

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA APPROVING THE MISSION CANYON COMMUNITY PLAN FOR THE UNINCORPORATED MISSION CANYON AREA, REPEALING COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 84-159 REGARDING THE MISSION CANYON SPECIFIC PLAN, AND MAKING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

WHEREAS, in August 1982 the County of Santa Barbara, with Clean Water Grant funding, began studies which examined various alternatives for resolving wastewater disposal problems in the Mission Canyon area;

WHEREAS, in March 1983, the State Regional Water Quality Control Board established a moratorium on septic systems for portions of the area and established a deadline of July 1, 1986, for installing sewers in the southern portion of the area;

WHEREAS, the unincorporated Mission Canyon area is with the Sphere of Influence of the City of Santa Barbara;

WHEREAS, on May 24, 1983, upon a request from the Board of Supervisors, the City Council reviewed the prospect of annexation of the area for connection to the City Wastewater collection system. This wording is a bit odd. Please confirm who made the request and how it came to the City Council's attention.] and (i) determined that annexation was not cost effective, (ii) granted conceptual approval to provide wastewater to service to the area, (iii) authorized staff to negotiate with County staff to develop appropriate changes and a joint powers agreement, and (iv) directed staff and the Planning Commission to advise City Council on the mechanism that would provide for City review of future land use and development proposal concerning planning issues;

WHEREAS, on August 13, 1984, the Board of Supervisors approved the Joint Powers Agreement which includes provisions for the Mission Canyon Area Specific Plan and referred the agreement to the City Council;

WHEREAS, on October 2, 1984, the City Council authorized the execution of the Joint Powers Agreement;

WHEREAS, on October 23, 1984, following the recommendation of the City Planning Commission, the City Council approved the Mission Canyon Area Specific Plan (Resolution 84-159);

WHEREAS, November 21, 2006, the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors appointed a Mission Canyon Planning Advisory Committee (MCPAC) to develop recommendations and assist Long Range Planning Staff to develop Design Guidelines

and update the Mission Canyon Area Specific Plan (Resolution 06-365);

WHEREAS, on June 4, 2008, the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission recommended the County Board of Supervisors initiate environmental review of the draft Mission Canyon Community Plan (MCCP);

WHEREAS, on July 10, 2008, the City Planning Commission considered the draft MCCP, and forwarded comments to the County of Santa Barbara (PC Resolution 027-08);

WHEREAS, on September 16, 2008, the County Board of Supervisors initiated environmental review of the draft MCCP, Residential Design Guidelines, and Land Use Development Code amendments;

WHEREAS, on June 30, 2009, the County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Notice of Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and received public comments;

WHEREAS, on April 7, 2011, the City Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Draft EIR and provided comments;

WHEREAS, on February 20, 2013, a revised Draft EIR was circulated for public comment due to the following sections of the document that substantially changed as a result of updated baseline and buildout information: Project Description, Air Quality, Fire Protection, and Traffic and Circulation;

WHEREAS; on November 21, 2013, a joint County of Santa Barbara and City of Santa Barbara Planning Commission public hearing was held to comment on the Draft MCCP and Final Draft EIR;

WHEREAS, on November 21, 2013, the City Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend that Council rescind the Mission Canyon Specific Plan (Resolution 84-159), consider the final EIR for the MCCP and make the findings, and approve the Mission Canyon Community Plan with revisions;

WHEREAS, on February 18, 2014, the County Board of Supervisors certified the MCCP Final EIR (FEIR) (County Environmental Document No. 09-EIR-02, State Clearinghouse No 2009061066) and voted unanimously to approve a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the following categories: Biological Resources, Cultural and Historic Resources, Fire Protection, and Traffic and Circulation;

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented, the testimony received, and deliberation by the City Council, the Council concluded that the Mission Canyon Community Plan Final EIR was adequate and prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and that the Mission Canyon Community Plan can be approved;

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Barbara and the County of Santa Barbara will continue to collaborate on issues of mutual interest identified in the Mission Canyon Community Plan, including, but not limited to emergency services mutual aid, water conservation, Mission Canyon Road improvements and resource protection;

WHEREAS, there are no changes to the Joint Power Agreement and the additional units at buildout in the service area should not require new or altered sewer system facilities beyond that already accounted for when sewer service was first provided to this area under the 1984 Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) between the City of Santa Barbara and the County for Wastewater Collection, Treatment and Disposal in the Mission Canyon Area; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has conducted a duly noticed public hearing pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 3, Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California.

