Santa Barbara

GENERAL PLAN



Adopted December 2011

Acknowledgements

City Council

Helene Schneider, Mayor Dale Francisco Frank Hotchkiss Grant House Randy Rowse Michael Self Harwood White

Previous City Council Members to 2010

Marty Blum, Mayor Iya Falcone Roger Horton Das Williams

Planning Commission	Previous Planning Commission to 2010
John Jostes, Chair	George C. Myers
Bruce Bartlett	Addison Thompson
Charmaine Jacobs	Harwood White
Mike Jordan	
Stella Larson	
Sheila Lodge	
Deborah L. Schwartz	

Plan Santa Barbara Planning Commission Sub-Committee Members		
Bruce Bartlett	George C. Myers (2007-2008)	
John Jostes	Addison Thompson (2008-2009)	
Sheila Lodge		

Outreach Committee Members		
Josephine Black	Roger Horton	
Marty Blum	David Jacoby	
David Davis	John Jostes	
Iya Falcone	Naomi Kovacs	
Joe Rution	George C. Myers	

Public Participants

It is impossible to recognize all the individuals and groups who gave up their personal time to participate in their city's general plan update process. The City thanks them all for their civic investment in the future of Santa Barbara. A special thanks to the Historic Resources Element Task Force for their help with the history sections of the General Plan.

City Staff

Jim Armstrong, City Administrator Steve Wiley, City Attorney Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney Paul Casey, Assistant City Administrator and Community Development Director Bettie Weiss, City Planner

General Plan Team

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner Peggy Burbank, Project Planner Beatriz Gularte, Project Planner Elizabeth Limón, Project Planner Barbara R. Shelton, Project Planner Irma Unzueta, Project Planner Adam Nares, GIS Technician

Contributing Staff Members

Jaime Limón, Senior Planner II Heather Baker, Project Planner Jake Jacobus, Associate Planner Deana McMillion, Administrative/Clerical Supervisor Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary Alison Grube, Graphic Designer Steven Faulstich, Housing Programs Supervisor Sarah Grant, Assistant Transportation Planner Simon Kiefer, Project Planner Nancy Rapp, Parks and Recreation Director Cameron Benson, Manager Creeks Division Bill Ferguson, Water Resources Supervisor Gabriela Feliciano, Commission Secretary

Consultants

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc. Stephanie Diaz Fehr & Peers Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc. Strategic Economics Woodie Tescher, PBS&J

Eable of Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Table of Contents	3
Figures	9
Maps	11
Tables	13
Appendices	15

INTRODUCTION

Genera	I Plan Introduction	1
	General Plan Purpose and Need	1
	Issues and Policy Drivers	2
Sustair	nability Framework	7
	Santa Barbara as a Sustainable Community	7
	Sustainability Principles	9
	Sustainability and Resource Capacity	- 10
	Adaptive Management	- 10
	Sustainability Framework	-11
	Public Participation	- 12
	How Elements Work Together	-13
	Content of This and Future Updates	- 13
Backgr	ound and Setting	15
	Historic Context	15
	History of City Planning	19
Plan Sa	anta Barbara Process	22
	City Profile – 2009	25

LAND USE ELEMENT (Adopted 2011)

Land Use Introduction	1
Land Use Patterns	1
Sustainable Development	2
Principles for Development	2
Land Use Designations	5
Distribution of Land Uses	5
Open Space	6
Hillside	7
SubUrban	8
General Urban	9
Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program Map	13
Institutional and Related	18

Growth Management	. 23
Non-Residential	. 23
Residential	. 24
Community Design	. 25
Design Review	. 25
Regulatory Ordinances	. 26
Design Guidelines	. 27
Design Districts	. 28
Special Use Districts	. 29
Santa Barbara's Neighborhoods	. 31
Background	. 31
Desired Neighborhood Qualities	. 31
Neighborhood Issues	. 32
Neighborhoods Map	. 33
Neighborhood Planning Efforts	. 35
Sustainable Neighborhoods	. 37
Regional Governance	. 39
Regional Issues	. 39
Regional Approach	. 39
Sphere of Influence and Annexations	. 40
Sphere of Influence Map	. 45
Goals, Policies and Implementation	. 47
Growth Management and Resource Allocation Policies	. 47
Land Use Policies	. 49
Community Design Policies	. 53
Neighborhood Policies	55
Regional Governance Policies	. 57
General Plan Map	. 61

HOUSING ELEMENT (Adopted 2011)

Hous	sing Introduction	1
	Housing Element Requirements	2
	City in Context of the South Coast Region	3
	Public Outreach and Participation	3
Evaluation		5
	Context and Purpose	5
	Evaluation	6
	Results	15

Housing Needs Assessment17		
Population Trends and Characteristics		
Employment Trends		
Household Characteristics		
Housing Stock and Market Conditions		
Assessment of "At Risk" Assisted Units		
Housing Needs		
Constraints		
Governmental Constraints		
Non-Governmental Constraints		
Suitable Sites Inventory81		
Regional Housing Needs Allocation		
Current Housing Production		
Suitable Site Inventory and Development Capacity		
Quantified Objectives		
Goals, Policies and Implementation93		
Housing Opportunities Policies		
New Housing Development Policies		
Conservation and Improvement of Existing Housing Policies		
Regional Cooperation and Jobs/Housing Balance Policies		
Public Education and Information Policies		

OPEN SPACE, PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT

Content of these Goals Policies and Implementation Actions	1
Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions (2011)	3
Open Space Element (Adopted 1972)	7(Pgs. 101-106)
Parks and Recreation Element (Adopted 1964, Amended 1982)	. 13(Pgs. 94-101)
Open Space, Parks and Recreation Map	. 21

ECONOMY AND FISCAL HEALTH ELEMENT (Adopted 2011)

Content of this Element	1
Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions	3

HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT (Adopted 2012)

Historic Resources Introduction	1
Santa Barbara's Tradition: Planning with History in Mind	3
Major Milestones	3
Economic and Environmental Benefits of Historic Preservation	4
Future Issues and Challenges	4
Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions	9
Definitions	17

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES ELEMENT

Content of these Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions	1
Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions (2011)	3
Conservation Element (Adopted 1979, Last Amended 1994)	17(Pgs. i – A6)
Noise Element (Adopted 1979, Last Amended 1983)	93(Pgs. i – 49)
Flood Plain Map	149

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Content of these Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions	1
Goals and Policies and Implementation Actions (2011)	3
Circulation Element (Adopted 1964, Amended 1997)	9(Pgs. 1 – 20-10)
Scenic Highways Element (Adopted 1974)	219 (Pgs. 115 – 124)

SAFETY ELEMENT

Safety Element Introduction1
Why Prepare a Safety Element?1
Hazards, Risks and Vulnerability2
Community Resilience2
Relationship to Other General Plan Elements and Planning Programs4
Limitations9
The Santa Barbara Community 11
Geographic Areas 11
Geologic and Seismic Hazards17
Fault Rupture 17
Ground Shaking 18
Liquefaction
Seiche
Landslides
Coastal Bluff Retreat
Soil Erosion
Expansive Soil
Radon
High Groundwater 26
Fire Hazards
Wildfire Fire Hazards
Structure Fires
Flooding Hazards
Stream Flooding
Dam Failure
Coastal Flooding and Inundation
Hazardous Matorials 30

Public Safety	
Aircraft Operations	
Hazardous Material Transport	
Natural Gas Pipelines	
Electromagnetic Fields	
Public Services	
Emergency Preparedness	
Goals Policies and Implementation Actions	

efinitions	1
eferences	17



Figures

INTRODUCTION

Figure 1:	General Plan Sustainability Framework11
Figure 2:	History of Population Growth for Santa Barbara, 1880 to 2000
LAND USE E	LEMENT
Figure 3:	Land Use Designations
HOUSING E	LEMENT
Figure 4:	Units in Structure by Tenure (2000)
Figure 5:	Housing Characteristics – Year Housing Built
Figure 6:	Overcrowding by Tenure (1980-2000)
Figure 7:	Typical Local Discretionary Review Process for SHO and PC Projects
SAFETY ELE	MENT
Figure 1	General Plan Geographic Areas 13
APPENDIX J	
Figure 2	General Plan Geology
Figure 3	General Plan Soils
Figure 4	Fault Activity Descriptions
Figure 5	1925 Santa Barbara Earthquake
Figure 6	General Plan Fault Hazard Zones
Figure 7	How Earthquakes Are Measured
Figure 8	Peak Ground Acceleration
Figure 9	Potential Liquefaction Hazard Zones
Figure 10	Recent Tsunami Events In Santa Barbara 401
Figure 11	General Plan Tsunami Hazard Zone 403
Figure 12	Tsunami Ready [™] Designated Evacuation Routes

Figure 13	Slope Failure Hazard Zones 40	9
Figure 14	General Plan 75 Year Coastal Bluff Retreat Zone 41	7
Figure 15	General Plan Erosion Potential Hazard Zones 42	3
Figure 16	General Plan Expansive Soils Hazard Zones 42	7
Figure 17	General Plan Redon Hazard Zones 43	1
Figure 18	Shallow Groundwater Hazard Zones 43	5
Figure 19	Sundowner Winds In Santa Barbara 43	9
Figure 20	General Plan High Fire Hazard Zones 44	1
Figure 21	General Plan Santa Barbara Region Recent Wildfires	5
Figure 22	Recent Wildfires In Santa Barbara 44	8
Figure 23	General Plan Santa Barbara Area Watersheds 45	7
Figure 24	General Plan 100-Year Floodplains 46	1
Figure 25	General Plan Coastal Storm Surge 46	9
Figure 26	General Plan Hazardous Material Release Areas	5
Figure 27	General Plan Airport Protection Zones	9

Maps

LAND USE ELEMENT

	Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program Map 13	3
	Neighborhood Map	3
	Sphere of Influence Map 4	5
	General Plan Map 6	1
OPEN SPAC	E, PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT	
	Open Space, Parks and Recreation Map2	1
HISTORIC F	RESOURCES ELEMENT	
	Historic, Special Design, and Landmark Districts Map	7
ENVIRONM	ENTAL RESOURCES ELEMENT	
	Flood Plain Map	3
APPENDICE	S	
	Appendix B: General Plan with Neighborhood Boundaries 1	7
	Appendix H: Housing Element Inventory Sites	7
	Appendix J: General Plan Geology (Figure 2)	7
	General Plan Soils (Figure 3) 37	1
	General Plan Fault Hazard Zones (Figure 6)	5
	Peak Ground Acceleration (Figure 8)	1
	Potential Liquefaction Hazard Zones (Figure 9)	7
	General Plan Tsunami Hazard Zone (Figure 11) 403	3
	Slope Failure Hazard Zones (Figure 13) 409	9
	General Plan 75 Year Coastal Bluff Retreat Zone (Figure 14) 41	7
	General Plan Erosion Potential Hazard Zones (Figure 15) 423	3
	General Plan Expansive Soils Hazard Zones (Figure 16)	7
	General Plan Redon Hazard Zones (Figure 17)	1

Shallow Groundwater Hazard Zones (Figure 18) 435
General Plan High Fire Hazard Zones (Figure 20) 441
General Plan Santa Barbara Region Recent Wildfires (Figure 21) 445
General Plan Santa Barbara Area Watersheds (Figure 23) 457
General Plan 100-Year Floodplains (Figure 24) 461
General Plan Coastal Storm Surge (Figure 25) 469
General Plan Hazardous Material Release Areas (Figure 26) 475
General Plan Airport Protection Zones (Figure 27) 479



INTRODUCTION

Table I-1:	General Plan Elements 14	
------------	--------------------------	--

LAND USE ELEMENT

Table LU-1:	Santa Barbara Elementary Schools, Santa Barbara School District 1	19
Table LU-2:	Santa Barbara Secondary Schools, Santa Barbara School District 1	19
Table LU 3:	Santa Barbara Elementary Schools, Hope Elementary School District	19

HOUSING ELEMENT

Table H-1:	Senior Housing Opportunities (2001-2007)	7
Table H-2:	Homeless Housing Opportunities (2001-2007)	8
Table H-3:	Housing Opportunities for the Disabled (2001-2007)	9
Table H-4:	Affordable Housing Opportunities (2001-2007)	9
Table H-5:	Housing Production (2001-2007)1	5
Table H-6:	Population Growth Trends (1980 – 2000), City of Santa Barbara 18	8
Table H-7:	Population by Age (1990 – 2008), City of Santa Barbara	9
Table H-8:	Population by Race and Ethnicity (1990 – 2008), City of Santa Barbara 24	0
Table H-9:	Employment by Industry (2000), City of Santa Barbara 2	1
Table H-10:	City Resident Employment Less Than County (2000) 2	1
Table H-11:	City Resident Employment More Than County (2000) 22	2
Table H-12:	Residents in Workforce by Occupation (2000-2008) City vs. County of Santa Barbara	2
Table H-13:	Top Ten Industries That Employ City Residents (2006), City of Santa Barbara	3
Table H-14:	Household Growth Trends (1990 – 2008), City of Santa Barbara 24	4
Table H-15:	Household Size (1990 – 2008), City of Santa Barbara	4
Table H-16:	Households by Income (2008)	5
Table H-17:	Housing Units and Type (1990 – 2009), City of Santa Barbara 24	6
Table H-18:	Households by Tenure (1990 – 2008), City of Santa Barbara 2	7
Table H-19:	Housing Condition Survey: Westside (2009), City of Santa Barbara	0
Table H-20:	Housing Condition Survey: Eastside (2009), City of Santa Barbara	0

TABLES

Table H-21:	Housing Cost as a Percentage of Household Income (2000), City of Santa Barbara	31
Table H-22:	Rental Prices (2009), City of Santa Barbara	32
Table H-23:	Projects With Affordable Rental Housing At Risk (2010-2019), City of Santa Barbara	34
Table H-24:	Projects With Affordable Ownership Housing At Risk (2010-2019), City of Santa Barbara	36
Table H-25:	Affordable Housing With Expired Affordability Covenants (2000 – 2009), City of Santa Barbara	37
Table H-26:	Affordable Housing Projects Using Set-Aside Funds	39
Table H-27:	Persons With Disabilities (2000), City of Santa Barbara	43
Table H-28:	Education and Employment for Disabled (2000), City of Santa Barbara	43
Table H-29:	Households With 5+ Persons By Tenure (2000), City of Santa Barbara	44
Table H-30:	Female Headed Households (2000), City of Santa Barbara	45
Table H-31:	Homeless Facilities/Housing, City of Santa Barbara (2009)	47
Table H-32:	Proposed Projects for Homeless, City of Santa Barbara (2009)	49
Table H-33:	Overcrowded Households (2000), City of Santa Barbara	51
Table H-34:	Overcrowded Households (2000 – 2008), City of Santa Barbara	52
Table H-35:	Household & Family Income (2000), City of Santa Barbara	53
Table H-36:	Renter Households Overpaying, City of Santa Barbara (2000)	54
Table H-37:	Owner-Occupied Households Overpaying, City of Santa Barbara (2000)	54
Table H-38:	Extremely Low Income Households, City of Santa Barbara (2000)	55
Table H-39:	Income Distribution in Santa Barbara (2000), City of Santa Barbara	56
Table H-40:	Regional Housing Needs Assessment, South Coast Jurisdictions (2007 – 2014)	58
Table H-41:	Remaining Housing Need (2001-2007)	59
Table H-42:	Housing Units Constructed (2007 – 2011)	59
Table H-43:	Income Categories (2007-2011)	60
Table H-44:	Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2007 – 2014), City of Santa Barbara	82
Table H-45:	Units Issued Building Permits by Zone (2007-2009), City of Santa Barbara	82
Table H-46:	Units Approved by Zone (2007-2009), City of Santa Barbara	83
Table H-47:	Units Pending Review and Approved by Zone, City of Santa Barbara	84
Table H-48:	Summary of Opportunity Sites Development Potential, City of Santa Barbara	91
Table H-49:	Quantified Objectives (2007 – 2014)	92

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS3
APPENDIX B:	NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTIONS13
APPENDIX C:	HISTORY OF THE CITY71
APPENDIX D:	DEMOGRAPHICS83
APPENDIX E:	2004 HOUSING ELEMENT EVALUATION TABLE91
APPENDIX F:	ZONING INFORMATION AND FEES 127
	PERMITTED USES IN VARIOUS ZONES129
	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS157
	PERMIT PROCESS TIMELINES161
	CITY PARKING REQUIREMENTS 165
	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND FEES169
	INCLUSIONARY HOUSING ORDINANCE173
APPENDIX G	2011 HOUSING ELEMENT FIVE-YEAR WORK PROGRAM
APPENDIX H	AVAILABLE LAND INVENTORY TABLE AND MAP 215
APPENDIX I	LAWS, REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES 359
APPENDIX J	SAFETY ELEMENT TECHNICAL BACKGROUND REPORT
APPENDIX K	ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT SETBACKS FROM COASTAI BLUFFS 491
APPENDIX L	ADDENDUM TO PROGRAM EIR 517



General Plan Introduction

"Santa Barbara has built into its very substance a meaning. A reason for being. The natural beauty of its setting speaks of this meaning. Its history and its past generations of dwellers speak of it. What Santa Barbara seems to be saying transcends all of mankind's material sciences, most of his culture. It touches a basic need in man to feel and be reminded of his source, to sense the depth and strength of his roots, and hence to be assured of his own meaning. It offers the experience of man's relationship to his Earth neither dominating nor being suppressed, but each existing in harmony with the other." (Excerpt from the Introduction, Santa Barbara General Plan, 1964.)

The City of Santa Barbara nestles in a beautiful setting between the Santa Ynez Mountains and the Pacific Ocean with expansive views of the sea and of the mountains. In its temperate Mediterranean climate almost everything grows. Tens of thousands of street trees provide shade, beauty and a calming serenity.

Santa Barbara's history extends back some 8,000 years to its first human settlements. The periods of Hispanic and early California history are captured in the beautiful architecture of the built environment, creating a unique and diverse community of charm, warmth and grace.

The Downtown is vibrant and eminently walkable; the arts and culture lively and engaging. There are fine art, historic and natural history museums, and Santa Barbara's zoo is a delight for people of all ages. There are numerous parks as well as a state historic park. There are miles of lovely and easily accessible beaches. In addition, Santa Barbara is an extraordinarily environmentally responsible and caring community. Hundreds of non-profit organizations work to improve the lives of the people of the area.

Generations of Santa Barbarans have worked with determination to protect and preserve Santa Barbara's special qualities, its beautiful views, its sense of place, its small town feel and its environment. These are the things about Santa Barbara that residents and visitors alike cherish. These are the things about Santa Barbara that make it internationally renowned.

This General Plan seeks to maintain these special qualities and a socially, environmentally, and economically healthy and sustainable community as the City goes forward to 2030.

GENERAL PLAN PURPOSE AND NEED

The health, safety and welfare of the community are of primary importance to the City. In addition, the people of Santa Barbara have affirmed the importance of sustainability with adoption of "Living Within Our Resources" as a central mission statement.

Because of its desirability as a place to live, housing and land prices have always been higher in Santa Barbara than in communities in North Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. Although a significant portion of the city's housing stock is affordable to low and very low income households, few middle-income affordable housing options exist for the needs of our diverse community, risking the very character we strive to retain.

High energy prices and global unrest add a new dimension of economic complexity and uncertainty to people's life choices about where to live and work. Affordable transportation will likely follow suit. The portion of Santa Barbara's workforce, economically displaced to live in outlying communities, will face higher commute costs, threatening business and service industries that keep our community running.

Climate change may indeed influence our pattern of living, how we do business, and how we use local resources. It may influence how we get our energy, food and water. We may rely less on fossil fuels for travel and household needs. Increasing food distribution costs will urge us to seek food sources more locally.

Global weather and temperature changes could also impact our region's water supply, compelling us to pursue new conservation and supply options. The City's infrastructure is maintained by a network of funding mechanisms. The current funding structure covers only the minimum in maintenance and limits our ability to fund solutions to existing and future challenges. Moving forward with a vision of sustainability will require new funding approaches and unwavering political will.

In order for the community to successfully address the issues that challenge our ways of life and those of future generations, Santa Barbara will need to become a more sustainable community (for a definition of a sustainable community see page 23). The purpose of this updated 2011 General Plan¹ is to adjust our current course to become more holistically sustainable. For Santa Barbara, sustainability is to blend and balance protecting and enhancing our natural and built environments, social equity, and economic vitality, which together form the character of our community.

The challenges facing the City now and into the future include many that are familiar, such as growth management, environmental stewardship, affordable housing, historic preservation and design compatibility, and a few that are new, such as sustainability, climate change and the promotion of community health. How Santa Barbara's government and its people address these challenges will influence Santa Barbara's evolution in the next twenty years and beyond.

ISSUES AND POLICY DRIVERS

Development and Growth Issues

Both local necessities and global forces compelled updating the City's General Plan beginning in 2005.

- The need for the community to revisit the City's Charter sections §1507, living within resource limits, and §1508, managing growth particularly non-residential development, which expired December 31, 2009;
- The need to adequately fund the city's capital and service needs;
- The socio-economic consequences of the types of market housing that have been built throughout the past decade; and
- The increasing global need to live and develop in a more sustainable way.

These trends and forces are in fact highly interconnected and encompass a myriad of considerations for the General Plan. The baseline report, *Conditions, Trends and Issues* (2005) defined the status of important city components, and identified numerous key land use issues. These issues and additional ones offered by

¹ For an explanation of the approach to the General Plan and which elements were comprehensively updated as part of the 2011 *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update please refer to pages 27 and Content section for each of the goals and policies section.

members of the public were discussed throughout a year-long consultation process that is distilled in the *Community Input Summary Report*, 2007. From all of these sources, the compatibilities and conflicts became evident between community values and aspirations, global and regional forces and trends, physical limitations, and economic realities.

What emerged were several recurring themes that have shaped and focused the substance of this plan. These themes or "policy drivers" have been divided into five groups. However, connecting all of them is the underlying, indisputable need for Santa Barbara, along with the rest of the world, to become more sustainable.

Policy Drivers

In considering the recent trends and challenges facing Santa Barbara, the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update process focused on several key issues that have gained importance as the planning process has evolved. These issues and implications also reflect comments and concerns about growth expressed by residents and community interest groups that participated in the 2007 *Plan Santa Barbara* outreach and workshop process. They are issues that have continued to inform the community dialogue about reassessing existing City land use and growth management policies, with the objective of determining which policies should be reaffirmed, which policies amended, and what new policies are required. Balancing among competing policy objectives is a key challenge in this effort.

These issues are referred to in this document as "policy drivers" because they often underlie a number of key policy questions demanding an integrated response. The following discussion also identifies some of the possible implications of future growth and development if the City made no changes to its current growth management policies, and the development trends since 1990 continued to the year 2030. Equally important, these policy drivers and implications are addressed thematically in the proposed Sustainability Principles, as well as through specific yet correlative goals and policies found throughout the several areas of the General Plan. Five key policy drivers that have been identified in the *Plan Santa Barbara* process are:

- Economic and Fiscal Health
- Historic and Community Character
- Growth Management
- Public and Community Health
- Energy and Climate Change

Economic and Fiscal Health

Economic events such as the 2008 stock market crash, housing market meltdown, and ensuing international credit crisis are sobering reminders of the cyclical nature of economies. From time to time Santa Barbara must expect and be prepared for such reversals. The abiding trends of loss of affordable housing, loss of our socio-economic diversity, and loss of local businesses have not changed. Also unchanged is the government sectors' struggle with funding for public services and for maintaining and expanding necessary infrastructure.

The lack of affordable housing will continue to have an effect on the "jobs/housing" imbalance, long distance commuting, overcrowding and illegal dwellings, and worker recruitment and retention. One significant fiscal concern related to housing is the expiration of the Redevelopment Agency in 2015 as it has funded a sizable percentage of the City's permanently affordable housing stock.

Though more transitory in nature, but significant nevertheless, the current state of the economy could extend deferred maintenance of City infrastructure. Continuing to defer maintenance or upgrades to infrastructure will likely increase the overall cost when it is eventually undertaken, and could possibly in the meantime delay desired development for lack of capacity.

Numerous City programs are in place to provide for water service, wastewater collection and treatment, storm drains, waste management and recycling, fire and police protection, schools, parks and recreation, disaster preparation, and other public facilities and services. There are also extensive regulations and development review criteria in place for considering the infrastructure and services issues of new development. The continuing challenge is to ensure adequate public facilities and services, and their maintenance, commensurate with future growth. Some potential implications of future development on infrastructure and services are:

- Difficulties in continuing to provide adequate funding, as public facilities and service costs increase over time, and as services are expanded to support upgraded service levels or new development.
- Increase in long-term water demand exceeding the level presently planned for, along with potential reduction in Lake Cachuma and Gibraltar Reservoir surface water supplies due to environmental water releases and sedimentation.
- Potential increased facility and service needs for wastewater, solid waste management, police and fire protection and disaster planning, parks and recreation, schools and other child care and youth services, health care facilities, and County services.
- Cumulative loss of open space.

Historic and Community Character

Numerous General Plan policies and guidelines for site and architectural design, circulation, landscaping, historic preservation, and neighborhood preservation have been adopted and implemented by the City over the past 40 years. Development over this period has resulted in many benefits to the Downtown commercial/mixed use center, including rehabilitation/revitalization of buildings, landscape improvements, paseos, and other improvements that foster accessibility, visual character and aesthetics, and a sense of community.

The City of Santa Barbara is largely built out, and development predominately involves demolition and redevelopment of already built sites, and development of in-fill sites. The development policies and design guidelines provide for flexible application to specific site circumstances. Therefore, substantial discretion on the part of decision-makers is also provided with respect to project sizes and compatibility issues.

The recent growth pattern of redevelopment has been for larger and taller mixed-use structures and sizable condominiums within commercially zoned areas, and larger additions and home replacements in residential neighborhoods. The Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance addresses the latter issue. Continuing this trend of larger redevelopment and in-fill development into the future has the following potential implications to community character and design:

- Larger and taller mixed-use structures and sizeable condominiums within commercially zoned areas.
- Additional pedestrian activity in the Downtown and other commercial districts.
- Changes in visual and historic character of the urban Downtown.
- Cumulative and localized reduction in openness and scenic views.

Growth Management

Policies were developed to control growth, particularly non-residential development, in part due to concerns over resource limitations, and to try to correct an imbalance between jobs and affordable housing available in the City. City Charter Section 1508 ("Measure E") was effective in limiting net new non-residential growth, as well as encouraging infill development and the redevelopment of existing structures.

Non-residential development will continue to be limited and, for the next increment of non-residential growth, expected to be 1.35 million net new square feet with support for Community Benefit uses.

On the other side of the equation, the City affordable housing programs and policies have successfully produced a significant amount of affordable housing in an area with very high land values. From 1990 to 2007, 698 units of affordable housing have been built or are under construction, with additional units approved or with applications pending (this includes both public and private projects). As of 2009, approximately 8 percent of the housing units in the City are affordable under long-term restrictions, and another 4 percent are rented to low income persons at affordable rents under the HUD Section 8 Voucher Program. The City's goal is to maintain or increase the percent of affordable housing.

However, continuing increases in land values and the cost of housing have resulted in most new market-rate housing being unaffordable to the work force. Further, one of the unforeseen consequences of limiting non-residential projects under Section 1508 and encouraging mixed-use development has been the proliferation of large condominiums. Some potential implications of continuing current housing trends include:

- Continued development of large condominiums and loss of sense of community due to more part-time residents.
- Loss of affordable housing and escalating housing costs resulting in additional residents and workers relocating out of town, particularly critical workers such as those in the fire, police, health and education sectors.
- Decreased socio-economic diversity.
- Worsening jobs/housing imbalance due to continuing job growth without sufficient affordable housing.
- Recruitment and retention concerns for employers.

Public Health

A causal relationship has been identified between the built environment and public health issues, especially in relation to epidemics such as obesity, respiratory disease and diabetes. Health professionals maintain that where we locate our housing, how we get from Point A to Point B, and what kind of access is available to open space, recreation, and healthy food are key determinants of such epidemics. Planning decisions may link the physical environment and public health, and include consideration of public health and particularly active living in preparing plans and project review.

Potential benefits of designing the built environment with regard to public health issues include:

- A decrease in the number of residents with obesity, respiratory disease, and diabetes.
- Greater opportunities to live a safe and healthy lifestyle.
- An increased level of productivity and quality of life.
- A stabilization or reduction in the cost of healthcare.

These positive impacts can be realized by:

- Creating neighborhoods that are safe for walking and biking by people of all ages.
- Creating neighborhoods that promote physical activity.
- Promoting convenient access to affordable and healthy food.
- Reducing air pollution.
- Providing a wide variety of housing options for people of all income levels to help address the need of the local healthcare workforce.

Energy and Climate Change

Like the nation, state and region, Santa Barbara looks to petroleum for a multitude of necessities and pleasures. If fossil fuels become scarce, the consequences could touch many aspects of our lives including: mobility restrictions, economic development, food production and perhaps climate changes (fires, flooding and sea-level rise), some of which could be potentially severe. If needed, shifting Santa Barbara's economy to one less dependent on fossil fuels and inclusive of more "green businesses" would require conscientious planning and political will. Beyond how Santa Barbara chooses to address these issues as a community, state law now requires specific planning as outlined in recent legislation.²

Single occupant vehicles are the main determinant influencing fuel consumption, regional and local land use development patterns, economic development, air quality, and perhaps global climate impacts. Failure to address the role of the automobile over the next 20 years could extend well beyond increasing congestion levels at local freeway interchanges. Transportation implications of future growth may include the following:

- The City's continuing position as a regional employment, commercial, educational, institutional, cultural, and recreational center could attract added regional trips contributing to congestion at freeway interchanges and City streets serving them.
- Additional job creation in the City without sufficient affordable housing would result in more commuters, freeway and interchange congestion, as well as potential traffic effects in the jurisdictions housing workers.
- The construction process for planned highway improvements south of Santa Barbara, including freeway widening, could result in increased highway congestion over the next one to two decades.
- External factors affect increased traffic congestion even more than land development, including population, per capita vehicle ownership, Highway 101 congestion levels, land prices, location choices for jobs and homes, and availability of commute alternatives.

The response to these policy drivers is presented through a sustainable planning approach for Santa Barbara, and specifically through a sustainability framework for the new General Plan.

² AB32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, 2006, and SB375 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, in 2008.

Sustainability Framework

This section defines sustainability for Santa Barbara, establishes a set of sustainability principles, outlines the sustainability framework for the General Plan, and provides a systematic process to assess the progress toward General Plan goals set forth in this framework. To achieve a flexible and resilient community, the goals and policies that guide decisions need to be expanded beyond living within our resources in which we simply consider existing resource capacities to manage growth and preserve the City's heritage and lifestyle. We need to look at our ecological footprint and determine how we are using those resources and, equally important, to what end. Being a sustainable community means making decisions based on the connections between the environment, the economy, and the people of our community, for the benefit of all the residents of our city, present and future, and to preserve and enhance our community character.

Santa Barbara is an ecosystem where individual, organizational, and governmental decisions affect the sustenance of all. These decisions can enhance or hurt the natural and physical environment, the valued qualities of our city, diversity, and health, safety and welfare of all residents and visitors. Therefore, a new policy framework is needed to inform and support individual, organizational, and governmental decisions to move in a direction that brings about a more sustainable Santa Barbara.

SANTA BARBARA AS A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY

A comprehensive definition of sustainability takes into account a number of factors, including:

- A long-term, and regional perspective;
- Concern for the welfare of the entire population, both current and future generations;
- Acknowledgment of human dependence on Earth's finite natural resources; and
- Recognition of the relationship between humans and their environment that attempts to achieve a steady balance over time.

A sustainable Santa Barbara is a diverse community that strives to live within its resource capacities and integrate all aspects of its ecosystem, while protecting and improving the natural and built environment for the social and economic benefit of present and future generations.

The vision for this 2011 General Plan, therefore, is one in which the goals, policies and implementation measures work together to move Santa Barbara toward increasing sustainability. This vision is based on the *Community Input Summary Report* (2007) which summarized the public input received during the community outreach phase at the beginning of the *Plan Santa Barbara* process.

Vision of a Sustainable Santa Barbara

Santa Barbara strives to become a more sustainable community. All members of the Santa Barbara community are stewards, and we accept that responsibility with the understanding that change is inevitable, that perfection can only be pursued, that there will always be a dynamic tension between our many goals, and achieving a momentary balance between them is a never-ending challenge.

The City, residents, businesses, developers and community organizations envision working together to achieve the following:

Sustainability: Becoming more sustainable by managing wise use of resources.

Community Health: Providing a physical environment that is healthy, and encourages healthy, active living.

Environment: Protecting and enhancing the scenic beauty of Santa Barbara's natural setting and built environment which is intrinsic to our appreciation and enjoyment of the City. At the same time, improving on conservation of resources such as, energy, water, open space, and native habitat, through innovation and determination.

Growth: Managing growth within our limited resources, and in so doing, retaining the desirable aspects of the physical city without sacrificing its economic vibrancy and demographic diversity.

Community Design: Carrying on the tradition of preserving open space for public enjoyment, preserving historic buildings, and the continuity of emblematic architecture in new development and redevelopment.

Historic Resources: Preserving and enhancing historic resources now and in the future.

Housing: Allowing as much housing as possible within resource limits to provide an array of lifestyle options for a demographically and economically diverse resident population.

Transportation: Creating a diverse transportation network that serves our community's economic vitality, small-town feel, a variety of housing options, economic stewardship, and healthy lifestyles.

Public Services and Facilities: Understanding that public services and facilities are limited resources, in particular with respect to financial considerations, explore technological solutions to safeguard, improve and expand the natural resources of Santa Barbara, while applying innovation to maintain or improve the quality of life and protect the natural environment.

Economy: Seeking stability through diversity, and balance between serving residents and visitors or non-resident investors, consistent with our environmental values and the need to be sustainable and retain unique character.

Civic Participation: Believing the best decisions are made with the greatest community participation. We know that full consensus is rare, but greater participation, where people have an opportunity to be heard and all opinions are respected, will achieve greater understanding, acceptance and appreciation which are so essential to our sense of community.

Over the next 20 years, these are the values for Santa Barbara to increasingly reflect in all its manifestations: physical, cultural and social, and through its General Plan.

SUSTAINABILITY PRINCIPLES

The following set of principles elaborate on the basic components of sustainability: Economy, Environment, and Equity, to reflect the key challenges for Santa Barbara. Maintaining Santa Barbara's natural and historic resources and community character are integral to all three components.

Economy

- The vitality and long-term health of the Santa Barbara economy relies on maintaining the City as a center for commerce, tourism, education, employment, institutions, medicine, culture and recreation for the South Coast region, as well as encouraging economic retooling that improves the natural environment, while improving social equity.
- A fiscally sound municipal government is essential to actively support the types of public services, infrastructure, and facilities that will be required to move the community towards a more sustainable future.

Environment

- "Living Within Our Resources" means effectively managing growth and in-fill development to conserve and protect the community's natural, physical, historic and cultural resources for present and future generations. Future development and resource use must be met with creative solutions for the multiple objectives of the General Plan including preserving historic and cultural resources, retaining community character, a diverse population and culture, and allowing sufficient growth to support a steady economy.
- Efficiently and effectively managing and protecting our natural and physical resources entails practicing innovative strategies that achieve protection, conservation, enhancement, reduced consumption, reuse, recycling, self-sufficiency, and adaptation to changing climate conditions, should they occur.
- Historic and cultural resources and the small town character of Santa Barbara need to be protected throughout the City by utilizing preservation strategies to enhance the human scale of architecture, public open space, landscaping, and public views.
- Circulation within, to and from Santa Barbara should fully utilize all available modes of transportation. If fossil fuels become increasingly scarce and prices rise, the City may need to dramatically accelerate efforts to plan, improve and build viable alternatives such as transit, rail, bicycle, and pedestrian/wheel chair access ways.

Equity

- Socio-economic diversity is important for maintaining a healthy culture and stable economy, and should be supported through: housing affordable to all income levels and mobility options for a range of income levels; economic policy to encourage livable wages and good jobs; and opportunities for all to participate in education, cultural events and the arts.
- A healthy community requires investment in public infrastructure, facilities and services that provide equal access to open space and recreation, clean air, healthy food, housing and neighborhood-serving commercial uses. The plan for the entire community should provide for all life phases, the design of the built environment needs to be responsive to the needs of all, including youth, seniors and people with disabilities.

- All members of the community should be provided with information about and strongly encouraged to participate in community decisions that affect them.
- "Living Within Our Resources" includes supporting, maintaining and enhancing our human resource, such as our workforce, in particular workers needed to keep the city functioning for normal day to day living, or in the event of disaster.

SUSTAINABILITY AND RESOURCE CAPACITY

Resource capacity has been an important part of "Living Within Our Resources," and it is an important aspect of sustainability as well.

However, sustainability is a broader, more challenging concept in which resource capacity is but one of several factors to consider in making decisions for the whole of the community. For many resources, their capacity to support a population is not a fixed amount in absolute terms, though it may be at any moment in time. Resource capacities can be increased or decreased depending on life-style preferences, conservation strategies, technological advances, availability of alternative resources or substitutes, and changes in relative resource costs. Santa Barbara can grow and evolve and also retain a high quality of life and an amenable environment, with foresight in the management of its resources.

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

An Adaptive Management Program (AMP) contains the evaluation, feedback, and adaptation components of the General Plan to track progress toward achieving the plan's goals, objectives and desired outcomes. Adaptive management enables revision of policies and implementation measures throughout the 20-year planning period to effect course corrections in response to external trends or to avert future unintended consequences. Incorporating an adaptive management approach supports sustainability by allowing the General Plan to be a living document, maintaining its relevancy through timely adjustments, and reducing the need for major updates that are often after-the-fact and reactive.

In order to measure progress toward General Plan goals, the Sustainability Framework sets out objectives, which will be found in the AMP, for each of the elements. The objectives provide the link between the General Plan and the AMP by interpreting the aspirations of the goals into more explicit statements. Objectives can express either a desired end-state or a benchmark toward a desired end-state. While goals generally remain constant, the objectives may change throughout the course of the General Plan either as they are achieved and new objectives are desired, or more relevant measures are developed. Some policies include a monitoring requirement as well.

