



**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Santa Barbara County Planning Commission

FROM: Matt Schneider, Deputy Director  
Long Range Planning Division

DATE: July 14, 2015

RE: Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan  
County Planning Commission Hearing of July 22, 2015  
Case Nos. 14GPA-00000-00018, 14GPA-00000-00019, 11ORD-00000-00015,  
13ORD-00000-00011, 11RZN-00000-00002, and 15RZN-00000-00004

---

On June 17, 2015, the County Planning Commission held a hearing to consider making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for the adoption of the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan (EGVCP). This memorandum responds to questions and provides additional information and clarifications requested by the Planning Commission at that hearing.

**1. Property Owner Requested Changes**

On June 17, 2015, the Planning Commission received testimony from property owners and/or their agents regarding four sites, requesting the consideration of alternative land use and zoning designations and a revision to policy language that would affect development of a specific site. The following responds to the Planning Commission's requests for additional information to address each of these requests.

***MTD – Housing Opportunity Site 1 (APN 059-140-004, -005, -006)***

The EGVCP proposes to change the land use designation of 10.2 acres of the 17-acre site from Agriculture to Residential-20, 20 units per acre, and apply the Design Residential zone, DR-20. The remaining 6.8 acres would remain Agriculture with AG-I-5 zoning. On June 17, 2015, the owner, MTD, requested that the remaining 6.8 acres be designated Residential and zoned 5-E-1. The proposed change would not result in an increase in land use density or increase the number of residential units that could be developed on the site. AG-I-5 allows one residential unit per 5 acres, as does 5-E-1.

Following consultation with MTD staff, County staff suggests an alternative residential zone, Design Residential (DR-0.2), as these 6.8 acres would be located between the 10.2 acres to be

zoned DR-20, and a 1.4-acre parcel also zoned DR-20 and owned by MTD. DR-0.2 allows one residential unit per 5 acres but may allow for greater design flexibility should MTD decide to develop all of the parcels at one time. The proposal to convert the remaining 6.8 acres from an agricultural use to a residential use can be supported for the following reasons:

1. The property has not been farmed for approximately 15 years.
2. The draft plan forwarded by the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors for initiation proposed to convert the entire site from agriculture to residential and designate all 17 acres as Planned Residential Development with a maximum of 204 units (PRD-204). The “split” zoning was proposed at the Board of Supervisors hearing to be consistent with County Housing Element Program 1.3 in response to comments received from the State Department of Housing and Community Development.
3. The Draft Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) analyzed the impacts to agricultural resources that would result from conversion of the entire 17-acre site to residential uses and concluded that impacts would be less than significant (Class III). Of note, under an evaluation of the existing site for agricultural viability using the County’s weighted point system (*Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*), the site received a score of 52 points, below the County’s 60-point screening threshold (FEIR page 4.4-37 and Appendix E). The weighted point system provides an initial assessment of the potential for a project to impact agricultural resources. It assigns relative values to particular physical characteristics of a site’s agricultural productivity (e.g., soil type, water supply). Where the points total 60 or more, a site is considered potentially physically viable for agriculture and more analysis is required to determine the level of impact. When the points total below 60 points, as in this case, a site is not considered viable for agriculture and a project’s impact is considered less than significant (Class III).
4. The EIR also analyzed the potential impacts to biological resources resulting from conversion of the entire site to residential uses. The EIR concluded that impacts would be significant and unavoidable (Class I) due to the potential for impacts to various identified resources and a lack of any specific development proposal and design (FEIR p. 4.6-54, -57, -60, -61, -66, -69, -73, and -75). Changing the land use from Agriculture to Residential for the remaining 6.8 acres would not change this conclusion as each designation would allow only one residential unit for the 6.8 acres.
5. Existing surrounding uses include a multifamily apartment complex and a vacant parcel to the west (zoned DR-20), multifamily residential development to the north (zoned DR-7 and DR-12.3), and County administrative buildings to the east (zoned Recreation but with a land use designation of Institutional/Government Facility). The surrounding uses combined with the designation of two-thirds of the MTD site as DR-20 further limits the potential for a viable agricultural operation on the remaining 6.8 acres.