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

SECTION 1. CEQA Findings

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings pursuant to CEQA (California Public Resources Code §§ 21081, 21081.6) and State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations §15091):

- I. The City Council has read and fully considered the Mission Canyon Community Plan Certified Final EIR dated November 2013 and, has determined, in their independent judgment and analysis and on the basis of the whole record before the City Council, that 1) the document constitutes a complete, accurate, and good faith effort toward full disclosure of the project's impacts and is an adequate environmental analysis of the project, 2) the document has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines

The location and custodian of the documents which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the project decision is based is the City of Santa Barbara Planning Division, 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, California. County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department, 123 E Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, CA is the Lead Agency and custodian of documents for the environmental impact report.

A mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the project has been made a condition of project approval and was adopted by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors. Mitigation measures have been made enforceable through incorporation in the Mission Canyon Plan.

- II. Findings That Certain Unavoidable Impacts Are Mitigated to The Maximum Extent Feasible

The Final EIR (09EIR-00000-00002) for the project identifies ten significant environmental impacts which cannot be fully mitigated and are therefore considered unavoidable (Class I). Those impacts are in the following areas: Biological Resources, Cultural and Historic Resources, Fire Protection, and Traffic and Circulation. To the extent the impacts remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, legal, technical, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations included herein. For each of the Class I impacts identified by the Final EIR (09EIR-00000-00002), feasible changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which partially avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect, as discussed below:

Biological Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified significant project specific and cumulative impacts related to environmentally sensitive plant communities and habitat (Impact BIO-2), special status animal and plant species and habitat (Impact BIO-5), and cumulative impacts (Impact BIO-6).

Mitigation: Beyond the programmatic mitigation policies included in the MCCP (MMBIO- 2.1), the EIR recommends eight mitigation measures (MM BIO-2.2, MM BIO-2.3, MM BIO-2.4, MM BIO-2.5, MM-BIO-5.1, MM BIO-5.2, MM BIO-5.3, and MM BIO- 5.4) which either amend draft policies, development standards, and actions or create new ones.

Impacts to environmentally sensitive plant communities and habitat (Impact BIO-2) are reduced as follows: (1) MM-BIO-2.2 adds a new plant community category to the list of environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH); (2) MM-BIO-2.3 requires permits for vegetation removal in ESH through an amendment to the LUDC; (3) MM-BIO-2.4 increases the riparian habitat buffer; and MM-BIO-2.5 improves protection of sensitive habitat and natural communities. These mitigation measures were incorporated into the proposed MCCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which would further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable worst-case scenario of full Plan Area buildout, impacts to sensitive plant species and habitat would not be fully mitigated and would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impacts to special status animal and plant species and habitats (Impact BIO-5) are reduced as follows: (1) MM-BIO-5.1 amends the LUDC to include outdoor lighting regulations to reduce the impact of night lighting on sensitive species; (2) MM-BIO-5.2 requires a mitigation and monitoring plan for projects that affect special status species and nesting birds; (3) MM-BIO-5.3 protects wildlife corridors; and (4) MM-BIO-5.4 defines special status animal and plant species. These mitigation measures were incorporated into the proposed MCCP. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which would further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable worst-case scenario of full Plan Area buildout, impacts to special status animal and

plant species and habitats would not be fully mitigated and would remain significant and unavoidable.

