

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Section 3.1 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for aesthetics and visual resources relating to the proposed project;
- the impacts associated with aesthetics and visual resources that would result from the proposed project; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

Proposed policy amendment LU 3.2 would allow consideration of new areas for regional commercial development as appropriate through project review. Although this policy amendment could potentially affect visual character associated with 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 proposed amendment to Policy LU 11 and LU-IA-2 would remove nonresidential growth management policies from the GP/CLUP. The impacts of the removal of policies LU 11 and LU-1A-2 are analyzed in Section 3.8.3.3. In summary, all growth within the City (commercial, industrial, residential, etc.) is currently regulated by GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 (Land Use Plan Map), adopted as part of the GP/CLUP in 2006. Given the small amount of developable vacant land left remaining in the City, GP/CLUP Figure 2-1 is an appropriate growth management tool, and the currently specified land use designations have accounted for an acceptable ratio of development. While removal of the nonresidential growth policies from the GP/CLUP and elimination of the GGMO may affect the pacing of nonresidential growth within the city, removal of those specific regulations would not alter the amount, type, or location of nonresidential growth in the City as previously analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR. Impacts to visual character would not be significant (refer to Section 3.8, Impact 3.8-2 for additional discussion).

Policy amendments CE 1.6, CE 3.4, CE 3.5, and CE 8.4 would reduce the quantity of lands designated as ESHA. Although these proposed policy amendments could introduce additional development and result in loss of habitat, 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, and the requirements that apply to biological resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

Proposed policy amendment CE 2.5 would allow for the construction of bridge abutments within creeks and riparian corridors. Although these proposed policy amendments could introduce additional development to creeks and riparian corridors affecting the existing visual character of these areas, 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, and the requirements that apply to visual resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

Proposed policy amendment CE 2.5 would remove toyons from the list of protected trees. The loss of such trees from future construction and development could alter the visual character of

an area. These 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, and the requirements that apply to visual resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

Policy amendments CE 9.4 and 9.5 could result in reduced life span of mature and or established trees. The loss of such trees could alter the visual character of an area. These 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, and the requirements that apply to visual resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

In sum, the GP/CLUP amendments listed in Table 2-1 of this Supplemental EIR would not result in greater or different impacts to aesthetics and visual resources than those analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR, do not have the potential to result in new potentially significant impacts to aesthetics and visual resources, and are not proposed to policies cited as mitigation for potential impacts to aesthetics and visual resources in the 2006 Final EIR. **Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.1 of the 2006 Final EIR, and no further discussion need be presented in this Supplemental EIR.**