After reviewing these options, Steve Maas, Manager of Government Relations and Compliance at MTD contacted Planning and Development (P&D) and indicated a preliminary preference for the DR-0.2 zoning (personal communication June 26, 2015). Therefore, staff recommends the remaining 6.8 acres be zoned DR-0.2 with a corresponding Residential land use designation.

***Tatum – Housing Opportunity Site 2 (APN 065-040-026)***

The agent for the property owner requested that *Policy LUR-EGV-2.5* be revised to provide greater flexibility for locating future development on the site than would be provided by the proposed zoning boundaries. The agent submitted suggested language. Staff reviewed the language and recognizes that a more flexible boundary could facilitate better site design and protection of onsite biological resources. Staff recommends the following revisions to the policy below:

***Policy LUR-EGV-2.5: MTD and Tatum/School District: The MTD properties (APNs 059-140-004, -005, -006), located at 4678 Calle Real/149 North San Antonio Road, and the Tatum/Santa Barbara School District property (APN 065-040-026), located at 4750 Hollister Avenue shall receive land use designations appropriate for Residential Neighborhood Development ~~provided residential land uses are consistent with this Plan.~~ The boundaries of these designations and associated zone districts may be modified as part of a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Development Plan application provided the total acreage associated with the designations does not change and the modification furthers the objectives of this policy. A Development Plan for these properties, respectively, shall: ...***

This policy change would also affect the MTD site, which would benefit as much from the change as would the Tatum site.

***Anderson – Housing Opportunity Site 8 (APN 061-110-014)***

Jim Slaughter, agent for the owner, Cynthia Anderson, objected to the proposed combination of Mixed Use and DR-20 for the 1.71-acre Anderson property on State Street. Staff reviewed these comments and additional information presented to P&D in a Pre-Application (14PRE-00000-00010) filed in November 2014 and met with Mr. Slaughter on June 25, 2015. Constraints to development exist on the site, of which staff and the Goleta Valley Planning Advisory Committee (GVPAC) were likely unaware when developing the proposed “split” land use and zoning designations for the site. These include soil contamination, property encroachments, and a sewer line and easement that bisect the property. Based on this information staff recommends that the entire property be zoned Mixed Use, eliminating the “split” zoning and the proposed DR-20 zone of the southern 0.71 acre. The agent indicated that removal of the DR-20 zone is preferred. Rezoning the entire site Mixed Use would reduce the potential residential buildout on this site by 14 units. Potential environmental impacts as a result of the change would be negligible as the reduced potential residential buildout would balance potential increases in commercial square footage under the Mixed Use zone.

***Sulzbach (APN 077-030-004)***

The Sulzbach property is a 46.77-acre parcel currently located within the Holiday Hill Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN) and zoned AG-I-5 (5-acre minimum lot size). The EGVCP proposes to remove the Sulzbach property from the EDRN and rezone it AG-II-40. The purpose of the change is to strengthen the Rural Area boundary and enhance protection of agricultural resources by reducing the possibility of parcelization of a productive agricultural site.

At the June 17 hearing, the owner requested that the property remain within the EDRN and retain the current AG-I-5 zoning. The Planning Commission discussed conceptual support for the request, and continued further discussion to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the request. The Planning Commission directed staff to provide the boundaries and acreages of the surrounding properties. The attached map provides the requested information (Attachment A).

The owner's request does not warrant additional environmental review at this time because the request would retain the current zoning adopted as part of the 1993 Goleta Community Plan. The EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects of EGVCP-proposed changes in density, land use, and/or zoning. The EIR is a program environmental document that analyzes the potential environmental effects of the proposed community plan, including overall buildout under the plan. As a result, it generally analyzes effects on a regional rather than a parcel-by-parcel level. Exceptions include the housing opportunity sites. Maintaining the existing land use density and zoning designation on the Sulzbach property does not fall within this scale of development and, therefore, does not currently require site-specific analysis.