The components of the AMP include baseline information, community indicators, monitoring procedures and timeframes, and reports. The environmental assessment for the General Plan Update provides much of the baseline data along with other studies.

The community indicators are the applied measures (often referred to as "metrics") which can be methodically observed, enumerated, calculated, or gauged. Indicators will be developed through review of the baseline data, the objectives, and community and Planning Commission input. Monitoring procedures will employ a variety of methods that may involve statistical evaluation, technical measurement or the use of surveys. The availability of water is a primary resource to sustain growth and development, and is a good example of an existing community indicator.

The AMP includes reports to the City Council on the status of the City's water supply management program, which includes tracking new demand and the status of the City's various water supplies. On a five year cycle, the City also conducts a more formal water supply update in the form of its Urban Water Management Plan.

The AMP will set out a comprehensive schedule of regular reports for each of the community indicators. Reports will provide the results of monitoring, explain the process and techniques used, and make recommendations for revisions to the General Plan.

SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK

The diagram of the Proposed Sustainability Framework (Figure 1) helps to better understand how the key issues that have driven the *Plan Santa Barbara* process are carried forward into the General Plan elements, implementation actions and feedback mechanisms.

Sustainability Principles: These overarching principles are the bridge between the definition of a sustainable Santa Barbara and the goals and policies of each respective General Plan element. The principles also directly address the key policy issues (or "drivers") the community faces today and into the future.

Policy Drivers: These are the issue areas with local, regional and global significance that affect both the guiding principles and the goals and policies. The policy drivers: growth management, energy and climate change, community character, economy and fiscal health, and public health, were discussed in the previous section.



Figure 1: General Plan Sustainability Framework

General Plan Elements: The General Plan is organized by the elements that comprise the updated General Plan document. As noted later under the Climate Change policies in this plan, a comprehensive program to address climate change may affect elements of the General Plan.

The proposed General Plan Elements include:

- Land Use (updated in 2011)
- Housing (updated in 2011)
- Open Space, Parks, and Recreation(new goals, policies and implementation actions)
- Economy and Fiscal Health (new Element)
- Environmental Resources (new goals, policies and implementation actions)

- Historic Resources (new Element with expected completion in 2012)
- Circulation (new goals, policies and implementation actions)
- Safety and Public Services (new goals, policies and implementation actions)

The proposed goals and policies contained in the general plan elements provide the specific direction to make the City General Plan more sustainability-focused. However, many existing goals and policies already reflect a sustainable approach or address key planning considerations for Santa Barbara. These goals and policies have been retained, sometimes revised and/or relocated to a different element, and are still part of the General Plan. As additional elements are updated, many existing policies, standards and implementation actions will be carried forward into the updated General Plan, most of which are anticipated to remain unchanged.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A key component of the Sustainability Framework is public participation, for there can be no social equity without an informed and engaged community. Initiating and sustaining participation across all socioeconomic levels during a long-term planning process, such as a General Plan Update process, can be a particular challenge. However, public participation lies at the heart of our democracy and is reflected in the community planning process.

In 2005, the City Council set a public participation goal for the General Plan Update process: *Encourage public involvement and participation at all levels of city planning and other government activities.* This acknowledges the critical importance of public participation to the balancing of needs in the resulting planning policies. But public participation does not stop with completion of the plan. The General Plan must continue to impartially encourage and facilitate the public's role in the planning decision process for development, and in resource use and stewardship in relation to individual projects, development of implementation tools or future plan amendments.

GOAL

• *Fostering Public Participation.* The City provides a public participation process that is inclusive, responsive, and balanced with regard to the broad needs of the community.

Public Participation Policies

- PP1: Access to Information. Members of the public shall have access to the necessary information and understanding of procedures to participate in decisions that affect them.
- PP2: Wide Participation. The City shall encourage the widest possible citizen participation in local government decision-making by:
 - Welcoming, encouraging and enabling participation in the planning process by citizens who may be unfamiliar with City procedures.
 - The City Council, Boards and Commissions meeting in the evening, as necessary and appropriate, so that all citizens can take part.

HOW ELEMENTS WORK TOGETHER

Legal Requirements

Cities and counties in the state of California are required by law to have an operating General Plan at all times to address its physical development. While charter cities such as Santa Barbara are exempt from some state land use law, all California counties and cities including charter cities must have a general plan containing, at a minimum, the required substance for the mandated elements. Further, all general plans must be internally consistent.

State legislation specifies the content and process for developing the plans. Although the legislation mandates seven elements: Land Use, Housing, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, Safety, and Noise, it also permits a local government to prepare optional elements to focus on additional issues, or topics that are particularly relevant to the community, such as historic resources, public health or the local economy. All elements have the same force and effect, including optional elements, and no element takes precedence over any other. All parts of the general plan must be weighed equally in making decisions on individual developments.

The State also advocates that a general plan be "clear, concise and easy to use," and suggests that condensing elements is one way to achieve this. The State encourages combining elements or reorganizing the statutory issues into elements considered more functional or appropriate for a particular jurisdiction. Local governments are encouraged to prepare a plan that best suits their community, provided that it addresses all of the relevant statutory issues.

Consistency

The California Government Code also requires that general plans contain an integrated, internally consistent set of policies. When an element of the General Plan is revised, and especially when new policies and priorities are proposed, the other elements must be reviewed and, if necessary, updated to ensure that internal consistency is maintained. Integration in policies is not only required, it is unavoidable in order to address issues holistically without overlooking an important facet.

One of the primary tenets of the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update process was to provide a framework to further consistency and integration among the elements. The 2011 Santa Barbara General Plan is based on an overarching sustainability framework, guided by sustainability principals of economy, environment and equity. These principals are carried forward through the goals, policies and implementation actions of each respective General Plan element. A thorough review was conducted of all existing General Plan goals and policies as part of the *Plan Santa Barbara* process to ensure, among other factors, internal consistency.

CONTENT OF THIS AND FUTURE UPDATES

This edition of the General Plan incorporates a subtle shift in the concept of its permanency. As part of a more sustainable approach, the plan is expected to provide continuity and certainty while responding to changing trends and planning outcomes. Consequently, the General Plan is no longer viewed as a static set of policies to guide growth and development in the city for the next 20 years; rather, it is intended to be an evolving set of policies that can adjust to new issues, or imbalance between goals and outcomes. The Adaptive Management Program is one tool to implement this approach. No recommendation in this plan shall be interpreted as mandating the hiring of additional personnel or consultants.

The 2011 update to the Santa Barbara General Plan reformats the plan with an overarching introduction explaining the sustainability framework and providing a background of history as well as a city profile. The elements have been re-organized around the sustainability framework, to provide a more integrated plan, with comprehensive updates to the Land Use Element, the General Plan Map, and the Housing Element.

The sustainability framework also provides direction for the future update of the remaining elements through the Sustainability Principles as well as specific goals for each of the respective elements. Selected policies have also been identified for the remaining elements that either were reorganized from a previous element or arose as a new policy during the *Plan Santa Barbara* process. Up until the time the remaining elements are updated, the new goals and policies as well as the existing elements will remain in force.

Plan Elements, Goals, Policies and Implementation

The 2011 General Plan is comprised of the eight reorganized elements, of which the seven mandatory elements are included therein. Optional stand alone elements include Historic Resources and Economy Fiscal Health. Each element contains a set of goals, policies and implementation actions to be considered.

The *goals* provide the general direction and desired outcome for each chapter within each respective element. The California General Plan Guidelines defines a goal as, "a direction setter. It is an ideal future end, condition, or state related to the public health, safety or general welfare toward which planning and planning implementation measures are directed. A goal is a general expression of community values and, therefore, is abstract in nature. A goal is generally not quantifiable, time-dependant or suggestive of specific actions for its achievement."

A *policy* is the method to achieve the goals, and typically there are numerous policies under each goal. The General Plan Guidelines defines a policy as, "a specific statement that guides decision-making. It indicates a clear commitment of the local legislative body."

Implementation strategies are specific methods to achieve the vision of a more sustainable community and provide examples of programs and actions that the City may take to achieve the goal and policy. The General Plan Guidelines define an implementation strategy as "a rule of measure establishing a level of quantity that must be complied with or satisfied. Implementation strategies further define the abstract terms of goals and policies." To underscore that these are examples of what may be undertaken by the City, the subheading "*Possible Implementation Action to be Considered*" is used throughout the document.

Required Elements	Existing Optional Elements (prior to 2011)	PlanSB Elements
Land Use	Parks and Recreation Scenic Highways	Land Use
Housing		Housing
Circulation		Circulation (& Scenic Highways)
Open Space		Open Space, Parks and Recreation
Conservation		Environmental Resources
		(& Conservation & Noise)
Safety		Safety and Public Services
Noise		Economy and Fiscal Health
		Historic Resources

Table I-1: General Plan Elements

Background and Setting

The best way to plan for tomorrow is with a clear understanding and appreciation for today and yesterday. This chapter includes a summary of the history of Santa Barbara, its history of city planning, and a profile of the city as of 2010. The historical summary highlights key events in the City's history that cumulatively have brought us to the present time, and provides the backdrop for city planning along the way. A fuller city history is provided in Appendix C. The planning history explains how values, concerns and planning solutions have evolved throughout the City's planning history, including the most recent *Plan Santa Barbara* process. Finally, the Setting presents a snapshot of Santa Barbara, circa 2009; the starting point and benchmark for resource use, development, preservation, and conservation activities over the next 20 years.

HISTORIC CONTEXT

Chumash Period (before 1782), Spanish and Mexican Periods (1782 – 1848)

Santa Barbara's history extends back some 8,000 years to its first human settlements. In 1769 when the Spanish Portola Expedition visited Syuxtun, they found it to be a thriving village of approximately 600 Chumash. Archaeologists now estimate that the village, located at the beach, west of the mouth of Mission Creek, had been continuously inhabited for at least 800 years prior to contact with the Spanish (Cabrillo) Expedition in 1542.

Permanent European settlement began when the Spanish returned and established the presidio (fort) in Santa Barbara in 1782. Once the presidio was complete, the Franciscans founded the Mission Santa Barbara on December 4 (St. Barbara's Day), 1786. A major earthquake destroyed the adobe structure in 1812. It took five years to construct a new sandstone church. The second tower was added in 1833, giving the mission its iconic symmetrical façade.

A dam and aqueduct system was constructed about 1.5 miles up Mission Canyon in 1807 to provide water to the growing community living on mission grounds. An 1806 reservoir near the Mission was so well built that it was used to store water until 1993, when it was transferred from Public Works to the Parks Department.



Reconstructed Chapel and Comandante's Quarters at El Presidio de Santa Bárbara State Historic Park

The presidio, also damaged by the 1812 earthquake, gradually lost its military importance. For their service to the Spanish Crown, presidio soldiers were given small land grants adjacent to the presidio. A pueblo characterized by small single-story adobe houses connected by irregular pathways began to form around the deteriorating fort. These simple adobe structures, built using available building materials, were virtually unadorned, yet their character is often emulated in Santa Barbara today.

In 1821, Mexico achieved independence from Spain, and California became a Mexican territory. Santa Barbara continued to develop slowly as a Mexican pueblo until California was ceded to the United States by the Mexican government at the conclusion of the Mexican-American war in 1848.

Americanization Period (1848 – 1902)

At the close of the Mexican-American War in 1848, California was under the control of the United States military. Two years later, on September 9, 1850, California became the 31st state without first passing through a territorial stage. At this time, Santa Barbara had already incorporated as an American City on April 9, 1850 (five months before California became a state). Early in its existence, the City Council hired Captain Salisbury Haley to survey the city and create an "American" grid street system to replace the winding pathways of the former pueblo. The survey lacked uniformity in the block sizes despite City Council direction to make each side 450 feet long. A deliberate misalignment is at the intersection of Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Street and De La Guerra Streets, resulting from the position of the Leyva Adobe formerly located on De la Guerra Street just east of State Street. Most of the errors in dimensions were the result of poor surveying on the part of Haley.

American migrants to Santa Barbara did not favor the existing Spanish style adobe homes and introduced wood frame construction to the city. Since the main form of access to the city was by steamships, significant growth did not occur until the completion of Stearns Wharf in 1872. The deep-water wharf provided the City with dockage for steam ships, which brought people and building materials. This improved access, along with a beautiful setting and favorable climate made Santa Barbara ripe as a tourist destination. The City's first public transportation system, a mule-car line, was completed in 1875. The system provided direct access to the Arlington Hotel from Stearns Wharf, and also provided service along Cabrillo Boulevard to the Bath House at Castillo Street. The mule-cars operated for 22 years.

The railroad finally arrived in Santa Barbara in 1887, providing regular service to Los Angeles. With this reliable and convenient transportation link to Los Angeles, came the establishment of Santa Barbara as a premier destination for wealthy families from the east coast, midwest, and Europe. Resort hotels, such as the Arlington, catered to their visitors. Businesses needed to support Santa Barbara's growing tourism industry expanded the City's center, especially along State Street, which was then surrounded by new houses needed by the increasing work force. Well-to-do families began to construct winter homes on the upper east side. Most of the buildings constructed during this late Victorian period were built in the popular architectural styles of the day; Italianate, Stick/Eastlake, Stick, Folk Victorian, and Queen Anne, which were prevalent throughout the country. Parts of Santa Barbara looked like any small American city. The City's first major medical center, "Cottage Hospital" opened on December 8, 1891. The hospital would shape the development of the surrounding Oak Park neighborhood for over one-hundred years.

The Consolidated Electric Company was organized in 1896 to provide electric street-car service in Santa Barbara. The narrow gauge tracks serviced East Beach and West Beach, State Street to the Arlington Hotel, and extended to Cottage Hospital and the Old Mission. This street-car service helped to establish Santa Barbara's earliest residential suburbs.

As different ethnic groups arrived, they formed separate centers for their businesses and surrounding homes, creating neighborhoods where their culture and language were predominant. In the early twentieth century, Chinatown occupied the first block of East Canon Perdido Street. Japanese immigrants resided in various parts of the city, but many chose to locate on the second block of East Canon Perdido Street. English and Italian stone masons created the majority of the stone retaining walls, stone steps, and gate posts found throughout the Riviera section of Santa Barbara.

Late in this period renewed interest in the history of the California Missions became the inspiration for the Mission Revival architectural style in California. Only three major buildings in Santa Barbara (the second Arlington Hotel, the Potter Hotel, and the Southern Pacific Railroad Station) would be constructed in the Mission Revival style. The style was relatively short-lived in Santa Barbara, being quickly eclipsed by the popular Spanish Colonial Revival style of architecture.

Santa Barbara (1902 – 1925)

Santa Barbara embraced the City Beautiful Movement with open arms. In 1904, the City Council added two important parks (Oak Park and East Beach Park, now known as Chase Palm Park) to the City's park system. During this time period (and through at least 1931), various civic organizations bought much of the remaining waterfront assuring its preservation for public use.

By the turn of the 20th Century, Santa Barbara was well established as a vacation destination for people trying to escape the frozen winters back east. In 1902, the 600-room Potter Hotel was constructed near the beach, and ten years later the new Arlington hotel was completed after fire destroyed the first hotel in 1909. Both hotels were eventually destroyed; the Potter by fire in 1921 and the 1925 earthquake severely damaged the Arlington Hotel, which was then demolished.

In 1901, the long awaited railroad link to San Francisco was completed allowing travel to Santa Barbara by rail from either Los Angeles or San Francisco. During this time the City's streetcar system was expanded and one could travel from the beach to the Mission, and in 1913, up to the State Normal School campus located on the Riviera. The Riviera Development Company had bought about 300 acres of land, built the roads, sandstone retaining walls, underground utilities, and had planted hundreds of oak trees. This substantial subdivision imposed the first restrictions requiring use of the "Riviera" style which featured white stucco walls with red tile roofs.

Shortly after the conclusion of the First World War, Santa Barbara began to revamp its visual image. During this period, in 1919, a competition was held for the design of a "County courthouse and WWI memorial with some county and city offices," requiring that both structures be designed in a Hispanic/Mediterranean style. Between 1923 and 1925, there were a series of public exhibitions of drawings showing how individual blocks of State Street could be rebuilt using a unifying Hispanic architectural theme.

Civic leaders Pearl Chase and Bernhard Hoffmann of the Plans and Planting Committee, formed in 1922, were the driving force behind the movement to return Santa Barbara to a Hispanic city. One year later, in 1923, the City Council created a Planning Commission and in 1925 adopted a building and zoning ordinance. At the urging of the Plans and Planting Committee, several important civic buildings were constructed in the Spanish Colonial Revival Style between 1922 and 1924. These were the City Hall, Santa Barbara High School, the original Roosevelt Elementary School, and the Lobero Theater. Additionally, several important private buildings were also constructed between 1922 and 1925. The most influential of these was El Paseo, still



El Paseo Courtyard, Spanish Colonial Revival Style

regarded today as one of the finest examples in scale and details that characterize the Spanish Colonial Revival style of architecture. Pearl Chase, dubbed "Santa Barbara's Pearl" continued to work tirelessly to beautify Santa Barbara until her death in 1979 at the age of 90.

Tragic Opportunity (1925 - 1939)

One of the most significant catalysts for the architectural development of Santa Barbara was the massive earthquake which struck at 6:42 A.M. on June 29th, 1925. The earthquake severely damaged most of Santa Barbara's business district, which was comprised of mainly un-reinforced masonry buildings. Fortunately, a vast majority of the residential structures in town were wood-frame and stood-up to the shaking, mainly loosing brick chimneys, but otherwise left intact.

During this time, city activists such as Bernhard Hoffmann and Pearl Chase were carefully educating the public on the need for and value of architectural controls and a City Council appointed public safety board established the Architectural Advisory Committee. One function of the Committee was a Community Drafting Room, which provided certain free services to the public. The City Council created an Architectural Board of Review (ABR) by ordinance in July, 1925. This ABR only lasted nine months.

During this time period, the introduction of affordable automobiles facilitated the creation of Santa Barbara's early automobile suburbs on the upper east and west sides and eventually further out, such as San Roque, and up on the Mesa. In the early suburbs, such as the upper west side, the garages were detached structures placed at the rear of the lot allowing the houses, generally with covered porches, to be oriented to the street, retaining a traditional development pattern.

Later development patterns on the Mesa placed two car garages at the front of the house, providing larger private back-yards, but this change in orientation fostered less interaction between neighbors. As a result of the popularity of private automobiles, the city abandoned its street-car lines in 1929. Private bus systems followed.

The Second World War and Beyond (1940 – 1975)

The largest impact that World War II had on Santa Barbara was the construction of a large military hospital (Hoff General Hospital) in the Casa Loma area, near the Samarkand neighborhood. Most of the war surplus buildings had been moved or demolished by 1960 to make way for MacKenzie Park and the Municipal Golf Course. The historic Naval Reserve Center and adjacent ship repair and warehouse shops serviced Navy destroyers during the war.

As was the case across the country, Santa Barbara experienced a post-war population and construction boom to provide housing for returning World War II veterans. Although Santa Barbara established a board of architectural review in 1947, by the mid-1950's the architectural character of the city began to change. In response to development pressure and the loss of several of the City's historic adobes, the El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District (EPV) was established by ordinance in 1960. The original EPV encompassed a 16-block area representing the approximate location of the old pueblo. The City Council designated the Advisory Landmark Committee to oversee implementation of the new ordinance.

In 1969, the largest oil blowout in the waters off of California, and now the third largest in the United States, occurred in the Santa Barbara Channel. It is estimated that up to 100,000 barrels of oil erupted into the Channel. Crude oil coated the city's beaches and wildlife and damaged Santa Barbara's environment and economy. The event had an international impact, and it is considered the source of the modern environmental movement.
Development by Design (1975 – 2010)

In 1977, the boundaries of the EPV were expanded to include more of the commercial center of the city and the principal streets providing access from the 101 Freeway. Eventually the importance of the established guidelines for the architecture within the EPV necessitated the elevation of the Landmarks Committee to a "Historic Landmarks Commission" by City Charter amendment.

Another driving force that significantly shaped Santa Barbara was the creation of the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) with two of its Redevelopment Project areas, which were the Presidio Springs under HUD's Neighborhood Development Program (NDP) and the Central City Redevelopment Project area (CCRP). The agency has been responsible for many improvements in the city including the widening of the sidewalks, addition of significant landscaping along the lower State Street corridor, and a number of almost invisible public parking garages, which service the central business district. The RDA also constructed affordable housing projects that were designed to be compatible with their setting and have the appearance of market rate housing. The development of the Paseo Nuevo outdoor shopping mall Downtown in 1990 by the RDA was the most significant catalyst for the rejuvenation of State Street as a shopping district.

HISTORY OF CITY PLANNING

As evidenced by its history, both local and external events, pressures and trends have shaped the city for more than 200 years and will continue to do so. These forces were recognized by the early residents and city officials, and as a result the city has benefited from a high level of civic involvement ever since.

The first comprehensive zoning ordinance was adopted in 1930. The current comprehensive ordinance was adopted in 1957. The General Plan was adopted in 1964. The Historic Landmarks Commission began as an advisory committee in 1960 and received additional powers in 1977. The current Architectural Board of Review was established in 1947, and the Planning Commission was established in 1923. These planning milestones and many others were in response to public expressions of concern about the direction of the city, and, within the limits of state and city requirements, express the general public will. The planning documents, regulation, and the review and decision making bodies have been principal agents guiding city growth, form and character.

1964 Plan to 2005

The original 1964 General Plan comprised the total plan in one volume plus a map and did not include many of the elements (see below) that currently exist. Since then a number of amendments have been made to the adopted plan.

While there have been amendments over the intervening years, the city's General Plan has never been comprehensively updated.

Other elements of the city's General Plan were completed, or substantially updated on the following dates:

- Land Use Element, July 1964, March 1972, last updated in February 1995
- Current General Plan Map, March 1975
- Conservation Element, August 1979, July 1994
- Circulation Element, July 1964, 1971, November 1979, Interim March 1988, November 1997
- Housing Element February 1977, 1982, 1985 Addendum, February 1995, August 2004

- Noise Element, August 1979, November 1983
- Open Space Element, January 1972
- Scenic Highways Element, February 1974
- Parks and Recreation Element, July 1964, August 1982
- Seismic Safety and Safety Element, August 1979

A major planning effort included the City of Santa Barbara's Goals Report submitted by the Citizens General Plan Goals Committee in April 1971. This committee, appointed by City Council in 1970, worked for a year to study the general plan goals and to formulate recommendations. The City Council adopted the committee's report in 1971 as an official statement of City policy. Large scale amendments were made to the General Plan in 1972 including a section called "Principles and Goals" with the adopted goals. Building on these goals and the values within them, goals have been rewritten for this 2011 General Plan Update.

Even in 1964, the original plan's predominant focus was to preserve Santa Barbara's distinctive character and "feel", and it raised concerns about growth despite its passive support of a significant amount of development, both residential and non-residential. Bit by bit over the intervening years, goals and policies have been revised in response to evolving community values and concerns over growth as various elements were prepared and updated, with "Living Within Our Resources" being just the beginning.

A more sustainable approach to city planning was heralded in the 1997 update to the Circulation Element, in which the automobile and alternative transportation received equal attention. The primacy of affordable housing addressed in the Housing Element in 1995 and again in 2004 addressed the equity component of sustainability for the city. Before it became a household term, Santa Barbara was going sustainable. But a persistent planning concern since the 1970s has been to manage Santa Barbara's growth.

Growth Management

The 1964 General Plan reflected the build-out potential under the existing zoning in excess of 100 million square feet of nonresidential development, and a potential residential population of between 140,000 and 170,000. Following its adoption, community concern began to grow regarding the effects that the maximum build-out could have on the community and the ability of the City to provide resources to support that amount of development.

In response to this concern for the quality of life in Santa Barbara and its relation to resource limits, and at the recommendation of the Planning Commission that a study be carried out, the City Council contracted with the Santa Barbara Planning Task Force in 1974 to conduct a study, which resulted in the 1974 report *Impacts of Growth*. The study looked at what the city would be like at different population levels. It showed that significant effects on the quality of life would occur if population increased to the then theoretical buildout (140,000 to 170,000) because the City would not have the resources to maintain the population at the theoretical buildout.

In response to the study, the City Council adopted amendments to both the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance which resulted in the 1975 residential down zoning which reduced densities in residential areas to accommodate an optimum population level of 85,000. However, no commercial down zoning occurred. The 1975 down zoning was the initial step towards a concept which has come to be known as "Living Within Our Resources." The concept of "Living Within Our Resources" calls for a population build-out level consistent with the City's water supply, traffic and parking capacity, sewage treatment capacity, air quality, etc., which maintain the high quality of life that Santa Barbarans presently enjoy.

In 1977, due to concerns with increasing population a two part advisory measure was put on the ballot to give City Council the opinion of the voters regarding the down zoning. The ballot asked the community if they supported efforts to limit population to 85,000 and if voter approval should be required for changes that would increase the population. The community voted affirmatively to both and the City Council upheld the 1975 down zoning.

In 1982, the City Council established a Charter Committee to incorporate the 85,000 population goal into the City Charter. It was determined that a population goal was too specific and legally could not be incorporated into the Charter. The result of the Charter Committee's discussions was a ballot measure, Measure K, which proposed a Charter Amendment mandating that "land development shall not exceed its public services and physical and natural resources...All land use policies shall provide for a level and balance of residential and commercial development which will effectively utilize, but will not exhaust, the City's resources in the foreseeable future..." Measure K was approved by 60 percent of the voters and incorporated into the City Charter as Section 1507.

In 1982, technical studies for a General Plan Update (GPU) were initiated. The GPU Public Participation Process began in 1988. In 1989, the City Council placed the nonresidential growth limitation before the voters as ballot Measure E which was approved by 55 percent of the voters. Measure E was incorporated into the City Charter as Section 1508.

In 1990, the City Council adopted amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance which:

- Reduced commercial development potential;
- Recognized residential needs as the highest priority;
- Limited development based on the 1985 Master Water Plan which assumed a capacity equivalent to 40,005 dwelling units;
- Established mixed use development as a high priority implementation strategy to provide additional multi-family housing;
- Determined that transitional areas must be studied and plans prepared to preserve existing dwelling units; and
- Established higher density residential in the Downtown area as a high priority implementation strategy to provide additional dwelling units.

In 1995, the Housing Element was amended with a special emphasis on multi-family housing in and around the Downtown employment center and incentives for mixed use development. The Housing Element goals were supported and substantiated with the 1997 update of the City's Circulation Element. The emphasis of the Circulation Element Update was on alternative modes of transportation.

Concurrent with the adoption of the 1995 Housing Element, the City Council also amended the Land Use Element to incorporate the discussion regarding the theoretical maximum residential build out of 40,000 residential units.

In 2005, the City Council initiated the *Plan Santa Barbara* process with an updated affirmation of the 1988 General Plan Update Goals.

In 2011, the City Council continued to recognize the importance of limiting new non-residential square footage due to concerns such as the jobs to housing ratio and set 1.35 million new square feet as the amount of commercial growth permitted to 2030.

PLAN SANTA BARBARA PROCESS

The City Council initiated *Plan Santa Barbara* to update the Land Use and Housing Elements of the General Plan, specifically to address the sunset of Charter Section 1508, which regulates non-residential growth in the City, and to reassess the City's capability to construct more than 40,005 housing units as specified by the Housing Element.

One of the first tasks was to inventory city resources, facilities and services which was completed in 2005 and published as the *Conditions, Trends and Issues Report.* Also in 2005, a ten-member Outreach Committee, comprised of City Council members, Planning Commissioners and community leaders was appointed by City Council to help guide the public outreach process.

Plan Santa Barbara Public Outreach Effort

In the spring of 2007 (2006 was devoted to the Upper State Street Study), the public outreach phase of the *Plan Santa Barbara* process began in earnest. Staff from the City Planning Division led this outreach effort in coordination with the Outreach Committee. In an effort to reach a wide selection of community members, a variety of methods were utilized, including informational mailings, community workshops, forums, a website, surveys, and Planning Commission meetings.



City residents attend community workshop related to future City growth



City residents provide input at public workshops

Plan Santa Barbara Website

The City launched the *YouPlanSB.org* website in the spring of 2007. The website was intended to involve the public in the planning process. The website served to provide up-to-date information about the General Plan Update process, post planning documents and staff reports, and announce public workshops and meetings related to the update process. Individuals interested in participating could register on the site and receive periodic updates whenever new information was posted. It also allowed City residents to provide online feedback. The website contained a library of planning documents prepared as part of the update process, as well as videos of all the workshops and some Planning Commission work sessions. The City maintained a distribution list of interested individuals and community groups and organizations. Public Service Announcements (PSA) were also released advertising the community workshops in an effort to outreach to as much of the community as possible.

Plan Santa Barbara Brochure and Comment Cards

A four-page informational brochure was also mailed in the spring of 2007 to over 36,000 households and businesses in Santa Barbara. The brochure contained an explanation of the *Plan Santa Barbara* process, information about upcoming community workshops, and a bilingual comment form that could be mailed back to the City or submitted via the plan website. The City received 546 individual comment cards either sent by mail or through the website.

Grassroots Meetings

To actively seek out community input from individuals who might not otherwise attend a public workshop related to the *Plan Santa Barbara* process, Outreach Committee members and City staff attended approximately 40 local grassroots meetings with local organizations. Participants of these meetings represented a broad range of community interests, including affordable housing, growth capacity, preserving residential neighborhoods, youth, economy, transportation, environment, and health. Approximately 700 individuals participated in these meetings, which provided an opportunity for focused dialogue with committee members and City Staff. A complete list of the groups participating in the grassroots outreach meetings is provided below:

GROUPS PARTICIPATING IN GRASSROOTS MEETINGS		
Allied Neighborhood Association	Green Hills Software	
Arts Advisory Committee	Independent Living Resource Center	
Board of Realtors Government Relations	League of Women Voters	
Bungalow Haven	Legal Aid Foundation	
Chamber of Commerce	Nonprofit Support Center	
Child Care Planning Council	Pearl Chase Society	
Christian Science First Church	Rotary Club	
Citizens Planning Association	Safe Routes to School	
Coalition for Sustainable Transportation	Santa Barbara Association of Realtors	
Coalition for Community Wellness	Santa Barbara Beautiful	
Coastal Housing Partnership	Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition	
Community Environmental Council	Santa Barbara Contractors Association	
Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital	Santa Barbara County Action Network	
Downtown Organization	Santa Barbara High School Swap Meet	
Downtown Santa Barbara Childcare	Second Baptist Church	
Endowment for Youth	Sunrise Rotary Club	
Faith Baptist Church	The Sustainability Project	
Green Building Alliance	Vista Del Monte	

Between March and September of 2007, well over 900 City residents attended small group meetings and public workshops. During the public workshops and grassroots meetings, City staff recorded individual comments as precisely as possible in order to fully capture all comments. The comments were then transcribed, compiled and categorized in source documents to create the *Community Input Summary Report* (December 2007). Summaries for each meeting were also made available on the *YouPlanSB.org* Website.

Youth Survey

A youth survey was undertaken to gain input from high school aged members of the community. The survey created an opportunity for youth to express their concerns and ideas about their community. The City Youth Council in collaboration with City staff developed the questions for the Youth Survey. In May 2008, 400 high school students from eight different schools in the City participated in taking the survey. The survey covered the following areas: student information, neighborhoods, things to do-places to go, and transportation. Key findings of the survey related to housing and community are summarized below:

- The need for affordable retail and affordable housing elicited the highest response, which parallels what the larger community has expressed in the *Plan Santa Barbara* process.
- Approximately 56 percent of the respondents did not believe they could afford to live in Santa Barbara.
- The majority (73 percent) of youth responding indicated that they are satisfied with their neighborhood.
- Approximately 29 percent indicated walkability as the most importance aspect of their neighborhood.

Community Workshops and Reports

During the months of June and July 2007, a series of four community workshops were held in different areas of the City. Workshop participants learned about the *Plan Santa Barbara* process through a video and a PowerPoint presentation. Community input was gathered through the following activities:

- As a large group, workshop participants discussed what they loved about Santa Barbara.
- In smaller groups, participants discussed their hopes, concerns, and suggestions related to housing and neighborhoods, transportation, the environment, the economy, community design and services and facilities.
- In a final large group, the participants presented ideas for the City's future.

In the fall of 2007, the *Community Input Summary Report* was published that summarized all the comments received to date from the website, comments cards and workshops.

In April 2008, a *Development Trends Report* was released to the public presenting residential and nonresidential development trends that have occurred in the City between 1990 and 2007. Subsequent to the release of the report and a worksession with the Planning Commission, the City held two public workshops to discuss the overall implications of these trends and potential adjustments to City policies, standards and programs. Approximately 150 participants had the opportunity to focus on questions about future growth, living within our resources, housing, community character and transportation.

In July 2008, a *Policy Options Report* was issued to the public and two community workshops were held to discuss draft policies contained in the report. Draft policies categorized under issue areas raised consistently during the *Plan Santa Barbara* process were presented. These included land use/growth management, community character, housing, transportation, energy and climate change. The workshops involved four different exercises and were attended by over 250 people.

In the fall of 2008, building on the value themes identified in the *Community Input Summary*, as well as community input on the *Development Trends Report*, and the *Policy Options Report*, the draft goals and policies for guiding preparation of the new General Plan were developed. These draft goals and policies were presented within in a sustainability framework for the General Plan entitled the *Draft Policy Preferences* report that City Council accepted in December 2008 for initiating the environmental review process, and further policy development.

In June 2009, two community workshops were held to solicit feedback from the public related to the feasibility of constructing non-subsidized affordable housing units targeted to middle-income and workforce households. A panel discussion with two economists and City staff allowed the community to provide comments and ask questions about the feasibility to increase residential densities in the Downtown area and certain multi-family zones.

Starting in 2009 and culminating in this document, the City undertook several parallel efforts: (1) further development and refinement of the *Sustainability Framework*, goals and policies for the General Plan Update; (2) preparation of the *Land Use Element*; (3) conversion to digital format, update and revision of the *General Plan Map*; and (4) preparation of the 2011 *Housing Element Update*. Additionally, the City prepared and adopted a city-wide programmatic environmental impact report, and drafted an adaptive management program for monitoring the effectiveness of general plan policies.

Work Sessions, Public Hearings and Final Products

In the fall of 2010, the City Council formed the PlanSB Council AdHoc Subcommittee that held 14 meetings to discuss and make recommendations to the full Council on key policy issues in the General Plan.

As of December 2011, forty-six work sessions and public hearings with the Planning Commission and/or the City Council were held to provide information associated with the General Plan Update process. All meetings were treated as public hearings allowing City residents to provide verbal comment or submit written testimony. In addition, meetings were noticed to interested individuals and community groups via email and/or mailed notice.

CITY PROFILE



Photo credit: AMEC, 2009.

This section provides a brief profile of the city of Santa Barbara as an orientation for users of the General Plan. Greater detail on several topics is provided in specific elements or appendices.

Santa Barbara is a small city within a larger unincorporated urban area, along with neighboring cities of Carpinteria and Goleta. The urban area is encircled by open space, be it agriculture, the rugged Santa Ynez Mountains, or the Pacific Ocean. Located on the south coast of Santa Barbara County, the city and area are distinguished by their culture, geography, and climate.

Culture

The high regard with which the Santa Barbara community views the importance of maintaining a continuing program of education and cultural activities for all of its citizens is apparent in their profusion throughout the year. Days are rare indeed that a lecture, theatrical performance, concert or exhibit is not offered to the public. More often than not, there is a choice of several such activities.

In addition there is a broad and many-faceted schedule of participative activities. These are provided by Santa Barbara Community College's Adult Education program and a host of non-profit organizations offering opportunities for the learning and exercising of a variety of arts, skills and subjects. Openings abound for the city's residents to participate to whatever active degree wished in a cultural pursuit of particular interest.

One of the effects of this atmosphere of cultural respect is to make the Santa Barbara area attractive for the establishment of institutions of education and the arts as well as corporate research headquarters. These institutions not only thrive in such an atmosphere, but give back as much or more than they receive, thereby enhancing the reputation of the community as a cultural center. The largest single influence on the community in this field has been the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB). Many of the events provided by UCSB's Arts and Lectures are held in the city. Westmont College and Santa Barbara Community College provide lectures, concerts and theater as well.

Santa Barbara contains numerous performing art venues, including the Arlington Theater, the historic Lobero Theater, the Granada Theater (completely rebuilt in 2008), and an art gallery and small theater in Paseo Nuevo. The Santa Barbara Bowl seats thousands in an outdoor performance space. Classical music lovers have several excellent concert series to choose among. These include the Santa Barbara Symphony, the Santa Barbara Chamber Orchestra and Camerata Pacifica, a small chamber music group. The Music Academy of the West, a summer music school, hosts an annual music festival. The Santa Barbara International Film Festival, begun in 1985, has grown in stature over the years and provides an opportunity for the community to see a wide range of new movies from independent film makers every year.

A number of cultural festivals are celebrated annually at Oak Park that draw hundreds of participants, including the Greek, French and Jewish festivals. Santa Barbara also celebrates its history and its creativity. Two major parades -- the Fiesta Parade and the Summer Solstice Parade -- started as small local events; each now attracts upwards of 100,00 attendees.

The city's fine art, historic and natural history museums continue to grow, refine and expand their collections and facilities. They and many of the musical groups provide special educational programs for children as well as the general population. Santa Barbara's strong support for the arts enriches the lives of all. This community makeup leads to a broad view of the human situation, to engagement in community life and to preservation of what makes Santa Barbara a very special place.

Physical Characteristics

Santa Barbara is prized for many things, but the most basic are the city's setting and climate.