For cumulative impacts (Impact BIO-6), no feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce cumulative impacts below a level of significance. Biological resources impacts occurring in areas outside the Plan Area are added to impacts expected in the Plan Area. The combined effect of cumulative development is anticipated to result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to biological resources.

Findings: City Council finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR and incorporated into the MCCP which lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR to the maximum extent feasible; however, even with mitigation measures, impacts to biological resources would remain significant and unavoidable. City Council finds the MCCP's residual impacts to biological resources are acceptable due to the overriding considerations that support approval of the MCCP discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations

Cultural and Historic Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified significant project specific and cumulative impacts related to the potential for impacts to unknown buried prehistoric and historic archaeological materials (Impact CR-2).

Mitigation: Beyond the existing policies in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan, the EIR identifies three mitigation measures (MM-CR-1.1, MM-CR-1.2, and MMCR-1.3) which either amend draft development standards and actions or add new policies. MM-CR-1.1 incorporates programmatic history and archaeology and visual resource policies (for protection of the Mission Canyon Scenic Corridor, which is also historic), development standards, and actions (or comparable language) into the final MCCP. MM-CR-1.2 clarifies the process for performing archaeological surveys. MMCR- 1.3 protects traditional cultural, historic, and spiritual sites of concern to the Chumash Indians. These measures were incorporated in the final MCCP. The potential for residual project-specific and cumulative impacts on subsurface archaeological resources are considered significant and unavoidable because the ability to completely avoid significant impacts on all archaeological sites through project redesign or specifications is unlikely.

Findings: The City Council finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR and incorporated into the MCCP which lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible; however even with mitigation measures, residual impacts to unknown buried prehistoric and archaeological resources remains significant and unavoidable. The City Council finds the MCCP's residual impacts to cultural resources are acceptable

due to the overriding considerations that support approval of the MCCP discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Fire Protection

Impacts: The EIR identified a significant impact related to exposure of people or structures to wildland fires (Impact FIRE-2), a significant impact to emergency ingress and egress and emergency responder's ability to provide optimal protection to the citizens of Mission Canyon (Impact FIRE-3), and cumulative risk of wildfire impacts and emergency ingress and egress impacts (Impact FIRE-5).

Mitigation: In addition to existing policies in the Santa Barbara County's Seismic Safety and Safety Element of the Comprehensive Plan and the programmatic measures included in the MCCP, the EIR recommends eight mitigation measures (MM-FIRE-1.1, MM-FIRE-1.2, MM-FIRE-2.1, MM-FIRE-2.2, MM-FIRE-2.3, MM-FIRE-2.4, MM-FIRE-2.5, and MM-FIRE-2.6) to mitigate the above-described impacts. These measures were incorporated into the MCCP Fire Protection/Hazards and Circulation and Parking sections.

For Impact FIRE-2, MM-FIRE-1.1 incorporates programmatic land use (goal and policy recognizing land use constraints with respect to fire hazards) and fire protection goals, policies, actions and development standards (or comparable language) policies into the final MCCP. MM-FIRE-1.2 proposes future funding of additional fire prevention services to reduce the damage and severity of wildfires. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which would further reduce the impact. Due to the existing extreme high fire hazard, the impact of Plan Area buildout to people and structures would not be fully mitigated and would remain significant and unavoidable.

There are six mitigation measures for the impact of Plan Area buildout potentially impacting emergency ingress and egress and emergency responder's ability to provide optimal protection to the citizens of Mission Canyon (Impact FIRE-3). MM-FIRE-2.1 incorporates programmatic fire protection policies, actions, and development standards and circulation development standard and policies (dealing with road improvements to provide space for emergency turnout zones, coordinating temporary road closures with the Fire Department, and building access roads and driveways to allow emergency vehicle access) into the final MCCP. MM FIRE-2.2 integrates new policies, development standards and an action identified in the Residential Parking Strategy project into the final MCCP. These new policies, development standards, and action are focused on clearing existing public roads of cars and encroachments into the public right-of-way to ensure adequate space is available for vehicle ingress and egress. MM FIRE- 2.2 also clarifies how encroachments in the public right-of-way are handled during reconstruction of damaged and destroyed structures. MM-FIRE 2.3 requires dedication of emergency turnout zones at critical locations to allow additional evacuation traffic capacity. MMFIRE 2.4 promotes implementation of an optimized