At approximately 47 acres in size, the Sulzbach property could be subdivided under the current land use density (A-I-5) and zoning (AG-I-5) (5-acre minimum lot size) to create 9 lots. Any proposal to subdivide the property would require additional environmental review to analyze site-specific effects that were not analyzed in the EGVCP EIR. Land Use Development Policy 2 of the Land Use Element states:

*The densities specified in the Land Use Plan are maximums and may be reduced if it is determined that such reduction is warranted by conditions specifically applicable to a site, such as topography, geologic or flood hazards, habitat areas, or steep slopes. ...*

Thus, there is no guarantee of approval of a subdivision at the maximum density. Ultimately, a lower density and fewer lots could result based on analysis of a specific subdivision proposal and its associated environmental analysis of site-specific conditions, including agricultural, biological, cultural, visual, or other environmental resources.

## **2. Questions and Clarifications**

At the hearing on June 17, 2015, the Planning Commission requested additional information to clarify various policies and development standards, including potential revisions to certain policies.

### ***Creek/Riparian Habitat Setback (Buffer) for Urban Area***

In response to a request from the Environmental Defense Center (EDC) and the Urban Creeks Council (UCC), the Planning Commission directed staff to study the potential for increasing the setback from creeks and riparian habitats (i.e., riparian Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESH)) in the Urban Area to a setback similar to that of the City of Goleta (100 feet from top-of-bank or edge of riparian habitat, allowing an increase or decrease on a case-by-case basis).

Currently, EGVCP *Policy ECO-EGV-5.5* proposes a 50-foot minimum buffer (i.e., setback) within the Urban Area and EDRNs measured from top-of-bank or edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is further. This policy continues the existing 50-foot setback within the Urban Area. EGVCP *DevStd ECO-EGV-5D* allows adjustment of the minimum setback upward or downward on a case-by-case basis and states that the setback shall not preclude reasonable use of a parcel. The policy includes several criteria for consideration when deciding whether to adjust the setback. The 50-foot setback from creeks and riparian habitat is the County's standard setback within the Urban Area of Coastal Zone and in Urban Areas and EDRNs throughout the County where community plans have been adopted. The development standard allowing flexibility in adjusting the width of setback is also typically applied throughout the County.

Staff reviewed the City of Goleta's creek setback policy (Attachment B) and consulted with Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager at the City of Goleta regarding implementation of the policy (June 26, 2015, personal communication). Although the policy sets the standard setback at 100 feet, it allows adjustments on a case-by-case basis. Since Goleta's General Plan was adopted, only one of seven projects involving creek setbacks was approved with a setback of 100 feet or greater. The setback for one project was established as a range from 50 feet to 360 feet, three setbacks were established at 50 feet, one setback was established at 25 feet, and one project encroached into the setback as it was a roadway extension with no feasible alternative location.

The City of Santa Barbara Environmental Resources Element Action ER21.1 recommends a minimum setback for new structures of 25 feet from top-of-bank. The City's Zoning Ordinance establishes a minimum setback of 25 feet from top-of-bank along Mission Creek; setbacks from other creeks are determined on a case-by-case basis.

Within the County's jurisdiction in the Eastern Goleta Valley, land use densities adjacent to creeks and riparian ESH are high and parcels are small. There are few parcels adjacent to a creek with development or redevelopment potential where an increased setback could potentially reduce impacts to creeks, water quality, or jurisdictional wetlands. Most parcels abutting creeks in the Urban Area are developed with single-family residential subdivisions with most lots

ranging in size from 7,000 to 20,000 square feet. Larger parcels (e.g., one-acre) are located in the urban foothills. Four parcels are agricultural parcels within the urban South Patterson Agricultural Block.

Approximately 1,000 existing parcels in the Urban Area are affected by the current 50-foot setback. If the creek setback in the Urban Area is increased to 100 feet, approximately 500 additional properties would be affected. Most of these parcels are developed with single family residences. At 50 feet, the current creek setback typically affects the rear yards of existing residences. Thus, the majority of existing residences are conforming structures (i.e., they conform to ESH setbacks). At 100 feet, the setback would affect a significantly larger area of these parcels, creating nonconforming residential structures. In some cases, an increase of the creek setback to 100 feet would affect parcels on the opposite side of a roadway located between the creek and the residential parcel.