QUICK FACTS: Physical Characteristics			
Area (2009)	Total 44.3 sq. miles; Land 21.75 sq. miles; (13,920 ac); Water		
	22.0 sq. miles		
Elevation	Sea Level to 1,200 ft. (Majority of city is below 300 ft.)		
Length of Coastline	5.75 miles		
Average Temperatures:	(Daily Mean Temperatures)		
Winter	56°		
Summer	71°		
Annual	61°		
Average Rainfall	17.7 inches, annual total (WRCC, 2009)		
Days of Sunshine	220+ sunny days per year (City GP, 1995)		
Foggy Days	Average of 21 heavy fog days per year (WRCC, 2009)		

Geography

Santa Barbara is located at the approximate center of a narrow, coastal shelf which extends in an east-west trending direction for about 25 miles along the South Coast of Santa Barbara County. From the arcing beach containing Stearns Wharf, the oldest portion of the city occupies a basin between the Mesa, standing 300 to 400 feet in elevation on the southwest, and the Santa Ynez Mountains on the northeast and north, that reach just over 4,000 feet at their highest peaks. The city extends up onto both the Mesa and the Santa Ynez foothills reaching a highpoint of approximately 1,200 feet in the foothills. At the base of the Santa Ynez Mountains, the city turns westward into the Goleta Valley.

Approximately eight miles west of the city's main area, a separate 952 acres of land comprises the City's airport, related industrial land, and most of the Goleta Slough.

The city's 5.75-mile shoreline is roughly half maintained beach extending approximately 3 miles east to west, and half narrow or intertidal beaches backed by eroding cliffs that rise up to 60 feet. To the southeast, about 30 miles offshore from Santa Barbara, four of the Channel Islands - Santa Rosa, San Miguel, Santa Cruz and Anacapa - lie parallel to the coast impeding the predominantly southeasterly swell coming in from the Pacific Ocean during the summer months.

Surrounding communities include unincorporated Goleta Valley and Montecito and the cities of Goleta and Carpinteria. The University of California Santa Barbara campus adjoins the airport portion of the city on the west. Ranch and farmland occupy part of the Carpinteria Valley to the east, and north and west of the city of Goleta. Also to the west of the south coast urban area are three major state beach parks: El Capitan, Refugio, and Gaviota. Los Padres National Forest occupies the majority of the upper portion of the Santa Ynez Mountains which forms an imposing backdrop for the entire south coast and the city.

Climate

Santa Barbara's latitude is sufficiently south to be out of the path of most of the Pacific storms which come onto the mainland out of the northwest. At the same time, it is far enough north to receive precipitation from the nearly spent storms which impact the coast of Northern California. This geographic location, combined with the modifying influence of the ocean and the protective encirclement of mountains, hills and islands, compose a mild climate with a mean winter temperature of 56 degrees and a mean summer temperature of 71 degrees with cool nights. With averages of 17.7 inches of rainfall and more than 220 sunny days per year, occasional fogs and the infrequent intrusion of blustering storms out of the less protected southeast, Santa Barbara's climate is as much enjoyed for its diversity as for its equability.

Occasionally, a mass of warm, dry air is pushed over the mountains from the eastern deserts, sweeping into the South Coast for several days at a time. Originally referred to as "Santanas," these "Santa Ana" winds affect most of coastal Southern California during the spring and fall. Locally, the winds are referred to as "sundowners" as they often intensify in the late afternoon or early evening rising in temperature as they come over the mountains down to lower elevations.

Indigenous vegetation is diverse and comprises species that are suited to the Mediterranean climate, adapted to periodic drought and fire. Emblematic species include the coast live oak, sycamore, laurel, toyon, ceanothus, and sages. Indigenous bunch grass species can sometimes still be found, but have long been replaced by European grasses imported since the time of the first explorers and rancheros.

Though scientists have estimated that the California Sierra snow pack has decreased by 10 percent, and sea level has risen by 7 inches in the last 100 years, the impacts of climate change to date for Santa Barbara are not yet known (CA DWR, 2005). It may be necessary to consider future impacts of climate change, not only on the weather, but on existing and new development.

Geology

Santa Barbara occupies the steep lateral ridges and canyons on the south-facing flanks of the Santa Ynez Mountains, the coastal plain at their base that extends to the city's beachfront, and the uplifted marine terrace which forms the Mesa.

The coastal shelf which supports the South Coast urban area of the county, including the city of Santa Barbara, lies within the Santa Barbara Fold Belt, a geological structure containing numerous folds and faults in the marine and alluvial material that was laid down over about 1.6 million years. The folding and faulting is considered the result of movement along the San Andreas Fault which lies 40 miles northwest of the city. Overlying the fold belt for much of the city is marine sedimentary rock. However, Rincon Shale and Monterey Formation rock are found in the foothill areas of the city such as Northridge Road, Mission Canyon, Riviera, as well as the Las Positas Valley. Where these materials combine with steep slopes, there is a higher potential for soil creep, slumps and landslides.

Numerous faults encircle the city. Active or potentially active faults in the Santa Barbara Channel south of the city include the Oak Ridge Fault, North Channel Slope Fault, Red Mountain Fault and the Santa Cruz Island Fault. North of the city in the foothills is the More Ranch Fault, and six miles beyond in the mountains is the Santa Ynez Fault. On the Mesa side are the La Mesa and Lavigia faults, and on the Riviera side are the Mission Ridge Fault Zone and the Lagoon Fault. Needless to say, Santa Barbara has experienced several major earthquakes: in 1806, 1812 and 1852. Since the invention of the seismograph, major quakes include: 1925 (magnitude 6.8); 1941 (magnitude 5.9); 1968 (magnitude 5.2); and 1978 (magnitude 5.1).

Demographic Characteristics

Santa Barbara is the largest city on the South Coast. Its 2000 census population was 89,606, while that of the South Coast was approximately 250,000. Though the entire South Coast Region's population has slowly increased over the last decade, both the U.S. Census Bureau and the State Department of Finance estimate that Santa Barbara's population has remained essentially unchanged since 2000.

QUICK FACTS: Demographic Characteristics of Santa Barbara		
Population (2009 est.)	90,308	
2000 – 2009 Growth Rate	0.8% (< 0.1%/year)	
Median Age (2008)	37.7 years	
Male/Female Ratio (2008)	Male 50.5%; Female 49.5%	
Diversity (2008):		
White	59.9%	
Black	2.1%	
Asian	3.8%	
Native American	0.2%	
Other or multi-racial	1.8%	
Hispanic/Latino	32.1%	
Number of Households (2008)	35,461	
Average Household Size (2008) 2.35		
(Sources: 2006-08 American Communities Survey; DOF, 2009)		

Based on the recent estimates available from the U.S. Census and state Department of Finance, in comparison with 2000 census data Santa Barbara's population has on average aged by about 3 years. The average household size has decreased; it is less diverse ethnically; and it appears the male population has increased disproportionately to the female population.

Historically, the greatest relative growth, took place between 1880 and 1930 where, with the exception of the 1890s, growth averaged about 70 percent each decade, increasing 5-fold in 5 decades to a total of 33,600. Between 1940 and 1970, Santa Barbara's population more than doubled from 34,960 to 70,215, with the greatest population increase of almost 14,000 occurring in the 1950s. Population has increased every decade since 1970, though at slower rates, to the estimated 90,300 for 2009. (DOF, 2009)



Figure 2: History of Population Growth for Santa Barbara, 1880 to 2000

(Source: U.S. Census, 2006-08; DOF, 2009)

The steady growth trend from 1940 to 1990 began to slow throughout the 1990s and may have faltered since 2000. US Census estimates for the inter-census years since 2000 indicate the population may have even dropped throughout the years from 2000 to 2006, then rebounded slightly starting in 2007. Although their estimates for changes in population size and trajectory over the inter-census years differ, both DOF (2009) and the US Census (2006-08) estimate that Santa Barbara's population has been slowly growing again in the last few years. It is too soon to evaluate whether or not this is a sustained trend.

Economic Characteristics

Given the dramatic turns taken by the economy recently, it is extremely difficult to present an accurate economic picture of Santa Barbara at this time. Using the estimates presented in the chart below, the jobs to housing ratio for 2008 was about 1.22 jobs for each housing unit. This could be a reduction from the 2000 ratio of 1.48:1 (U.S. Census, 2000). If the jobs/housing ratio has declined it could be a reflection of the current global recession.

It is worth noting that more than half of Santa Barbara's residents are renters; that two-thirds of them are paying more than 30 percent of their income for housing; and over 50 percent of jobs in the city are in the retail or service sectors of the economy.

QUICK FACTS: Economic Indicators		
Housing Costs		
Dwelling units (2008)	37,720	
Median Home Value (2007)	\$1,000,000.00	
Median Monthly Rent (2007)	\$1,310.00	
Vacancy Rate (2008)	6.0%	
Residents Paying Housing Costs Above Affordable Levels (2007):		
Level for Renters - 30%	61.6%	
Level for Owners 35%	35.2%	
Proportion of Owners to Renters (2008)	Owners 41.3% / Renters	
	58.7%	
Income and Employment	1	
Size of City Workforce (2008)	46,465	
Percent of City Population (+16 yrs old) Employed	63.8%	
Median Income (2009 est.)	\$60,396	
2006-2008 Employment by Industry:		
Agriculture, Fishing, and Mining	.5%	
Construction	6.6	
Manufacturing	6.3	
Transportation, Warehousing, Information, Utilities	5.5	
Retail Trade	10.6	
Wholesale I rade	2.1	
Finance, Insurance, Keal Estate	/.4	
Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative and Waste	177	
Educational Services Health Care and Social Assistance	1/./ 22 /i	
Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation, Food Services	12.4	
Other Services	61	
Public Administration	2.3	
Private wage and Salary workers	74.8	
Government Workers	13.8	
Other (e.g. self-employed)	11.5	
Total Private and Public Sectors	100%	
(Source: American Community Survey, 2007 estimates; ACS 2006-2008)		

In a report on economic conditions prepared for the City in 2009, Strategic Economics offered the following findings:

Santa Barbara's economy is highly reliant on institutional sectors including health, education and government, which are relatively stable and can moderate regional economic fluctuations. This sector which provides higher incomes is expected to grow modestly over the next 20 years.

The tourism industry is also an important part of the economy supporting jobs in retail and hospitality, but is more susceptible to economic fluctuations. Long-term growth projections favor this sector which generates current incomes ranging from \$30,000 to \$40,000 annually.

In 2000, 50,741 residents were in the city's workforce, and over a third of them worked outside the city (The Inter-Regional Partnership for Jobs, Housing and Mobility, Part I, June 2004). Conversely, of approximately 48,000 jobs in the city then, 29,240 (61 percent) were filled by residents and 39 percent filled by commuters from elsewhere. By 2006, only 36 percent of jobs in the city were filled by residents, with another 15 percent residing in communities nearby, including Goleta, Isla Vista, Montecito and Carpinteria. Nearly 50 percent of employees commuted from beyond the South Coast Region. (Strategic Economics, 2009)

In 2000, the household income of residents that worked in the city had a bi-modal profile with the highest concentrations of employees in the highest categories (41 percent earning \$75,000 and above at that time) and a much smaller concentration in the lowest income categories (about 27 percent earning below \$40,000). At that time, the low income threshold was \$37,000 (Strategic Economics, 2009). Inter-census data indicates that this pattern has not changed.

When the economic and demographic information is taken together, one conclusion could be that Santa Barbara is becoming even more of a retirement and vacation community, losing its families with children as well as its resident work force in their prime years, while being replaced by predominantly single males working in the tourism industry, in services and retail positions.

Existing Land Uses

The chart below summarizes the general land uses that comprised the city in 2009. Based on land use, it is evident that Santa Barbara is predominantly a residential city, despite serving as a regional center for government, health, cultural institutions, and tourism. Over 60 percent of land is in residential use. This does exclude the residential portion of mixed-use developments in the Downtown or other commercial areas.

QUICK FACTS: Existing Land Use Summary, 2009		
Land Use	Acres	% of City
Residential – single family	7,587	53.2
Residential – multi-family	1,137	8.0
Commercial	1,096	7.7
Industrial	303	2.1
Institutional	593	4.2
Airport	400	2.8
Open Space/Parks	1,086*	7.6
Circulation	2,052	14.4
TOTAL	14,254	100.0
*This total does not include beaches (which lack parcel definition) and City-owned parkland outside corporate boundaries.		

(Source: City GIS database, 2009.)

The almost 600 acres of institutional uses include such things as schools, hospitals and government buildings. Open space and parks acreage is understated as it includes only publicly provided space within the boundaries of the city (and excluding beaches in the above table). At the current estimated population of 90,308, that equates to about 12 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. Much of this open space is provided by the Goleta Slough and hilly, natural areas.

Greater detail on land use is provided in the Land Use Element.

Annexations

The City of Santa Barbara has grown from a land area of slightly less than four square miles in 1855 to almost 22 square miles of land at present, including the airport. Over the first 100 years of its incorporation, the area of the city grew by huge swaths of land, including: the harbor and shoreline; the Westside; the Eastside, Riviera and Cottage Hospital area; the Mesa; Samarkand and San Roque; the eastern foothills; Veronica Meadows area, and Cater Treatment Plant. All totaled, there have been about 115 annexation proceedings that have expanded the geographic breadth of the city. Since the 1950s, though there have been numerous annexations, only a handful have exceeded 50 acres and few have exceeded 100 acres.

QUICK FACTS: History of Annexations, 1855-2009 (land area only)				
Dates	#	Area	Cumulative (acres)	
Original Charter City	-	~ 4 sq.mi.	2,560.00	
1855 – 1899	1	3,402.60 ac.	5,962.60	
1900 – 1924	4	5,442.60 ac.	11,405.20	
1925 – 1949	7	855.28 ac.	12,260.48	
1950 – 1974	68	2,591.36 ac.	14,851.84	
1975 - 1999	27	138.51 ac. 14,990.35		
2000 - 2009	8	260.67 ac.	15,251.02	
Totals (Approximate land area in sq.mi.)	115	23.83 sq.mi.*		
		Totals (Approximate land area in sq.mi.)		
*Total exceeds 2009 official land area (see Quick Facts for Physical Characteristics above) due to a portion of tidelands included in annexations #2, 1899, and #4 and #5, 1921.				

Over the 160 years since incorporation, the city's land area is more than five times its original size. The constant process of growth involved annexations of parcels of land ranging in size from less than one acre to over 2,000 acres, none over 1,000 acres since 1921. The average annexation has been approximately 130 acres in size. Almost 40 percent have been less than 10 acres in size.

Land Use Introduction

The original General Plan, adopted in 1964, included an extensive history, vision and series of maps, but no formal goals or policies. A General Plan amendment in 1972 resulted in the addition of a section called "Principles and Goals." In the 1970s, the General Plan was amended to include the Open Space and Scenic Highways Elements, which were located within what then became the Land Use Element. In the 1980s, significant goal and policy amendments were incorporated into the Land Use Element, which included: the institution of Charter Section 1507 (sometimes referred to as "Living Within Our Resources"); Charter Section 1508 "Measure E" to manage non-residential growth; the concept of mixed-use development; and strong support and encouragement for the construction of affordable housing.

As noted in the Introduction to the General Plan, the core values underlying "Living Within Our Resources" have evolved into a vision of long-term sustainability. Clearly, maintaining the physical and socio-economic character of Santa Barbara through environmental protection, growth management, mixed-use development, and affordable housing have been found to be consistent with the sustainable principles of equity, environment, and economics. The challenge is finding a balance among these values that can be articulated through policies and ultimately implemented through actions.

Today the Land Use Element contains goals, policies, and implementation actions related to the four topics of Land Use, Growth Management, Community Design, and Neighborhoods. This Introduction provides the context through a discussion of land use history, land use patterns, sustainable development, and the Principles of Development.

LAND USE PATTERNS

The Downtown land use "grid" pattern, which was established in the 1850s by Captain Haley, is still intact today and constitutes the heart of the city. The last major building boom in the 1960s and 1970s produced some of the residential subdivisions and commercial development in the Upper State Street area (once referred to as "Outer" State Street). Since that time, most of the significant physical changes to the urban fabric of the city have been circulation improvements to enhance connectivity, either under or over Highway 101, or beautification projects such as lower State Street.

This basic layout of the city with a downtown grid, one major commercial corridor running north/south (more or less), surrounded by suburban neighborhoods between the ocean and the mountains, is not anticipated to change over the next 20 years. Santa Barbara is now largely a built-out city, with well established neighborhoods, relatively few vacant parcels, and a set of height restrictions and design review requirements that maintain the City's distinct architectural character.

Since 1989 Santa Barbara has also consciously managed the amount of non-residential growth, limiting new development to three million square feet through 2009 and 1.35 million net new square feet through 2030. The effect of this program has been to encourage infill and redevelopment of existing commercial parcels, with a market driven emphasis on mixed residential and commercial projects. The types of mixed-use residential units that have been produced by the market over the last ten years, however, have not been affordable to the majority of the City's workforce.

Santa Barbara's land use and transportation patterns have historically evolved in a sustainable manner with the highest residential densities at the center of the city adjacent to commercial and transit, with concentric rings of lesser and lesser densities. The higher density, multi-family neighborhoods adjacent to the commercial districts, followed by the medium density, duplex neighborhoods, followed by the single family neighborhoods, followed by the hillsides, open space and ocean.

The 2011 General Plan continues to maintain the base residential land use designation of 12 dwelling units per acre for the multi-family and mixed use areas along with an Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program that allows for increased densities in select areas. These densities support land use transitions and buffers through density, building size, and intensity of use. The lowest densities continue to protect the single family neighborhoods, and the highest densities focus the targeted and closely monitored growth on the construction of smaller, more affordable housing units.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

A more sustainable approach to development has many facets, as noted in the Introduction to the General Plan. For Santa Barbara, maintaining its historic, small town character is most definitely part and parcel of a sustainable Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara has a deep appreciation for its historical past, as well as the present day aesthetic of both the built and natural environment. Consequently, urban and historic design regulations, as well as environmental standards and project review are some of the most stringent in the nation.

Santa Barbara's neighborhoods also comprise a significant element of the community character. While most neighborhoods are already well defined, a number of neighborhoods have expressed interest in a more localized, sustainable planning effort. The Sustainable Neighborhoods concept now included in this element has, in fact, already taken root on the Mesa (see Santa Barbara Neighborhood section, Mesa Village sidebar) and will be a key implementation effort in the years to come.

Santa Barbara also has had a long standing commitment to provide affordable housing and maintain socioeconomic diversity within the community. As of 2009, approximately 11 percent of the City's housing stock is affordable for the very-low to moderate income households due, in large part, to Redevelopment Agency funding that sunsets in 2015. Despite this significant achievement, however, the cost of housing has escalated beyond the reach of the middle-income workforce, contributing to a regional jobs/housing imbalance, traffic congestion, and an erosion of the community's socio-economic diversity.

The greatest challenge for Santa Barbara through the year 2030 will be how to encourage both more affordable housing adjacent to transit and commercial activity, and smaller, pedestrian scale buildings that do not exceed available resources to support the targeted level of development. Hence, the following Principles for Development have been established to help meet these challenges.

PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Principles for Development are to further encourage sustainable land use and circulation patterns. Specifically, the principles: focus growth; encourage a mix of land uses; strengthen mobility options and promote healthy, active living.

• *Focus growth* to encourage affordable housing within a quarter mile of frequent transit service and commercial services. Provide incentives to develop affordable housing such as: higher densities, transit resources, parking demand standards, targeted infrastructure improvements, and increased public areas and open space.

- *Encourage a mix of land uses* to include: strong retail and workplace centers, residential living in commercial centers with easy access to grocery stores and recreation, connectivity and civic engagement, and public space for pedestrians.
- *Strengthen mobility options and promote healthy active living* by: linking mixed-use development with transit; encouraging compact, vibrant, walkable places; encouraging the use of bicycles; and reducing the need for parking.

The city's flatter topography in and around the Downtown was historically the first to develop, and where higher residential densities have been built. These areas are also most conducive to walking and biking, and the north/south and east/west axis are well served by transit. The Principles for Development build on these historic patterns.

Housing

New residential development over the next 20 years will provide a relatively modest amount of housing. Given the majority of the City is built-out, the existing single family and multi-family neighborhoods are expected to change very little. In fact, of the approximately 37,720 units on the ground in 2009, the next projected increment of residential growth (estimated to be 2,800 units through 2030) is less than an 8 percent increase in the existing housing stock.

The existing housing stock comprised of single family homes, duplexes, apartments, and condominiums located in established neighborhoods will continue to provide a wide range of housing types. Presumably, the majority of households, of which approximately 60 percent rent and 40 percent own, will continue to utilize this range of housing stock through 2030. For the next 8 percent increment of housing, however, the location and type of housing will be critical in order to further the community's desire to become more sustainable in the long-term. The majority of this new housing is targeted as infill development in the higher density land use designations.

Beyond the Land Use designations that help shape the physical relationship and intensity of land uses, the Housing Element also provides policies and programs to further encourage the construction of workforce and affordable housing, consistent with Principles for Development.

Mobility

One of the tenets of sustainability is to reduce the necessity to drive. Corresponding with that goal, the community has determined that the remaining increment of growth should occur while minimizing congestion. Accordingly, focused growth within the commercial and multi-family districts is oriented toward the availability and use of alternative modes of transportation. Residential growth will be targeted to smaller, more affordable units with less need and capacity for automobile use. Commercial land uses will have incentives for employees to use alternative transportation and disincentives to drive, while customers will be given the most flexibility to drive and park.

Sustainable land use and circulation patterns allow easy walking and biking distances between home and commercial services, transit, open space, and recreation. These patterns also minimize the need to use an automobile. The lifestyle this development pattern encourages is not, nor will be, appropriate for everyone. Smaller, affordable units located in a more urban residential setting, do however, meet an existing community need, and a growing market niche, whether they are young professionals or "downsizing" seniors.

Historic Resources

The protection of Santa Barbara's historic resources continues to be a concern. Indeed, the center of the city that includes the best transit, job, housing, commercial, and walking opportunities, is also the heart of the city's El Pueblo Viejo historic district. The design challenge is to integrate the Principles of Development into each project in such a way that the character of El Pueblo Viejo is not compromised.

Understanding the residential density designations in relation to how a particular project is approved and built is critical to ensuring that the next increment of housing that is constructed is compatible with the existing historic resources. While the Historic Landmarks Commission has broad discretionary authority to make findings that a particular project is compatible or incompatible with the surrounding historic resources, the community is requesting more certainty. Hence, implementation of the General Plan policies will include Design Overlay Areas with new tools to be developed including Floor Area Ratios (FARs) to ensure sympathetic development in historic areas.

The use of Design Overlay areas and FARs will be particularly important adjacent to historic resources. The objective is to more effectively control the size of structures, while also permitting the necessary flexibility to construct the requisite density for affordable units within the building "envelope". These design tools will be used to further design compatibility through pre-established design standards to be applied in some cases, down to the block level.

Furthermore, in June 2011, in response to strong public support for creation of the Historic Resources Element, the City Council authorized the initiation of the preparation of the Historic Resources Element and the formation of the Historic Resources Element Task Force made up of members of the Historic Landmarks Commission, Planning Commission and community representatives.

Land Use Designations

The purpose of land use designations is to identify the planned land uses and residential densities within the city. These designations, when combined with specific locations on the General Plan Map, summarize the community's vision for the physical development of the city.

The land use designations as described below, and reflected on the Land Use Map¹, have remained essentially consistent since the map was last updated in 1975. Changes that have been incorporated into the updated map include an explicit recognition of mixed use; a new Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program, dividing the multi-family and mixed use designations into different densities that allow higher residential densities and smaller units at the city center and other commercial areas; designation title changes (to simplify the organization and improve the ease of use); and a more accurate Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping format to improve implementation consistency. (See General Plan Map on page 61.)

DISTRIBUTION OF LAND USES

The following distribution of land by General Plan land use designations reflects: the predominance of Single Family residential areas (51 percent); followed by Medium to High Density Residential (16 percent); Parks and Open Space (11 percent); Commercial and Office (9 percent); Institutional including public schools (9 percent); Goleta Slough Natural Reserve and Shoreline (4 percent); and Industrial (1 percent).



Figure 3: Land Use Designations

¹ A Land Use diagram (or map) depicting the location and extent of land uses is a required component of a General Plan per Government Code § 65302.

OPEN SPACE

The open spaces in the city from the foothills to the ocean have important physical, social, aesthetic and economic benefits for the enjoyment of the community and visitors. The Open Space land use designation includes four areas, the Shoreline, Parks, Creeks, and the Goleta Slough Natural Reserve. Currently, there are more than 1,800 acres of natural open space, parkland and other recreational facilities.

Other open space areas include recreational facilities, hillsides, as well as private open spaces provided as part of the development of private land uses. The Open Space Element and Environmental Resources Element help protect the character of Santa Barbara through conserving significant open space and natural landforms. The existing Park and Recreation Element addresses the provision of parks and recreational facilities.

Shoreline

The Santa Barbara shoreline is one of the City's most significant and defining public open spaces extending over three miles from the Bird Refuge on the east to the Mesa bluffs on the west. This area includes the public beaches, harbor, and bluffs, and adjacent park areas and is one of the most actively used open spaces in the community. Previous generations, recognizing the inherent importance of the public shoreline, preserved all of the land on the ocean side of Cabrillo Boulevard, as well as the park strip in front of the Double Tree Hotel in City ownership. The expansion of Chase Palm Park, a large community park constructed in 1998, has added recreational open space along this area. The City's Local Coastal Plan and Harbor Master Plan dictate key land use policies for this area.

Parks

The Parks land use designation on the General Plan Map includes public parks, two large privately-owned recreation facilities, Elings Park and the Montecito Country Club, as well as the State owned El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historic Park. The Park and Recreation Element identifies eight classifications of park and recreation facilities: neighborhood parks, community parks, regional parks, special use facilities, golf courses, riding and hiking trails, beaches and bikeways. The categories of park and recreation facilities and allowed uses in the Park and Recreation Zone are also spelled out in the Zoning Ordinance and City Council Resolution.

Creeks

Creeks are recognized as important natural open space corridors within the City. In addition, creeks provide drainage from the mountains and hills to the sea, as well as wildlife habitat and other environmental benefits, and are largely natural in appearance contributing significantly to the aesthetic quality of the City.

There are seven major creeks and primary tributaries within the City. These include Old Mission and Mission Creek, Arroyo Burro Creek, Sycamore Creek, Arroyo Hondo, Lighthouse Creek, Laguna Channel and Cieneguitas Creek. Three additional creeks, Tecolotito, Carneros, and San Pedro are part of the Goleta Slough watershed and traverse Santa Barbara Municipal Airport lands. The Environmental Resources Element includes goals, policies, and implementation strategies related to the creek-side environment.

Goleta Slough Natural Reserve

The Goleta Slough is a 400 acre saltwater marsh located on the Municipal Airport property and is the largest environmentally sensitive habitat in the City's Coastal Zone. The Goleta Slough is designated as Recreation Open Space in the 2003 City of Santa Barbara Coastal Plan for the Airport and Goleta Slough, and ordinances limit use to educational and scientific activities.

HILLSIDE

As of 2009, approximately 6,000 acres or 51 percent of the City is designated primarily for single family residential use. The majority of that land is located in hillside areas. The hillside areas contain three different single family residential designations that range in density from one dwelling unit per acre to three dwelling units per acre. In many cases, parcels are developed at lower densities than the maximum allowed due to the physical slope constraints, high fire risk, and the desire to protect hillside open space and view sheds.

The Slope Density Ordinance is a key implementation tool to regulate and limit residential development of hillside areas. This section of the zoning ordinance applies to creation of lots in the single and two-family zones. It requires that new lots created with a 10 percent or greater slope must provide more lot area than required by the base density and thus provide more open area. The current ordinance requires that lots with a 10 to 20 percent slope provide 1.5 times the lot area, lots with 20 percent to 30 percent slope provide 2 times the lot area, and lots of over 30 percent slope provide 3 times the required lot area.

Environmental Resources goals and policies specifically address hillside protection, conservation of open space, discourage development in high fire areas, and limit development on steep slopes.

Planned Unit Developments and the Planned Residence Developments are two other implementation tools that provide regulatory flexibility in order to preserve hillside areas and open spaces. These tools promote smaller residential lots in conjunction with large open spaces, recreational areas, or commonly owned facilities.

Exceptions to the maximum residential densities are established for affordable housing projects or secondary dwelling units. Though secondary dwelling units are prohibited in the High Fire Hazard Areas, there are some Hillside designations in the single family areas south or south west of the freeway (i.e., the Bel Air and Alta Mesa neighborhoods), where these units could potentially be built.

Low Density Residential (Max 1 du/acre)

The one dwelling unit per acre (du/acre) designation is the most restrictive classification of the single family residential areas in order to preserve the integrity of the hillside environment and protect private property while allowing limited residential use.

There are two areas in the City that are designated as Major Hillsides in the Open Space Element. The first area is the northern foothills in the areas around Lauro Canyon Reservoir, Las Canoas Road, Mountain Drive, and the Sycamore Canyon Road area. The other is in the area of the Miramonte Hill, the area around Escondido and Hilda Ray Parks and the area north of Campanil Hill. Subdivisions in these areas are encouraged to consider a density below one dwelling unit per acre, given the particular topography and characteristics of the land. Densities as low as one dwelling unit for every ten or more acres may be appropriate in some of the areas with steep slopes and/or site constraints.

The one dwelling unit per acre designation compares with the current A-1 One-Family Residence zone classification that requires a minimum of one acre (43,560 feet) per lot.²

² For descriptions of Zoning Classifications see Appendix F.

Low Density Residential (Max 2 du/acre)

The intent of the two dwelling unit per acre designation is to permit slightly higher single family residential densities while still maintaining the hillside open spaces. The Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood, Mission Ridge Road area east of Franceschi Park in the Riviera neighborhood and the recently annexed Veronica Meadows at the end of Alan Road are the areas in the city with this designation. Subdivisions must comply with the land use designation and any corresponding slope density requirements as discussed above.

The two dwelling unit per acre designation compares closely with the existing A-2, One-Family Residence zone classification that requires a minimum of 25,000 square feet of lot area.

Low Density Residential (Max 3 du/acre)

The three dwelling unit per acre designation is the least restrictive hillside single family residential designation in recognition of the historically lower densities in the areas. This designation is found in areas typically surrounded by one and two dwelling units per acre neighborhoods. City neighborhoods that include this designation are Lower Riviera, Eucalyptus Hill, Foothill, Campanil, Bel Air and Alta Mesa.

The three dwelling units per acre designation compares closely with the existing E-1, One-Family Residence Zone classification which requires 15,000 square feet of lot area.

SUBURBAN

The Suburban land use designations reflect those areas that provide a transition between the lower density hillside residential uses and the more urban uses near the Downtown and along the transit corridors. These are areas of primarily lower density residential with some denser locations zoned for duplexes, and are developed with non-conforming apartments.

Low Density Residential (Max 3 du/acre)

The three dwelling units per acre General Plan designation is primarily designed for single family residential units; however, other uses such as recreation, assembly, educational facilities, childcare centers and group homes are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit. Future new development is limited as most of the areas are built out. Neighborhoods that include this General Plan designation are portions of Hidden Valley, and Upper East.

The three dwelling units per acre designation compares closely with the existing E-1, One-Family Residence Zone classification which requires 15,000 square feet of lot area.

Low Density Residential (Max 5 du/acre)

The five dwelling units per acre General Plan designation is primarily designed for single family residential units; however, other uses such as recreation, assembly, education facilities, childcare centers and group homes are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit. Neighborhoods that include this General Plan designation are Hidden Valley, Mesa, Westside, Hitchcock, San Roque and Hope, Eastside, Samarkand, and Foothill.

The five dwelling units per acre designation applies over the following types of zoning classifications: E-2 (10,000 square feet minimum lot area); E-3 (7,500 square feet minimum lot area); and R-1 (6,000 square feet minimum lot area).

Medium Density Residential (12du/acre)

The Medium Density Residential 12 dwelling units per acre designation serves as a transition area between single family areas and the higher density areas of the City. The largest areas are located on the Eastside, Westside, Upper East Valerio Street area, Hidden Valley, Contstance and State, and Hope area. There are also areas around San Remo near Upper State Street, Hitchcock Way, Santa Barbara City College and the Mesa Shopping Center with this land use designation.

This designation is primarily designed to encourage one and two- family dwellings and their accessory uses. Other uses permitted are child care centers, community care facilities, churches, educational facilities, boarding houses, and garden apartments subject to certain Zoning Ordinance requirements. Newly created lots in this classification require a minimum of 7,000 square feet, and allow two dwelling units. A small accessory dwelling unit may be allowed on lots less than 6,000 square feet, under certain conditions, to encourage smaller rental units or multi-generational housing.

The 12 dwelling units per acre land use designation compares to areas of the City that have the R-2, Two-Family Residence Zone classification.

Office Low Impact Research and Development

There are two small areas of the City which have a land use designation of Office Low Impact Research and Development (R&D) with a residential density of three dwelling units per acre. In addition to residential uses, the uses permitted are research and development and related administrative operations, administrative offices, and radio and television transmitting and broadcasting stations.

These two areas are located within residential neighborhoods where a lower level of intensity for nonresidential land uses is desired than what is allowed in a general commercial area. The areas include the properties in and around the Riviera Campus Specific Plan and Miramonte Hill. The specific land uses allowed for the Riviera Campus Specific Plan are outlined in the Zoning Ordinance.

Both of these areas have an overlay zoning designation of C-X, Research and Development and Administrative Office, along with the residential zoning classification of the underlying zone. The area to the west of the Riviera Campus while R-2, Two Family Residence Zone, has a historic General Plan land use designation of three dwelling units per acre, consistent with the Hillside, Low Density Residential surrounding the area. Miramonte Hill has an underlying zone designation of E-1, Single Family Residential, and a General Plan land use designation of three dwelling units per acre which is generally consistent with the surrounding zoning.

GENERAL URBAN

The General Urban land use designations include multi-family, commercial and industrial designations, and are located in areas within and around the Downtown and commercial corridors as shown on the General Plan Map. They include the multi-family Medium High and High Density commercial/residential, as well as those commercial, office, and industrial areas that have historically provided work, recreation, shopping, and increasingly mixed commercial/residential uses. The primary commercial areas include the City's Downtown, Upper State Street, the Milpas Corridor, Coast Village Road, the Waterfront, and a small portion of the Mesa.

The base density of the multi-family and commercial zones (where residential is allowed) has historically been and continues to be a range of 12 - 18 dwelling units per acre. However, one of the main goals of the 2011 General Plan Update is to encourage smaller rental and workforce units close to transit, and easy walking and/or biking distance to commercial services and recreational opportunities.

Land Use and Housing Element policies allow for increased densities under an Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program; the details to be developed in an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. The density incentives allow for a range of density for the Medium/High Density (15-27 dwelling units per acre) and the High Density (28-36 dwelling units per acre) depending on the average size of the units. The Priority Housing Overlay would allow a range of 49 - 63 dwelling units per acre in select areas of the City to encourage rental, employer and co-op housing.

This incentive program would replace the City's Variable Density ordinance in effect at the time of the General Plan Update. This three tier density incentive program, as outlined below, will be implemented on an 8 year "trial basis" after ordinance adoption, or until the construction of 250 units, whichever occurs first. If the Average Unit-size Density Program is allowed to sunset, then the Zoning Ordinance would default to the City's existing Variable Density program based on number of bedrooms in effect as of December 2011 (see Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program Map on page 13).

AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The purpose of an Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program is to encourage smaller, more affordable units through established unit sizes, while allowing flexibility for larger units, which help subsidize the cost of the smaller units. Under this program, there are two multi-family land use designations: Medium-High Residential and High Residential and an additional Priority Housing Overlay. When combined with other uses, such as commercial or office, these residential uses are characterized as mixed-use.

For mixed-use designations, the non-residential portion of a project is calculated independent of the residential density. The amount of non-residential square footage is regulated through the Development Plan Ordinance, and the overall scale and design of the proposed structure (both residential and non-residential) is regulated by Municipal Code and Design Review Process (height, setbacks, parking, etc.), including findings of neighborhood compatibility.

The multi-family residential and mixed-use land use designations calculate residential densities based on average unit sizes. For example, in the Medium High Density designation the range could be from 1,450 square feet project average for the lowest densities to 805 square feet for the highest densities. In the High Density designation, the range could be from 1,245 square feet project average for the lowest densities. In addition, the Priority Housing Overlay could allow additional units above the High Density incentive program if built at 600 square feet.

For each land use designation the target unit size is approximately 1,000 square feet, sufficient to accommodate two bedrooms. In 2009, two bedroom units were the most highly demanded unit type on the market, given the City's historically low 2.35 persons per household demographic (compared to 2.72 for the county and 2.92 for the state), and the financial advantages of joint tenancy or home/office use.

The permitted densities under this incentive program are both minimums and maximums per the respective designation. Larger sized units are permitted within each "average unit size" category, although a corresponding number of smaller units are then required in order to achieve the "average size". Single family homes and multi-family projects that develop at the base density of 12 - 18 dwelling units per acre are exempted from the minimum requirement and are not subject to unit size limitations.

Therefore, the residential density for any given project under this program is calculated by the number of average size units that can fit into the building envelope (or volume of space) that is established by development review standards including design review considerations. The smaller the average size unit, the greater the density up to a maximum of either 27 du/ac under the Medium High Density designation, 36 du/ac under the High Density designation, or 63 du/ac under the Priority Housing Overlay.

Additional density incentives are also available for all affordable projects, on a project-by-project basis consistent with the City's Affordable Housing Policies and Procedures.





Medium-High Density Residential

The Medium-High Density Residential designation applies primarily to the periphery of the Downtown, and commercial corridors. This designation has a base density of 12 -18 dwelling units per acre and principally serves as a transition from the medium density neighborhoods to the commercial centers of the city. A density range of 15 – 27 dwelling units per acre can be allowed under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. This designation applies to areas on the City's Eastside, Lower Riviera, Upper State Street, Westside, Laguna, Oak Park, West Beach and East Beach and reflect multi-family residential land uses. The areas around the Saint Vincent's housing project near Highway 154 also have this land use designation. The designation is consistent with the existing R-3 and R-4, Multiple-Family zoning classifications.

High Density Residential

High Density Residential applies to both multi-family and mixed use designations in the more urban centers, with an allowed base density of 12-18 dwelling units per acre. Higher densities of 28-36 dwelling units per acre are allowed as an incentive to develop the denser housing close to the urban centers. These densities are intended to work in tandem with better transit, and a closer proximity to a wide variety of commercial services, open space, recreation and jobs.