traffic control plan during an evacuation, MM-FIRE 2.5 recommends development of new or alternate access routes, and MM-FIRE 2.6 requires a Fire Protection Plan as part of the condition of approval for Conditional Use Permits that include special events. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which would further reduce the impact. Due to the existing extreme high fire hazard, the impact of Plan Area on emergency ingress and egress would not be fully mitigated and would remain significant and unavoidable.

For the cumulative risk of wildfire impacts and emergency ingress and egress (Impact FIRE-5), no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to avoid adverse environmental effects.

Findings: The City Council finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR and incorporated which lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible; however, even with the mitigation measures, the project's risk of fire impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The City Council finds that residual significant impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations contained within the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Traffic and Circulation

Impacts: The EIR determined that buildout of the Plan Area would contribute additional vehicle trips that would result in two significant impacts: (1) roadway segments that could exceed circulation element capacities (Impact TC-1); and (2) an increase in volume to capacity ratios at one intersection (Impact TC-2). The EIR also identified cumulative impacts on traffic and circulation (Impact TC-4).

Mitigation: The EIR includes two new actions to mitigate Impact TC-1 and Impact TC-2. Both actions call for monitoring traffic to determine if the impact actually occurs. MMTC- 1 monitors and plans for traffic flow improvements on Mission Canyon Road south of Foothill Road and MM-TC-2 considers a new traffic signal at the intersection of Mission Canyon Road and Mountain Drive. No other feasible mitigation measures are known which would further reduce impacts. It is unknown if the mitigation strategies would be effective in reducing the impacts given potential policy conflicts between the improvements and preservation of historic and scenic resources. Therefore, the MCCP's contribution to the roadway and intersection impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

For the MCCP's contribution to cumulative impacts on traffic and circulation (Impact TC-4), no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to avoid adverse environmental effects.

Findings: The City Council finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR and incorporated which lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR to the maximum extent feasible; however, even

with the mitigation measures, the project's contribution to traffic and circulation impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The City Council finds that residual significant impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations contained within the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

II.1 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN IMPACTS ARE MITIGATED TO INSIGNIFICANCE BY CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The Final EIR (09EIR-00000-00002) identified several subject areas for which the project is considered to cause or contribute to significant, but mitigable environmental impacts (Class II). For each of these Class II impacts identified by the Final EIR feasible changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect, as discussed below:

Aesthetics

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific impacts resulting from buildout of the Plan Area potentially obstructing scenic vistas or views or changing the visual character of the area (Impact AES-2).

Mitigation: In addition to existing policies in Santa Barbara County's Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan and Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines, MM-AES-1 incorporates land use (encouraging excellence in architectural and landscape design and directing use of the Residential Design Guidelines) and visual resource goals, policies, development standards, and actions (or comparable language) into the final MCCP. MM-AES-2 amends the proposed Mission Canyon Scenic Corridor overlay zone development standards to ensure secondary front setbacks on corner lots are treated the same as primary front setbacks. The impact would be less than significant with implementation of these mitigation measures.

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-AES-1 and MM-AES-2 mitigate or avoid significant effects on aesthetics to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCP would incorporate the above noted mitigation measures.

Air Quality

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific and cumulative air quality impacts from incremental short-term construction activity associated with buildout of the Plan Area (Impact AQ-1).

Mitigation: Measures included in the County's Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures (revised February 2013) to reduce construction-related emissions would apply to construction activity associated with Plan Area buildout. These include measures to limit fugitive dust (PM10). Projects implemented under

the MCCC would include standard fugitive dust control measures listed in MM-AQ-1.