Based on the existing development patterns in the Urban Area, the proposed increased setback would provide negligible additional protection of creeks and riparian habitats, or reduce impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and waters (Impact BIO-4). The primary result of the change would be additional time during application review of dwelling additions and rebuilds to address nonconforming structure regulations and to determine how much to adjust the setback to allow reasonable use. Therefore, staff does not recommend the proposed change to Urban Area creek/ESH setbacks.

### ***Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Mapping***

In response to a request from the EDC, the Planning Commission directed staff to study:

- The feasibility of adding a disclaimer to the ESH/Riparian Corridor (RC) Overlay Map.
- The EDC's proposed language for updating the ESH/RC Overlay Map.

Regarding the first request, EGVCP *Policy ECO-EGV-5.4*, as revised by Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1, identifies 15 biological resources and habitats as Environmentally Sensitive Habitats and states they shall be designated on the ESH/RC Overlay Map. The policy also includes the following disclaimer:

*... Note: The scale of the overlay map precludes complete accuracy in the mapping of habitat areas. In some cases, the precise location of habitat areas is not known and is therefore not mapped. In addition, the migration of species or the discovery of new habitats may result in the designation of new areas, or site-specific reviews may indicate different habitat designations. ...*

The purpose of the disclaimer is to notify applicants and staff that not all habitats can be accurately mapped, which is why the EGVCP includes policies referencing the identification of habitat during site-specific surveys and requires ESH protection whenever the habitat is identified. Although future efforts to update the ESH map may result in better information given

new technological advances, unless a biologist maps the precise boundaries of a habitat based on field work, no ESH mapping effort can provide 100% accuracy and site-specific assessments will be required. Boundaries can change over time due to changing conditions (such as rainfall amounts), which render mapping imprecise and transitory.

Therefore, staff recommends adding a disclaimer to the ESH/RC Overlay Map (Figure 22 of the EGVCP as well as the official ESH/RC Overlay Map that will be adopted with the General Plan and Zoning Map Amendments). Staff proposes the following language:

*The extent of ESH and RC habitats depicted on the map is approximate and based on known resources at the time of adoption of the map. In some cases, the precise location of habitat areas is not known (e.g., isolated wetlands, vernal pools, native grasslands) and is therefore not mapped. In addition, chaparral, which covers most of the Rural Area that is not in agricultural production, and other identified ESHs may not be shown on this map. Before removing vegetation or beginning any activity that requires a permit, including removal of chaparral or other ESHs, which might require a permit absent any proposed development, please consult the EGVCP and Planning and Development staff and/or have an onsite survey completed by a qualified biologist.*

Regarding the second request, staff does not recommend setting a specific deadline for completing ESH mapping given funding and staffing constraints that must be addressed by the Board of Supervisors. However, staff recommends that *Program ECO-EGV-5C* be revised as follows to take advantage of opportunities to complete mapping:

***Program ECO-EGV-5C:** The County shall periodically review and update ~~the extent of the ESH/RC overlays~~ Overlay Map as needed to incorporate any and all new data; and include all habitats identified by Policy ECO-EGV-5.4 to the maximum extent feasible. The County shall pursue grants and other funding opportunities and collaborate with third parties, such as UCSB, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Land Trust of Santa Barbara County, to coordinate habitat mapping efforts and maximize funding opportunities. ~~This is~~ Periodic updates are important since the scale of the overlay maps precludes complete accuracy in the mapping of habitat areas and, in some cases, the precise location and extent of ESH/RC areas are not known until new data becomes available. In addition, the migration of species or discovery of habitats may result in the designation of additional areas.*

### ***Trails***

The Planning Commission directed staff to review the proposed EGVCP trails policies and actions in concert with past letters from the Santa Barbara County Trails Council (Trails Council) to the GVPAC (2009 and 2011, Attachment C) and consider whether any suggestions within these letters could be incorporated. The Planning Commission also directed staff to return with

revised language for *Action PRT-EGV-5B* to address the development of incentives for trail acquisition. Staff recommends the following revisions to *Action PRT-TGV-5B* to address this request.