The High Density areas also can permit higher densities of 49 - 63 dwelling units per acre if developed under the Priority Housing Overlay Program and the units are restricted to rental, employer sponsored housing, or cooperative housing. This designation is applied to a portion of the residential parcels in the Downtown area generally between Sola Street, De La Vina Street, the freeway and Haley Street.

This area has historically been developed with denser, multi-family uses, and the land use designation is consistent with the existing R-3 and R-4, Multiple-Family residential zoning classifications.

Hotel/Medium High Density Residential

This land use designation applies to the West Beach neighborhood and the area to the west of Dwight Murphy Field, and the residential base density is 12-18 dwelling units per acre with a range of 15 to 27 dwelling units per acre allowed with the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. These areas are currently developed with denser multi-family uses and a scattering of hotels. The allowed uses are primarily multiple family housing, hotels, and other auxiliary uses primarily for use by hotel guests. The existing zoning classification for this area is R-4, Hotel Multiple Residence Zone.

Ocean Related Commercial/Medium High Density Residential

This designation is applied to much of the hotel and limited residential areas between Cabrillo Boulevard and the freeway, with a residential base density of 12-18 dwelling units per acre with a range of 15 to 27 dwelling units per acre allowed with the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The areas bordering Cabrillo and Castillo Street do not allow residential uses and allow primarily hotels and motels as well as other auxiliary uses for hotel guests. Where residential is permitted, there must be a mix of 70 percent residential and 30 percent ocean related. These uses are consistent with the City's Local Coastal Program.

The existing zoning varies between HRC-1, HRC-2 (Hotel and Related Commerce Zones) and O-C (Ocean-Related Commercial) and includes multi-family and hotel and related uses. The area below the railroad tracks in what has become known as the "funk zone" is zoned for primarily ocean dependent and ocean oriented uses, commercial recreational uses, arts and related uses, restaurants, and small stores. The Cabrillo Plaza project Specific Plan, also in this area, could add housing and commercial space to this area.

Office/Medium Density Residential

The Office/Medium Density Residential designation is characterized by office and medical office uses primarily in the Cottage Hospital area and a few pockets on the Mesa and on Upper State Street that have a zoning classification of R-O, Restricted Office. The Medium Residential Density designation permits 12 du/ac. Due to their location near either low or medium density neighborhoods, the Medium Density designation is consistent with historical allowed densities.

Existing zoning classifications for these areas are C-O, Medical Office and R-O, Restricted Office.

Office/High Density Residential

The Office/High Density Residential designation is characterized by office and multi-family residential uses. The High Density Residential designation has an allowed base density of 12-18 dwelling units per acre. A higher density of 28 to 36 dwelling units per acre is allowed as an incentive to develop the denser housing close to the urban centers. Areas of the city with this designation are areas along the southwest side of Garden Street between Carrillo Street and Victoria Street which have a mix of office, multi-family residential, and institutional uses, and in the area of Anacapa Street and Sola Street.

The Office/High Density Residential areas also can permit higher densities of 49 - 63 dwelling units per acre if developed under the Priority Housing Overlay Program and the units are restricted to rental, employer sponsored housing, or cooperative housing.

Existing zoning classifications for these areas are C-2, Commercial, R-O, Restricted Office, and R-3, Multiple-Family Residence which would be appropriate for a rezone to commercial zone in the future.

Commercial/Medium High Density Residential

The Commercial/Medium-High Density land use designation generally applies to commercial neighborhood serving centers historically located within residential areas. The Medium-High Residential Density designation permits a base density of 12-18 dwelling units per acre. A range of 15 to 27 dwelling units per acre is allowed with the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. Some of the areas with this land use designation include State Street (from Haley Street to just past Mission Street) and approximately 14 blocks of El Pueblo Viejo Downtown where many historic resources are located, including El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historic Park; Salinas Street on the Eastside; the Mesa shopping areas; San Andres and Carrillo Street on the Westside; major portions of Upper State Street; and the Coast Village area. An area along Carrillo Street near the Santa Barbara High School also includes this designation.

The allowed land uses in these areas include residential, office, service shops, grocery stores, restaurants, banks, dry cleaners, childcare centers, pet shops, repair shops, and various other neighborhood/commercial serving businesses. These neighborhood and commercial service centers provide easy access to goods and services and help improve the livability and sustainability in areas with a high concentration of residential uses. As the Sustainable Neighborhood Plans develop, additional areas may be needed with this land use category and corresponding zoning.

This designation generally has an existing zoning classification of C-P, Restricted Commercial, and is more restrictive in height and setback standards than the general commercial areas, given the proximity of the surrounding residential uses. Areas of Downtown, Upper State, Coast Village Road and Carrillo Street currently have C-2, C-1 or other commercial zones.

Commercial/High Density Residential

The Commercial/High Density Residential designation serves some of the general commercial areas of the City that are located along and/or near the major transit corridors. The areas include the south side of Upper State Street (La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area), a portion along Milpas Street, and various areas in and around the Downtown center. The High Density Residential designation permits an allowed base density of 12-18 dwelling units per acre. A higher density of 28 to 36 dwelling units per acre is allowed as an incentive to develop the denser housing close to the urban centers. An exception is the area of Downtown that includes a large number of historic resources which have a Commercial/Medium High Density Residential designation.

The Commercial High Density Residential areas also permit higher densities of 49 - 63 dwelling units per acre if developed under the Priority Housing Overlay incentive program and the units are restricted to rental, employer sponsored housing, or cooperative housing.

The City's Downtown is the most concentrated and intensively used district of the City, and because most of these areas are general commercial, the widest range of commercial uses is permitted. City policies also promote the highest residential densities to encourage affordable housing that is close to transit, employment, shopping, cultural, recreational, and governmental facilities.

Commercial Industrial/Medium High Density Residential

The Commercial Industrial designation area is bound by Ortega, Haley, Anacapa and Quarantina streets. This designation allows a wide variety of uses including manufacturing, automotive repair, office, retail, and residential. Many of the historic uses in this area provide essential services for the functioning of the city. This area currently has a zoning classification of C-M, Commercial Manufacturing Zone.

The General Plan recognizes the need for light industrial and manufacturing uses given that many of the businesses that could be displaced are local, in some cases one of a kind, and provide vital services to the community. This area has a base residential designation of 12-18 dwelling units per acre. The Medium-High Density allows also allows a range of 15 - 27 du/acre under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. To minimize the amount of market residential or displacement of light industrial and manufacturing sites with housing, the policies to allow additional densities for market rate rental housing would not apply in this area, however, higher densities could be allowed under the Priority Housing Overlay incentive program for rental, employer sponsored housing, or cooperative housing. Additional densities under the City's Affordable Housing Policies and Procedures could still be considered.

Industrial

The General Urban, Industrial designation includes the area generally bound by Haley, Cacique, Milpas and Garden Streets. These industrial areas encompass approximately 120 acres and permit all land uses with the exception of residential which is specifically prohibited. The area historically included a variety of manufacturing and industrial uses including: a garbage, waste management and recycling facility; a concrete business; open yard uses; and others. This area is zoned M-1, Light Manufacturing.

The General Plan supports having an industrial area dedicated to industrial uses which provide vital services to the community as well as areas of the South Coast. The General Plan supports narrowing the range of commercial uses in the industrial area, in order to mitigate the potential increase in land costs and the associated displacement of heavier industrial uses. Commercial and office uses are thereby narrowed to those that are ancillary to industrial uses.

Ocean Related Industrial

The Ocean Related Industrial designation covers the industrial area below the freeway between Calle Cesar Chavez and Garden Streets, where the El Estero Wastewater Treatment plant is located. Uses permitted are defined as ocean dependent and related industrial, in close proximity to the Harbor/Wharf complex. Industrial uses compatible with ocean dependent or ocean related uses are also allowed with a Conditional Use Permit. In addition, ocean related uses may be deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission. Wastewater/sanitation treatment facilities and other essential public service facilities owned and operated by the City are also permitted. This area is zoned OM-1, Ocean-Oriented Light Manufacturing.

INSTITUTIONAL AND RELATED

The Institutional and Related designation provides for public facilities and private and/or non-profit uses which offer public services to the community. Uses include, but are not limited to schools, libraries, hospitals, government offices, water treatment plants, reservoirs, the harbor and the municipal airport. These land uses are specifically identified on the General Plan Map.

Institutional

There are a number of public facilities throughout the City that provide important public services. These are allowed uses in most commercial zones and allowed with a Conditional Use Permit when located in a residential zone.

Among the public buildings are: City Hall, the police station, seven fire stations, parks and recreation facilities, libraries, waste water treatment facilities, reservoirs, harbor facilities, etc. Many other County, State, and Federally owned institutions are located in the Downtown and surrounding area (e.g., County Courthouse). The General Plan recognizes the Downtown's importance as a major governmental activity center for the City and the South Coast. This close proximity of governmental uses is encouraged as it allows greater interaction between all levels of government and best serves the public as more residential uses are built in and around the Downtown.

Hospital

Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital, located in the Oak Park neighborhood of the City, is one of the largest acute care teaching hospitals between Los Angeles and San Francisco. As of 2009, the hospital has 408 beds, annual admission of more than 19,000 patients, 40,000 emergency department visits, and over 2,800 births. The main hospital building is bounded by Bath, Oak Park Lane, Pueblo and Junipero streets with parking and other structures also on Bath and Pueblo streets.

In 2005 a Specific Plan was adopted for a Hospital Zone, which allows uses including a general acute care hospital facility and other related uses including: parking structures, gift stores, ATM facilities, restaurants, retail or personal service shops, and childcare facilities. A major reconstruction project began in 2007 and is scheduled to be completed by 2013, with later phases anticipated.

Public School Districts

Public schools and related uses located in the City of Santa Barbara are part of the Santa Barbara Elementary School District, Santa Barbara Secondary School District, and the Hope School District. Santa Barbara City College is also a major educational facility in the City.

The Santa Barbara School Districts consist of two separate district boundaries: an elementary district and high school district. The elementary district covers approximately 22 square miles located within the City. The high school district service area covers approximately 136 square miles located within the City, and the surrounding metropolitan areas from Montecito to Goleta. There are also a number of private elementary schools, high schools, trade schools, and colleges located throughout the City.

The Santa Barbara School District and the City Parks and Recreation Departments often share facilities through a joint use agreement which extends through 2012. The agreement calls for the two agencies to cooperatively plan the development and maintenance of specific schools, recreational areas, and facilities.

Public schools within City limits include (also see the General Plan Map page 61):

(Ganta Darbara Elementary School District)		
School Facility	Size of Site (Acres)	
Adams	10	
Adelante Charter *		
Cleveland	8.5	
Franklin	10.7	
Harding	5.1	
McKinley	10.6	
Monroe	9.85	
Open Alternative**		
Peabody Charter	6.8	
Roosevelt 4.1		
Santa Barbara Community Academy***		
Santa Barbara Charter****		
Washington 8.2		
0.2		
*Located at Franklin Elementary School		
**Located at La Colina Jr. High School		
***Located at La Cumbre Jr. High School		
****Located at Goleta Vallev Ir. High School		
Sources: Santa Ranhara School Districts 2003 Facilities Master		
Dlan Santa Ranhana School Districts, 2005 I utilities Master Dlan II.		
December 2007, SRCEO 2000		
Located at La Cumbre Jr. High School *Located at Goleta Valley Jr. High School Sources: Santa Barbara School Districts, 2003 Facilities Master Plan; Santa Barbara School Districts Facilities Master Plan Update, December 2007: SBCEO 2009		

Table LU-1:	Santa Barbara	Elementary Schools
(Santa Barl	bara Elementar	ry School District)

There are two additional public schools located within city boundaries that are not part of the Santa Barbara School District. These are located in the Hope School District and include Hope and Monte Vista schools.

(Hope District)		
School Facility Size of Site (Acro		
Hope	8.3	
Monte Vista	8.6	

Table LU-3: Santa Barbara Elementary Schools

Table LU-2:	Santa Barbara Secondary Schools
(Sant	a Barbara School District)

School Facility	Size of Site (Acres)	
La Colina Jr. High	29	
La Cuesta Continuation High*		
La Cumbre Middle School	22	
Las Alturas Continuation High**		
Santa Barbara Charter Middle***		
Santa Barbara Junior High	709	
Santa Barbara High School	40	
*La Cuesta students attend class in various locations including		
Downtown, and Santa Barbara City College.		
**Located on the La Colina Jr. High Campus.		
***Located on the Goleta Valley Jr. High Campus		
Sources: Santa Barbara School Districts, 2003 Facilities		
Master Plan; Santa Barbara School Districts Facilities Master		
Plan Update, December 2007; SBCEO 2009		

There is currently no public elementary school located Downtown. The projected increase in residential density particularly within the Downtown could increase student populations and the need for a Downtown elementary school. A public school would most logically be within the Santa Barbara School District.

Santa Barbara City College

The Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) is a community college that serves the south coast of Santa Barbara County. SBCC is renowned as one of the leading two year colleges in California and in the nation. In 2009 the college had an enrollment of over 20,000 students with over 7,500 full time students. It is located on a 74 acre site. In addition, the Schott Continuing Education Center located near Cottage Hospital and the Wake Center (in an unincorporated area of Goleta) offer a comprehensive, non-credit program with an enrollment of over 43,000 people.

SBCC is located in the Coastal Zone and any development or new uses are subject to approval by the California Coastal Commission.

Harbor-Stearns Wharf

The City's Harbor-Stearns Wharf area encompasses about 252 acres with about two thirds of the area being water and one third being land. Since the original General Plan was adopted in 1964, the Local Coastal Plan and the Harbor Master Plan have been adopted and now guide development in these areas. Coastal Act policies mandate public access to the coast and give priority to ocean dependent and related uses; the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP) applies these statewide polices and tailors them to Santa Barbara. Similarly, the Harbor Master Plan is consistent with the Coastal Act in describing its mission that the Harbor be a working harbor with priority given to ocean dependent uses and that Stearns Wharf consist of a mixture of visitor serving and ocean dependent and ocean related uses.

This area is currently zoned HC Harbor Commercial Zone, which specifies the primary (ocean dependent), and secondary (ocean related and visitor serving) uses for both the Harbor and Stearns Wharf.

Airport

The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is owned and operated by the City and is the largest commercial service airport between San Jose and Los Angeles. It serves approximately 750,000 passengers and handles approximately 23,000 commercial service arrivals and departures annually.

The property consists of approximately 950 acres with 400 acres dedicated to aviation uses, 100 acres dedicated to commercial/industrial uses, and 450 acres of Goleta Slough Ecological Reserve. In the late 90s, the City completed the Airport Master Plan for all 950 acres of Airport Property. The Master Plan consists of two parts: the Aviation Facilities Plan and the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan. The Aviation Facilities Plan covers the part of the Airport that is focused on air transportation activities, including the Airline Terminal, the runways, taxiways and related facilities.

The Airport Specific Plan covers the uses allowed in the areas north and south of Hollister. The Airport lands along the south side of Hollister are located in the Coastal Zone. Uses allowed for specific areas are dictated by policies and regulations of the Coastal Act, Local Coastal Plan, the Aviation Facilities Plan, the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan, and the Zoning Ordinance.
Airport Specific Plan

The Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan (1998) encompasses approximately 225 acres and is located along the north and south sides of Hollister Avenue. This area includes both aviation and non-aviation related uses and activities. The overall purpose of the Specific Plan is to identify appropriate land uses and locations where implementation will assist in revenue generation for the Airport's operation, maintenance and capital improvements.

The Specific Plan includes a large range of policies as well as the land uses that apply to this area. The Airport Specific Plan Land Use Map (1998) calls for the area north of Hollister Avenue to be developed with Light Industrial (including Open Yard Uses), Commercial, Entertainment, Golf Course, Park and Open Space (along the creeks). The area south of Hollister Avenue calls for: Existing Aviation Related Uses, Proposed Aviation Related Uses, Public/Institutional, and Open Space (Goleta Slough and along the creeks).



Growth Management

Future growth from 2011 to 2030 will be carefully managed, with priority given to the development of affordable housing. Updating Charter Section 1508 and the city's non-residential growth management program, was one of the key objectives of the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update process. Early-on in that process, affordable housing was found to be the number one resource allocation priority among both residential and non-residential land uses competing for future resources. Equally as important, an Adaptive Management Program (AMP) was identified as a critical means to ensure development does not exceed available resources over the lifetime of the plan.

Growth management policies will now help to pace both non-residential and residential land use development. The availability of resources such as water, wastewater treatment capacity, and other key infrastructure will be closely monitored in relation to specific resource objectives and thresholds. The community has identified initial growth constraints for both land use sectors based on what is known regarding key resource availability as of 2009.

The 2010 Environmental Impact Report for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update analysis, among other sources, establishes a number of resource baselines to determine the starting points for this planning period. For each of the AMP objectives, specific reporting deadlines provide the opportunity to gauge progress towards meeting the respective objective and the ability to readjust the objective as necessary. In addition, as new resource data becomes available, such as updates to the Water Master Plan, the objectives can be amended accordingly.

NON-RESIDENTIAL

With the adoption of the 2011 General Plan Update, the maximum allowable non-residential square footage through the year 2030 was set at 1.35 million net new square feet for the entire City. Once the Development Plan Ordinance is amended, the total net new square footage will be allocated among Vacant Property, Small Additions, and Community Benefit Development categories. Approved projects, pending projects, minor additions, government buildings and replacement of existing square footage would be exempt from the 1.35 million square feet.

Under Charter Section 1508, a Community Priority project has historically been one that City Council finds is needed to satisfy a present or projected need directly related to public health, safety or general welfare, such as parks and recreation facilities; community centers; educational institutions; cultural and arts facilities; youth development programs and childcare facilities; and community gardens and urban farming. At the time the Development Plan ordinance is amended, this category will be broadened and prioritized to include Community Benefit including Economic Development, "Green" Economic Development; Small and Local Business; and Development for Special Needs. These categories are more fully defined in the Goals and Policies section.

RESIDENTIAL

The 2011 Housing Element (for the planning period 2007-2014) estimates the city's potential residential build-out capacity to be 6,808³ units, with the majority of the development occurring in the commercial and multi-family zones.

The 2010 Program Environmental Impact Report for *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update estimates there are sufficient resources available to accommodate up to 4,803 new residential units. The historical trend for the 18 years preceding the 2010 *Plan Santa Barbara* Environmental Impact Report has been approximately 151 units a year; thus, a 20 year projection based on this trend would equal a total of approximately 3,020 units. With the adoption of the 2011 General Plan Update, monitoring resource capacities and assessment objectives and standards set through the Adaptive Management Program will occur.

³ Number of units determined as part of the Suitable Sites Inventory of the Housing Element.

Community Design

What constitutes Santa Barbara's physical character? It is its street layout, and how its buildings and structures relate to the city's setting of mountains, hills and coastline, and to each other. It is the scale, thematic architecture and historic sites of the Downtown. It is its public open spaces and landscaping. It is its distinctive architecture and neighborhoods. Community Design considerations focus on what people see, and how they experience the interrelationship between buildings, the city's setting, and public spaces, be these streets, sidewalks, parks and parkways, plazas or paseos.

Part of being a sustainable community is preserving, enhancing, and building on the desirable qualities enshrined in existing private and public land uses. Preservation and adaptive reuse combined with energy efficiency can benefit the environment. These considerations are addressed in the Environmental Resources Element and Historic Resources Element policies. From the perspective of design, enhancing public spaces can increase pleasure, health and economic benefits for people using these spaces. Focusing not only on the quality and character of buildings, but also on their relationships to each other and to their public access is critical to Santa Barbara's identity.

Santa Barbara has many examples of successful public spaces: In the Downtown, State Street and the many paseos, such as El Paseo, Paseo Nuevo and La Arcada, are places where there is a continuity between buildings and public access-ways; the waterfront where beach-goers, strollers, bicyclists and drivers experience the continuum from mountains, to town, to beach, to ocean; the Presidio whose restored "punctured" walls allow drivers and pedestrians to move in and out of history. These parts of the city provide their users with multiple ways to experience them and multiple reasons to be there.

Successful mixed-use areas provide many reasons for people to be there as well: residents, workers, shoppers, and visitors, whether as drivers, pedestrians, transit users, or bicyclists will linger and return not only for different purposes, but because the public space is inviting, entertaining, safe and visually pleasing.

During the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update process, the City and community explored new approaches and measures, and existing processes and requirements, in order to preserve and enhance Santa Barbara's visual character, while attaining an acceptable balance with sustainability goals.

For Community Design the City's visual achievements will be retained through a combination of new and old planning tools.

DESIGN REVIEW

The mainstay of community design is the City's design review process and the roles played by the Architectural Board of Review, the Historic Landmarks Commission, the Single Family Design Board and the Sign Committee. This review process increasingly has a broader perspective beyond simply the buildings and the landscaping, to include the relationship of a project to the streetscape and how it influences a person's use of the adjoining public space, be they driving, walking or bicycling, or sitting on a park bench or at a sidewalk cafe. Importantly, a proposed project's relationship to adjoining or nearby historic resources, including public views to and from these resources, will continue to require careful consideration.

To help achieve this expanded review, new approaches including Floor Area to Lot Area Ratios (FARs) will be applied in combination with existing tools.

REGULATORY ORDINANCES

There are a number of tools that apply to land use development in the city and that help shape community character. These include: standards that apply based on zoning designations, district or land use; design guidelines that guide the aesthetic quality of the built environment; and, plans that dictate allowed land uses and regulations of an area. Many of these are either incorporated in or provided in support of regulations included in several ordinances.

The following is a summary of some of the main existing ordinances.

The Zoning Ordinance

The City's Zoning Ordinance establishes the zone classifications and districts and regulates therein the use of property within the city. The Zoning Ordinance defines the development regulations for existing and future growth in the different zone classifications while serving the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the community. It includes standards for allowed uses, range of densities, setbacks, open space, parking and landscaping requirements, etc., and the process by which development can proceed while implementing General Plan goals and policies. Amendments to the existing zoning ordinance will be necessary to make it consistent with the land use designations and policies adopted as part of the *Plan Santa Barbara* process.

Mixed Use Standards

Due to the City's pyramid zoning, which allows residential use in most commercial zones, and policies and programs that strongly support mixed use and housing along commercial corridors, the character of some of the traditional service area and commercial neighborhoods has been changing. The zoning ordinance currently allows for parking reductions and setback variations when a mixed use development on a site is proposed. Further regulation of mixed use projects to improve standards such as size, bulk and scale considerations, variable setbacks and open space, will be developed through new land use policies and implementation actions.

The Subdivision Ordinance

The City's subdivision ordinance carries out the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and regulates the design and improvement of the subdivision of land. The ordinance establishes public improvement standards and mandates consistency with the General Plan. The ordinance is applied to the subdivision of land, new condominiums and condo conversions in the city. Since there are few large remaining undeveloped parcels in the City, land that is subdivided physically into more than 2-4 single family lots is rare. In recent years, the opposite of subdividing has occurred with the combination of smaller lots in older neighborhoods and in some hillside areas.

Project Compatibility Analysis

Because neighborhood compatibility is very important, the City adopted in 2008 the Project Compatibility Analysis Ordinance for projects subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission, Staff Hearing Officer, Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC), and Architectural Board of Review (ABR).

The ordinance serves as an analytical tool to carefully consider possible size, bulk, scale and height issues with any proposed development and to help preserve the historic character of certain areas of the City. One of the key considerations of the ordinance is compatibility of the project with the architectural qualities, characteristics, and size, mass, bulk and scale of the surrounding development.

Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance

The Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance (NPO) requires neighborhood preservation findings for proposed new multi-story residences or major alterations to single family residential projects and residences located in the Hillside Design District. The purpose of the NPO is to ensure neighborhood compatibility while meeting the needs and expectations of the community for single family and hillside areas. Either the Single Family Design Board, Historic Landmarks Commission or, occasionally, the Planning Commission are charged with implementing the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

While permitted land uses are designated in the Land Use Element and the Zoning Ordinance, the character of a neighborhood is largely defined by design features of the built environment and physical characteristics of the surrounding geography. New developments are subject to a number of city guidelines that are used to evaluate the physical design of an individual project. Some apply to development city-wide; others to specifically delineated districts.

- Architectural Board of Review Guidelines
- Chapala Street Guidelines
- El Pueblo Viejo District Guidelines
- Haley-Milpas Design Guidelines
- Harbor Master Plan Design Guidelines
- Lower Riviera Special Design District Guidelines
- Outdoor Lighting Design Guidelines
- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Single Family Residence Design Guidelines
- State Street Landscaping Guidelines
- Upper State Street Guidelines
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Waterfront Area Design Guidelines

Design Guidelines in the future may include Design Overlay areas and Floor Area Ratios (FARs) that will more effectively control the size of structures.

DESIGN DISTRICTS

Since the adoption of the General Plan in the 1960s, a number of design and development districts have been created. The existing guidelines that pertain to these districts affect the character of the various districts and neighborhoods of the city. Districts have been formed for various purposes including: historic and neighborhood character preservation; compatibility of single family homes and considerations for hillsides and open spaces; and urban design and circulation. While standards are the rules a development must adhere to, the guidelines are what guide the design review boards (and/or Planning Commission and City Council) in reviewing the design, size, and site layout of a development.

A brief description of these important districts and guidelines follows:

El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District

The oldest design district in Santa Barbara is El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District adopted in 1960 and encompassing a 16-block area, the approximate site of the original pueblo. Since then El Pueblo Viejo District boundaries have expanded to include gateways into the city, and both sides of Cabrillo Boulevard. El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District Part II was established to include an area around the Mission with the goal of preserving the Mission's historic architecture and setting, the Museum of Natural History, the Mission Historical Park, and nearby residential and institutional properties.

The purpose of El Pueblo Viejo is to preserve and enhance the unique heritage and architectural character of the central area of the city which contains many of the city's important historic and architectural landmarks while allowing reasonable development. Due to the sensitivity and importance of the area and heritage resources throughout the community, the *Plan Santa Barbara* process identified the need for a separate Historic Resources Element as part of the city's General Plan.

Two other districts with important historical architectural character include the Brinkerhoff Avenue Landmark District and the Riviera Campus Historic District. The Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) is charged with the design review in these areas along with Part 1 and II of El Pueblo Viejo.

The Bungalow District

The Lower Riviera Survey Area Bungalow District is specifically defined in the zoning ordinance and generally is the area bound by East Arrellaga Street, Laguna Street, East Victoria Street and Alta Vista Road. This district was created in 2007 to preserve those examples of Bungalow or Arts and Crafts style residential buildings appropriate for historical preservation. All applications to demolish or develop in the Bungalow District are subject to review by the ABR and require special findings including that the development will not substantially diminish the unique architectural style and character of the Bungalow District as a residential neighborhood of the City.

Hillside Design District

The Hillside Design District covers three large areas of the City which are generally located north of Foothill Road; the Cielito, Riviera and Eucalyptus Hill area; and the Mesa and Campanil areas. These are areas that generally have average slopes of 20 percent or greater. Applications to construct or alter a single family residence in the Hillside Design District are subject to review by the Single Family Design Board or ABR and are subject to the Single Family Design Guidelines.

Upper State Street

The Upper State Street Area is a distinct area of the City where commercial corridor development patterns have evolved adjacent to residential neighborhoods. There are development plan requirements (e.g., building heights and front yard setbacks) and findings for development within the Upper State Street Area. The area has a variety of architectural styles, and there is a community desire for it to possess its own identity within the context of Santa Barbara's character.

In 2009, the Special Upper State Street guidelines were developed to carry forward the results of the City Council's 2007 Upper State Street Study (USSS) recommendations and to help implement the goals and objectives outlined in the Study. The purpose of the guidelines is to provide additional direction for how property owners, both public and private, can make improvements to their properties to collectively improve the visual character and circulation of the Upper State Street area. The ABR is charged with the design review of commercial or multi-family development in Upper State Street.

SPECIAL USE DISTRICTS

Redevelopment Area

In August 1977, the Santa Barbara Redevelopment Project was adopted. The Redevelopment Plan for the Santa Barbara Central City Redevelopment Project sets forth the policies and standards against which future Agency activities should be evaluated. The Redevelopment Area covers the Downtown, West Downtown, Lower State, West Beach, Waterfront and East Beach neighborhoods. If the Agency sunsets in 2015, as is presently scheduled, the 2010-2014 Implementation Plan would be the last full, five-year plan for the Project Area.

The purpose of the plan is for cultural and economic development in the Plan area to bring desirable activity to the area, resulting in increased tax increment and greater patronage of stores, restaurants, and hotels in the area. Increased vitality will reduce and forestall the blight associated with building vacancies and declining retail sales, especially within the City's Cultural Arts District. Some of the results have been affordable housing Downtown, improvements to lower State Street, State Street sidewalk and landscaping enhancements, Paseo Nuevo, and public art. The Redevelopment Agency implements projects in this area.

City's Cultural Arts District

The City's Cultural Arts District is informally recognized as the area bounded by Carrillo Street, Micheltorena, Anacapa and Chapala Streets as well as surrounding areas and includes such venues as the Arlington Theater, the newly renovated Granada Theater, the Victoria Theater, and Santa Barbara Art Museum. The City recognizes the importance of enhancing the cultural arts venues and preserving the vibrant arts community within the Redevelopment Project Area. The purpose of supporting venues, facilities, events, and public artwork within the cultural arts district is to benefit the community culturally, socially, and economically. The Redevelopment Agency implements projects in this area.

Waterfront/Harbor

Keeping the Downtown connected to the waterfront and maintaining open access and appropriate land uses in the coastal zone of the city is a high priority. The goals and policies for the waterfront, shoreline and harbor are carried out through the State Coastal Act, the City's Local Coastal Plan and the Harbor Master Plan.

Since the adoption of the original General Plan, the Coastal Act was passed in 1976. Subsequently, in 1981, the City of Santa Barbara Local Coastal Plan was adopted. The City's Harbor Master Plan was adopted in 1996 with the main goal of providing for primary ocean dependent uses, such as commercial fishing and recreation boating and for secondary uses such as ocean related and visitor serving uses in the Harbor and Stearns Wharf area.

The waterfront area is uniquely important to the economic base of the City and plays a major role in setting the character and quality of the community. The City is fortunate in that previous generations, recognizing the inherent importance of the shoreline to the City as a whole, have preserved all of the land on the ocean side of Cabrillo Boulevard in City ownership.

Airport

The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, located approximately eight miles away from the City, is the largest commercial service airport on the California coast between San Jose and Los Angeles. The City has owned and managed the airport since 1942. The airport provides a variety of aviation services and is also a major economic benefit to the South Coast.

The Airport Facilities Plan (AFP) regulates the commercial operations south of Hollister. Land development and uses on the south side of Hollister must be consistent with the AFP and the Local Coastal Plan as well as the Goleta Slough Reserve regulations.

The Airport Specific Plan, adopted in 1998, encompasses 225.2 acres of Airport property located along the north and south sides of Hollister Avenue. The overall purpose of the Specific Plan is to identify appropriate land uses and locations where implementation will assist in revenue generation for the Airport's operation, maintenance and capital improvements. The Specific Plan includes all the policies and actions for the commercial/industrial uses for the area.

The ABR is charged with design review of these areas.

Santa Barbara's Neighborhoods

BACKGROUND

The residents of Santa Barbara place a high value on the quality of life and unique desirability of the city, with a key component being the character of the neighborhoods. Protecting, preserving and improving neighborhood character will be critical as development changes occur over the next 20 years. This section discusses some of the desired neighborhood qualities identified through the *Plan Santa Barbara* process, common neighborhood issues, and some initial grass roots neighborhood planning efforts. New policies are intended to facilitate a pattern of more sustainable neighborhoods and encourage grass root efforts.

DESIRED NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITIES

In 2007, as part of the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update process, extensive community input was received on a variety of topics including what neighborhood qualities should be preserved or enhanced. A number of common neighborhood qualities were expressed that are pertinent to many, if not all, including the following:

- A sense of place and a small town and intimate scale feeling, particularly in the single family, older established neighborhoods, and historical districts;
- Development where the size and scale is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood;
- Preservation of the historic and aesthetic character;
- Sustainable with local serving uses for the daily needs of its residents within walking, biking or bus distance;
- Physical connectivity between neighborhoods and services for less reliance on the automobile for daily needs;
- Convenient access to affordable and healthy food;
- Open space on-site as infill areas are developed, especially in the commercial districts where minimal setbacks or open space are currently required;
- Protection, and when possible, enhancement of the common open space and gathering areas in a neighborhood;
- A local community center;
- A pedestrian friendly and safe environment;
- Rental housing to serve the majority of people that are renters in our community;
- Enjoyment of the City's natural features (beaches, ocean, mountains, creeks, etc,) scenic beauties and views;
- A diverse social, economic, and cultural population (and facilities).

The Land Use Element goals, policies and implementation actions closely reflect these desired neighborhood qualities and strive to further enhance existing neighborhoods in a more sustainable manner. While the low density character of single and two-family neighborhoods will be maintained, future actions are aimed at ensuring all multi-family neighborhoods are pedestrian and bike friendly, well served by transit, and have ready access to open space and recreational opportunities.

NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

The City is currently comprised of 32 different neighborhoods (page 33), of which the boundaries and names were first identified in the Neighborhood Fact Book, part of the Impacts of Growth study prepared in 1974. General descriptions for the individual neighborhoods are found in General Plan Appendix B. Many neighborhoods have similar issues that in part define their character, which are discussed below by the general type of neighborhood or district.

Hillside Neighborhoods

The hillside neighborhoods are the least dense areas of the City. City policies discourage hillside grading on steep slopes given geologic constraints underlying hillside development such as erosion, landslides, and drainage; some portions are also in flood zones. Due to the narrow and windy roads and steep slopes, the availability of water and sewer service, fire access, and evacuation routes are physical constraints to further development. Zoning ordinance policies restrict densities on the steepest hillside areas (e.g., greater than 30 percent) which help to mitigate these constraints as well as maintain the foothill open space and creek watershed resources.

Other hillside development issues include building size, bulk, and scale compatibility, as well as the loss of private views of the hillsides or ocean. The City has adopted special Hillside Design District guidelines that are administered by staff and the Single Family Design Review Board (SFDB). Neighborhood compatibility issues also periodically arise when existing institutional, public, or other non-residential type uses in these low density residential neighborhoods propose remodeling and/or an expansion of use.

Single Family Neighborhoods

The single family neighborhoods are expected to change very little over the next 20 years based on the limited development potential of vacant sites, and continued project review by the SFDB. Two issues that have arisen since the 1990s have been whether to further encourage the construction of "granny" units as a means to promote affordable housing, and the desire to slow down automobile traffic. While the future could include a relaxation of the City standards for secondary dwelling units that are close to transit or commercial services, both of these issues are controversial with neighborhood residents and will require further study and discussion.

Multi-Family Neighborhoods

The multi-family neighborhoods have traditionally been a mix of single family residences, duplexes, apartments, and corner markets. The Eastside and Westside neighborhoods are perhaps the best known of these "family" neighborhoods, and historically have provided much of the city's affordable housing in the form of more modest, single family residences, duplex rentals and rental apartments.

Since the 1980s, there have been two distinct development trends: smaller infill projects of one to four units constructed behind the original single family residences and often retained by the original property owners, and redevelopment projects (including condominiums) that have tended to be denser and larger in size, which in turn have raised issues of neighborhood compatibility. These compatibility issues have been particularly pronounced in those portions of the multi-family neighborhoods that are predominately single family in nature and/or contain historically significant homes.



2011 LAND USE ELEMENT

 \mathfrak{Z}



While the community generally supports and recognizes the advantages of more sustainable neighborhoods with relatively more affordable housing, neighborhood serving uses within walking or biking distance and good transit service, others are more concerned with automobile traffic, circulation, and the potential loss of convenient on-street parking.

Downtown and Mixed Use Districts

Since the 1980s, the Downtown and to a lesser degree the commercial corridors along Upper State Street and Milpas Street have experienced added residential development as a result of city policies that have encouraged mixed use projects in the commercial zones. One of the unintended consequences has been the construction of large, expensive condominiums that are not affordable to the local workforce, and in some cases, in buildings that portions of the community find to be too tall and massive. Related concerns have been the proximity of these larger mixed-use projects to the city's historic resources, which tend to be one and two stories in height, and the potential loss of mountain views.

The Land Use Element goals, policies and implementation actions are designed to address a number of these issues including affordability, as well as building size, bulk and scale, and design deference to historic resources. In addition, as these districts continue to develop as mixed-use neighborhoods, other land uses will need to be enhanced such as the availability and access to parks, open space, recreational opportunities, grocery stores, and perhaps (the return of) an elementary school in the Downtown.

The role of the automobile in the Downtown and along the commercial corridors is also a concern to some segments of the community who view residential uses as potentially worsening traffic congestion and parking. These issues are specifically addressed in the Circulation Element as part of an overall strategy to improve mobility city-wide, through the encouragement of all modes of travel, and Transportation Demand Management.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING EFFORTS

Since early 2000, self-selected neighborhoods across the city have initiated neighborhood level planning efforts to address the specific issues and needs of their respective community. These neighborhoods have included: the Mesa, Coast Village Road, the Upper Eastside, West Downtown, and the Oak Park neighborhoods. In 2006, a more formal study was completed by the City of the Upper State Street area culminating in design guidelines and targeted circulation improvements to, in part, enhance the livability of the area. The following descriptions provide a snapshot of the varied approaches that have been employed to date.

The Mesa

A group of Mesa neighbors, primarily architects and long-time residents, initially came together for the specific purpose of developing a neighborhood plan. Their overarching goal was to strengthen the Mesa as a "village" through greater self-sufficiency and sustainability. Once they drafted a concept plan, they met with city staff to vet some of the concepts, created a website and presentation, and began meeting with neighborhood groups to gather input and support. (See page 38 *Vision for a Sustainable Neighborhood.*)

Some of their specific recommendations include: encouraging neighborhood serving commercial and entertainment uses to reduce the need for travel to other parts of the City; small grocery or convenience stores strategically located along Cliff Drive, the main transit corridor of the Mesa; increasing residential density near Cliff Drive; developing Cliff Drive as the "Main Street" of the Mesa; encouraging City college to take responsibility for housing their students; improved access between parks; more beach access; public facilities such as a public library.