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-AQ-1 mitigates or avoids significant effects on air quality to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCC would incorporate the above noted mitigation measure.

Biological Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific and cumulative impacts by replacing the 1984 Specific Plan with the MCCC (Impact BIO-1) and introducing invasive plant species into sensitive habitat areas (Impact BIO-3). The EIR identified and direct and indirect impacts to steelhead trout and other aquatic species habitats (Impact BIO-4).

Mitigation: The 1984 Specific Plan includes a development regulation protecting native and specimen non-native trees. The replacement of the 1984 Specific Plan with the MCCC resulted in Impact BIO-1 because the MCCC did not specifically protect specimen non-native trees. MM-BIO-1 protects non-native trees that have a biological or ecological function, thus mitigating the impact.

Impact BIO-3 is mitigated by MM-BIO-3 restricting use of invasive plant species in landscaping. Impact BIO-4 is mitigated by programmatic mitigation in the MCCC (MM-BIO-4.1), enhanced protection of stream corridors (MM-BIO-4.2), and measures to provide for fish passage and mitigation for impacts to steelhead habitat (MM-BIO-4.3).

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-BIO-1, MM-BIO-3, MM-BIO-4.1, MM-BIO-4.2, and MM-BIO-4.3 mitigate or avoid the significant effects on Biological Resources to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCC would incorporate the above noted mitigation measures.

Cultural and Historic Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable cumulative impacts on historic buildings (Impact CUL-4).

Mitigation: In addition to programmatic policies in the MCCC, the EIR identified MM-CR-1.2 and MM-CR-1.3 to mitigate cumulative impacts described in Impact CUL-4. The mitigation measures are the same as those described for Class I impacts to archaeological resources described above.

Findings: The City Council finds that the inclusion of MM CR-1.2 and MM-CR-1.3 in the MCCC would reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCC would incorporate the above noted mitigation measures.

Fire Protection

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific and cumulative impacts due to fire flow and pump station capacity deficiencies (Impact FIRE-4).

Mitigation: MM-FIRE-3 clarifies that new projects must be served by fire hydrants that meet minimum flow and pressure requirements.

Findings: The City Council finds that the inclusion of MM-FIRE-3 in the MCCP would reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCP would incorporate the above noted mitigation measure.

Geologic Processes

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific and cumulative impacts from exposure of structures to unstable earth conditions (Impact GEO-2) and expose of structures to excessive grading, expansive soils, and erosion (Impact GEO-3).

Mitigation: In addition to policies in the Santa Barbara County Seismic Safety and Safety Element of the Comprehensive Plan and provisions in the Uniform Building Code, the EIR identifies MM GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2 that mitigate the above-described impacts. Both mitigation measures incorporate programmatic geologic hazard policies and development standards and hillside and watershed protection policies (or comparable language) into the final MCCP.

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-GEO-1 and MM-GEO-2 would reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCP would incorporate the above noted mitigation measures.

Public Facilities – Solid Waste

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific and cumulative impacts to the Tajiguas Landfill from short (from demolition and construction) and long-term (project occupancy) waste (Impact PF-2).

Mitigation: The EIR identifies MM-PF-1 to mitigate the above-described impact. The mitigation measure incorporates a programmatic waste reduction goal, policy, and development standard (or comparable language) into the final MCCP.

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-PF-1 incorporated into the MCCP would reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCP would incorporate the above noted mitigation measures.

Public Facilities – Wastewater

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific and cumulative water quality impacts from development of new onsite wastewater treatment systems (Impact PF-4).

Mitigation: The EIR identifies programmatic mitigation MM-PF-4.2 to mitigate the above-described impact. MM-PF-4.2 incorporates proposed wastewater goal, policy, development standards, and action (or comparable language) into the final MCCP.

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-PF-4.2 would reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCP would incorporate the above noted mitigation measure.

Transportation and Circulation

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially but mitigable impact on the capacity of the street system due to increased on-street parking demand at buildout (Impact TC-3).