***Action PRT-EGV-5B:*** *The County shall ~~R~~review, address, and revise the Goleta Trails Implementation Study. In addition to any revisions necessary to update information contained in the current document, the revised implementation study shall investigate additional opportunities to add proposed trail corridors to the PRT map. The revised implementation study shall study and recommend to the Board of Supervisors incentives to encourage property owners to dedicate trail easements as determined to be feasible. The study shall consider opportunities to develop incentives appropriate for various project types, including General Plan Amendments, Rezones, Conditional Use Permits and subdivisions. Incentives may include but are not limited to: tax reductions, benefit assessment districts, priority processing of applications, Development Impact Mitigation Fee discounts, and where appropriate, limited increases in development where consistent with resource protection and applicable general plan policies (e.g., additional parcels or residential units).*

The 2011 Trails Council letter recognizes that several suggestions of its 2009 letter were incorporated into the plan. For example, the PRT map (Figure 16, formerly Figure 25) has been updated providing better information regarding existing and proposed trails, parks, and open space, along with road and creek names for better orientation. The EGVCP also added a policy specifically protecting the visual character and aesthetics of existing and proposed trails (*Policy PRT-EGV-6.4*) to complement *Policy VIS-EGV-1.5* which requires high quality design of projects when they would be highly visible from public places, including trails.

Staff also recommends that the following existing policies be revised to enhance opportunities for trail planning, acquisition, and protection. The proposed changes are derived from suggestions of the 2011 Trails Council letter and would clarify policy direction for future efforts to acquire and protect trail easements.

***Policy PRT-EGV-5.2:*** *The County shall foster and support efforts of private community trail organizations in the planning, design, construction and maintenance of trails in Eastern Goleta Valley, and/or efforts to establish a Goleta Trails Foundation. County support may include, but is not limited to: coordinating volunteer efforts, acting as liaison between volunteer groups and County Parks Division, providing information ~~of~~ and/or coordinating grant opportunities, facilitating required permits, and facilitating communication between ~~their organization and other~~ various trail organizations.*

***Policy PRT-EGV-5.3:*** *The County Parks Division, ~~or~~ and any group pursuing implementation of the trail system, shall refer to the PRT policies of this EGVCP,*



*Figure 16, the PRT maps, the EGVCP EIR, and the Goleta Trails Implementation Study, together with its trail siting and design guidelines, to generally guide trail siting, acquisition, and implementation.*

***Policy PRT-EGV-5.10:*** *The County shall actively pursue acquisition of public trails through exactions as part of development agreements and permitting, through negotiation with property owners for purchase or other transaction, through exchange for surplus County property as available, ~~and/or~~ through acceptance of gifts and other voluntary dedications of easements, and/or through the use of incentives as developed through the revised Goleta Trails Implementation Study.*

### ***Water Resources***

The Planning Commission requested additional information regarding water resources, including whether there would be adequate water supply for the proposed Mixed Use zone. Throughout the EGVCP planning process, P&D has coordinated with the local water providers, the Goleta Water District (GWD) and the La Cumbre Mutual Water Company (LCMWC).

Although the GWD has indicated that it has the water supply to serve buildout of the EGVCP, the Draft FEIR identifies a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact to water supply due to uncertainties in supply during unprecedented multiple dry years. Notice of Availability of the public review period of the DEIR was provided to both providers but P&D received comments only from the GWD. The GWD did not identify flaws in the analysis or recommend mitigation.

The EGVCP includes many policies to minimize water use with future development. New developments under the provisions of the EGVCP will not occur all at once and Policy WAT-EGV-1.3 requires a determination by the water providers that sufficient long-term water is available to serve the proposed development. Although the Mixed Use zone proposed for the Hollister Avenue-State Street commercial corridor would allow more residential uses than would be allowed under the General Commercial and Retail Commercial zones, the Mixed Use zone allows flexibility of use. Development in this area would occur over many years and the final uses and densities would depend upon the types of developments proposed, approved and constructed. As required by Policy WAT-EGV-1.3, to be approved and constructed, each individual project would require a determination before approval that adequate water is available to serve the project. Thus, approved development under the Mixed Use zone would have adequate water supply.