Coast Village Road

In 2008, the Coast Village Business Association in conjunction with local property owners and other interested parties conducted a series of workshops to develop a local plan for Coast Village Road district. The result of their work is a set of Draft Design Guidelines in which the primary goal is to: "protect and enhance the ambiance and theme of an upscale small town that defines this area while retaining the attraction to visitors who come to this destination for the lifestyle it exudes." One of their recommendations is for the city to adopt an Overlay Design District with associated guidelines to ensure all development carefully considers the community context and neighborhood compatibility.

Upper Eastside

During the *Plan Santa Barbara* review of the draft *Policy Preferences Report*, the Upper Eastside Association met to solicit formal input from their members. The Upper Eastside Association does not support any major changes to their neighborhood, particularly increased density. Many do not support relaxing the high standards of approval for Secondary Dwelling Unit because of concerns over: increased density; aesthetic impacts to the character of the neighborhood; increased traffic and parking; and, the need for additional infrastructure.

The Upper East Association did recommend a neighborhood boundary change to include Roosevelt School and nearby streets of Plaza Rubio, East Padre, Montgomery Street, and Pedregosa to Olive Avenue. They also would like to exclude the Bungalow Special Design District from the Upper Eastside neighborhood.

West Downtown

The neighborhood planning that has occurred in the West Downtown since early 2000 has been the result of, in large part, the proposed Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Capital Improvement Program. The RDA conducted a number of neighborhood workshops to gather input as to what was needed in terms of infrastructure improvements in West Downtown. The neighbors have identified physical improvements to include: sidewalks, landscaping, and street lighting. In addition, a number of other issues have been raised including: gang activity, graffiti abatement, homeless individuals, Marijuana dispensaries, and police response.

Oak Park

Since early 2000, the Oak Park Neighborhood Association's planning efforts have centered on the renovation of Cottage Hospital and the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update process. The Oak Park residents do not support any increased density in their neighborhood, given the Cottage Hospital project and existing medical offices that increase traffic and reduce street parking. While Oak Park supports workforce housing, they believe any increased density should be shared by other neighborhoods across the City.

Should any increased residential density be proposed, they recommend developer funded parks and the enhancement of Oak Park in particular. They also support walk zones, no drive areas, separated bike lanes, adherence to on-site parking standards and a parking permit program for residents.

SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBORHOODS

The Sustainable Neighborhood Planning policy, found in the Land Use Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions below, encourages neighborhoods to preserve and enhance their sense of place, provide opportunities for healthy living and accessibility. The objective of this policy is to facilitate the development of comprehensive neighborhood plans throughout the City in a manner best suited for each particular neighborhood or district. The City will likely initiate formal neighborhood planning efforts for those areas identified as priorities due to more rapid change and associated urban design concerns (e.g., Downtown, Coast Village, Upper State Street, and the Milpas and Haley/Gutierrez corridors).

For the remainder of the neighborhoods, the self-initiated process appears to be a model worthy of emulation. As noted above, a number of neighborhoods have already self-initiated neighborhood planning to varying degrees, and the next step will be to develop an appropriate process to guide these efforts toward formal adoption and implementation. While the City Council will ultimately determine what resources can be devoted toward neighborhood planning and implementation, recognizing and encouraging neighborhoods to initiate the process is an important first step.

Vision for a Sustainable Neighborhood

Mesa Village

In 2007 a group of architects living on the Mesa met to discuss ideas for improving their neighborhood. They soon realized that Cliff Drive is a defining element of the Mesa and devoted a Saturday morning to walking its length and discussing ideas for future improvements. This volunteer group continued meeting over the next several months, creating maps, collecting photos of the current Mesa, and gathering inspirational images from other cities. Using the theme "from good to great" they developed a vision of the Mesa becoming a self-sufficient, sustainable village within the city.

They propose improving parks and circulation to enhance community, promoting local culture and business to increase self-sufficiency, and providing walk-ability, safe bicycle routes, and public transportation. Other ideas include a village center with a public plaza, a Mesa loop trail, and the transformation of Cliff Drive from a highway into a people-friendly city street. The Mesa Architects hope their work will inspire other neighborhoods in the city to develop their own visions for community, self-sufficiency and sustainability.



Cliff Drive before



Cliff Drive after



Mesa shopping center before



Mesa shopping center after

Regional Governance

The City of Santa Barbara has a history of regional participation and cooperation. Taking a more sustainable approach to planning for the city necessitates thinking about the larger context. Santa Barbara is part of the South Coast urban area of Santa Barbara County, and consequently shares regional planning issues with its neighbors – the County, Carpinteria and Goleta. Planning issues requiring a regional approach include transportation, housing, economic prosperity and natural resource conservation, among others.

The sustainability goals and policies prepared in this update to the General Plan contain numerous policies throughout the elements that advocate cooperative regional planning. A combined effort will be necessary under the requirements of AB32 and SB375 regarding climate change, affordable housing and regional transportation, but there are many issues where all would benefit from a collaborative effort.

REGIONAL ISSUES

The Santa Barbara's housing market has become one of the most expensive in the State and it is no longer relevant to consider market conditions as solely a matter for the City to address. The city of Santa Barbara is, in fact, one of four jurisdictions along the South Coast that comprise the local housing market. Historically, the local housing market has been considered to extend from Carpinteria to Gaviota. This area is now believed to extend south to Ventura County and north to Santa Ynez Valley and Santa Maria, as evidenced by the congestion on Highway 101 during peak commute hours.

While the City has limited the amount of new commercial development that can be approved in the city since 1990, the region has not adopted similar control measures, nor managed to produce similar levels of affordable housing. This points to the need for an increased City presence in regional and statewide issues as well as the urgent need for regional land use and transportation planning in the coming years.

The 2011 General Plan Update included a look at resources, infrastructure and service capacities, recent trends in city development, and alternative growth scenarios. While this approach was done in preparation for the expiration of the City's commercial growth restrictions established in 1989 by Measure E, it has also highlighted the need for a regional response to those issues that have no regard for jurisdictional boundaries, such as housing, transportation, preservation of open space, and the economy.

To become more sustainable will necessitate the region's governments cooperating and coordinating their efforts to address these topics. In fact, recent state legislation is compelling the cities and county take this approach.

REGIONAL APPROACH

Throughout the General Plan elements many policies propose a more regional solution to planning issues and urge the City's continuing participation in regional efforts. There is a general need among the jurisdictions for regional playing fields used by youth and adults regardless of where they live. Multi-use trails frequently cross jurisdictional boundaries, including the Los Padres National Forest boundary. Preserving and linking remaining open space on a regional scale is not only important for recreational purposes; it could help preserve habitat for wildlife and maintain groundwater resources.

For some issues, taking a regional approach is not just a matter of geography. The economic health of the region is dependent on the integration of regional employment, the provision of sufficient affordable housing and public transportation options. Further, balancing jobs and housing could also benefit traffic flows and air quality. The updated Housing Element particularly addresses the issues of affordable housing, and the jobs/housing balance. Policies proposing a regional approach will be found not only in the updated Land Use and Housing elements, but also in the goals and policies for many of the other elements.

As stated above, there are policies throughout this plan that advocate a regional approach to particular planning issues. The ability to take a regional perspective in local planning depends on regional governance. With three cities and the County, not to mention special districts and SBCAG, found along the South Coast of Santa Barbara County, cooperation and coordination among all jurisdictions will be essential. Unfortunately, regional cooperation has met with limited success in recent years, due in part to fundamental differences between the South Coast and the North County.

Regional Mandates

Recent state legislation, specifically AB32 and SB375, now mandate regional governance in an effort to reduce green house gas emissions through closer transportation and land use planning. Under AB32, The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is tasked with setting emission level standards, administered through the Metropolitan Planning Organizations, which locally is the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG).

Similarly, SBCAG is also tasked with administering SB375, which requires that the emission standards set by the CARB be met through a new regional Sustainable Communities Strategy, which effectively coordinates the existing Regional Transportation Plan with the Housing Element Update process. As of 2010, the CARB has set initial emission targets for Santa Barbara County, based on recommendations made by SBCAG, and a timeline and rough scope of work have been established for the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Related considerations are rational jurisdictional boundaries, addressed here for the city in its sphere of influence and annexation policies.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AND ANNEXATIONS

In the past, annexations have generally been considered on a case-by-case basis. The resultant City boundary line is somewhat irregular with enclosed peninsulas and even islands of County land completely surrounded by City territory. State law attempted to rationalize annexations throughout California, with the Local Government Reorganization Act adopted in 1985. Cities are now required to identify a sphere of influence at or beyond the city limits.

A sphere of influence is defined as a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency. The sphere's purpose is to demarcate the area which should eventually be within a city's jurisdiction. The Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is responsible for establishing the City's sphere.

The City's sphere once included all land between Gaviota and Rincon. In 1987, LAFCO removed most of the Goleta Valley (excluding Hope Ranch) from the City's sphere to allow for the consideration of a Goleta incorporation effort. After that cityhood effort failed, the sphere was not returned to its original boundaries. In 1991, LAFCO reduced the City's Sphere on the east to allow for an unsuccessful Montecito incorporation effort. There have been only minor modifications to the City's sphere since that time. See the City of Santa Barbara Sphere of Influence Map (page 45).

In 2000, the City passed an ordinance to set priorities and guide future annexations. The goal of that ordinance is to simplify the present city boundaries and provision of services by encouraging annexation of unincorporated islands and peninsulas of land contiguous to the City. In February, 2002, the western Goleta Valley was incorporated as the City of Goleta.

Following that, residents in the eastern Goleta Valley formed a citizens committee (The Committee for One) and applied to LAFCO to become part of the city of Santa Barbara. Their application was declined by LAFCO, and subsequently the Committee for One submitted a request directly to the city for incorporation into its sphere of influence. A sphere of influence analysis was undertaken and in 2006 the City Council voted in favor of the Committee for One. However, by then eastern Goleta Valley residents expressed more ambivalence and LAFCO declined the change to the city's sphere.

Starting in 2009, Santa Barbara County has undertaken a project to update the existing Goleta Valley Community Plan for the remaining unincorporated area. It is anticipated that Eastern Goleta Valley will remain unincorporated.

Few annexations have occurred throughout the 2000s, and essentially all have contributed to the goal to rationalize the boundaries of the city for efficient service delivery. However, even with more logical boundaries, the need to cooperate and coordinate with the County and other cities on the South Coast continues. Unincorporated land within the City's sphere of influence that could be incorporated over the next 20 years totals 5,430 acres.



Sphere of Influence Map





Goals, Policies and Implementation

GOALS

- **Resource Allocation:** Achieve a balance in the amount, location and type of growth within the context of available resources including water, energy, food, housing, and transportation.
- *Character:* Maintain the small town character of Santa Barbara as a unique and desirable place to live, work, and visit.
- **Design:** Protect and enhance the community's character with appropriately sized and scaled buildings, a walkable town, useable and well-located open space, and abundant, sustainable landscaping.
- *Historic Preservation:* Protect, preserve and enhance the City's historic resources.
- Neighborhoods: Maintain and enhance neighborhoods with community centers where requested, and improved connectivity to daily necessities, including limited commercial activity, transit, and open spaces while protecting the established character of the neighborhood. Maintain or reduce the existing ambient noise levels in single family neighborhoods.
- Public Health: Improve public health through community design and location of resources by promoting physical activity, access to healthy foods and improved air quality.
- *Mobility:* Apply land use planning tools and strategies that support the city's mobility goals.
- **Regional Approach:** Support the establishment of the best possible government, jurisdictions, and intergovernmental working relationships for the South Coast area, from Gaviota to the City of Ventura.

Growth Management and Resource Allocation Policies

LG1. **Resource Allocation Priority.** Prioritize the use of available resources capacities for additional affordable housing for extremely low, very low, low, moderate, and middle income households over all other new development.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG1.1 <u>Affordable Housing</u>. Support affordable housing consistent with Housing Element goals and requirements and develop incentives in the form of flexibility in densities or standards for affordable housing projects if supported by available resource capacities.
- LG1.2 <u>Available Resources.</u> Monitor resource capacities and policy effectiveness at intervals commensurate with Housing Element planning periods and adjust specific housing policies as necessary to further achieve the City's Housing Element goals and requirements.
- LG2. Limit Non-Residential Growth. Establish the net new non-residential square-foot limitations through the year 2030 at 1.35 million square feet, and assess the need for increases in non-residential square footage based on availability of resources, and on economic and community need through a comprehensive Adaptive Management Program.

The 1.35 million square feet of non-residential development potential shall be allocated to the three following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Square Footage</u>
Small Additions	400,000
Vacant	350,000
Community Benefit	600,000

Non-residential square footage associated with Minor Additions, demolition and replacement of existing square-footage on-site, projects that are pending and approved as of time of ordinance adoption, government buildings, and sphere of influence annexations with existing development are not included in the 1.35 million square feet established above.

Existing permitted square footage not in the City, but in the sphere of influence, that is part of an annexation shall not count as new square footage necessitating a growth management allocation. However, once annexed, all development or developable parcels that propose net new square footage are subject to the limitations of the City's growth management ordinance.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG2.1 <u>Amount of Non-Residential Growth.</u> Provided it is demonstrated that it can be supported by available resources capacities, amend the City's Development Plan Ordinance (SBMC Section 28.87.300) to limit net new non-residential growth to 1.35 million square feet. Amend the non-residential development categories and allocation amounts to reflect this new development potential.
- LG2.2 <u>Set Aside</u>. Any square footage which is not utilized in any category shall be set aside for possible use after twenty years, or used during that twenty year period for a project approved by the voters.
- LG2.3 <u>Findings</u>. Develop findings to assure that resources will be available and public benefit improvements will be in place at the time the project is ready for occupancy.
- LG2.4 <u>Transfer of Existing Development Rights (TEDR)</u>. Study the existing TEDR Ordinance and the disposition of future demolished non-residential square footage that is not rebuilt.

LG3. Live Within Our Resources. New development shall be monitored to ensure that we are living within our resources through a comprehensive Adaptive Management Program.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG3.1 <u>Adaptive Management Program (AMP)</u>. Develop a comprehensive AMP that will monitor, assess, adapt, and inform the public and decision makers about the implications to resources from the next increment of growth in order to revise General Plan policies as necessary. The program will start small with priority resources and use of existing data whenever possible.
 - a. Monitor resource capacities for appropriate measurable community indicators including jobs/housing imbalance and transportation mode shifts at meaningful time intervals.
 - b. Assess community indicators annually and conduct overall assessments every four to eight years and with a comprehensive review of goals, policies, and implementation procedures in the year 2020 and 2030.
 - c. Where warranted by monitoring and assessment adapt and revise policies consistent with resource capacities (e.g., water, sewer, affordable housing, traffic, etc.).
 - d. Inform the public and staff about current science and state-of the art technology related to sustainability, and other topics relevant to the General Plan.

Land Use Policies

- LG4. **Principles for Development.** Establish the following Principles for Development to focus growth, encourage a mix of land uses, strengthen mobility options and promote healthy active living.
 - Focus Growth. Encourage workforce and affordable housing within a quarter mile of frequent transit service and commercial services through smaller units and increased density, transit resources, parking demand standards, targeted infrastructure improvements, and increased public areas and open space. Incorporate ideas as a result of an employee survey.
 - <u>Mix of Land Uses.</u> Encourage a mix of land uses, particularly in the Downtown to maintain its strength as a viable commercial center, to include retail, office, restaurant, residential, institutional, financial and cultural arts, encourage easy access to basic needs such as groceries, drug stores, community services, recreation, and public space.
 - <u>Mobility and Active Living</u>. Link mixed-use development with main transit lines; promote active living by encouraging compact, vibrant, walkable places; encourage the use of bicycles; and reduce the need for residential parking.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG4.1 Work with the private sector to support focused growth by conducting a survey of employees in the Central Business District to determine demographic information pertinent to workforce and affordable housing and transportation patterns of employees.
- LG4.2 <u>Capital Improvement Program (CIP)</u>. Focus transportation CIP expenditures on all mobility options (e.g., quality transit facilities, bicycle infrastructure and secure parking, automobile motorists' needs, enhanced pedestrian facilities, and car and bike-share programs) that facilitate ease of movement from one form of travel to another.

- LG4.3 <u>Downtown School.</u> Facilitate any future application of the Santa Barbara School District for a public elementary school Downtown, particularly in conjunction with childcare and other community services.
- LG4.4 <u>Corner Stores/Small Neighborhood Centers.</u> Amend the Zoning Ordinance to enable and ease establishment of limited neighborhood-serving commercial and mixed use in residential zones.
- LG5. **Community Benefit Housing.** While acknowledging the need to balance the provision of affordable housing with market-rate housing, new residential development in multi-family and commercial zones, including mixed-use projects, should include affordable housing and open space benefits.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG5.1 <u>Affordable Housing</u>. Develop standards and project level findings to encourage the development of Community Benefit Housing defined as:
 - Rental housing;
 - Housing affordable to low, moderate, or middle income households;
 - Employer sponsored workforce housing;
 - Limited Equity Co-operative Housing;
 - Affordable Housing Downtown for Downtown Workers; and/or
 - Transitional housing, single residential occupancy, and other housing for special needs populations including seniors, physically or mentally disabled, homeless, and children aging out of foster care.
- LG5.2 <u>Open Space</u>. Develop on and off site open space standards for incorporation into the development review process to include:
 - Access to adequate public open space within a ¹/₂-mile radius; and/or
 - Dedication of sufficient useable open space on-site; and/or
 - A contribution made toward future parks through in-lieu fees.
- LG6. Location of Residential Growth. Encourage new residential units in multi-family and commercial areas of the City with the highest densities to be located in the Downtown, La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area and along Milpas Street.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

LG6.1 <u>Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program.</u> Amend the Zoning Ordinance to incorporate an Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program in multi-family and commercial zones based on smaller unit sizes and higher densities adjacent to transit and commercial uses and to implement Housing Element policies for higher densities for affordable and/or Community Benefit projects.

- LG6.2 <u>Average Unit Density Components.</u> The program developed under LG6.1 shall be in effect for 8 years from implementing ordinance adoption or once 250 units have been developed in the High Density areas, whichever occurs sooner. The program will include the following components:
 - a. The 250 unit limitation shall apply to projects developed in the High Density and/or Priority Housing Overlay;
 - b. All units within a project developed at either the High Density or Priority Housing Overlay will be included in the 250 unit maximum;
 - c. The minimum parking requirement for projects using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program is 1 space per unit; and
 - d. A report to Council will be made to analyze the effectiveness of the program as part of the Adaptive Management Program for the General Plan, and as the trial period is approaching its end, the Council will consider whether to extend or modify the program. In absence of Council review before the trial period expires, the allowed residential density will default to the Variable Density standards allowed under SBMC 28.21.080. F as it existed in 2011.
- LG6.3 <u>Priority Housing Overlay.</u> Encourage the construction of rental and employer housing and limited equity co-operatives in select multi-family and commercial zones where residential use is allowed by providing increased density (over Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program).
- LG6.4 <u>Public Housing and All Affordable Partnership Projects.</u> Community Benefit projects such as public housing and partnership projects (e.g., El Carrillo, Garden Court) can be considered at higher densities on a case-by-case basis per the City's Affordable Housing Policies and Procedures.
- LG6.5 <u>High Fire Areas.</u> Limit new residential development in the High Fire Areas by offering incentives and/or an option for property owners to transfer development rights from the High Fire Area to the High Density residential land use designations.
- LG6.6 <u>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)</u>. Develop a TDR (or densities) program that allows transfer of residential density to sites adjacent to frequent transit, within easy walking and biking, in order to reduce commuting and to preserve open space.

Program considerations include:

- a. Development transfer from residentially zoned properties with severe site constraints; or
- b. Preservation of open space, within residentially zoned areas as long as there is no increase in the overall allowed densities of the area and; or
- c. The regional transfer of development rights with local and regional cooperation to allow transfer of development from rural lands and important urban open spaces to higher density, urban in-fill sites.
- LG6.7 <u>Housing for Downtown Workers.</u> Encourage affordable housing projects by expediting and facilitating downtown housing construction that includes provisions prioritizing downtown workers to the extent legally possible.

- LG7. **Community Benefit Non-Residential Land Uses.** Community Benefit Land Uses are determined and defined by City Council and shall include the following categories:
 - a. Community Priority,
 - b. Economic Development,
 - c. "Green" Economic Development,
 - d. Small and Local Business, or
 - e. Development of Special Needs

Possible Implementation Action to be Considered

- LG7.1 <u>Findings.</u> Develop project level findings of approval for the following Community Benefit Non-residential development uses:
 - a. <u>Community Priority Development.</u> This type of project addresses a present or projected need directly related to public health, safety or general welfare including but not limited to:
 - Parks and recreation facilities;
 - Community centers;
 - Educational institutions and uses including schools;
 - Public cultural or arts facilities;
 - Youth development programs and childcare facilities; and
 - Community gardens and urban farming; or
 - b. <u>Economic Development.</u> This type of project enhances the standard of living for City and South Coast residents and/or strengthens the local and regional economy by expanding economic diversity, such as providing a new or under-represented service or commodity; or
 - c. <u>"Green" Economic Development.</u> Business that provides "green" products or "greencollar" jobs (e.g., sustainable water, energy and waste management facilities, or green building products, or climate change research, but not solely a green building or structure); or
 - d. <u>Small and Local Business.</u> A small and/or local business in the community that is started, maintained, relocated, redeveloped or expanded; or
 - e. <u>Development for Special Needs.</u> A project that meets the present or projected needs of people with disabilities, the workforce that provides them direct support, and the agencies or organizations providing programs and services to them.
- LG8. Manufacturing Uses. Preserve and encourage the long-term integrity of light manufacturing uses.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

LG8.1 <u>Narrow Commercial Uses</u>. Narrow the range of permitted commercial uses to ancillary types in the M-1 zone for protection of industrial/manufacturing and related land uses.

- LG8.2 <u>Limit Residential</u>. Better define residential uses in the C-M Zone to both encourage priority housing and to protect existing manufacturing and industrial uses.
- LG9. **Multigenerational Facilities and Services.** The City recognizes that there is an increasing need for multigenerational facilities and services. The City shall encourage development which provides for multigenerational facilities and services.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG9.1 <u>Facilities</u>. Plan for community facilities to serve multigenerational needs including support services for seniors with long term care needs.
- LG9.2 <u>Use Permits.</u> Simplify the Conditional Use Permit process to facilitate the development of day use facilities and/or services that serve children, youth and seniors.
- LG9.3 <u>Site Identification</u>. Identify specific suitable areas and encourage the development of schools, preschools, or day care centers that are compatible with surrounding land uses and that minimize travel demand.
- LG9.4 <u>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</u>. Include in the TDM plan a provision to encourage inclusion of on-site child care in large scale development projects as a means of reducing traffic.
- LG9.5 <u>Project Evaluation Criteria</u>. Include child care as one of the criteria for project evaluation of proposed development projects.
- LG10. Live-Work. Provide viable live-work opportunities throughout the City.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG10.1 <u>Live Work.</u> Create a live-work land use category, zoning designation, or standards to enable viable live work opportunities including standards for home occupations in residential zones that are consistent with building codes.
- LG10.2 <u>Establish Criteria</u>. Establish criteria and standards for Artists' live-work space in the OC or C-M zones of the City.

Community Design Policies

LG11. Healthy Urban Environment. Consider health in land use, circulation and park and recreation decisions.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG11.1 <u>Solicit Input.</u> City staff shall conduct meetings, workshops, or public hearings with the community in order to solicit input from interested individuals and organizations on opportunities and recommendations for further integrating health concerns into local land use planning.
- LG11.2 <u>Create Guidelines.</u> Create appropriate development guidelines to promote a healthy urban environment in which community health is considered in all land use, circulation and park and recreation decisions (e.g., similar to those developed by the Sustainable Sites Initiative in their work with the US Green Building Council and LEED site standards).

- LG11.3 <u>Report Back.</u> City staff shall report back to the City Council with recommendations on ways that the City may amend the General Plan to further promote a healthy urban environment.
- LG11.4 <u>Audit for Community Gardens.</u> Conduct an audit to determine if the City owns land that could be used for community gardens and encourage voluntary private development of gardens.
- LG12. Community Character. Strengthen and enhance design and development review standards and process to enhance community character, promote affordable housing, and further community sustainability principles.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG12.1 <u>Design Overlays.</u> Create Design Overlay areas for selected non-residential and residential areas of the city through Floor Area Ratios (FARs), building setbacks, landscaping and open space requirements, and design guidelines. Commercial areas, historic districts, streets, or a single block with unique qualities can be evaluated for improved guidance to ensure compatibility in scale, bulk and size. Specific areas to receive priority evaluation for a Design Overlay area include:
 - 1. Downtown
 - 2. Coast Village Road
 - 3. Upper State Street
 - 4. Milpas Street
 - 5. Haley/Gutierrez Streets
 - 6. The "Funk Zone" (i.e., Yanonali and Helena Streets)
- LG12.2 <u>Building Size, Bulk and Scale.</u> Ensure that proposed buildings are compatible in scale with the surrounding built environment.
 - a. <u>Standards and Findings.</u> Strengthen and expand building size, bulk and scale standards and findings for development projects of 10,000 square feet or more in the commercial zones to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses, particularly historic resources and residential neighborhoods.
 - b. <u>Floor Area Ratios (FARs)</u>. Develop a set of maximum FARs for the non-residential and High Density areas of the City, with particular attention to protecting historic resources and areas that are adjacent to single family zoned areas, maintaining Santa Barbara's small town character, and encouraging small, affordable residential units.
 - i) Maximums. Develop a set of maximum FARs that permit the largest structures in the center of the city (adjacent to transit and commercial services), and reduce maximum building size/FARs moving outward from the center. (This approval would be similar to the "Parking Zone of Benefit" model);
 - ii) Buffers. On parcels adjoining historic structures, establish "buffers" using more restrictive FAR limits;
 - iii) Incentives. Consider higher FARs for multi-family rental projects and small, affordable residential units; and

- iv) Guidelines. Consider FAR Guidelines for development models such as where parking is proposed at the ground or in basement floors.
- v) Development Community. Create a working group that includes local professionals from the development community when developing FARs.
- c. <u>Development Monitoring.</u> Develop a program to monitor the scale and pace of development within the City; take action where transformative developments may occur along a block or corridor to guide development along that corridor.
- d. <u>Community Character Preservation</u>. Include in design guidelines that as part of any major new in-fill development or remodel, consider the context of the proposed structure in relation to surrounding uses and parcels along the entire block; ensure that the proposed development will not eliminate or preclude preservation of the key visual assets of the particular block or corridor, including landmark structures, structures of merit, potentially historic structures, key scenic view points that provide unique or important views to the surrounding hills, and specimen trees and other important visual resources. Require building design modifications as needed to preserve essential elements of the community character along that block or corridor.
- LG12.3 <u>Building Set-Backs</u>. The frontage of commercial buildings Downtown should have variation in building setback along the street facades to make the streetscape more interesting.
 - a. <u>Guidelines and Standards.</u> Prepare guidelines and, as necessary, Zoning Ordinance standards for the use, design, and landscaping of the street frontage for commercial buildings in Downtown, consistent with the Pedestrian Master Plan and Urban Design Guidelines. Where suitable, the building set-back should accommodate significant trees, consistent with fire safety and protection of public views.
 - b. <u>Pedestrian Environment.</u> Provide for a successful pedestrian environment including the promotion of canopy trees to be integrated into projects and along the public streets.
- LG12.4 <u>Building Height.</u> Amend zoning standards to include special findings and super majority approval by the Planning Commission for Community Benefit projects that exceed 45 feet in height.
- LG12.5 <u>Coast Village Road.</u> Establish a process to coordinate with the County, Montecito Association, and/or Coast Village Business Association regarding new construction in the Coast Village Road area subject to City design review and permitting.
- LG13. **Multi-Family Design Guidelines.** Develop multi-family residential design guidelines and standards to address unit sizes, setbacks, open space, landscaping, building size, bulk and scale, and site planning (e.g., pedestrian-friendly design, front porches facing the street or courtyard, and parking located out of sight).

Neighborhood Policies

LG14. Low Density Single Family Zoned Residential Areas. Maintain and protect the character and quality of life of single family zoned neighborhoods as a low density residential community.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG14.1 <u>Study Lower Densities.</u> In the steeper single family hillside areas classified as Major Hillside in the Open Space Element, study establishing densities as low as one dwelling unit for every ten or more acres due to such constraints as steep hillsides, need for excessive grading, fire, emergency access and evacuation, degradation of viewshed, ground-water recharge, and increased storm water run-off.
- LG14.2 <u>Slope Density Standards.</u> Require new subdivisions of land classified single family and twofamily with a 10 percent or greater average slope to comply with slope density standards as set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- LG14.3 <u>Clustered Development.</u> Continue to encourage the grouping of dwelling units for preservation of open space on steeper and open hillside areas as allowed via the City's Planned Residence Development and Planned Unit Development Ordinances.
- LG15. **Sustainable Neighborhood Planning**. Neighborhoods shall be encouraged to preserve and enhance the sense of place, provide opportunities for healthy living and accessibility, while reducing the community's carbon footprint.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- LG15.1 <u>Sustainable Neighborhood Plans (SNPs).</u> Develop comprehensive SNPs through-out the City (where desired by residents). A SNP may incorporate goals, objectives, policies and implementation actions addressing the following components, as applicable:
 - a. A variety of housing types and affordability ranges;
 - b. Neighborhood-serving commercial uses, especially retail food establishments such as small markets, green groceries, coffee shops;
 - c. New grocery stores in underserved areas;
 - d. Parks, recreational facilities, trails;
 - e. Community gardens;
 - f. Street tree planting program;
 - g. Watershed protection, creeks restoration, public access to creeks;
 - h. Transit, bicycle (including new Class 1 bike paths) and vehicle connectivity;
 - i. Walkable streets with an appealing and comfortable pedestrian environment that promote physical activity and can be used safely by people of all ages or abilities including wheelchairs;
 - j. Traffic calming along walkable and bicycle routes to school;
 - k. Reduced impervious area (such as street and parking areas);
 - 1. Community services (e.g., schools, branch library, community center, clinics, etc.);
 - m. Childcare and senior serving facilities;
 - n. General safety (e.g., lighting); and
 - o. Infrastructure needs.
- LG15.2 La Cumbre Plaza Specific Plan. Prepare an initial framework for a future La Cumbre Plaza Specific Plan for the eventual redevelopment of the site based on the analysis in the Upper State Street Study, including identification of applicable parcels, and issues to be addressed in the future Specific Plan. Include consideration of a mixed commercial and residential village approach and possible public improvements such as a transit center, open space/public park, pedestrian connections, east/west vehicle circulation connections, and parking structures.
- LG15.3 <u>Institutional Uses.</u> Review the permitting process for government public facilities and institutional uses and strengthen the findings as needed for neighborhood compatibility in residential areas.
- LG15.4 <u>Best Practices for Institutional Uses.</u> As part of neighborhood planning, as appropriate, initiate and conduct studies in residential neighborhoods that have various established institutional uses. The purpose of the study is to engage those who manage these institutional uses in a discussion with neighborhood representatives and City officials to develop "best practices" for the conduct of activities associated with the institutional land uses in order to improve their compatibility with their adjacent residential neighbors on a voluntary basis. Such a study should be conducted in the Upper East Neighborhood that has a unique concentration of existing institutional land uses. Subsequent to this study, and the identification of best practices, these practices should be considered citywide, as appropriate.

Regional Governance

R1. **Regional Planning.** Work cooperatively with the County and other local jurisdictions through the SB375 process to better coordinate land use and transportation planning, including the provision of affordable housing.

Possible Implementation Action to be Considered

- R1.1 <u>Regional Land Use/Transportation Plan.</u> Actively participate with the County and other local jurisdictions to produce a Regional Land Use/Transportation plan as mandated by SB375.
- R2. **Extension of Sphere of Influence.** Extend City's Sphere of Influence to include the eastern Goleta Valley, specifically:

The eastern Goleta Valley, between the existing western boundary of the city of Santa Barbara and the eastern boundary of the City of Goleta and from the northern urban line to the ocean, excluding the existing mobile home parks. Lands within this area should be retained in the land use category designated by the County of Santa Barbara.

- Should the eastern Goleta Valley be included in the City's sphere of influence, then at an appropriate time in the future with the concurrence of the County and affected property owners, the City should pursue annexation
- R3. **Annexations.** Annexation of land to the City shall only be allowed if resource capacities exist to serve the additional area and population, the use of resource capacities will not jeopardize priority development (i.e., affordable housing), and the annexation will minimize impacts on service costs.

- R3.1 <u>Resource Capacity.</u> It is the City's preference to merge under one government the city of Santa Barbara and the area within its sphere of influence. However, all proposed annexations shall be assessed for potential impacts on the costs and capacities of resources, for example, on water, wastewater treatment, public safety, and affordable housing.
- R3.2 <u>Consistency.</u> New residential subdivisions shall comply with established density and lot area size requirements unless the development includes affordable housing consistent with State Law and General Plan policies.
- R3.3 <u>Compatibility.</u> Residential properties that are annexed to the city shall be designated and zoned to be compatible with adjoining residential areas of the city.
- R4. **Future Annexations.** Areas of unincorporated land which should be annexed at the earliest opportunity are:
 - The Las Positas Valley, extending from U.S. Highway 101 on the north, to Cliff Drive on the south;
 - Apple Grove and Golf Acres subdivisions, Earl Warren Showgrounds and unincorporated territory easterly and adjacent to La Cumbre Plaza; and
 - Land generally located between Hope Avenue and La Colina Junior High School south of Foothill Road in the Hope Neighborhood.

General Plan Map





Eable of Contents

2015 HOUSING ELEMENT

Housing Introduction	1
Housing Element Requirements	1
City in Context of the South Coast Region	2
Public Outreach and Participation	3
General Plan Consistency	5
Evaluation	7
Context and Purpose	7
Evaluation	8
Results	15
Housing Needs Assessment	17
Population Trends and Characteristics	
Employment Trends	21
Household Characteristics	
Housing Stock and Market Conditions	24
Assessment of "At Risk" Assisted Units	
Special Housing Needs	
Constraints	57
Governmental Constraints	
Non-Governmental Constraints	74
Suitable Sites Inventory	77
Regional Housing Needs Allocation	77
Suitable Site Inventory and Development Capacity	78
Quantified Objectives	
Goals, Policies and Implementation	
Housing Opportunities Policies	
New Housing Development Policies	
Conservation and Improvement of Existing Housing Policies	
Regional Cooperation and Jobs/Housing Balance Policies	
Public Education and Information Policies	100



Figures

Figure H-1:	Units in Structure by Tenure (2000)	19
Figure H-2:	Housing Characteristics – Year Housing Built	27
Figure H-3:	Overcrowding by Tenure (1980-2000)	28
Figure H-4:	Typical Local Discretionary Review Process for SHO and PC Projects	61



Table H-1:	Senior Housing Opportunities (2007-2014)	. 9
Table H-2:	Homeless Housing Opportunities (2007-2014)	10
Table H-3:	Housing Opportunities for the Disabled (2007-2014)	11
Table H-4:	Affordable Housing Opportunities (2007-2014)	12
Table H-5:	Housing Production (2007-2014)	16
Table H-6:	Population Growth Trends (1980 – 2014), City of Santa Barbara	18
Table H-7:	Age Distribution (2010 Census), City vs. Santa Barbara County	19
Table H-8:	Population by Race and Ethnicity (2010 Census), City vs. Santa Barbara County	20
Table H-9:	Employment by Industry (2008-2012 Census), City vs. Santa Barbara County	21
Table H-10:	Residents in Workforce by Occupation (2008-2012), City vs. County of Santa Barbara2	22
Table H-11:	Household Growth Trends (1990-2014), City Santa Barbara	23
Table H-12:	Household Size (1990-2014), City of Santa Barbara	23
Table H-13:	Households by Income (2008-2012)	24
Table H-14:	Housing Units and Type (2000-2014), City of Santa Barbara	25
Table H-15:	Tenured Vacancy Rates (2000-2012), City of Santa Barbara	26
Table H-16:	Housing Unit Size by Tenure (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	26
Table H-17:	Housing Unit Age (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	27
Table H-18:	Housing Condition Survey: Westside (2009), City of Santa Barbara	29
Table H-19:	Housing Condition Survey: Eastside (2009), City of Santa Barbara	29
Table H-20:	Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs (2014), Santa Barbara County	30

Table H-21:	Projects With Affordable Rental Housing At Risk (2015-2025, City of Santa Barbara	33
Table H-22:	Projects With Affordable Ownership Housing At Risk (2015 – 2025), City of Santa Barbara	35
Table H-23:	Affordable Rental Housing With Expired Affordability Covenants (2007-2014) City of Santa Barbara	36
Table H-24:	Affordable Housing Projects Using Set-Aside Funds, City of Santa Barbara	38
Table H-25:	Persons With Disabilities (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	41
Table H-26:	Household Size by Tenure (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	43
Table H-27:	Female Headed Households (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	44
Table H-28:	Homeless Counts by Area (2011-2013), Santa Barbara County	45
Table H-29:	Homeless Shelters (2013), City of Santa Barbara	46
Table H-30:	Homeless Facilities/Housing (2014), City of Santa Barbara	46
Table H-31:	Overcrowded Households by Tenure (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	49
Table H-32:	Household Income Distribution (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	49
Table H-33:	Households Overpaying (2008-2012), City of Santa Barbara	50
Table H-34:	Regional Housing Needs Assessment, South Coast Jurisdictions (2014-2022)	54
Table H-35:	Remaining Housing Need (2015-2023), City of Santa Barbara	54
Table H-36:	Income Categories (2014)	55
Table H-37:	Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2014-2022), City of Santa Barbara	78
Table H-38:	Summary of Opportunity Sites Development Potential (2014), City of Santa Barbara	35
Table H-39:	Quantified Objectives (2015-2023), City of Santa Barbara	36

Housing Introduction

The City has a long standing commitment to affordable housing and sound community planning. Protecting and enhancing the quality of life and "living within our resources" have been fundamental goals for Santa Barbara since the adoption of the first General Plan in 1964. Concerns about the City's optimum growth potential and its effects on the quality of life for its residents prompted significant actions in the 1970s and 1980s (see Planning History in General Plan Introduction).