Mitigation: The EIR identifies programmatic mitigation MM-TC-3 to amend the LUDC to increase the required number of residential parking spaces per dwelling unit.

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-TC-3 incorporated into the MCCP reduces the impact to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCP would incorporate the above noted mitigation measure.

Water Resources, Drainage and Flooding

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project specific water resources impacts from Plan Area buildout potentially exposing some properties to flood hazards (Impact WR-2), temporary water quality impacts from erosion and sedimentation during construction (Impact WR-3), and long-term water quality and stormwater runoff impacts to the Mission Creek watershed (Impact WR-4).

Mitigation: For Impact WR-2, the EIR identifies mitigation measure (MM-WR-1.1) to incorporate programmatic flood hazard policy into the final MCCP and a new development standard to further reduce risks of flood damage (MM-WR-1.2). For Impact WR-3, the EIR identifies programmatic mitigation measures (MM-WR-2.1) that minimize temporary impacts to water quality from construction and MM-WR-2.2 that revises flooding and drainage policy and development standards to reduce redundancy, clarify the policy, and ensure consistency with best practices (MM-WR-2.2). For Impact WR-4, the EIR identifies MM-WR-3.1 to improve site design and onsite management of stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

Findings: The City Council finds that MM-WR-1.1, MM-WR-1.2, MM-WR-2.1, and MM-WR-2.2 incorporated into the MCCP reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Future development under the MCCP would incorporate the above noted mitigation measures.

II.2 FINDINGS THAT IDENTIFIED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES OR MITIGATION MEASURES ARE NOT FEASIBLE

The Final EIR (09EIR-00000-00002), prepared for the project evaluated a No Project Alternative and a Reduced Buildout Alternative as methods of reducing or eliminating potentially significant environmental impacts. The City Council finds that the following alternatives are infeasible for the reasons stated:

1. No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative assumes that the 1984 Mission Canyon Specific Plan is not updated and policy direction for the Plan Area is not changed. The projected buildout under the 1984 Specific Plan would result in an increase in allowable residential second units, and none of the policies, development standards, and actions of the MCCP would be implemented, including the policies for the Residential Parking Strategy project.

The No Project Alternative would, therefore result in greater impacts on the following resources relative to the MCCP, in part due to the absence of protective policies that are provided in the MCCP:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Historic Resources
- Energy
- Fire Protection
- Geologic Processes
- Land Use
- Police, Schools, and Parks
- Wastewater
- Water Resources: Drainage and Flooding

The No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the MCCP:

- Air Quality: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Noise
- Solid Waste

The No Project Alternative would result in reduced impacts relative to the MCCP to:

- Transportation and Circulation

The reduced Transportation and Circulation impact is not due to a reduction in daily trips but is the result of using a more permissive threshold for evaluating impacts. The No Project Alternative would evaluate impacts relative to the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan's Circulation Element standards, rather than the MCCP's Circulation Element standards that impose a new roadway classification system. The new roadway classification system uses road capacities and level of service standards consistent with the community's desire to maintain semi-rural character.

The No Project Alternative fails to achieve the basic objectives of the project, stated as follows:

1. Replace the 1984 Mission Canyon Area Specific Plan with a Community Plan that reflects community goals as articulated by the Mission Canyon Planning Advisory Committee in the Vision Statement of the draft Mission Canyon Community Plan (see below).
2. Approve Community Plan policies, development standards and actions to plan for the buildout of the plan area using existing Land Use densities and primary Zone District designations compatible with community character, with adequate services and infrastructure for public health and safety.