### ***More Mesa Subsequent Environmental Review***

In response to a request from Valerie Olson, the Planning Commission directed staff to review the information presented in the Draft FEIR regarding More Mesa. Specifically, the Planning Commission asked whether the More Mesa discussion could be deleted from the Draft FEIR and if future development on the site would rely solely on the analysis of the FEIR.

First, the Draft FEIR mentions More Mesa at least 44 times. More Mesa is a component of the EGVCP, which includes a policy and development standards to guide future development of the site, protect biological and visual resources, and provide coastal access. It is a substantive part of the EGVCP project description and inclusion of More Mesa in the FEIR is appropriate. Therefore, staff does not recommend deleting from the Draft FEIR any references to More Mesa.

Second, the Draft FEIR analyzed the impacts of proposed land use density and zoning changes and the theoretical buildout of the plan. Site-specific analyses were conducted only for the housing opportunity sites and were not completed for property where the land use and zoning designations would remain unchanged. Regarding More Mesa, the EGVCP does not propose any changes: the land use and zoning designations, policy, and development standards were carried over from the 1993 Goleta Community Plan. Thus, the analysis focused on the theoretical buildout under the current land use designations, policy and development standards. For More Mesa, more detailed environmental review would be required when a specific development proposal is submitted.

Section 1.5 of the Draft FEIR explains the process and approach for using a program EIR with a community plan (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168). It also summarizes how the program EIR may be used with later activities. Any future subdivision and development at More Mesa would require environmental review to analyze any environmental impacts that would result from a specific development proposal. A more detailed impact analysis in the EGVCP program EIR would be speculative without a specific development proposal. Therefore, future development at More Mesa could not rely solely on the FEIR for the EGVCP.

### ***Secondary Access and Chaparral Protection***

The Planning Commission raised a concern regarding possible conflicts between policies that promote fire access roads and the protection of chaparral, which would be designated ESH with adoption of the EGVCP. This question appears to address two provisions regarding access for fire protection.

First, *Policy FIRE-EGV-2.3* states secondary access shall be a consideration in the location and design of development and requires it for discretionary development unless waived by the County Fire Department. Implementation of community plans often require the balancing of policies. As with most policies, this policy would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Whether any habitat issues would arise depends upon the location of proposed development and any proposed access. The first step would involve study of a proposal and its site to determine if a location could be found that would not require secondary access. If the secondary access is required, the development, including access, would be reviewed to reduce impacts on chaparral ESH. Mitigation measures, including habitat restoration, may also be required as the final step in the process.

Second, *Policy FIRE-EGV-2.4* states that additional rural fire access routes that increase accessibility to rural areas in the event of wildfire should be considered. This policy, along with

*Policy FIRE-EGV-2.5*, provides direction to the County to consider the development of reasonable fire access roads to improve response to wildfires. As with individual development projects, any effort undertaken by the County to develop fire access roads would need to study the location and design of such roads in a manner that would minimize impacts to chaparral ESH and mitigate impacts, if necessary.

### ***Well-Drilling Noise***

The Planning Commission requested information on existing noise regulations that apply to drilling of new wells. It also asked whether any new regulations are warranted. The drilling of water wells is exempt from Land Use Permits in the Inland Area of the County if the well would serve only one domestic, commercial, industrial, or recreational connection (County LUDC Subsection 35.20.040.B.2.k). Wells for agricultural water systems are also exempt if located in zones that do not require a Development Plan. When an activity is exempt, P&D does not have the ability to apply noise reducing or other conditions of approval.

Separate from P&D permit requirements, the Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of the Public Health Department requires a ministerial permit for the siting and construction (i.e., drilling) of all wells. However, the State regulations do not allow EHS discretion to apply conditions of approval such as measures to reduce noise generated by the construction of a well.