The 1982 Housing Element identified the City's growing need to provide affordable housing as well as address the jobs/housing imbalance issue. Several goals and policies designed to promote affordable housing, and preserve and improve the existing housing stock were included in the Element. Housing policies contained in the 1985 Housing Element Addendum emphasized preserving units within the commercial zone and creating additional residential opportunities. The primary focus of the 1995 Housing Element was to remove regulatory barriers and to stimulate the development and construction of housing. Special emphasis was given to multi-family housing in and around the Downtown employment center and incentives for mixed-use development. These housing element goals were further supported and substantiated in the City's Circulation Element.

The 2004 Housing Element continued the City's strong Affordable Housing Program in the midst of a difficult fiscal environment. The City has supported the construction of affordable housing since 1970. Approximately 12 percent of its housing stock is developed or assisted with local, state, federal and in some cases private non-profit funding. Approximately 8 percent are considered long-term affordable units and 4 percent are assisted units (i.e., Section 8).

The 2011 Housing Element contained new and/or revised policies and implementation actions focused on affordable housing opportunities with specific emphasis on increased rental and non-subsidized affordable housing units. It carried forward the majority of the 2004 Housing Element goals, policies and programs, providing continuity and permanence to the City's commitment to the production of affordable housing.

Consistent with State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) policy that residential development be within "proximity to transit, jobs centers and public and community services", the 2015 Housing Element continues to encourage smaller units and increased densities in the Downtown area and multi-family zones. This document serves to provide policy guidance to local decision-makers regarding the production and preservation of housing.

HOUSING ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS

State law requires the preparation of a Housing Element as part of the City's General Plan. Cities and counties are required to identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs for all segments of the community, and identify goals, policies and quantified objectives to meet those needs. The Housing Element must accomplish the following:

- Identify and analyze the current and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community, including special needs populations.
- Evaluate current and potential governmental and non-governmental constraints, and where feasible and appropriate, remove such constraints to meet housing needs.

- Identify and assess the availability of land suitable for residential use.
- Develop objectives, policies, and programs that set forth a 5-year housing work plan of actions to meet existing and projected housing needs.

Senate Bill 375, adopted by the State Legislature in 2008, established an eight-year update cycle for Housing Elements concurrent with every other update to the Regional Transportation Plan. This update addresses the 2015 to 2023 planning period, and has been prepared to comply with State law and address local and regional housing and community planning issues. The Housing Element is organized with the following sections:

- Introduction. Discusses the purpose and statutory requirement of the Housing Element and describes the public outreach process.
- Evaluation of Previous Housing Element. Evaluates the effectiveness and appropriateness of the goals, polices and implementation strategies in meeting the housing objectives of the previous 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period.
- Housing Needs Assessment. Provides a detailed analysis of demographic, housing and special needs characteristics and trends.
- Constraints. Discusses market, governmental and environmental factors that serve as barriers and may affect ability to address housing needs.
- Suitable Sites Inventory. Identifies and evaluates the amount of vacant and underutilized land suitable for residential development.
- Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions. Presents housing goals, policies and action programs to address the housing needs of City residents.

For a clear understanding of the policy direction and content of this Housing Element, it is important to understand the housing policy issues and discussions that have been at the forefront in recent years. It is also important to have an understanding of the City as part of Santa Barbara County, Southern California and the State. This Introduction section is included to provide this context as well as to describe the community involvement that has occurred in the development of new Housing Element policies and implementation actions.

CITY IN CONTEXT OF THE SOUTH COAST REGION

The South Coast region housing market area extends from the city of Carpinteria and the Ventura County line to the city of Goleta, including the city of Santa Barbara and all of the region's unincorporated communities. The County of Santa Barbara and the cities of Goleta, Carpinteria and Santa Barbara have regulatory authority over housing and job growth, as well as the provision of affordable housing.

Affordable housing on the South Coast is currently provided by a combination of local government agencies and programs, private non-profit housing developers, federal government rental subsidies, and privatelyowned housing that may be more affordable than typical market rate housing. The city of Santa Barbara has provided, to developers and non-profit sponsors, financial and/or land use incentives in exchange for long-term recorded affordability agreements ensuring that 3,075 units will remain affordable for a specified number of years. In addition, 1,568 units are subsidized under the Shelter Plus/Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program. In total, there are 4,643 affordable and assisted units currently provided by the City. Although the South Coast is a single housing market, median single-family housing prices vary by city or region, ranging from about \$700,000 in Carpinteria and Goleta to over \$2 million in some portions of the city of Santa Barbara (DataQuick 2014). However, even where lower median home values exist, these prices are generally unaffordable to the vast majority of households living in the South Coast. For the City, it is clear that providing the amount of housing necessary to bring the median sale price anywhere near an amount affordable to persons earning the area median income in the near future would collide with long-standing community values of local control, protection of resources and quality of life.

While the City has limited the amount of new commercial development that can be approved in the City since 1990, the region has not adopted similar control measures, nor managed to produce similar levels of affordable housing. Regional cooperation in addressing the jobs/housing balance issues that affect the South Coast region continue to be an important goal of this Housing Element. Policies and implementation actions recognizing and promoting the City's commitment toward a coordinated regional effort in addressing the South Coast region's housing market are included in the Element.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION

Housing issues have been at the forefront of City policy discussions by decision-makers, the public and the local press since 1998. A great deal of community attention and dialogue has focused on the rapid changes occurring in the South Coast housing market. Never has an issue affected so many people in our community as has the cost and availability of housing.

This update to the 2011 Housing Element began in 2005 as part of the City's *Plan Santa Barbara* process. The public outreach and participation effort entailed a variety of methods including informational mailings, community workshops, community grassroots meetings, youth survey, and website. A more detailed description of these efforts is included in the Introduction chapter of the City's General Plan. Below is a summary of the key comments associated with housing issues received from City residents during the public participation process.

Community Input

During the public workshops and grassroots meetings, as well as via comment cards received from City residents, affordable housing for the middle class, working class and critical workforce was identified as a priority issue for the community. The following list summarizes the key comments, issues and concerns expressed by the participants:

- Although some participants were concerned about more growth, the need for affordable housing was still seen as a critical issue for the City.
- Participants raised the matter of high housing costs as cause for concern, as many young professional and first time homeowners are unable to purchase a home in Santa Barbara.
- Many felt that traffic congestion has increased because middle to lower-income earners are unable to find homes close to their place of employment, and must commute from areas outside the City.
- Some participants advocated a strict no-growth approach, stating that it is economically and environmentally infeasible for the City to accommodate additional housing.
- Finding a balance between providing housing opportunities for all segments of the community and preserving the attractive and small-town character of the City was urged through the careful examination of Land Use and Housing Element policies.

- Some participants expressed concern that increased densities would jeopardize the City's small-town character.
- Other participants expressed support for increasing densities to provide additional affordable housing for the City's workforce. Such housing opportunities would benefit young families and youth living in Santa Barbara.
- Mixed reviews were received regarding the City's proposal to regulate residential densities in commercial and multi-family zones based on unit size. Some questioned whether smaller unit sizes would be marketable.
- Providing an "unbundled parking" approach in order to allow homeowners to purchase parking spaces separately from the residential unit was identified as an incentive to produce additional affordable housing. Many participants felt that this approach could be detrimental to neighborhoods experiencing parking deficits. Others urged exploration of other approaches such as pooled parking or the use of public parking garages.

City residents through the *Plan Santa Barbara* process have engaged in a dialogue to identify and define the issues that matter most to the community. Opportunities to become involved in the outreach process were provided through mailings, surveys, community workshops, a website, and public hearings. The lack of housing affordability for City residents, especially for the local workforce, was identified as a major concern that requires prompt and creative solutions. Equally important is the goal of "Living Within Our Resources" and the desire to maintain the small-town character of Santa Barbara.

Since the adoption of the General Plan Update in 2011, opportunities for public input related to the Housing Element have continued (see Table below). Residents have remained engaged in housing issues through the implementation of various Housing Element programs as well as the preparation of the 2015 Housing Element Update. All City meetings and workshops are open to the public. Notification of public meetings were provided at least 10 days in advance in a local newspaper, mailed to interested parties, and posted on the City's website. The draft Housing Element was made available for review at the Community Development Department and on the City's website prior to the community workshop and public meetings. Housing agencies and advocacy groups were also notified of the availability to review the draft Housing Element.

Public Meeting/Workshop	Date				
Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program					
City Council initiation of Zoning Ordinance Amendments	4/10/12				
Planning Commission 1 st review	7/26/12				
Employer Sponsored Housing Community Forum	9/12/12				
Planning Commission 2 nd review	4/11/13				
City Council adoption	7/30/13				
Emergency Shelter Zoning (SB2)					
City Council initiation of Zoning Ordinance Amendments	11/12/13				
Ordinance Committee review	5/13/14				
Planning Commission review	6/5/14				
City Council adoption	7/22/14				
2015 Housing Element Update					
Planning Commission initiation of General Plan Amendment	5/8/14				
Joint City Council/Planning Commission	9/11/14				
Public Workshop	10/22/14				
Planning Commission review	10/23/14				
City Council adoption	2/10/15				

Public Participation Opportunities

Input from community members and decision-makers has guided the policies and implementation actions in the Housing Element. The 2015 Housing Element carries on the City's commitment to providing affordable housing, retaining and increasing rental housing, and encouraging the production of non-subsidized affordable housing. Protecting and maintaining the small-town character of Santa Barbara and its residential neighborhoods continues to be a key objective.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

The Housing Element must be consistent with other elements of the General Plan. The Housing Element has been prepared within the context of the other General Plan elements and is consistent with the policies and proposals set forth therein. The Housing Element is closely related to development policies contained in the Land Use Element, which establishes the location, type and intensity of land uses throughout the city. The Land Use Element determines the number and type of housing units that can be constructed in the various land use districts. Area designated for commercial and industrial uses create employment opportunities, which in turn, create demand for housing. The Circulation Element establishes the location and scale of streets, highways and other transportation routes that provide access to residential neighborhoods. Because of the requirements for consistency among the various General Plan elements, any proposed amendments to one element will be evaluated against the other elements of the General Plan will be processed concurrently with future Housing Element amendments. SB 1087 of 2005 requires cities to provide their Housing Element to local water and sewer providers, and also requires that these agencies provide priority hookups for developments with lower-income housing.



Evaluation

CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

State Government Code Section 65588 requires that the housing element be evaluated to assess the progress made in achieving the jurisdiction's housing goals and objectives. This step is important in assessing the appropriateness and effectiveness of the City's existing goals, policies and implementation actions, and documenting results that were achieved during the planning period 2007-2014, hereby referred to as the 2011 Housing Element. State law specifically calls for a three-step process:

- Effectiveness of the Element. A review of the actual results of the previous element's goals, objectives, policies, and programs. The results should be quantified where possible.
- Progress in Implementation. An analysis of the significant difference between what was projected or planned in the previous element and what was achieved.
- Appropriateness of goals, objectives and policies. A description of how the goals, objectives, policies and programs of the updated element incorporate what has been learned from the results of the previous element.

This analysis informed and directed the policy and program changes made in the 2015 Housing Element. To accomplish this evaluation, the Five Year Work Program of the previous Housing Element was reviewed. For every housing strategy, this work program identified an estimate of:

- Schedule
- Responsible Agency
- Time to complete
- Budget needed (if necessary)
- Anticipated outcome
- Potential funding sources.

The City of Santa Barbara has been producing and supporting affordable housing since approximately 1970. As of 2014, the City estimates that approximately 12 percent of the City's housing stock is assisted through local, state and federal funding, and in some cases private non-profit entities. The City would be a very different place today were it not for the vision of previously elected and appointed officials, City Staff, non-profit housing developers and community based organizations who have made affordable housing a land use and funding priority for the past four decades.

The 2011 Housing Element contained five goals, 26 policies and 129 implementation actions intended to address the City's housing needs. The majority of the actions are a continuation of the City's commitment to the production of affordable housing and sound community planning. Many of the programs identified in the 2011 Housing Element were aimed at protecting neighborhoods, quality design, historic preservation, environmental quality, affordable housing and socio-economic diversity.

Special emphasis was given to multi-family housing in and around the Downtown employment center and incentives for mixed-use development. During the 2011 Housing Element planning period, the City continued to develop the majority of new housing in commercial and multi-family zones in and around the Downtown area.

EVALUATION

This section evaluates the effectiveness and progress in producing housing since 2007 and implementing the policies and programs identified in the 2011 Housing Element. This step is important in determining the appropriateness of existing policies. It is also important to illustrate and acknowledge the value of strong housing policies and the results that have occurred. This evaluation coupled with the updated housing needs analysis informed and directed adjustments to the policies and programs for the 2015 Housing Element. The evaluation discussion is organized around the five goals of the element.

- Housing Opportunities
- New Housing Development
- Conservation and Improvement of Existing Housing
- Regional Cooperation and Jobs/Housing Balance
- Public Education

The City has been successful in implementing the goals and programs of the 2011 Housing Element, producing the majority of its new housing in commercial areas of the Downtown and surrounding multi-family residential zones. As such, good progress has been made in constructing infill development, special needs, and mixed-use housing. In addition, the City has substantially followed through with funding assistance for affordable housing in both new construction and rehabilitation programs. Further, amendments to the Municipal Code have been carried out to promote housing opportunities, preserve the existing housing stock and neighborhoods, and reduce residential development barriers.

Appendix E provides an analysis of the 2011 Housing Element, quantified whenever possible. The following narrative describes the effectiveness by housing element goal area, including specific program highlights.

GOAL 1: Housing Opportunities

The 2011 Housing Element established a detailed program of 36 implementation actions aimed at providing a full range of housing opportunities for all persons, including seniors, homeless, special needs households and households living in poverty. For the most part, the actions associated with this goal were implemented. Most of the implementation actions are ongoing to acknowledge the City's commitment to ensuring housing opportunities for all segments of the community. Highlights of achievements during the previous planning period are presented below.

Funding Resources

The City's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Human Services programs provided grants to local agencies for a wide range of housing, human and community service programs, and capital improvement projects. From 2007 to 2014, approximately \$12 million in grants were distributed to support thousands of people through non-profit community organizations and city programs. These programs strive to meet the needs of children, families, seniors and disabled persons, homeless, victims of domestic violence and others seeking assistance.

Housing Opportunities for Seniors

The Housing Element established a range of implementation actions to ensure the availability of housing for low and moderate-income seniors. The City was successful in producing and preserving senior housing during this planning period, securing 333 rental units for very low and low-income seniors using CDBG, SEMP and Housing Successor Entity (former Redevelopment Agency) funds. These units were accomplished through a combination of new construction as well as the rehabilitation or preservation rehabilitation of existing units. Table H-1 summarizes achievements and progress made toward meeting the objectives of the 2011 Housing Element:



Villa Caridad, affordable senior housing project

Project Name/Address	Units/Tenure	Туре	Affordability		
Villa Caridad	95/rental	New Construction	95 Very Low		
SHIFCO	107/rental	Rehabilitation	107 Very Low		
Cottage Garden Apartments	17/rental	Rehabilitation	17 Low		
Vine	6/rental	Rehabilitation	6 Low		
El Patio	48/rental	Preservation	48 Low		
Villa La Cumbre	60/rental	Preservation	60 Low		
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014					

Table H-1: Senior Housing Opportunities (2007 – 2014)

Housing Opportunities for the Homeless

The Housing Element calls for programs and efforts to provide shelter and services to the homeless and to prevent homelessness. Casa Esperanza, located in the City, provides the only walk-in day center program in the South Coast. The center offers coordinated, centralized supportive services to help homeless persons achieve their maximum level of self-sufficiency. The program is designed to serve any homeless person or family, although the clients tend to be chronically homeless individuals and those who are not eligible for any other homeless program. This facility provides 200 beds of emergency shelter in the winter months and 100 beds the remainder of the year.



Bradley Studios, affordable housing for homeless and downtown workers

The City was successful in providing housing opportunities for homeless individuals during the planning period securing 301 units and beds (Table H-2). This was accomplished through a combination of new construction and acquisition/rehabilitation of units, as well as operational funding for transitional housing and emergency shelter beds. During the 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period, the following achievements and progress were made toward meeting the housing needs of the homeless population:

Project Name/Address	Units/Tenure Type Afforda		Affordability
Bradley Studios	24/rental	24/rental New Construction	
Artisan Court	37/rental	New Construction	37 Very Low
Transition House	16/rental	New Construction	16 Very Low
Willbridge	8/beds	Acquisition/Rehabilitation	8 Very Low
Fire House	16/rental	Rehabilitation	16 Low
Casa Esperanza Emergency Shelter	200/beds (DecMar.) 100/beds (AprNov.)	Beds Preserved (funding assistance)	200/100 Very Low
Source: City of Santa Barba	vra 2014	1	

Table H-2: Homeless Housing Opportunities (2007 - 2014)

Source. Suy of Santa Daroana 2011

Municipal Code Amendments

The City's Safe Parking Program was initiated in 2002 to allow the night-time use of Recreational Vehicles (RV) on parking lots owned by local churches and nonprofit organizations. Since that time both the City and County of Santa Barbara have acted to permit night-time RV use at a number of public parking lots. In 2007, the Municipal Code was amended to expand locations where overnight RV parking can occur. The Safe Parking Program currently has 108 spaces in Santa Barbara with 90 of the parking spaces provided in City operated parking lots.



Artisan Court, affordable housing for homeless and downtown workers

 In July 2014, the Municipal Code was amended in accordance with Senate Bill 2 to allow emergency shelters without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) Zone.



Building Hope, affordable housing for disabled persons and low-income downtown workers

Housing Opportunities for the Disabled

Many of the implementation actions related to development and access for the disabled are now standard practice as a result of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). During the 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period approximately 163 units were constructed, acquired or rehabilitated to serve the housing needs of the disabled. Table H-3 summarizes the achievements and progress made toward meeting this objective:

Project Name/Address	Units/Tenure	Туре	Affordability		
Building Hope	39/rental	New Construction	39 Very Low		
Casa las Granadas	12/rental	New Construction	4 Very Low, 8 Low		
Victoria Hotel	28/rental	Rehabilitation	17 Very Low, 11 Low		
Sanctuary Psychiatric	27/rental	Rehabilitation	27 Low		
Hotel de Riviera	31/rental	Rehabilitation	31 Low		
Casa Juana María	6/rental	Rehabilitation	6 Low		
CADA Detox	12/rental (beds)	Acquisition/Rehabilitation	12 Low		
633 De la Vina Street	8/rental	Acquisition/Rehabilitation	7 Very Low, 1 Low		
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014					

Table H-3: Housing Opportunities for the Disabled (2007 - 2014)

Municipal Code Amendments

- In 2007, the Municipal Code was amended to include reasonable accommodation provisions for persons with disabilities.
- In 2007, the Municipal Code was amended to allow modifications to any zoning standard when necessary to make an existing residential unit accessible to persons with disabilities.

Affordable Housing Opportunities

Aside from the housing opportunities identified above for seniors, homeless, and persons with disabilities, 386 additional affordable housing opportunities were provided. Most of these units were supported with City funds. Table H-4 summarizes achievements and progress made toward meeting the housing needs of the very low, low and moderate-income households:



Paseo Voluntario, affordable multi-family housing project

Project Name/Address	Units/Tenure	Туре	Affordability		
Building Hope	12/rental	New Construction	12 Low		
630 Bath Street	2/rental	New Construction	2 Low		
Paseo Voluntario	20/rental	New Construction	2 Very Low, 8 Low, 10 Mod		
10 E Calle Crispis	1/rental	New Construction	1 Low		
Cañón Perdido Street	12/ownership	New Construction	12 Low		
2122 Cliff Drive	1/rental	New Construction	1 Low		
721 Chapala Street	5/ownership	New Construction	5 Moderate		
3965 Via Lucero	3/ownership	New Construction	3 Low		
Bradley Studios	30/rental	New Construction	30 Very Low		
Artisan Court	19/rental	New Construction	19 Low		
Mom's Place	8/rental	New Construction	8 Low		
1126 Del Mar Street	1/rental	New Construction	1 Low		
2416 Medcliff Road	1/rental	New Construction	1 Low		
2717 Samarkand Drive	1/rental	New Construction	1 Low		
San Pascual Street	4/ownership	New Construction	4 Low		
2 Skyline Circle	1/rental	New Construction	1 Low		
2109 Cliff Drive	3/ownership	New Construction	3 Above Moderate		
121 W. De la Guerra	3/ownership	New Construction	3 Above Moderate		
East Beach Collection	36/ownership	New Construction	36 Above Moderate		
Alma del Pueblo	5/ownership	New Construction	5 Above Moderate		
Sevilla	11/ownership	New Construction	11 Above Moderate		
Bella Riviera	81/ownership	New Construction	39 Moderate, 42 Above Moderate		
Mira las Olas	7/ownership	New Construction	7 Above Moderate		
2904 State Street	8/rental	Acquisition	8 Low		
2941 State Street	6/rental	Acquisition/Rehabilitation	6 Low		
233 W. Ortega Street	6/rental	Acquisition/Rehabilitation	6 Very Low		
El Patio	65/rental	Preservation	65 Low		
Coronel Place	20/rental	Preservation	10 Low, 10 Moderate		
Marianna Ranch	14/rental	Preservation	14 Low		
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014					

Table H-4: Affordable Housing Opportunities (2007 – 2014)

GOAL 2: New Housing Development

The Housing Element established a program of 46 implementation actions to promote new housing development. Special emphasis was given to multi-family housing in and around the Downtown employment center and incentives for mixed-use development. Many of these strategies were specific actions or zoning amendments that have been completed. The following highlights the City's accomplishments in this goal area.

- In 2013, the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program was adopted to encourage the construction of rental housing, employer sponsored housing and co-operative housing by allowing increased densities (up to 63 du/ac) and development standard incentives in certain areas of the City, particularly the Downtown.
- City's RDA provided approximately \$14.4 million to fund the construction of 6 affordable housing projects with 136 units. Of the total units, 131 units were very low and low-income.
- Funds were provided to local developers by the RDA for site acquisition, enabling them to land-bank sites for future development. This resulted in three new projects with 105 affordable housing units.



Casas las Granadas, affordable housing developed in conjunction with public parking

- Twelve affordable units were developed in conjunction with a new parking structure built on the site of a surface parking lot (Casas las Granadas).
- In 2009, the Mental Health Association project "Building Hope" was constructed consisting of 51 units facilitated by the RDA's transfer of ownership of a parking lot.

Between 2007 and 2014, 11 units were constructed under the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance program and 63 units were constructed through bonus density incentives.



St. Vincent's affordable housing project

GOAL 3: Conservation and Improvement of Existing Housing Stock

The Housing Element established a program of 20 implementation actions to conserve and improve existing housing stock, existing neighborhoods and community diversity and character. Most of the implementation actions are ongoing, have been implemented, or are no longer feasible due to lack of funding. The following presents highlights of achievements during the previous planning period (2007-2014)

Housing Rehabilitation

The City's Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program (HRLP) has four main objectives: 1) to maintain and upgrade Santa Barbara's housing by correcting hazards to health and safety; 2) to enhance older neighborhoods by upgrading properties, thereby encouraging others to make improvements; 3) to provide improvements that help conserve resources and reduce operating and maintenance costs; and 4) to improve the quality of life of low and moderate-income residents by providing a healthful and pleasant living environment.

Prior to 2011, most HRLP loans were made to low-income homeowners in Santa Barbara. Due to the decline in CDBG entitlement funding, demand and activity for this program and the retirement of the program's only employee, the determination was made to have a gradual phase out of this program for low income homeowners.

The HRLP, using program income generated from previous loans, will continue to provide rehabilitation loans or grants to apartment owners who agree to keep the rents affordable to low-income tenants. Many of these owners are non-profit developers who have acquired the property for the purpose of doing major rehabilitation and long-term management.

Rehabilitation Loans

• The HLRP provided \$4,035,400 to rehabilitate 12 single family (\$272,500) and 594 multi-family units (\$3,762,900) from 2007-2014.

Preservation of Housing Stock

The concern over the loss of older, affordable housing to redevelopment has remained a critical issue. Older housing is being demolished and replaced by new housing development. The City is seeking to preserve residential properties with historic value through surveys and a demolition review ordinance. In addition, preservation (or replacement in kind) of older housing stock that is not of historic value is of concern. This is particularly true for older housing stock in residential zones where State law limits the City's ability to prohibit demolition of rental housing.

During the 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period, the following objectives were achieved:

- Extended affordability covenants to continue the affordability of 96 units to a period ranging from 30 to 99 years. New covenants for owner-occupied affordable units totaled 148.
- As directed by the 2004 Housing Element, historic surveys for two neighborhoods were completed during the planning period. The surveys serve as a tool to identify and protect buildings worthy of Landmark and Structure of Merit status.

GOAL 4: Regional Cooperation and Jobs/Housing Balance

This goal area continues to be a great challenge for the City. The primary reason is that to effectuate change in this area is not within the City's complete control and requires extensive cooperation and collaboration with neighboring jurisdictions. This is certainly not unique to the Santa Barbara area. The City continues to monitor State legislation and the efforts of the California Center for Regional Leadership for new programs to support better regional cooperation. The Housing Element established a program of 21 implementation actions to address jobs/housing balance issues and to further regional cooperation. The following presents three highlights in regional cooperation.

- The City continues to work with other cities in the South Coast region and the County of Santa Barbara to promote affordable housing.
- The City continues coordination with, and funding for MTD as it relates to the provision of public transit to housing developments. Likewise, coordination with the Coastal Housing Partnership designed to provide financial assistance programs and educational services to help employees acquire homes has and will continue.
- The City and County of Santa Barbara coordinated efforts and financial resources to facilitate the development (2008) of 170 very-low income rental units for seniors and low-income rental units for families at the St. Vincent's site. The City is currently processing a development application for the Hillside House project proposed to be annexed to the City. The project if approved will result in 121 housing units.
- The City worked closely with the Santa Barbara Association of Governments (SBCAG) to produce the regional *Sustainable Communities Strategies* that promotes higher density, infill, and transit oriented mixed-use projects, which was adopted by the SBCAG Board in August 2013.

GOAL 5: Public Education

This goal area was established in 1995 to recognize the important role the public plays in building and maintaining community support for affordable housing. The element included 6 implementation actions to expand public education regarding affordable housing. The following are highlights of the City's accomplishments in this goal area.

- The City continued to expand awareness of the benefits of creating new affordable housing opportunities, implementing mixed-use and transit oriented policies and programs, and providing shelter and support services to the homeless. Special segments related to community issues are regularly aired on the TV Government Channel. Readily accessible information also appeared on the City's website.
- The City received broad public media coverage of completed projects and received several prestigious awards for its projects from state and national organizations.

RESULTS

The Evaluation of the 2011 Housing Element identifies 12 implementation actions to be eliminated for various reasons, including completing or achieving the objective, or no longer needed or appropriate. The emphasis of the 2011 Housing Element was to encourage smaller units adjacent to commercial services, jobs and transit by allowing increased densities (based on unit size) in the commercial districts and multi-family zones, thereby promoting additional affordable and workforce housing in the most appropriate locations.

Between 2007 and 2014, 1,612 units were produced through new construction, rehabilitation, or preservation of existing units. These results demonstrate that the City's housing goals, policies and implementation actions, as well as funding programs have been successful in producing housing, including deed-restricted affordable units.

Income Groups	New Construction	Rehabilitation	Conservation & Preservation	Total	
Very Low	247	124	221	592	
Low	82	114	224	420	
Moderate	54	0	10	64	
Above Moderate	536			536	
Total	919	238	455	1,612	
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014					

Table H-5: Housing Production (2007 – 2014)

Housing Needs Assessment

This section provides updated information related to the City's demographic, household and housing characteristics and an analysis of the community's housing needs. Many demographic factors affect the demand for housing and the type of housing needed or preferred. Factors such as age, presence of children, size of family / household, and income all contribute to housing needs. The Housing Needs Assessment serves as the basis for which housing goals, policies and programs can be developed to meet the City housing demand as well as provide a fair share of the region's affordable housing.

The Housing Needs Assessment uses the most recent data available, including the 2010 U.S. Census, the, American Community Survey (ACS), California Department of Finance (DOF), California Employment Development Department (EDD), Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), and a variety of other private and non-profit agencies.

This section provides an assessment of:

- Population Growth Trends and Characteristics
- Employment Trends
- Household Characteristics
- Housing Stock and Market Conditions
- Assessment of "At-Risk" Assisted Units
- Housing Needs for Special Needs Population

POPULATION TRENDS AND CHARACTERISTICS

Population Growth Trends

In 1980 the City's population was 74,414 and by January 2014 the Department of Finance estimated the City's to be 90,385 persons, representing a 21 percent increase in the City's population over that 34-year period.

The State Department of Finance (DOF) provides annual updates to the census population figures, and as of January 2014, DOF estimated the City's population to be 90,385. Table H-6 illustrates how the City's population has changed over time. The largest population growth occurred between 1980 and 1990, with an increase of 11,157 people (15 percent), representing an annual growth rate of 1.5 percent. However, in the decades since 1990, the City's population rate of growth has been considerably slower.

Year	Population	Numerical Change	Percentage Change	Average Annual Growth Rate	
1980	74,414				
1990	85,571	11,157	15.0%	1.5%	
2000	89,606	4,035	4.7%	0.5%	
2010	88,410	(1,196)	(1.3)	(0.1%)	
2014	90,385	1,975	2.2%	0.2%	
Source: U.S. Census, Department of Finance 2014					

Table H-6: Population Growth Trends (1980 – 2014) City of Santa Barbara

The City as a percentage of the total Santa Barbara County population has been decreasing over time. While the City of Santa Barbara has historically been the largest incorporated City in the County, as of January 2006, the City of Santa Maria became the largest City in Santa Barbara County. The Regional Growth Forecast (RGF) 2010-2040 prepared by SBCAG indicates that a population shift has occurred from the South Coast region of the County to the North County. As of 2010, about 38 percent of the County's population was residing in North County cities and that share is forecast to increase to 41 percent by 2040. This shift is partly due to the availability of vacant land designated for residential and commercial use in the North County.

Projected Regional Growth

The RGF 2010–2040 forecasts demographic changes for the major economic and demographic regions and the eight incorporated cities of Santa Barbara County. The RGF estimates that from 2010 to 2040, population in the County will increase by more than 96,000 persons (23 percent) to a total of 519,965. Significant population increases are projected in the North County during the 2010-2040 period, while population increases in the South Coast region are expected to be substantially less. During this 30-year period, the South Coast region is forecast to grow in population by about 29,500 or 15 percent while North County is expected to grow by about 66,600 persons or 30 percent.

The City of Santa Barbara's population is projected to reach 96,000 by the year 2040. This represents a 9.8 percent total change or a 0.3 percent annual average increase from 2010 to 2040, representing a decrease in the City's growth trends during the 1980-2000 period.

Age Characteristics

Housing needs are influenced by the age characteristics of the population. Different age groups have different housing needs based on lifestyle, family types, income levels and housing preference. For the purposes of this analysis, the age groups are generally defined as preschool (0-4), school age (5-19), college / early workers / young adults (20-24), prime workforce and child rearing years (25-54), mid-life / pre-retirement (55–64), and senior / retirees (65+ years of age).

Table H-7 illustrates how the City's age distribution in 2010 compared to the County as a whole. This table shows that the City's population is older than Santa Barbara County as a whole, with a median age of 36.8 years compared to 33.6 years for the county. An aging population has implications regarding the type and size of future housing needs, as well as accessibility.

Age Crown	City		County		
Age Gloup	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
0-4 years	4,824	5.5%	27,350	6.5%	
5-19 years	14,451	16.3%	90,938	21.5%	
20-24 years	8,016	9.1%	43,026	10.2%	
25-54 years	37,768	42.7%	163,168	38.5%	
55-64 years	10,778	12.2%	45,015	10.6%	
65+ years	12,573	14.2%	54,398	12.8%	
Total	88,410	100%	423,895	100%	
Median Age	36.8 33.6			.6	
Source: 2010 Census					

Table H-7: Age Distribution City vs. Santa Barbara County





California Department of Finance population projections by age group for Santa Barbara County during the 2010-2060 period are illustrated in Figure H-1. Senior citizens are expected to be the fastest-growing age group over the next 50 years, with the 65+ group representing almost two-thirds of the total population increase. By contrast, the working-age adult population (25-64) is expected to comprise less than one-third of population growth. The Constraints section of this report describes how the City's land use plans and zoning regulations accommodate the housing needs of senior citizens.

Race and Ethnicity

The 2000 Census revised the questions on race and Hispanic origin to better reflect the country's growing diversity. According to a Census 2000 Brief on Race and Hispanic Origin, the federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. For the 2000 Census, the questions on race and Hispanic origin were asked of everyone. The question on Hispanic origin asked people if they were Spanish, Hispanic or Latino. The question on race asked people to report the race or races that they considered themselves to be. Responses to both questions are based on self-identification. The changes in how the census data are collected make comparisons with pre-2000 census data very difficult.

Population by Race and Ethnicity 2000-2010

According to the 2010 Census, persons categorizing themselves as Non-Hispanic White represented about 55 percent of the City's population, reflecting a decrease from 58 percent in 2000 (Table H-8). In contrast, about 38 percent of the City's population identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino in 2010, up from 35 percent in 2000. Compared to Santa Barbara County as a whole, the City had a slightly smaller proportion of Hispanic residents in 2010.

Decial/Ethnia Crown	Ci	ty	County				
Raciai/Etimic Group	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent			
Not Hispanic or Latino	54,819	62.0%	242,208	57.1%			
-White	48,417	54.8%	203,122	47.9%			
-Black or African American	1,177	1.3%	7,242	1.7%			
-American Indian/Alaska Native	313	0.4%	1,843	0.4%			
-Asian	2,927	3.3%	19,591	4.6%			
-Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	94	0.1%	680	0.2%			
-Other races or 2+ races	1,891	2.1%	9,730	2.3%			
Hispanic or Latino (any race)	33,591	38.0%	181,687	42.9%			
Total	88,410	100%	423,895	100%			
Source: 2010 Census, Table DP-1							

Table H-8: Population by Race and Ethnicity City vs. Santa Barbara County

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

City Resident Jobs by Industry

Information on jobs and employment gathered during the 2008-2012 Census American Community Survey is keyed to where people live. Table H-9 shows the distribution of employed City residents by industry compared to Santa Barbara County as a whole. The most notable differences between City and County employment seen in this table are the lower proportion of City residents employed in agriculture and the higher proportion of City residents employed in professional occupations and the arts and entertainment.

	С	ity	Cou	nty
Industry	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	776	1.6%	17,169	8.8%
Construction	3,099	6.6%	11,042	5.7%
Manufacturing	2,944	6.2%	14,411	7.4%
Wholesale trade	797	1.7%	4,729	2.4%
Retail trade	4,700	10.0%	19,575	10.0%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities:	813	1.7%	5,437	2.8%
Information	1,216	2.6%	4,190	2.1%
Finance, insurance, real estate, rental and leasing	2,669	5.7%	9,685	5.0%
Professional, scientific, management, and administration	8,108	17.2%	22,693	11.6%
Educational, health and social services	10,484	22.2%	45,651	23.4%
Arts, entertainment, recreation, and services	7,390	15.7%	22,545	11.6%
Other services	2,794	5.9%	9,409	4.8%
Public administration	1,368	2.9%	8,521	4.4%
Total	47,158	100%	195,057	100%
Source: 2008-2012 Census ACS, Table DP-3	·			

Table H-9: Employment by Industry (2008 – 2012) City vs. Santa Barbara County

City Resident Jobs by Occupation

According to the 2008-2012 American Community Survey, the majority (62 percent) of City residents are employed in white-collar occupations, including Management, business, science, arts, sales and office occupations. Compared to the County of Santa Barbara, City residents held white-collar jobs at a slightly higher rate during this period (Table H-10).

Orenaria Catalon	City of San	ta Barbara	Santa Barbara County	
Occupation Category	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	19,530	41.4%	68,322	35.0%
Service occupations	11,424	24.2%	41,731	21.4%
Sales and office occupations	9,831	20.8%	42,310	21.7%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	3,680	7.8%	26,685	13.7%
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	2,693	5.7%	16,009	8.2%
Total	47,158	100%	195,057	100%
Source: 2008-2012 American Community Survey				

Table H-10:	Residents in Workforce by Occupation (2008 – 2012)
	City vs. County of Santa Barbara

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Household Composition

Household characteristics are important indicators of the type and size of housing needed. Household type, income level, special needs population all contribute to the housing needs of a community. The formation of households can be influenced by population growth, adult children leaving home, divorce, and aging of the population.

The Census Bureau has very specific definitions of households and families. The Census defines a "household" as all persons occupying a housing unit, which may include single persons living alone, families related through blood, marriage or adoption, or unrelated persons sharing a single unit, such as roommates. The Census Bureau defines "family" as two or more persons living together who are related. This definition may differ from how "family" is defined under state or federal fair housing law (see further discussion in the Constraints section regarding the City's definition of "family" for zoning purposes). Persons living in group quarters, such as dormitories, retirement or convalescent homes, or other group living arrangements are included in population totals, but are not considered households.

Household Growth Trends 1990-2014

Table H-11 shows that between 1990 and 2000, the number of City households increased by 1,257, representing a slight annual increase of 0.4 percent. The 2010 Census reported a net loss of 156 households in the City during 2000-2010. The California Department of Finance estimated the number of households residing in the City to be 35,986 as of January 2014, an average annual increase of 0.4% since 2010.