The MCPAC articulated key goals for the plan as follows:

- Maintain and enhance existing community qualities, including Mission Canyon's natural scenic beauty and charm;
- Improve fire safe practices including vegetation management, defensible space, hydrants and water supply, road safety, and emergency ingress and egress;
- Protect public views of the ocean, mountains, and scenic corridors;
- Provide for the reasonable use of property and limited additional development that is compatible with the natural terrain and with the scale and character of existing structures in the area;
- Ensure that development does not exceed availability of adequate services and infrastructure to provide for public health and safety;
- Develop plans for possible post-disaster recovery and reconstruction that balances the likely conflict between the desire for rapid recovery and the competing desire to rebuild a community more resistant to future disaster;
- Protect sensitive habitats and other biological resources;
- Protect watershed function, groundwater and surface water quality, and

- prevent flooding and erosion;
- Provide safe and efficient circulation systems and improve pedestrian and bicyclist access and safety;
- Promote water conservation, resource recovery, green building practices, and energy conservation and generation;
- Preserve open space;
- Protect historic and cultural resources; and
- Improve aesthetics through the application of Residential Design Guidelines.

The No Project Alternative would not replace the 1984 Mission Canyon Area Specific Plan with a Community Plan. It would also not achieve the key goals articulated for the Community Plan to maintain community qualities, improve fire safe practices, and protect sensitive habitats and watershed function. Therefore, the City Council finds that the project is preferable to the No Project Alternative.

2. Reduced Buildout Alternative

The Reduced Buildout Alternative assumes approval of the MCCP, to reduce buildout potential. The Reduced Buildout Alternative analyzes the reduction of buildout potential through the use of two methods: (1) downzoning and (2) slope density formulas to increase minimum lot size.

Both the downzoning and slope density formulas would notably reduce the potential for additional residences from lots splits. However, buildout of lots large enough for a lot split assumed under Plan Area buildout (based on existing zoning) is speculative and there are many limiting factors (e.g., onsite wastewater system suitability, environmentally sensitive habitat, landowner preference for a larger lot) not taken into account in the estimate. Therefore, the number of additional residences due to lot splits may not be as high as estimated.

Because buildout would be reduced, the Reduced Buildout Alternative would not result in increased impacts on any resources relative to the MCCP.

The Reduced Buildout Alternative would result in similar impacts on the following resources relative to the MCCP:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources (Class I)
- Cultural Resources
- Fire Protection
- Geologic Processes
- Noise

- Transportation/Circulation
- Water Resources, Drainage, and Flooding

The Reduced Buildout Alternative would result in reduced impacts relative to the MCCP on the following resources;

- Air Quality: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources (Class II)
- Energy
- Public Facilities

Although the Reduced Buildout Alternative reduces environmental impacts relative to the project, the reduction would not be substantial enough to eliminate Class I impacts. The City Council finds that the Reduced Buildout Alternative does not meet the basic objective of the MCCP to plan for the buildout of the Plan Area using existing land use densities and zone districts because it would require major rezoning. The proposed MCCP was crafted to accommodate Plan Area buildout per the stated goals, rather than change existing plan area density. Procedurally, reduced density by the downzoning method could result in creating a large number of non-conforming parcels. Furthermore, although the slope density calculation results in a lower number of buildout units than under the project, there are proposed protective development standards for slopes in the MCCP that could result in an equivalent lower number of buildout units on slopes 20% or greater. In summary, the proposed project achieves all the stated objectives and provides case-by-case protections that could provide the functional equivalent of reducing buildout. Therefore, the City Council finds it preferable to plan for Plan Area buildout by incorporating the protective mitigating mechanisms in the MCCP as exemplified in the project rather than approve the Reduced Buildout Alternative.

III STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Mission Canyon Community Plan (MCCP), incorporated herein by reference, contains a special set of goals, policies, development standards, and actions that apply to the Mission Canyon Plan Area. It is part of and consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan (general plan). However, the MCCP is tailored to a smaller geographical area and generally provides greater environmental and other benefits to the Mission Canyon Plan Area as compared to the County Comprehensive Plan.