However, the drilling of wells in the Inland Area that would serve more than one connection and any well within the Coastal Zone require permits (LUDC Subsection 35.23.030-Tables 2-7, 2-8 and 2-9, and Article II Section 35-169.2.1). Therefore, when approving a permit for a well, P&D may apply a standard condition to mitigate the noise effects of the drilling operation on surrounding properties. The standard condition, ***Noise-04 Equipment Shielding-Construction***, requires the shielding of stationary construction equipment that generates noise exceeding 65 dBA at the project boundaries. This condition would be applied consistent with EGVCP DevStd N-EGV-1E. Therefore, staff does not recommend any changes to the EGVCP.

### ***Outdoor Lighting Regulations***

Development standard VIS-EGV-1O directs the County to revise the LUDC and Article II such that the outdoor lighting regulations, currently applicable to the Santa Ynez Valley, Mission Canyon, and Summerland plan areas, would apply to the EGVCP plan area. These outdoor lighting regulations would not supersede the development standards of the EGVCP. Rather, they would provide complementary protection of the night sky, including prohibitions of certain light fixtures and limitations on light usage between 9:00 p.m. and sunrise. Thus, they are consistent with and complement the EGVCP's development standards VIS-EGV-1H through -1N. A project with outdoor lighting must comply with the standards of both the EGVCP and the outdoor lighting regulations of the zoning ordinances.

### ***Cavaletto Rural Property (APN 067-010-011, -012 and 069-020-007)***

The Planning Commission asked staff to provide an exhibit depicting the location of the Cavaletto rural property (Attachment D). The Cavaletto family owns three adjacent parcels

totaling approximately 90 acres in the Rural Area. They are located north of Cathedral Oaks Road and just northeast of North Patterson Avenue.

### **3. Minor Edits and Errata**

#### ***Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations***

Under Section 3.0 of the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, the findings erroneously refer to the MMRP as being found in Chapter 8 of the EIR. The MMRP is found in Chapter 10 of the EIR. In addition, minor edits are proposed to the Statement of Overriding Considerations to reflect the recommended change of land use and zoning for the Anderson property (housing opportunity site 8). The revised findings are included as Attachment E to this staff memo.

#### ***Draft Final Environmental Impact Report***

Staff has identified typographic errors and other errata since release of the Draft FEIR. These errata are included as Attachment F of this staff memo. Staff also noted that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) attached to the staff report for the June 17, 2015 hearing was not updated to reflect staff's recommendation for Alternative E. The MMRP has been revised to reflect Alternative E (Attachment G of this staff memo). Finally, should the Planning Commission recommend any or all of the changes to the EGVCP discussed in this memo, staff will prepare a revision letter to the Draft FEIR to address the recommended changes to the EGVCP. The revision letter will be added to the Draft FEIR when it is forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

#### ***Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan***

The Planning Commission requested several minor edits and additions to the Cultural Resources (history and archaeology) and Visual Resources chapters of the EGVCP. It also directed staff to add the four historic resources tables from Section 4.8 of the EIR into a new appendix to the EGVCP. In addition, staff recommends adding language to *DevStd FIRE-EGV-1C* to refer to the California Invasive Plant Council's listing of invasive non-native species when identifying non-native plant species for removal. The additional language is consistent with a revision made to the Draft FEIR following a comment from the County Fire Department. The proposed edits are included as Attachment H of this staff memo.

#### ***Resolutions and Ordinance Amendments***

Staff corrected several typographic errors in the adopting resolutions and ordinance amendments. The corrections have been included in Attachments I and I-1 through I-6 of this memo.

### **4. Recommendation and Procedures**

Follow the procedures outlined below and recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve Case Nos. 14GPA-00000-00018, 14GPA-00000-00019, 11ORD-00000-00015, 13ORD-00000-00011, 11RZN-00000-00002, and 15RZN-00000-00004, based upon the project's consistency

with the Comprehensive Plan, including the Local Coastal Program, and based on the ability to make the required findings, including CEQA findings. The County Planning Commission's motion should include the following:

