 selected parcels, and applied an Open Space Overlay to those parcels. The purpose of the amendment was to retain a land use that is consistent with existing zoning. It was determined that development on these parcels may be limited and would not create additional impacts associated with GP/CLUP buildout that were not otherwise analyzed in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.10-8. The following policies in the existing GP/CLUP would ensure that impacts associated would remain less than significant:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 2: Residential Land Uses
- Policy LU 8: Central Hollister Residential Development Area
- Policy LU 12: Land Use In Goleta's Environs
- Policy HE 8: Preservation of Existing Housing and Neighborhoods
- Policy HE 9: Excellence in New Housing Design
- Policy TE 1.2: Transportation and Land Use Policy
- Policy TE 3: Streets and Highways Plan and Standards
- Policy TE 5: Planned Street and Road Improvements
- Policy TE 6: Street Design and Streetscape Character

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term less-than-significant impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1). None of the policies listed above are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation Impact 3.10-8.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has the same potential for long-term less-than-significant impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1). None of the policies listed above are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation Impact 3.10-8.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for long-term less-than-significant impacts to land use and recreation as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1). None of the policies listed above are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts to land use and recreation Impact 3.10-8.

Class IV Impacts

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short- or long-term beneficial (Class IV) impacts to land use and recreation associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

3.10.3.5 Cumulative Impacts

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, it is anticipated that development of the identified related projects and general regional growth would be reviewed for consistency with adopted and applicable land use plans and policies, in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the State Zoning and Planning Law, and the State Subdivision Map Act, all of which require findings of plan and policy consistency prior to approval of entitlements for development. For this reason, cumulative impacts associated with inconsistency of future development with adopted plans and policies would be less than significant.

The GP/CLUP, in combination with projects in nearby portions of the City of Santa Barbara, the County, and UCSB would result in a general increase in population and use intensity and would specifically add to an existing long-term trend of increased public use, access, and activities in recreational and open space areas, which may result in degradation of such facilities. The GP/CLUP includes new and expanded recreational facilities, parks, open space, trail segments, expansion and enhancement of existing public vertical coastal access facilities, and the planned conversion of the shoreline parcel currently occupied by the Venoco EOF to Open Space/Active Recreation. Future planned recreation facilities, in addition to policies and implementation actions supporting the maintenance of existing facilities, would reduce potential cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

As additional residential development in the County is approved, in-lieu fees for parks or donation of parkland (pursuant to the Quimby Act) would be required as part of the individual projects (UCSB 2004). In addition, grants from State and County bond sources (e.g., Proposition 12 and Proposition A) are available to fund additional parkland and recreational facilities in urban areas (UCSB 2004). These funding sources would provide additional parkland and recreational facilities in the County to satisfy demand from future population growth, and cumulative impacts on park and recreation facilities is anticipated to be less than significant as a result.

It is further anticipated that in order to accommodate future cumulative demand for park and recreation facilities, additional park and recreation facilities would be developed and constructed throughout the City and County of Santa Barbara. Because the size, location, and type of these future facilities is not known at this time, it is impossible to assess the magnitude of cumulative impacts associated with the construction of these facilities. However, it is reasonable to expect that all of these facilities would undergo CEQA review, and that project-specific impacts associated with development of each of these facilities would be mitigated to the extent feasible. As a result, cumulative impacts associated with construction of future park and recreation facilities are expected to be less than significant.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

In sum, the proposed amendments evaluated in this Supplemental EIR would not affect the level of significance of cumulative impacts determined for the 2006 Final EIR.

Mitigation

Modifications to GP/CLUP Policies

Proposed modifications to selected GP/CLUP policies are presented in Chapter 2.0 as amendments to the GP/CLUP. No further modifications are proposed for consideration beyond those identified as alternatives in this Supplemental EIR.

Other Mitigation

No mitigation is identified.

3.10.3.7 Residual Impacts

Implementation of the GP/CLUP land use policies, as amended under any of the alternatives under consideration herein, would reduce all significant Class II land use impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, there are no residual Class I or II land use or recreation impacts.

This page intentionally left blank