Final EIR (90EIR-00000-00002) for the MCCP states that the project will have unavoidable adverse environmental effects on biological resources, cultural and historic resources, fire protection, and traffic and circulation. The City Council has balanced “the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits” of the project against these effects and makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations which warrants approval of the project notwithstanding that all identified adverse environmental effects are not fully avoided or substantially lessened. [CEQA Guidelines Section

15093(a)] The City Council finds that the benefits of the “proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects” and, therefore, “the adverse environmental effects may be considered ‘acceptable.’” [CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)]

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15092, and 15093, any unavoidable significant adverse environmental effects of the project are acceptable due to the following environmental benefits and overriding considerations:

- A. The MCCP provides for necessary and orderly development to accommodate population growth within urban areas within the planning horizon consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Santa Barbara.
- B. The MCCP retains urban development within land designated for urban uses in accordance with the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element Land Use Development Policy 3. The environmental benefits include preserving natural and cultural resources in less developed rural areas.
- C. The MCCP provides for orderly economic and population growth within a reasonable time horizon in an area that has adequate public services (i.e., water, sewer, roads) in accordance with the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element Policies, the City of Santa Barbara General Plan, and consistent with the original Joint Powers Agreement for providing City sewer service to the unincorporated Mission Canyon Area.
- D. The MCCP protects hillsides, watersheds, and creeks with development standards for grading and required erosion control measures, management of stormwater runoff with Low Impact Development measures, and development prohibitions on extreme slopes in accordance with County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan and City of Santa Barbara General Plan Policies. These environmental benefits outweigh potential effects on other biological and cultural resources.
- E. The MCCP protects natural resources, preserves the area’s semi-rural character, and balances the needs of the future residents with the needs of existing residents.
- F. The MCCP provides for orderly development while requiring maximum effective and appropriate prevention measures to reduce fire hazards to the maximum extent feasible. The MCCP’s policies support the County Fire Department’s Development Standards, and the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan and the City of Santa Barbara General Plan policies. The MCCP includes policies that support mutual cooperation between agencies for fire hazard prevention. As a result, the MCCP provides

important economic, social, and environmental benefits.

- G. The MCCP policies protect and preserve archaeological and historical resources to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element and Conservation Element and are also consistent with the City of Santa Barbara General Plan.
- H. The MCCP affords protection of the important natural resources of the various habitats within the Plan Area's boundaries, and preserves the value of these lands for their important biologic, hydrologic, and aesthetic qualities in accordance with the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan Conservation Element, Preservation of Natural Systems, as well as the City of Santa Barbara General Plan.
- I. The MCCP contains an adequate circulation system that strives to achieve a balance between land use and roadway and intersection capacity in accordance with the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan Circulation Element. Furthermore, the MCCP encourages alternative modes of transportation and multimodal transportation improvements in accordance with Circulation Element Policy C and the state's Update to the General Plan Guidelines: Complete Streets and the County of Santa Barbara Comprehensive Plan Circulation Element.
- J. The MCCP provides clarity for future developers and land use regulators. Its clearly defined policies and development standards will minimize future environmental review, time, uncertainty, and cost in the permit process.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) the County to adopted a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to avoid or substantially lessen significant effects on the environment. The monitoring program is designed to ensure implementation of the adopted mitigation measures to reduce significant effects on the environment.

The mitigation measures are within the purview of the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Santa Barbara hereby delegates monitoring responsibilities to the County of Santa Barbara.

SECTION 2: Joint Powers Agreement

The proposed Mission Canyon Community Plan is equivalent to the Mission Canyon Specific Plan and no amendment to the Joint Powers Agreement is necessary.

SECTION 3: Mission Canyon Community Plan

Repeal Resolution No. 84-159 (adopting Specific Plan No. 3 for the Unincorporated Mission Canyon Area), dated October 23, 1984, and approve the Mission Canyon Community Plan.

SECTION 4: Annual Reporting & Monitoring

The County shall provide an annual report to the City detailing implementation of the Mission Canyon Community Plan policies and any major projects that were approved or completed in the Plan area during the reporting year, as well as, courtesy review of discretionary projects in the Plan area.