1. Make the findings for approval in Attachment E of the staff memo dated July 14, 2015, including CEQA findings, and recommend that the Board of Supervisors make the appropriate findings for approval of the proposed general plan amendments, ordinance amendments, and zoning map amendments.
2. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors certify the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (County Environmental Document No. 14EIR-00000-00005, State Clearinghouse No. 2012091048) (Attachment C of the staff report dated June 10, 2015), including Draft FEIR Errata (Attachment F of the staff memo dated July 14, 2015) and the EIR Revision Letter to be drafted by staff, and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment G of the staff memo dated July 14, 2015).
3. Approve and adopt a Resolution (Attachment I of the staff memo dated July 14, 2015) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan as revised by the Planning Commission on July 22, 2015 by taking the following actions:
  - A. Approve and adopt a Resolution amending the text and maps of the Land Use Element (Case No. 14GPA-00000-00019) of the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan (Attachment I-1), including revised land use designations as revised by the Planning Commission on July 22, 2015;
  - B. Approve and adopt an Ordinance amending the zoning regulations of the County Land Use and Development Code (Case No. 11ORD-00000-00015), Section 35-1 of Chapter 35, Zoning, of the Santa Barbara County Code (Attachment I-2);
  - C. Approve and adopt an Ordinance amending and adding new zones and overlay zones to the County Zoning Map (Case No. 11RZN-00000-00002) of the County Land Use and Development Code (Attachment I-3), including revised zoning designations as revised by the Planning Commission on July 22, 2015;
  - D. Approve and adopt a Resolution amending the text and maps of the Coastal Land Use Plan (Case No. 14GPA-00000-00018) of the Santa Barbara County Local Coastal Program (Attachment I-4);
  - E. Approve and adopt an Ordinance amending the zoning regulations of the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Case No. 13ORD-00000-00011) of Chapter 35, Zoning, of the Santa Barbara County Code (Attachment I-5); and

Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan

Case Nos.: 14GPA-00000-00018, 14GPA-00000-00019, 11ORD-00000-00015, 13ORD-00000-00011,  
11RZN-00000-00002, and 15RZN-00000-00004

Hearing Date: July 22, 2015

Page 14

- F. Approve and adopt an Ordinance amending the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance of Chapter 35, Zoning, of the Santa Barbara County Code by amending the existing Goleta Community Plan Zoning South map, the Goleta Community Plan Zoning Overlay map, and the Goleta Community Plan Environmentally Sensitive Habitat and Riparian Corridor Land Use and Zoning Overlays South map and adopting the new Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Zoning map, the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Zoning Overlay map, and the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Environmentally Sensitive Habitat and Riparian Corridor Land Use and Zoning Overlays map (Case No. 15RZN-00000-00004) (Attachment I-6).

Refer back to staff if the County Planning Commission takes other than the recommended action for appropriate findings.

## **5. Attachments**

- A. Sulzbach Property and Vicinity Map
- B. City of Goleta Creek Setback Policy
- C. Letters from the Santa Barbara Trails Council to GVPAC dated August, 19, 2009 and July 3, 2011
- D. Cavaletto Property
- E. Findings (including CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations)
- F. Draft FEIR Errata
- G. Revised Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- H. EGVCP Minor Edits
- I. Planning Commission Resolution
  - I-1. Board of Supervisors Resolution Amending the Land Use Element (Case No. 14GPA-00000-00019)
  - I-2. Board of Supervisors Ordinance Amending the County Land Use and Development Code (Case No. 11ORD-00000-00015)
  - I-3. Board of Supervisors Ordinance Amending the County Zoning Map (Case No. 11RZN-00000-00002)
  - I-4. Board of Supervisors Resolution Amending the Coastal Land Use Element (Case No. 14GPA-00000-00018)
  - I-5. Board of Supervisors Ordinance Amending the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Case No. 13ORD-00000-00011)
  - I-6. Board of Supervisors Ordinance Amending the Goleta Community Plan Zoning South map, the Goleta Community Plan Zoning Overlay map, and the Goleta Community Plan Environmentally Sensitive Habitat and Riparian Corridor Land Use and Zoning Overlays South map and adopting the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Zoning map, the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Zoning Overlay map, and the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Environmentally Sensitive Habitat and Riparian Corridor Land Use and Zoning Overlays map (Case No. 15RZN-00000-00004)