Year	Households	Numerical Change	Annual Percentage Change		
1990	34,348				
2000	35,605	1,257	0.4%		
2010	35,449	(156)	(0.04%)		
2014	35,986	537	0.4%		
Sources: 1990, 2000, 2010 Census, Department of Finance					

Table H-11: Household Growth Trends (1990 – 2014) City of Santa Barbara

Household Size

Table H-12 shows how household size has changed over time (1990 - 2014) for the City, the County of Santa Barbara and the State of California. Household size for the City increased slightly from 2.41 persons per households in 1990 to 2.47 persons per households in 2000. Countywide, household size increased to 2.8 persons per household. Statewide household size increased to 2.87 persons per household. The City's average household size has remained steady since 2000 while household sizes in the County and state as a whole have increased slightly. The City's average household size remains below the County and State.

Table H-12: Household Size (1990 – 2014) City of Santa Barbara

Year	City Household Size	County Household Size	State Household Size			
1990	2.41	2.73	2.79			
2000	2.47	2.80	2.87			
2010	2.45	2.86	2.90			
2014	2.47	2.88	2.95			
Source: 1990, 2000, 2010 Census, Department of Finance						

Household Income

Household income distribution for the City, County and the State as reported by the 2008-2012 American Community Survey is shown in Table H-13. This table shows that household incomes in the City are somewhat higher than the County and the State as a whole. The median household income for the City was estimated to be \$63,758. For the County and State the median household income was estimated at \$62,723 and \$61,400 respectively.

-	City of SB		SB County		California	
Income	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$10,000	1,578	4.5%	7,209	5.1%	683,523	5.5%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1,697	4.9%	6,380	4.5%	645,134	5.2%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	3,302	9.5%	12,907	9.1%	1,179,814	9.5%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	3,173	9.1%	12,883	9.1%	1,132,044	9.1%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	4,264	12.2%	17,613	12.5%	1,538,363	12.3%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	6,053	17.3%	25,691	18.2%	2,137,590	17.1%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	4,154	11.9%	17,639	12.5%	1,548,498	12.4%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	4,866	13.9%	21,525	15.2%	1,883,671	15.1%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	2,885	8.3%	9,833	7.0%	836,973	6.7%
\$200,000 or more	2,928	8.4%	9,567	6.8%	880,721	7.1%
Total Households	34,900	100%	141,247	100%	12,466,331	100%
Median HH Income	\$63,	758	\$62,723 \$61,400			400
Source: 2008-2012 American Community Survey Table DP-3						

Table H-13: Households by Income

Population Living In Poverty

The 2008-2012 American Community Survey estimated that 14.7 percent of City residents (12,844 persons) had incomes below the poverty level. In 2012, the federal poverty level for a family of four was \$23,850.

HOUSING STOCK AND MARKET CONDITIONS

Unit Type

Table H-14 reflects the housing unit mix for the City during 2000-2014. In the City, the breakdown in unit type has been very consistent over the last 30 years reflecting the City's age and historic development patterns.

In 2000, there were just over 37,000 housing units in the City. Of those 35,605 were occupied housing units (4.2 percent vacancy rate). Total housing units include single family homes, buildings or complexes involving 2 to 4 units and buildings or complexes with 5 or more units and a category for mobile homes, boats, RVs or trailers.

The 2000 Census found that 53.7 percent (19,971) of all units were single family homes. Another 14.8 percent (5,487) of the units were in complexes of two to four units; 30.1 percent (11,200) of the units were in complexes of 5 or more units and 1.4 percent (519) of the units were in mobile homes, boats, RVs or trailers. Countywide, 65 percent of housing was comprised of single family homes.

As of January 1, 2014, the total number of housing units had increased to 38,393 representing an increase of 573 units or about 1.5 percent. Approximately 56 percent were single family units, 15 percent were in complexes of two to four units, 29 percent were in complexes of 5 or more units, and 1 percent were in mobile homes, boats RVs or trailers.

City of Santa Darbara						
Housing Type	2000		2010		2014	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single Family	19,971	53.7%	21,412	56.6%	21,447	55.9%
Multi-Family 2 - 4 Units	5,487	14.8%	5,392	14.3%	5,550	14.5%
Multi-Family 5+ Units	11,200	30.1%	10,626	28.1%	11,006	28.7%
Mobile Home & Other	519	1.4%	390	1.0%	390	1.0%
Total	37,177	100%	37,820	100%	38,393	100%
Sources: 2000. 2010 Census. Department of Finance 2014						

Table H-14: Housing Units and Type (2000 – 2014) City of Santa Barbara

Tenure and Vacancy Rate

Table H-15 illustrates the occupied housing units in the City and the percentage breakdown of renter and owner occupied housing units. The breakdown has remained relatively constant over time with approximately 59 percent of units being renter-occupied and 41 percent of the City's units being owner-occupied as estimated by the 2008-2012 American Community Survey. The City has a lower rate of owner-occupancy than the rest of Santa Barbara County and that of California as a whole. In 2010, only 38.9 percent of occupied units in the City were owner-occupied, while the County and State had owner-occupancy rates of 53 percent and 56 percent, respectively.

One explanation for the lower rate of City home ownership, compared to the County and State, is the high housing prices in the South Coast region. Additionally, while there is no way to make a clear distinction, it is interesting to note that close to 56 percent of the City's housing stock are single family homes yet only 39 percent of all occupied units are owner occupied. Therefore, many single family homes are part of the City's rental housing stock.

Tenure	2000		2010		2008-2012	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner Occupied	14,957	42.0%	13,784	38.9%	14,230	40.8%
Renter Occupied	20,648	58.0%	21,665	61.1%	20,670	59.2%
Total Occupied	35,605	100%	35,449	100%	34,900	100%
Vacancy Rate	4.0	4.0%		3%	8.6	%
Source:2000, 2010 Census, 2008-2012 American Community Survey						

Table H-15: Tenure and Vacancy Rates (2000 – 2012) City of Santa Barbara

According to ACS estimates, the vacancy rate averaged about 8.6%¹ during 2008-2012. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), a vacancy rate of 5 percent is considered sufficient to provide choice and mobility. However, as is the case in many coastal areas, a portion of vacant units are second homes held for occasional use and therefore are not part of the rental housing stock.

Unit Size

Another important characteristic of the City's housing supply is the size of units with respect to number of bedrooms. Of the City's owner-occupied housing units, nearly half (49 percent) are 3-bedroom units while 25 percent are 2-bedroom and 18 percent are 4-bedroom units. About 5 percent are studio or 1-bedroom units, while about 3 percent have 5 or more bedrooms. Of the rental housing units in the City, about 36 percent are 1-bedroom units and 39 percent are 2-bedroom units. About 15 percent of units have 3 bedrooms, while only about 3 percent of units have 4 or more bedrooms.

City of Santa Darbara							
Unit Sine	Owner-C	Occupied	Renter-Occupied				
Unit Size	Units	Percent	Number	Percent			
0 bedrooms	43	0.3%	1,446	7.0%			
1 bedroom	640	4.5%	7,525	36.4%			
2 bedrooms	3,556	25.0%	7,997	38.7%			
3 bedrooms	6,969	49.0%	3,130	15.1%			
4 bedrooms	2,561	18.0%	358	1.7%			
5 or more bedrooms	461	3.2%	214	1.0%			
Total units	14,230	100%	20,670	100%			
Source: 2008-2012 ACS, Table DP-4							

Table H-16: Housing Unit Size by Tenure (2008 – 2012) City of Santa Barbara

¹ Housing market information for Santa Barbara indicates a considerably lower vacancy rate. According to a 2014 housing market survey prepared by Dyer Sheehan Group, Santa Barbara's average rental vacancy rate is 0.6 percent.


Figure H-2 Unit Size by Tenure (2008-2012)

Age of Housing Stock

Table H-17 and Figure H-3 show the year housing was built in the City of Santa Barbara compared to the County as a whole as reported in the 2008-2012 ACS. Over 80 percent of the City's housing stock was built prior to 1980. This raises an issue with respect to housing maintenance. Lack of maintenance can discourage reinvestment, and can result in depressed neighborhood property values and reduced quality of life in the community. Generally, residential structures begin to show signs of deterioration as they approach 30 years. Housing units older than 30 years typically need rehabilitation work to major elements of the structures, such as roofing, siding, plumbing and electrical systems.

	Santa I	Santa Barbara		ara County
Year Built	Units	Percent	Number	Percent
Built 2010 or later	22	0.1%	189	0.1%
Built 2000 to 2009	1,556	4.1%	13,228	8.7%
Built 1990 to 1999	1,590	4.2%	13,762	9.0%
Built 1980 to 1989	3,627	9.5%	24,750	16.2%
Built 1970 to 1979	7,157	18.7%	28,850	18.9%
Built 1960 to 1969	6,346	16.6%	32,009	21.0%
Built 1950 to 1959	7,124	18.7%	19,987	13.1%
Built 1940 to 1949	3,012	7.9%	6,458	4.2%
Built 1939 or earlier	7,742	20.3%	13,476	8.8%
Total units	38,176	100%	152,709	100%
Source: 2008-2012 ACS, Table DI	2-4			

Table H-17: Housing Unit Age (2008-2012) City of Santa Barbara



Figure H-3 Year Housing Unit Built (2008-2012) City of Santa Barbara

Housing Conditions

Using American Community Survey information and a windshield survey of two of the larger, older residential neighborhoods, a sample of information on housing conditions was prepared in 2009.

The age of housing in Santa Barbara is one indicator of the overall housing conditions. Many state and federal programs use age of housing to determine the availability of funds for housing or community development. A significant measure of housing age is the number of units built before 1949. According to the 2006-2008 American Community Survey, 12,172 housing units in the City were built prior to 1949. In addition, 452 units in the City were reported to lack complete kitchen facilities and 56 units lacked complete plumbing facilities.

In December 2009, City Building Inspectors performed a windshield survey of two residential neighborhoods known for containing a large number of older housing units. One survey area was located in the "Eastside" neighborhood and one survey area was located in the "Westside" neighborhood. The inspectors surveyed the housing units for the exterior condition of foundation, framing members, roof coverings, windows, exterior weatherproofing (walls) and electrical service. The condition of these elements was rated from "fair/good condition" to "replacement needed". Based on these ratings, the units were determined to be in "sound" to "dilapidated" condition.

The Westside survey area included 278 housing units (Table H-18). The majority of the units were single family dwellings, followed by duplex units, and multi-family unit complexes. Of the 278 units surveyed, 29 units were found to be in moderate or substantial need of repair. None of the units surveyed were considered to be dilapidated.

Housing Type	Sound	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Dilapidated	Total
Single	127	33	20	4	0	184
Duplex	31	7	2	2	0	42
Multi-family	46	5	1	0	0	52
Total	204	45	23	6	0	278
Percent	73%	16%	8%	2%	0%	
Source: 2009 City Building Inspection Survey						

Table H-18: Housing Condition Survey: Westside (2009) **City of Santa Barbara**

The Eastside survey area included 151 housing units (Table H-19). Of the 151 housing units surveyed, the majority of the units (118) were single family dwellings, followed by duplex units, and multi-family unit complexes, similar to the Westside survey area. In the Eastside survey, 15 units were found to be in moderate or substantial need of repair. None of the units surveyed were considered dilapidated.

City of Santa Barbara Minor Moderate **Substantial** Dilapidated Total **Housing Type** Sound Single 94 11 11 2 0 118 17 3 0 0 Duplex 1 21 10 1 0 0 Multi-family 1 12 Total 121 15 13 2 0 151 9% Percent 80% 10% 1% 0%

Table H-19: Housing Condition Survey: Eastside (2009)

Source: 2009 City Building Inspection Survey

The survey concluded that 44 out of a total 429 units, or 10 percent of the surveyed units, are in need of moderate or substantial repair. Housing units rated as needing "substantial" repair can be an indicator that those units may be in need of rehabilitation or replacement.

Based on the observations of City building and code compliance staff, housing conditions do not appear to have changed significantly in the past five years.

Housing Costs

Housing Affordability Criteria

State law establishes five income categories for purposes of housing programs based on the area (i.e., county) median income ("AMI"):

- Extremely-Low (30% or less of AMI)
- Very-Low (31-50% of AMI)

- Low (51-80% of AMI)
- Moderate (81-120% of AMI)
- Above Moderate (over 120% of AMI)

In addition to these categories, the City has identified "Middle-Income" 160% AMI and "Upper-Middle" 200% AMI in recognition of the high housing costs in the South Coast area.

Housing affordability is based on the relationship between household income and housing expenses. According to HUD and the California Department of Housing and Community Development, housing is considered "affordable" if the monthly payment is no more than 30% of a household's gross income. In some areas, these income limits may be increased to adjust for high housing costs.

Table H-20 shows 2014 affordable rent levels and estimated affordable purchase prices for housing in Santa Barbara County by income category. Based on state-adopted standards and a family of four, the maximum affordable monthly rent for extremely-low-income households is \$598, while the maximum affordable rent for very-low-income households is \$995. The maximum affordable rent for low-income households is \$1,593, while the maximum for moderate-income households is \$2,199.

Maximum purchase prices are more difficult to determine due to variations in mortgage interest rates and qualifying procedures, down payments, special tax assessments, homeowner association fees, property insurance rates, etc. With this caveat, the maximum home purchase prices by income category shown in Table H-20 have been estimated based on typical conditions.

2014 County Median Income = \$73,300	Income Limits	Affordable Rent	Affordable Price (est.)
Extremely Low (<30%)	\$23,900	\$598	
Very Low (31-50%)	\$39,800	\$995	\$150,000
Low (51-80%)	\$63,700	\$1,593	\$250,000
Moderate (81-120%)	\$87,950	\$2,199	\$350,000
Above moderate (>120%)	>\$87,950	>\$2,199	>\$350,000
Based on a family of 4		-	

Table H-20: Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs (2014) Santa Barbara County

-30% of gross income for rent or principle/interest/taxes/insurance (PITI)

-10% down payment, 4.5% interest, 1.25% taxes & insurance, \$200 HOA dues

Source: Cal. HCD; J.H. Douglas & Associates

For-Sale Housing

Housing sales price statistics reported by DataQuick Information Systems for calendar year 2013² showed median sales prices ranging from \$685,000 to \$2.3 million for single-family homes and from \$500,000 to \$1.2 million for condos in Santa Barbara depending on zip code. Based on the estimated affordable purchase prices shown in Table H-20, it is unlikely that many market rate homes or condos would be affordable to lower- or moderate-income residents. These data illustrate the fact that in beach communities, very large public subsidies are generally required to reduce sales prices to a level that is affordable to low- and moderate-income buyers. At a price of \$500,000, there is a "gap" of about \$150,000 between the market price and the maximum price a moderate-income household can afford to pay for a home. For low-income households, this gap is about \$250,000.

Rental Housing

An internet rental survey conducted in August 2014 found very few apartment units available in Santa Barbara for under \$2,000 per month. As would be expected in a desirable beach community in Southern California, when market rents are compared to the amounts households can afford to pay (Table H-20), it is clear that lower-income households have a very difficult time finding housing without overpaying. At a rent of \$2,000 per month, the gap between market rent and affordable rent at the very-low-income level is about \$1,000 per month, while the gap at the extremely-low-income level is about \$1,400 per month.

ASSESSMENT OF "AT RISK" ASSISTED UNITS

Statutory Requirements

2

Section 65583(a)(8) of the Government Code requires that the Housing Element analyze:

"Existing assisted housing developments that are eligible to change to non-low-income housing uses during the next 10 years due to termination of subsidy contracts, mortgage prepayment, or expiration of use restrictions."

"Assisted housing developments" are defined in State law as:

"Rental housing that receives government assistance under federal programs, state and local multi-family revenue bond programs, local redevelopment programs, the federal Community Development Block Grant Program, or local in-lieu fees, and multi-family rental units that were developed pursuant to local inclusionary housing programs or used to qualify for a density bonus."

http://www.dqnews.com/Charts/Annual-Charts/LA-Times-Charts/ZIPLAT13.aspx

Affordable Housing Units "At Risk"

As of July 2014, there are over 5,600 affordable housing units in the City of Santa Barbara, of which about 5,068 or 90 percent are affordable rental housing units. 2,186 of these affordable rental housing units involve federal rental housing subsidies (see Section 8 Program below). The remaining affordable rental housing units were subsidized with public funds (federal, state and local) that the City administers (see City of Santa Barbara's Affordable Housing Program below). With direct financial assistance from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the City's Housing Authority has constructed and now owns and manages nearly 912 units in the form of public housing for low and very low-income households. These affordable public housing units are strictly controlled by HUD and are not considered to be at risk of being sold or converted to market rate housing.

At-Risk Affordable Rental Housing Program

Except for the public housing and other Housing Authority units, the City does not own any affordable housing units. In return for the financial assistance the City provides, the developer/owners of the City's affordable housing stock are required to make the units affordable to low income households for a specified period of time. The City provides most of its financial assistance to local nonprofit organizations, since few for-profit firms have approached the City for assistance in building affordable housing. Regardless of whether they are for profit or nonprofit, all developer/owners sign affordability covenants that specify allowable rent and income levels for the project.

Upon expiration of a project's affordability controls, the affordable units are at risk of being sold or converted to market rate housing. Based on a thorough review of the City's database records, the affordable rental housing projects listed below in Table H-21 have affordability controls that will expire during the next 10 years (2015 through 2025).

Address	Owner	Affordable Units	Funding Sources	Earliest Exp. Date
1409 Kenwood Road	City SB Parks	1/Low	CDBG ¹	2015
1018-1028 Castillo Street	СНС	32/Low	CDBG, RDA ² , State Def	2015
227-C E. De la Guerra Street	De La Guerra Court Invest	1/Low	Zoning Mod ³	2016
620-652 Castillo Street	HASB	17/Low	CDBG, RDA	2016
910 E. Haley Street	Sherwin c/o Meridian Group	1/Low	Zoning Mod	2016
1426 Euclid Avenue	DeMare Inv.	1/Low	Zoning Mod	2016
401-404 Transfer Avenue	HASB	8/Low	RDA ²	2016
1511 Bath Street	Smagala	10/Low	RDA	2016
209 W. Cota Street	Smagala	6/Low	RDA	2017
222 W. Micheltorena Street	Smalgala	12/Low	Zoning Mod	2017
811-815 Salsipuedes Street	Hawkes	13/Low	RDA	2018
203-201 Hitchcock Way	Towbes Group	111/Moderate	Zoning Mod	2018
1215 Cacique Street	Wright	5/Low	Zoning Mod	2019
821 Bath Street	СНС	12/Low	CDBG, RDA	2019
420 E. De la Guerra Street	Goldrich, Kest & Associates	50/Low	HUD ⁴ Regulatory/Option	2018
221-223 W. Victoria Street	HASB	12/Low	RDA	2020
114 La Paz	William Reed	2/Low	Zoning Mod	2020
1306 Garden Street	Lippincott	4/Moderate	Zoning Mod	2021
1910-1912 Robbins Street	Rivera	2/Low	Zoning Mod	2021
222 Meigs Road	Shoreline Development	2/Moderate	Zoning Mod	2022
1104 Carpinteria Street	Borgatello	2/Moderate	Zoning Mod	2023
47 Broadmoor Plaza	СНС	15/Low	RDA	2023
107 E. Micheltorena Street	Phoenix House	11/Low	CDBG	2023
1409 Castillo Street	СНС	14/Low	CDBG/RDA	2024
803 Laguna Street	Laguna Cottages	44/Low	CDBG/RDA	2025
Total:	25 Projects	388		

Table H-21: Projects With Affordable Rental Housing At Risk (2015 – 2025) City of Santa Barbara

Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014

¹ CDBG stands for the federal Community Development Block Grant Program.

² RDA stands for the City's Redevelopment Agency Housing Set-Aside funds.

³ Zoning Mod does not stand for any source of funding, but rather for modifications to the City's zoning code that were granted in return for the dedication of affordable housing units.

⁴ HUD stands for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

As indicated in the Assessment of Conversion Risk section below, nonprofit owners are considerably more likely than for-profit owners to maintain affordable housing units beyond the expiration of affordability controls.

The majority of the at-risk affordable rental units owned by for-profit firms (50% percent) are located within one project – Rancho Franciscan (Table H-21). This 111-unit project is a senior housing development that is restricted to moderate income households. While the rent and income restrictions expire in 2018, the restrictions for senior housing continue for the life of the project. The project's affordability is not expected to change significantly for several reasons: 1) the current restrictions to moderate income rents approximate market rents, 2) the senior housing restrictions will continue, 3) a recent HUD refinance and regulatory agreement recorded on the property, and 4) the owner is a highly-regarded developer who is active in local philanthropy, serves on boards and advisory groups to several local nonprofit organizations, and participates in the Section 8 rental subsidy program for low income residents at Rancho Franciscan and other developments.

The remaining 21 at-risk affordable rental units owned by for-profit firms are located in 13 projects. Most projects did not receive any local subsidy funding to develop the affordable units, but did receive zoning modifications in the form of density bonus that resulted in mixed-income developments.

At-Risk Affordable Ownership Housing

The City also provides affordable ownership housing opportunities for moderate-income households. Most of the early ownership projects were developed by two nonprofit organizations, Homes for People and Santa Barbara Community Housing Corporation, with financial assistance from the City and its Redevelopment Agency. Covenants on units in these projects were typically 30-year covenants. Should the owner sell before the 30-year term concluded, then the next owner would sign on for a new 90-year covenant (up to a maximum 99-year period of affordability).

Listed below in Table H-22 are 19 ownership projects in which covenants for individual ownership units could expire during the next ten years (2015 through 2025). The 19 ownership projects constitute a total of 222 affordable units. Covenants for 112 units could expire during the next 10 years; the covenants for the remaining 110 units will not expire until later (since these units were sold to new qualifying homeowners before the end of their affordability period). It is possible that owners in some of the 112 units with expiring covenants may end up selling before the end of their affordability period, which would trigger an additional period of affordability up to a maximum of 99 years.

Most of the new affordable ownership housing projects are currently built by for-profit developers without financial assistance from the City or its Successor Housing Entity. The projects are built pursuant to Inclusionary Housing requirements and Density Bonus incentives. Affordability periods have been extended to 90 years (which "roll" upon resale to a maximum affordability period of 99 years).

Address	At Risk Units	Total # Affordable Units	Funding Sources	Earliest Exp. Date
3902-3930 Vía Diego/402-432 Vía Rosa				
La Colina Village	31/Moderate	50	Zoning Mod ¹	2015
3558-3578 Modoc Road				
Arroyo Verde	5/Moderate	13	Zoning Mod	2016
22 N. Voluntario Street				
Los Sueños	6/Moderate	6	RDA ²	2016
2001-11 Elise Way				
Maravillas	2/Moderate	6	RDA	2016
329 W. Ortega Street				
Ortega Homes	1/Moderate	3	RDA	2017
1024-1030 Quinientos/2-12 S. Voluntario Street				
Campos Feliz	9/Moderate	18	RDA	2018
3708-3773 Greggory Way				
Franciscan Villas	18/Moderate	46	Zoning Mod	2018
414 W. De la Guerra Street				
Casa Chula	3/Moderate	5	RDA	2019
915, 917, 919 Bath Street				
Old Vic	1/Moderate	3	RDA	2019
1310 San Andres Street				
Canto Arroyo	4/Moderate	5	RDA	2020
820 W. Victoria Street				
Victoria Town Homes	1/Moderate	1	Zoning Mod	2020
1019 Quinientos Street				
La Ventura	3/Moderate	10	RDA	2021
2014-2016 Modoc/2041-2051 Oak Avenue				
Oak Creek	1/Moderate	6	RDA	2022
1838 San Andres Street				
Pinecone	7/Moderate	10	RDA	2022
720 Castillo Street				
The Commons	1/Moderate	3	RDA	2022
33 Ocean View Avenue				
Pueblo Andaluz	6/Moderate	10	RDA	2023
1920 Robbins Street		<i>.</i>		2022
Robbins Court	4/Moderate	6	Zoning Mod	2023
211 W. Gutierrez Street	704 1	16	DDA	202/
	//Moderate	16	KDA	2024
831 W. Anapamu Street	2/14/1	-		2025
/ Oaks	2/Moderate	5	Zoning Mod	2025
Total: 19 Projects	112	222		

Table H-22: Projects With Affordable Ownership Housing At Risk (2015 – 2025) City of Santa Barbara

Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014

¹Zoning Mod does not stand for any source of funding, but rather for modifications to the City's zoning code that were granted in return for the dedication of affordable housing units.

²*RDA stands for the City's Redevelopment Agency Housing Set-Aside funds.*

Affordable Housing Projects with Expired Affordability Covenants

There are four projects with a total of 9 units where affordability covenants have expired since the City's last Housing Element Update (from 2007 through 2011). The four projects (all rentals) are listed in Table H-23 below. The four projects owned by for-profits received density bonus zoning modifications (but no City funds).

In 2010, the City changed its policies to extend the affordability period for rental projects from 60 to 90 years.

Table H-23: Affordable Rental Housing With Expired Affordability Covenants (2007 – 2014) City of Santa Barbara

Project	Units	Status
520 E. Olive/De la Guerra Streets	1	Affordability covenant with private owner expired in 2009
232 E. Cañón Perdido Street	1	Affordability covenant with private owner expired in 2010
126 E. Cañón Perdido Street	1	Affordability covenant with private owner expired in 2010
818 N. Salsipuedes Street	6	Affordability covenant with private owner expired in 2012
Total: 4 Projects	9	
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014		

Monitoring At-Risk Affordable Units

All affordable housing units are monitored throughout the affordability period established as part of their recorded affordability covenants. No later than 12 months prior to the expiration of an affordability covenant for rental properties, the property owner is contacted to discuss and identify ways to extend the affordability period.

If the affordability period is not extended, notices are sent to tenants with information regarding the impending expiration of the affordability period. Tenants are made aware that rents could be raised and are provided information on rules established by State law regarding rent increases, noticing requirements, City rental mediation services and other affordable housing providers in the area.

Implementation Action H21.1 is included in the Goals, Policies and Implementation section of this Element to monitor and preserve at-risk affordable housing units in order to maintain the affordability of existing units that serve low and moderate income households.

Assessment of Conversion

As enumerated above in Table H-21 and Table H-22, there are 25 affordable rental housing projects with 388 at-risk units, and 19 affordable ownership housing projects with 112 at-risk units. Affordable rental housing units under for-profit ownership are perceived as being at higher risk of conversion to market rate housing when affordability controls expire. This is in contrast to the affordable housing units owned by nonprofit organizations. Most of the at-risk affordable rental housing units (66 percent) are owned by non-profit organizations.

The affordable rental housing units considered at the highest risk of conversion are the remaining 132 units that are owned by for-profit firms. Fortunately, 111 of these 132 units (84 percent) are located in projects where either tenancy restrictions (such as senior housing) will continue for the life of the project, or the owner actively participates in the Section 8 Program (or both).

The City has taken steps to prolong the life of affordable housing units. As mentioned above, the term for new affordability covenants is now 90 years. The City also works nearly exclusively with nonprofit firms for the creation of its affordable rental housing, which effectively extends the affordability period in perpetuity (or at least for as long as the nonprofit organization is in existence). With the exception of secondary dwelling units, every affordable rental unit created over the last decade in Santa Barbara was created by a governmental and/or nonprofit organization.

The City relies mostly on for-profit firms to create the affordable ownership housing through density bonus incentives and inclusionary housing requirements. Covenant terms for ownership units were also extended to 90 years.

Qualified Entities and Resources to Preserve "At-Risk Units"

As described above, the entities most qualified to preserve at-risk units are nonprofit organizations. This City currently works with four non-profit organizations, whose sole mission is to create and preserve affordable housing for low and moderate income people. The City works nearly exclusively with these nonprofits in its programs to create affordable rental housing.

The Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program is a valuable resource that helps preserve at-risk units. Both nonprofit organizations and for-profit firms participate in this program, which is operated by the City's Housing Authority. Under this program, federal funds are used to help low income households pay rent for market rate housing. Under this program, eligible households find their own apartments and the property owners receive direct payments equal to the difference between the market rent and the tenant's contribution to the rent (30 percent of household income). There are currently 2,186 units that are now affordable to low income households under this program.

The Section 8 Program has been in existence since 1975. Funding for the program is always subject to federal budget decisions made in Congress. The City Housing Authority believes that there will continue to be sufficient Section 8 vouchers for all of the City projects that have recorded affordability conditions, but the number of vouchers available for use with private landlords may vary, depending on federal funding levels. The City and the City Housing Authority will continue to advocate for continued full funding of the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program.

Estimated Replacement Costs

Producing affordable housing in Santa Barbara is very expensive. Low income rents simply do not support the conventional financing needed to acquire property and build affordable housing. Deep subsidies are required. Land costs are high, even in areas with high concentrations of low income households. Nevertheless, the City works closely with non-profit developers to leverage additional funds and limit the need for local subsidy funds.

Based on new construction figures for the next affordable housing project to be built in the City, the total development cost is \$330,000 per unit. In leveraging other funds, such as tax-exempt bond financing, conventional loans, and contributions from the developer, the City subsidy was kept to \$72,500 per unit.

Financial Resources for Replacement Housing

The City is proud of its affordable housing record. Since 1973, the City has provided approximately \$131 million in grants and loans for the production and preservation of about 4,085 affordable housing units. As detailed below, the City receives affordable housing funds from a number of sources. Only a very small portion of these funds would be necessary to replace the 9 affordable rental units identified above as being at a higher risk of conversion. The remainder of the funds will be used to continue the City's strong commitment to providing affordable housing.

The City's Redevelopment Agency Housing Set-aside Funds

The largest source of City affordable housing financing was the City's Redevelopment Agency ("RDA"). As required under state redevelopment law, the RDA dedicated at least 20% of its "tax increment" income generated from its downtown redevelopment project area for affordable housing. Since the City's Redevelopment Agency began operating in 1977, the RDA provided \$66.1 million in loans and grants of redevelopment funds to affordable housing projects in the City. In June 2011, the California Legislature adopted the Assembly Bill 1X26 (the "Dissolution Act") resulting in the dissolution of all redevelopment agencies in California as of February 1, 2012. The Bill included provisions for the City, in which the agency was located, to assume all right, title and responsibility for the housing assets of the dissolved agency. On January 10, 2012, the Santa Barbara City Council designated the City of Santa Barbara as the Successor Housing Entity to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Santa Barbara and on November 20, 2012, the City adopted Resolution No. 12-083 and assumed all right, title and interest in all housing assets of the former Redevelopment Agency.

State Assembly Bill 341 became effective in January 2014. This Bill applies primarily to the unencumbered Housing Asset Funds (HAF) and provides that these funds must be used as was previously required for monies in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund established under the Community Redevelopment Law.

The City has invested \$14.38 million on five affordable housing projects intended to serve special needs/homeless populations with low, very low, and extremely low income levels. Table H-24 lists the six affordable housing projects totaling 136 units.

Only of Ganta Dalbala						
Project	Status	Amount (Millions)	Low	Very Low	Total Units	
Mom's Place	Completed	\$1.60	2	14	16	
Bradley Studios	Completed	\$8.40	0	54	54	
Habitat #3 Cañón Perdido	Construction	\$0.93	12	0	12	
233 W. Ortega/630 Bath Streets	Completed	\$0.30	2	0	6	
2904 State Street	Completed	\$1.15	8	0	8	
Jardín de las Rosas	Pre-development	\$2.00	39	0	40	
Total		\$14.38	63	68	136	
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014						

Table H-24: Affordable Housing Projects Using Set-Aside Funds

Federal Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program Funds

The City is a Participating Jurisdiction under the HOME Program and has received funding since the inception of the program in 1992. Allocations have decreased steadily from \$750,000 to \$384,000. By law, HOME funds must be spent on producing or preserving housing for low and very low-income households.

Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds

The City is a CDBG Entitlement Area and receives an annual allotment of funds accordingly. This funding has also decreased steadily from \$1.1 million to \$787,000. The funds must benefit low and very low-income individuals. The City spends most of its CDBG entitlement funds on capital improvements and related social services. As mentioned above, CDBG program income (loan repayments) is used for rehabilitation of non-profit rental projects.

SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS

This section describes the City of Santa Barbara's housing needs for "special needs" groups. The special needs analysis looks at housing needs for groups of people who are likely to be least able to compete for housing in the private market, including persons with disabilities, elderly, large households, farmworkers, female-headed households and the homeless. Information is also provided on overcrowding and overpayment, as well as a summary of the Housing Authority Waiting list for subsidized housing. A discussion is also presented of middle-income housing needs, and College and University Housing. Programs and policies to address the identified housing needs are presented in the Goals, Policies and Implementation section of the Housing Element.

Special Housing Needs Groups

Certain segments of the population have more difficulty finding decent and safe housing due to special circumstances. These circumstances could relate to family type, household size, disability or other household characteristics such as employment or limited/fixed income. Some groups may need special physical configurations, or support services. All special needs groups generally have difficulty competing for housing in a market where housing costs are high. State law has specific requirements for assessing the needs of the elderly, persons with disabilities, large families, farmworkers, families with female heads of households, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter."

This section identifies more specifically the needs of these groups, which often overlap and compete for the same type of housing. The most common and overriding need among the groups is for subsidized, affordable housing. In general, these special needs housing groups have been identified due to their limited incomes and inability to compete in the private sector housing market.

Elderly

The number of elderly persons is expected to continue to increase over the coming decades due to the aging "Baby Boom" generation and longer life expectancies. As discussed earlier, long-range forecasts by the California Department of Finance estimate that the increase in the senior population will far exceed those in younger age groups (see Figure H-1).

Housing affordability is an important consideration for older residents, as they typically live on fixed incomes. Persons age 65 and older often have special needs related to housing, such as particular construction and location requirements to facilitate mobility and access. For instance they may require ramps, handrails, lower cabinets, and counters to allow greater access and mobility. In addition, due to limited mobility, seniors need close proximity and access to public facilities (e.g., medical and shopping) as well as public transit. Housing for this age group is often constructed at higher densities and typically consists of one and two bedroom apartment units.

According to the 2010 Census, the City has a greater share of residents over the age of 65 (14.2 percent) compared to Santa Barbara County (12.8 percent) and California as a whole (11.4 percent).

Persons with Disabilities

Persons with disabilities have special housing needs and face unique problems in obtaining affordable and adequate housing. Persons with disabilities often have particular requirements due to accessibility issues, fixed or lower income and high health care costs. There are different types and levels of disabilities, including physical (mobility impairments, sight impairments, hearing impairments or speech impediments), mental and developmental disabilities. Because of this broad range of types of disabilities, identifying and meeting housing needs is challenging.

Individuals with disabilities require conveniently-located housing in close proximity to transit, retail and commercial services, as well as their place of employment. Housing which is adapted for wheelchair accessibility, ramps, lower sinks, grip bars, wider doorways, etc., is required for the physically disabled. Making a new or existing dwelling unit accessible requires different features depending on the type of disability. The Federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires new multi-family construction to be accessible to persons with disabilities. However, units built prior to ADA are rarely accessible and some of these units can be difficult to retrofit.

Another serious problem that people with disabilities face is one of housing affordability. The cost of housing in Santa Barbara and the low-income status of most people with disabilities make it difficult to find housing. For many of the disabled population, the only source of income is Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. Given this limited income, rent often accounts for a major portion of their monthly expenses. Therefore, a variety of housing types, both rental and owner-occupied, should be made available for this segment of the population.

Local community-based organizations that serve the disabled population include the Independent Living Resource Center, the Tri-Counties Regional Center, Alpha Resource Center, CHANCE, INC, AIDS Housing Santa Barbara, Catholic Charities, Salvation Army and the Mental Health Association.

As shown in Table H-25, about 10 percent of the civilian non-institutionalized population living in Santa Barbara stated that they had a disability.

As may be expected, persons 65 years of age and older reported the highest incidence of disabilities. About one-third of seniors indicated a disability. The most frequently reported disabilities were ambulatory difficulties (20 percent), independent living (17 percent) and hearing (15 percent).

Table H-25:	Persons	With	Disa	bilities	(2008 -	- 2012)
	City o	of San	ta Ba	rbara		

Disability by Age Group	Persons	Percent			
Total civilian non-institutionalized population	88,087	-			
With any disability	8,868	10.1%			
Under Age 5 - total persons	4,912				
With a hearing difficulty	65	1.3%			
With a vision difficulty	44	0.9%			
Age 5 to 17 - total persons	11,683				
With a hearing difficulty	57	0.5%			
With a vision difficulty	144	1.2%			
With a cognitive difficulty	182	1.6%			
With an ambulatory difficulty	102	0.9%			
With a self-care difficulty	94	0.8%			
Age 18 to 64 - total persons	58,922				
With a hearing difficulty	813	1.4%			
With a vision difficulty	820	1.4%			
With a cognitive difficulty	1,689	2.9%			
With an ambulatory difficulty	1,770	3.0%			
With a self-care difficulty	668	1.1%			
With an independent living difficulty	1,026	1.7%			
Age 65 and over - total persons	12,570				
With a hearing difficulty	1,900	15.1%			
With a vision difficulty	759	6.0%			
With a cognitive difficulty	1,171	9.3%			
With an ambulatory difficulty	2,511	20.0%			
With a self-care difficulty	990	7.9%			
With an independent living difficulty	2,098	16.7%			
Source: U.S. Census, 2008-2012 ACS Table S1810	·				
Note: Totals may exceed 100% due to multiple disabilities per person					

Developmental Disabilities

As defined by federal law, "developmental disability" means a severe, chronic disability of an individual that:

- Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- Is manifested before the individual attains age 18;
- Is likely to continue indefinitely;
- Results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: a) self-care; b) receptive and expressive language; c) learning; d) mobility; e) self-direction; f) capacity for independent living; or g) economic self-sufficiency; and
- Reflects the individual's need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.

The Census does not record developmental disabilities. According to the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities, an accepted estimate of the percentage of the population that can be defined as developmentally disabled is 1.5 percent. Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first issue in supportive housing for the developmentally disabled is the transition from the person's living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

The State Department of Developmental Services (DDS) currently provides community-based services to approximately 243,000 persons with developmental disabilities and their families through a statewide system of 21 regional centers, four developmental centers, and two community-based facilities. Santa Barbara is served by the Tri-Counties Regional Center³ (TCRC) which is based in Santa Barbara. As of 2014, TCRC served approximately 11,500 clients and had 280 staff persons, with approximately 1,000 clients living in Santa Barbara. Any resident who has a developmental disability that originated before age 18 is eligible for services. Services are offered to people with developmental disabilities based on Individual Program Plans and may include: Adult day programs; advocacy; assessment/consultation; behavior management programs; diagnosis and evaluation; independent living services; infant development programs; information and referrals; mobility training; prenatal diagnosis; residential care; respite care; physical and occupational therapy; transportation; consumer, family vendor training; and vocational training. TCRC also coordinates the statemandated Early Start program which provides services for children under age three who have or are at substantial risk of having a developmental disability.

³ www.tri-counties.org

Large Households

Large households are defined as those households with five or more persons. Large households generate a need for units with three or more bedrooms. This housing is often difficult to find, more expensive and, due to the higher expenses associated with larger households, less affordable for low and moderate-income households. Recent ACS surveys showed that only about 6 percent of owner households and about 10 percent of renter households had five or more persons (Table H-26). By comparison, single person households comprised 28 percent of owner households and 38 percent of renter households. While finding suitably-sized affordable housing can be difficult for large households, these statistics demonstrate that the need for small units far exceeds that for units with three or more bedrooms. This trend is expected to continue in the coming decades due to the growth in the senior population, who often live alone.

Harrach ald Stree	Own	ers	Renters		
riousenoid Size	Households	Percent	Households	Percent	
1 person	4,022	28.3%	7,851	38.0%	
2 persons	5,678	39.9%	5,817	28.1%	
3 persons	2,109	14.8%	3,106	15.0%	
4 persons	1,557	10.9%	1,880	9.1%	
5 persons	551	3.9%	927	4.5%	
6 persons	98	0.7%	505	2.4%	
7+ persons	215	1.5%	584	2.8%	
Total households	14,230	100%	20,670	100%	
Source: 2008-2012 ACS Table B25009					

Table H-26: Household Size by Tenure (2008 – 2012) City of Santa Barbara

When household size data is compared to the City's housing stock (Table H-16), it is apparent that there is an ample supply of large units to meet the needs of homeowners. About 70 percent of owner-occupied units have three or more bedrooms while only about 6 percent of owner households have five or more persons. The supply of large rental units also appears to be sufficient to accommodate renter households. About 18 percent of rental units have three or more bedrooms but less than 10 percent of renter households have five or more persons.

Female Headed Households

Single parent households, in particular female-headed households, generally have lower-incomes and experience higher living expenses. This makes it difficult to find safe, decent and affordable housing. These households can also face challenges in attaining affordable child care, health care and other supportive services. Female-headed households, especially those with children, have special needs with respect to adequately sized housing units, located near schools and recreational facilities.

Recent ACS estimates reported that about 6 percent of owner households and 14 percent of renter households were female headed households (Table H-27).

Howeehold True	Own	ers	Renters	
riousenoid Type	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
Married couple family	7,993	56.2%	5,122	24.8%
Male householder, no wife present	508	3.6%	994	4.8%
Female householder, no husband present	876	6.2%	2,840	13.7%
Non-family households	4,853	34.1%	11,714	56.7%
Total households	14,230	100%	20,670	100%
Source: 2008-2012 ACS Table B11012				

Table H-27: Female Headed Households (2008 – 2012) City of Santa Barbara

Farmworkers

The City of Santa Barbara has a limited amount of agriculture. Most of the agriculture is on the northern edge of the City north of Foothill Road and between the Riviera and the northern City limits. There are also smaller pockets in the Braemar Ranch area and on upper West Valerio Street. All of the agricultural uses occur on land zoned for single family residential use. The city of Santa Barbara does not have an agricultural zone designation.

The main agricultural crop grown is avocados, which traditionally is not labor intensive. Information contained in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for *Agricultural Uses: General Plan and Municipal Code Amendments (SB-147-90)* certified in 1993 indicates that there was approximately 130 acres of agricultural use within the City limits. Agricultural use categories include avocados, lemons/limes, and nursery. Avocados and lemons/limes are grown predominately on hillside areas and nursery stock is grown on relatively level mesa areas. It is estimated that there are only 20 to 30 larger agricultural operations in the City. The majority are small, possibly one-half acre or less. Therefore, agricultural uses have been relatively stable in the City of Santa Barbara.

The housing needs of farmworkers are difficult to quantify. The ability to gather information about farmworkers is limited because they are often mobile and reluctant to participate in any survey. According to the 2012 Census of Agriculture, there were 22,333 hired farmworkers in Santa Barbara County and 20,421 of those worked on larger farms with 10 or more workers. Data is not available at the city level. Based on the fact that farm operations in the City are relatively small and are located in residential zones, there is not a significant need for housing exclusively for farmworkers. Therefore the housing needs of farmworkers are addressed as part of the City's general affordable housing programs. City zoning regulations comply with state law and allow small farmworker housing developments as an agricultural use. (See also the discussion of farmworker housing regulations in the Constraints section.)

Homeless

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines the term "homeless" as the state of a person who lacks a fixed, regular and adequate night-time residence, or a person who has a primary night time residency that is:

• A supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations;

- An institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or
- A public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings.⁴

Although there are myriad causes of homelessness, among the most common are substance abuse and alcohol, domestic violence and mental illness.

Since 2003, all Continuum of Care Communities (those receiving Federal Grant Funds serving the homeless) have been required to report the number of people who are homeless at a particular point in time. Surveys are required every other year. The most recent Point in Time (PIT) homeless survey in Santa Barbara County was conducted by the Central Coast Coalition on Homelessness (C3H) on January 22-23, 2013.

At the direction of staff from C3H, approximately 650 volunteers were deployed to physically count the homeless population in Santa Barbara County during the two-day PIT event, and also administer the Vulnerability Index Survey for which respondents self-reported information. The total 2013 PIT homeless count was 1,466 persons compared to a total of 1,536 recorded in the 2011 PIT survey (Table H-28). The PIT survey reported 946 homeless persons in Santa Barbara, a reduction from 1,040 persons counted in 2011. Of the 1,466 persons encountered countywide, 1,111 Vulnerability Index Surveys were completed. This survey is more in-depth than the Point-In-Time count, and it determines individuals and family health needs and rank orders the most vulnerable at risk of dying prematurely due to health concerns. The next PIT count is scheduled for January 2015 and will include a Vulnerability Index & Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool (or VI---SPDAT). This tool will assist Santa Barbara County in developing a mechanism for common assessment and coordinated access.

Geographic Area	2011 Homeless Count	2013 Homeless Count			
Carpinteria	15	10			
Cuyama Valley	3	0			
Guadalupe	5	1			
Isla Vista/Goleta	114	81			
Lompoc	110	104			
Santa Barbara	1,040	946			
Santa Maria	243	300			
Santa Ynez Valley	6	24			
County Total	1,536	1,466			
Source: Central Coast Collaborative on Homelessness, 2013					

Table H-28: Homeless Counts by Area (2011 – 2013) Santa Barbara County

⁴ Stewart B. McKinney Act, 42 U.S.C. §11301, et seq. (1994)

Facilities Serving the Homeless

There are a number of facilities and programs that address homelessness in the southern Santa Barbara County area. Most of these are based in the City of Santa Barbara (Table H-29).

Facility	Capacity	
Casa Esperanza	100 beds (200 beds December to March)	
Rescue Mission	100 men and 24 women	
Good Samaritan*	90 beds; 90-day treatment	
Salvation Army	70 beds with counseling	
Transition House 70 beds; 120-day treatment		
*Located in the unincorporated area		
Source: Central Coast Collaborative on Homelessness, 2013		

Table H-29: Homeless Shelters City of Santa Barbara

Currently, the City provides 944 total beds/rooms/units during December-March and 844 total beds/rooms/units during April-November (Table H-30).

Table H-30: Homeless Facilities/Housing City of Santa Barbara (2014)

Facility Type	Capacity
Emergency Shelter	215 Beds + 100 December - March
Transitional Housing	335 Beds
Emergency RV Parking	42 Spaces
Permanent Units/Rooms	352 Units/Rooms
Total Capacity	944 Beds/Rooms/Units + 100 Beds December-March
Total Need*	946 Beds
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014 *Based on Central Coast Collaborative on Homelessness 2013	·

Only a limited amount of homeless needs may be addressed through a Housing Element. Needs that may be addressed are those of providing opportunities for, and encouraging, emergency shelters and transitional housing; reviewing the rules and regulation affecting affordable housing to make it easier and cost effective for developers to provide affordable housing; providing flexibility in development standards to encourage the broad range of housing opportunities needed; and providing education and public outreach to address concerns of neighbors in areas where these facilities may be located.

Although the County is the public entity responsible for attending to the homeless, the City is deeply involved in helping the homeless. The City implements an effective multi-pronged effort to provide adequate housing and social services to this population. The City has crafted a continuum of care that supports prevention programs, emergency shelter, transitional programs and permanent supportive housing.

The City is an active participant in Central Coast Collaborative on Homelessness (C3H), a countywide collaboration between homeless service providers, elected representatives, community leaders and advocacy groups, which is intended to prevent duplication of effort and better serve the most vulnerable homeless individuals, families and persons at risk of homelessness. This new model, implemented in January 2013, includes a countywide Policy Council comprised of elected representatives; a countywide Coordination Committee consisting of community leaders; housing, shelter and treatment providers; and advocacy groups. It is facilitated by an independent Homeless Coordinator. Data collection and performance evaluation countywide is an important aspect of this effort and the collaboration has formed a data subcommittee to identify the best way to get an unduplicated count of homeless persons, understand patterns of service use, and measure the effectiveness of homeless programs under this new model of collective impact.

Effective 2008, State Senate Bill 2 (SB2) considerably strengthened the requirements on zoning for emergency shelters. This new legislation requires that jurisdictions address the housing needs of the homeless, including the identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without discretionary review.

Regardless of the homeless housing need, SB2 requires that jurisdictions have a zone in place to permit at least one year-round emergency shelter without a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or any discretionary permit requirements. This can be accomplished by amending an existing zone district, establishing a new zone district, or creating an overlay zone for an existing zone district(s) to allow emergency shelters as a permitted use. In addition, the identified zone(s) must have sufficient land capacity to encourage emergency shelters consistent with SB2.

Facilities that provide overnight shelter to the homeless are considered short-term, transitional housing, similar to hotel use. Existing zones that allow overnight shelter include R-4 (Hotel-Motel-Multiple Residence), C-P (Restricted Commercial), C-L/C-1 (Limited Commercial), C-2 (General Commercial), C-M (Commercial Manufacturing), M-1 (Light Manufacturing) and HRC-1/HRC-2 (Hotel and Related Commerce) zone districts.

The two major emergency shelter facilities, Casa Esperanza Homeless Shelter zoned M-1/C-2/S-D-3 and Santa Barbara Rescue Mission zoned OM-1/S-D-3, are currently permitted with a CUP and are both located in the Coastal Zone. Amending their respective zones to allow these facilities by right would comply with SB2. However, the M-1 and OM-1 zones discourage residential uses and therefore could be considered incompatible with the use. Additionally, the Coastal Commission has opposed residential uses in certain areas of the Coastal Zone due to concerns that residential uses may become the dominant use in these areas.

To satisfy the requirements of SB2, the C-M zoning district was amended to allow emergency shelters as a permitted use (Implementation Action H4.1 of the 2011 Housing Element). The C-M zone allows the development of residential uses, including mixed-use development and other related uses that encourage emergency shelters.

Identified opportunity sites in the C-M zone district demonstrate sufficient capacity to support the development of additional emergency shelters. The City's Available Land Inventory Summary (Appendix H) lists approximately 152 vacant or underutilized C-M zoned properties ranging in size from .08 acres to 1.56 acres. In total, the C-M zoned properties make up 35.4 acres of available land. These parcels either separately (larger parcels) or in combination (smaller parcels) could accommodate the development of emergency shelter facilities. The consolidation of smaller and underutilized parcels is supported by Implementation Action H11.19, which is intended to encourage the development of affordable residential units, including special needs housing.

Transitional and Permanent Supportive Housing

Transitional housing is intended to facilitate the transition of homeless individuals and families to permanent housing. This type of housing limits the length of stay and re-circulates the assisted unit to another eligible individual or family. Supportive housing is defined as permanent rental housing linked to a range of support services designed to enable residents to maintain stable housing.

As reflected in Table H-30, the City continues its commitment to the production of transitional and supportive housing opportunities, with approximately 335 transitional units/rooms/beds, and 352 permanent units/rooms/beds currently available for eligible individuals and families.

As mandated by State law these housing units have been subjected to the same permitting processes as other residential development in the zone without undue special regulatory requirements. All the identified transitional and supportive units/room/beds are located on sites within City boundaries and are accessible to public services and facilities, including transit.

Housing Challenges

Overcrowding

A housing unit that is occupied by more than one person per room (excluding kitchens, bathrooms, hallways and porches) is defined by the Census as being overcrowded. A housing unit with more than 1.5 persons per room is considered severely overcrowded. Overcrowding can serve as an indicator that a community does not have an adequate supply of affordable housing and/or lacks housing units of adequate size to meet the need of large households. Overcrowding can also result when high housing costs relative to income force too many individuals or families to share housing. Overcrowding can accelerate deterioration of the housing stock and associated infrastructure.

ACS data for 2008-2012 estimated that approximately 2,527 (3.1 percent) of the City's occupied housing units were considered overcrowded (Table H-31). Overcrowding was more common among renters (10.7 percent) than for owners (2.2 percent), and about 5 percent of renter households reported severe overcrowding.

	Owner		Renter		Totals	
Persons per Room	HH	%	НН	%	нн	%
1.00 or less	13,924	97.8%	18,449	89.3%	32,373	92.8%
1.01 to 1.50	248	1.7%	1,207	5.8%	1,455	4.2%
1.51 or more	58	0.4%	1,014	4.9%	1,072	3.1%
Total Units	14,230	100%	20,670	100%	34,900	100%
Total Overcrowded	306	2.2%	2,221	10.7%	2,527	7.2%
Source: 2008-2012 ACS Table B25014						

Table H-31: Overcrowded Households by Tenure (2008 – 2012) City of Santa Barbara

Household Income and Overpayment

The Census Bureau distinguishes between a "household" and a "family." A "household" includes all people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence. A "family" is defined as a group of two or more people who reside together and who are related by birth, marriage or adoption. (*Note: As discussed later in the Constraints section, this definition of "family" differs from the definition used by the City for zoning purposes.)* Not all households contain families since a household may comprise a group of unrelated people or one person living alone. For purposes of assessing the community's housing needs, household income data is considered more relevant because it includes all occupied housing units while family income data excludes single-person households. The household income distribution for Santa Barbara as reported in the 2008-2012 ACS is shown in Table H-32. Median household income was estimated to be \$63,758.

Total Household Income	# of Households	% of Households	
Less than \$10,000	1,578	4.5%	
\$10,000 - 14,999	1,697	4.9%	
\$15,000 - 24,999	3,302	9.5%	
\$25, 000 – 34,999	3,173	9.1%	
\$35,000 - 49,999	4,264	12.2%	
\$50,000 - 74,999	6,053	17.3%	
\$75,000 – 99,999	4,154	11.9%	
\$100,000 - 149,999	4,866	13.9%	
\$150,000 - 199,999	2,885	8.3%	
\$200,000 +	2,928	8.4%	
Total Households	34,900	100%	
Median Household Income	\$63	,758	
Source: 2008-2012 ACS Table DP-3			

Table H-32: Household Income Distribution (2008 – 2012) City of Santa Barbara

According to state and federal housing policy, overpaying occurs when housing costs exceed 30% of gross household income. Although homeowners enjoy interest and property tax deductions and other benefits that help to compensate for high housing costs, lower-income homeowners may need to defer maintenance or repairs due to limited funds, which can lead to deterioration. For lower-income renters, severe cost burden can require families to double up, resulting in overcrowding and related problems.

Renter Households Overpaying

The ACS provides estimates of the percentage of household income paid for rent by total household income. High rents in the City have the most significant negative effect on lower income households. Table H-33 shows the number and percentage of renter households that pay 30 percent or more of the total household income in rent by household income categories.

During 2008-2012, the ACS estimated that about 48 percent of renter households were paying more than 30 percent of their household income for rent. Among lower-income renters, the overpayment rate was estimated to be 56 percent.

City of build building							
	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Lower income
Owner Households	1,256	1,293	2,928	1,238	8,763	15,478	5,477
Overpaying owner households	992	755	412	958	2,872	5,989	2,159
Percentage of overpaying owners	79.0%	58.3%	14.1%	77.4%	32.8%	38.7%	39.4%
Renter Households	3,780	3,282	7,621	2,852	5,782	23,316	14,683
Overpaying renter households	3,382	2,723	2,135	2,350	604	11,194	8,240
Percentage of overpaying renters	89.5%	83.0%	28.0%	82.4%	10.4%	48.0%	56.1%
Total Households	5,036	4,575	10,549	4,089	14,545	38,794	20,160
Overpaying households	4,375	3,477	2,547	3,308	3,476	17,183	10,399
Percentage of overpaying households	86.9%	76.0%	24.1%	80.9%	23.9%	44.3%	51.6%
Source: 2008-2012 ACS Table B25014							

Table H-33: Households Overpaying (2008 – 2012) City of Santa Barbara

This information is especially somber when one considers that the City estimates that 12 percent of the housing stock is publicly subsidized.

Owner Households Overpaying

The picture is also troubling for many who live in owner-occupied housing in the City. Overall, about 39 percent of owner-occupied households were estimated to be paying over 30 percent of total household income for housing costs. Overpayment for lower-income owners was also estimated to be 39 percent.

Extremely Low Income Households

Extremely low-income (ELI) is a subset of the very low-income group and is defined as households with income 30 percent or less of area median income. The Area Median Income (AMI) as established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) corresponds to the AMI *for a household of four*. According to the 2014 Income Limits published by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, extremely low-income for a 4-person household means an annual income of \$23,900 or less. Extremely low-income households have a variety of housing needs. Many families and individuals who receive public assistance, social security insurance or disability insurance benefits are considered extremely low-income households. In addition, employed households earning 30 percent or less of the AMI are also considered extremely low-income.

As shown in Table H-33 the ACS estimated that the City had 5,036 extremely low-income households during 2008-2012, representing approximately 13 percent of all households. Approximately 79 percent of ELI owners and 90 percent of ELI renters were reported to be overpaying for housing. Many extremely low-income households also face other housing problems, such as overcrowded living conditions and/or living without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

To determine the projected housing needs for extremely low-income households, the City assumed that 50 percent of the very-low income regional housing needs allocation are extremely low-income households. The RHNA allocation for very-low income housing need is 962 units; therefore, the projected need for extremely low-income households is approximately 481 units. As discussed previously, extremely low-income households typically experience overpayment, overcrowding or substandard housing. In addition, some of these households may have physical and mental disabilities, which require special housing needs.

To address the array of housing needs for extremely low-income households, the City continues to promote affordable housing opportunities for its special needs population. In 2004, the Building Code was amended to reduce the size requirement for SRO units to facilitate their construction. In addition, supportive and transitional housing is an important component of meeting the needs of extremely low-income individuals. The City has established partnerships and working relationships with non-profit developers, such as the Mental Health Association of Santa Barbara and the City Housing Authority to provide housing opportunities for extremely low-income households. Further, goals, policies and implementation actions intended to address the housing needs of extremely low-income households are included as part of this Housing Element.

Very Low, Low and Moderate Income Households

Approximately, 63 percent of the City's households are categorized as very low (including extremely low income), low and moderate income (Table H-33). As such, they qualify for affordable housing programs.

Housing for the low and moderate-income population has been a priority of the City for over two decades. Previous Housing Elements have contained a number of policies, which the City has implemented, to increase the affordable housing stock. That policy direction and commitment has been carried forward in this Housing Element.

The City has an inventory of 5,653 affordable units, including public housing, units assisted by the City (examples of assistance include bonus density or City financing), publicly owned units, Section 8 rent assisted units, rehabilitated units, and beds in group homes or shelters.

It is often difficult to accurately identify the low and moderate-income group as a whole because it covers such a wide range of family sizes and incomes. This group ranges from 0-120 percent of median income. Although virtually no funding sources for housing provide assistance to those who earn more than 120 percent of the median income level, it is difficult, if not impossible, for many families to purchase a home in Santa Barbara, even if their income exceeds 120 percent of the median income. Because the income range is so great, the needs of those on one end of the range are very different from those on the other end. A range of programs (H11.1, H11.2, H11.3, H11.10, H11.12, H12.1)) are included in the Housing Element to address the housing needs of those whose income exceeds 120 percent of the median income, such as teachers, firefighters, nurses, etc.

Housing Authority Waiting Lists

Another indicator of the need for low and moderate income housing can be found by looking at the waiting lists maintained by the Housing Authority of the City of Santa Barbara (HACSB). The HACSB maintains several waiting lists for different housing programs. A review of the HACSB waiting lists reflects only people who are eligible and aware of HACSB programs and services. It cannot be used to draw conclusions about overall need or general demographics in the City.

As of August 2014, approximately 15,181 applicant households were seeking assistance from the HACSB, including 7,008 applicants waiting for public housing and 8,173 applicants waiting for section 8 housing. Elderly applicants make up nearly 20 percent (2,990); persons with disabilities make up approximately 31 percent (4,637), and 37 percent (5,641) of the applicants are families with children. Approximately 75 percent (11,386) of these applicants are categorized as having extremely low incomes. This information indicates a need to house special needs populations.

Middle Income Households

Housing needs for middle-income individuals and families is an issue as noted above. The City defines "Middle-Income" as the range from 120 percent to 160 percent of the AMI. Middle-income households are a diverse range of semi-professional and professional workers in the community. The middle-income workforce represents a considerable segment of the community that wishes to purchase or rent a home in Santa Barbara, but is unable due to high housing prices.

A primary goal of the Housing Element is to provide affordable housing opportunities to all segments of the community. The City considers this goal to be of highest priority and encourages and promotes through a variety of policies and implementation actions the construction of affordable housing units for all income levels, including middle-income households.

With the dissolution of the City's Redevelopment Agency in 2012, it is all the more imperative that new construction of affordable housing units, including for middle-income households, be undertaken by private developers. The Housing Element contains policies H11 and H12 to specifically promote middle-income housing. In 2013, the City adopted the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program to encourage the construction of housing for the City's workforce, including middle-income individuals. The AUD Program allows increased densities and flexibility in development standards to facilitate the construction of additional ownership and rental housing. This Program is purposely intended to help provide housing opportunities to middle-income households.

College and University Housing

There are three major schools (a university and two colleges) within the Santa Barbara area. The University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) is located just west of the City. UCSB had an enrollment of 22,225

undergraduate and graduate students for Fall 2014. Although the University does provide on-campus dormitories as well as off-campus apartments for students and faculty, these units only meet a portion of the demand. Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) is located within the City of Santa Barbara. SBCC does not provide on-campus or off-campus housing for students. As of Fall 2014, SBCC had an enrollment of 27,715 students. Both UCSB and SBCC pose a housing challenge to the City, as they both contribute to the demand for affordable rental housing in the area. Because SBCC does not provide any student housing, its demand for local rental units adds more strain to the local rental housing market.

Westmont College is located in Montecito, a 10-minute drive east of Santa Barbara. Westmont is restricted to an enrollment of 1,200 students through a Conditional Use Permit. Westmont provides on-campus housing for 98 percent of its students; therefore, fewer Westmont students impact the rental housing market. Westmont also provides faculty and staff housing.

There are also a number of smaller schools in Santa Barbara, including Brooks Institute of Photography, Antioch University, Santa Barbara College of Law and Southern California Institute of Law. Although these schools have small enrollments or cater to those already living and working in Santa Barbara, they do contribute students to the demand for affordable rental units.

Foreign language schools in Santa Barbara also contribute to the demand for rental housing. While these schools offer a variety of housing accommodations, such as living with a host family, at a hotel, or in a dormitory with other students, students may choose to rent an apartment unit while attending school. Competing for rentals with local residents, not only impacts the availability of rental housing, but also makes it attractive for landlords to rent their units at higher prices.

University and college students have special housing needs due to limited income and financial resources. Most students are able to work only part-time to accommodate their study program. It is not uncommon for students to earn lower incomes and pay over half their annual income for housing. Students may double-up to make rent payments more affordable.

University and college students impact the rental housing market. These students can be a significant factor that affects housing availability and rent levels, especially in areas close to the schools. Apartments near these schools generally experience lower vacancy rates and a higher turnover due to the cyclical school year. Because of the increased demand placed by students, apartment owners with units close to colleges can charge higher rents. The issue of affordable housing for university and college students is addressed in Housing Element implementation actions targeted to affordable rental units.

Short-term Vacation Rentals

Short-term "vacation rentals" typically means a housing unit that is rented for a short period of time, usually less than 30 consecutive days. The trend of converting owner occupied and rental units into vacation rentals has become quite popular, especially in vacation destination communities such as Santa Barbara. The City considers short-term vacation rentals to be a commercial use and permits them with a change of use permit in any zone that allows hotel use. Despite the fact that hotels are only allowed in limited zones, vacation rentals in Santa Barbara have become common in most zones, especially residential zones. The use of residential units as short-term vacation rentals and/or only occupied as second homes poses a housing challenge to the City because these uses decrease available long-term housing opportunities for local residents as well as contribute to the increase in housing costs.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment – Remaining Need

State law requires that the City's housing needs assessment include a quantification and plan for meeting its fair share of the projected housing needs in the region / County. The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) adopted the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Plan for Santa Barbara County as part of the Regional Transportation Plan in August 2013. The RHNA "projection period" covers the period January 1, 2014, to September 30, 2022, while the Housing Element "planning period" spans the eight-year period from February 15, 2015 to February 15, 2023. This RHNA and Housing Element period is referred to as the "fifth cycle" since it is the fifth required update since housing element law was comprehensively revised by the state legislature in 1980.

The RHNA projects the need for 11,030 new housing units countywide during the new planning period, with the South Coast receiving 52 percent (5,743 new units) of the countywide allocation. The City received approximately 71 percent of the housing allocation for the South Coast subregion (Table H-34).

Jurisdictions	Number of Units	Percent	
City of Santa Barbara	4,099	71%	
City of Goleta	979	17%	
City of Carpinteria	163	3%	
Unincorporated South Coast	501	9%	
Total	5,743	100%	
Source: SBCAG Regional Housing Needs Plan 2013			

Table H-34: Regional Housing Needs Assessment South Coast Iurisdictions (2014 – 2022)

The Suitable Sites Inventory section of this Housing Element demonstrates that sufficient vacant and underdeveloped opportunity sites exist in the City to accommodate the remaining housing need identified in Table H-35.

Table H-35: Remaining Housing Need (2015 – 2023) City of Santa Barbara

	Α	В	A-B	
Income Groups	New Construction Need	Units Built, Under Construction or Approved	Remaining Need	
Very Low	962	47	915	
Low	701	0	701	
Moderate	820	4	816	
Above Moderate	1,617	241	1,376	
Total Units	4,099	292	3,808	
Source: SBCAG Regional Housing Needs Plan 2013, City of Santa Barbara 2014				

Progress in Meeting the Regional Housing Needs

Between January 1, 2014, and June 30, 2014, approximately 292 residential units were constructed, issued building permits or approved. Of these units, 51 units were affordable to lower or moderate income households, and the remaining 241 units to above moderate income households (Table H-35).

The units identified in Table H-35 were assigned to income group categories based on the affordability requirements outlined in the City's Affordable Housing Policies and Procedures Handbook. The affordability requirements relate to the very low, low, moderate, middle, and upper-middle income categories which are based on various percentages of the Area Median Income (AMI) established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as shown in Table H-36.

Income Groups	Percentage of Area Median	
Very low Income	50% or below	
Low Income	>50% - 80%	
Moderate Income	>80% - 120%	
Above Moderate Income * >120%		
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014 *Price-restricted middle and upper-middle income units are included in the Above Moderate Income category		

Affordable rents and sale prices are based on the target income for the income category which the unit is meant to serve. For example, low income rentals are generally targeted to households with income at 60 percent of the AMI; moderate income condominiums are targeted to 100 percent of the AMI; middle income condominiums are targeted to 120 percent of the AMI, and upper-middle income condominiums are targeted to 160 percent of the AMI.

The very low, low, moderate, and some of the above moderate income units identified in Table H-36 are priced controlled by means of a recorded affordability covenant executed by the property owner and City to assure conformance with the City's affordability requirements. The City requires every owner of rent-restricted units to file reports annually and upon each change in occupancy to ensure compliance with the recorded affordability covenant to assure long-term affordability of the unit, thus remaining affordable to subsequent owners. Affordability periods are typically 45 years and "roll" upon resale to a maximum affordability period of 90 years.



Constraints

Pursuant to State law, jurisdictions are required to assess constraints imposed by local government on the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including housing for persons with disabilities, and to consider removing any constraints that impede achieving the jurisdiction's fair share of regional housing need.

As part of initiating the *Plan Santa Barbara* (General Plan Update) process in 2005, the City Council reaffirmed the goal of "ensuring affordable housing opportunities for all economic levels in the community, while protecting the character of established neighborhoods." It was also recognized that a wide range of housing options is important to maintain an economically and socially diverse population. Retaining and housing its local workforce has become a community value for Santa Barbara. As such, providing affordable housing to help maintain socio-economic diversity, while preserving Santa Barbara's small-town character will likely require trade-offs to achieve these goals.

GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Local government can affect the production and preservation of housing through land use and development regulations and standards. Severely limiting the amount of residentially designated land or densities, requiring onerous project review periods prior to approval, and imposing high fees and exactions are some of the practices which impede residential development. In addition, other City goals may conflict with providing housing, such as protecting archaeological, historic, biological and other environmental resources, as well as the desire to provide open space and parks for the community. Further, limited infrastructure capacities may result in barriers to the production of housing for all income groups.

Land Use Controls

General Plan

The City regulates the type, location, density and scale of residential development primarily through the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The General Plan establishes the overall character and development of the community and identifies residential land use categories throughout the City ranging in densities from one unit to 36 units per acre depending on the average unit size (higher densities, up to 63 units per acre, can be achieved under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive program). In addition, the General Plan goals and policies support the opportunity for a broad range of housing types and densities, with special attention given to densities that encourage smaller, more affordable units.

Zoning Ordinance

Local land use controls also include the Zoning Ordinance, which shapes the form and intensity of residential development. In general, the City's zoning regulations and standards are intended to balance the goal of providing affordable housing opportunities with the goal of preserving the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods.

Zoning for a Variety of Residential Uses. Consistent with the General Plan, the City's Zoning Ordinance allows a range of zones and dwelling unit densities to facilitate a variety of housing types for households of all income categories and need, including single- and multi-family units, Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units, mobile home and emergency shelter units. For more detailed information regarding uses permitted by zone see Appendix F, Zoning Information and Fees, *Use Permitted in Various Zones*.

The City's residential development standards help to facilitate development of housing for low-income persons. The minimum dwelling unit size for single family residences, duplexes, and multi-family units is 400 square feet and 220 square feet for SRO units. Minimum setbacks for residential use in a residential zone range from 3 to 15 feet for the interior yard, and from 10 to 35 feet for the front yard. Maximum building height ranges from 30 feet in the single family zones to 45 feet in the multi-family zones and some commercial zones. Maximum building heights of 60 feet are allowed in certain commercial and manufacturing zones for community benefit land uses, including affordable housing. For more detailed information regarding residential development standards in residential zones see Appendix F, Zoning Information and Fees, *Residential Development Standards*.

While the City's development standards may be viewed as constraints to residential development, it should be noted that any development standard except for height limits, can be reduced or eliminated through the City's zoning modification process. In keeping with the City's long standing encouragement of affordable housing, residential development, particularly housing for lower income households are frequently afforded relief from these standards, which results in reduced costs to the developer. Additionally, the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program and/or Priority Housing Overlay Program allow increased densities, particularly for affordable housing projects.

Mobile homes on permanent foundations and factory-built homes are permitted in the same manner as traditional residential structures.

Density

Although a range of densities, setbacks, and building heights allow for a variety of residential land uses, over time the market cost of land has increased such that affordable "least cost housing" was difficult to achieve under previous density limits. Least cost housing is the least expensive, unsubsidized housing the private market can provide. Zoning which limits the density of housing units means that high land costs must be absorbed by fewer housing units than might otherwise be economically desirable. This causes the cost of an individual unit to increase.

The Land Use and Housing Elements address the management of residential and non-residential growth in the City through 2030. Recognizing the community's mandate to "live within our resources" and the need to create housing opportunities for City residents, the Land Use Element now allows increased residential densities in some commercial zones (up to 36 du/acre) and multi-family zones (up to 27 du/acre). In addition, the Priority Housing Overlay allows up to 63 du/ac in select areas of the City. The increased densities serve to encourage smaller, compact housing to support the production of additional affordable housing.

Land Use Element Implementation Action LG6.1 directs amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to provide an Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program in multi-family and commercial zones. The program permits higher densities based on smaller unit sizes and proximity to transit services and commercial uses. It also allows increased densities for affordable housing and/or Community Benefit and Priority Housing projects. To encourage rental housing at affordable rental rates, Housing Element Implementation Action H11.2 allows increased densities (above the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program) to rental, employer sponsored, and co-operative housing projects. Further, to preserve existing rental units, H13.3 allows the reconstruction or rehabilitation of existing rental apartments at non-conforming densities and zoning standards.

Increased density permits the private market to develop housing at a lower cost per unit; however, allowed higher density does not necessarily result in lower priced units, as the housing market determines the price at which a unit will sell. In addition, the City through its bonus density and inclusionary housing programs allows increased density in return for price/rent controls for some or all of the units in a development. Granting bonus density units to projects can reduce the per-unit costs and allows the development of some or all of the units as affordable to low or moderate income households.

Development of inclusionary housing may increase the per-unit costs of the market-rate housing, but it does provide price controls available to middle-and upper-middle-income homebuyers. Input from the development community resulted in two key provisions in the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO). First, the ordinance must allow a density bonus for the required inclusionary units. Second, the prices of the required inclusionary units should be affordable to middle-income households rather than low-income households. Because of the additional density and higher sales prices, the sale price of the inclusionary units may be equivalent to the marginal development cost of the units, so that the developer breaks even on the inclusionary units.

Development Review Process

The City regularly examines and streamlines its development review process. This internal assessment results in improved coordinated review between the various City Departments through the Pre-Application Team (PRT) and Development Application Review Team (DART) processes and allows for early identification of project issues/concerns. The PRT and DART process (explained below) has greatly reduced the number of "late hits" for projects (see Figure H-4).

The recent economic climate and housing market have resulted in a slow-down in the number of housing projects in the development review system. The most important actions the City can take are to maintain its commitment to housing and a balanced and efficient development review process.

The development review process is an important tool in ensuring that new housing meets all necessary health and safety codes, conforms to architectural and aesthetic design standards for neighborhood compatibility, is supplied with all necessary utilities and infrastructure and does not have a significant impact on the environment. While this review process has the potential to constrain opportunities for the development of lower income housing, particularly through the indirect cost of time in the process and fees, the City's review process is designed to minimize delays.

Projects that do not require discretionary review (i.e., review by one of the City's design review boards, Staff Hearing Officer, Planning Commission, or City Council) are referred to as "ministerial" projects. Ministerial projects are not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and therefore are exempt from environmental review. Projects requiring discretionary review, such as review by the Staff Hearing Officer, Planning Commission or one of the design review boards would be subject to CEQA, and would undergo the appropriate level of environmental review.

New affordable rental housing would not necessarily require review by the Staff Hearing Officer or Planning Commission. If a proposed project complies with all of the requirements of State density bonus law, and the density bonus requested is no more than the density bonus mandated by State law, then the project's density can be considered consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and therefore, a lot area modification would not be required. However, the project would continue to be subject to design review.

In response to concerns that a better forum for public input was needed to work through policy intent and community issues, the Municipal Code was amended to increase the Planning Commission's involvement in the review of certain AUD rental projects. Rental projects developed under the High Density and Priority Housing Overlay designations on lots of 15,000 square feet or more are conceptually reviewed by the Planning Commission and majority comments and recommendations are forwarded to the designated design review board prior to project approval. While this extra step in the review process adds more processing time for these rental projects, it also provides another public review opportunity which could be helpful in achieving community acceptance of larger AUD rental projects.

Pre-Application Review Team

For projects requiring discretionary review, the City's development review process is structured to allow for early identification of resource, zoning, planning, design, and infrastructure issues. This is accomplished through either early meetings with City Staff or through the more formal Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) process. Staff members from various City departments make up the review team. Certain types of projects (subdivisions and, condominiums of more than four units, etc.) are required by the Municipal Code to apply for PRT review. However, it is recommended that larger projects or projects that have the potential to cause neighborhood/community concern also apply for PRT review. In some cases, an applicant may elect to apply for PRT review.

Following the submittal of a PRT application, all project information and materials are distributed to those agencies and departments that will be reviewing the development proposal. Planning Staff utilizes the Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) to determine the need for special studies (e.g., geology and soils, traffic, cultural resources, etc.) or if environmental thresholds are exceeded. If special studies are required, they are submitted with the formal application for Planning Commission review. Comments on the proposed development proposal are transmitted to the applicant typically within four-five weeks of the application submittal.

Development Application Review Team Process

Subsequent to PRT review, a formal application for Staff Hearing Officer or Planning Commission is submitted. Consistent with the State Permit Streamlining Act, the City must determine within 30 days if the application submittal is complete and notify the applicant accordingly. This completeness determination is coordinated with other City Departments through the Development Application Review Team (DART) process. In general, if a project received PRT review, the same City Staff team members perform the DART review to provide consistency in the review and comments. City Staff works with an applicant to obtain a complete application by the end of the second DART review. Occasionally, additional reviews are necessary. Once a complete application is accepted, environmental review commences.

Figure H-4:



CEQA Review

Most small projects are categorically exempt from CEQA and therefore can proceed directly to the decisionmaking body for consideration and approval. If the project is not exempt, an Initial Study is prepared to identify potential environmental impacts, identify mitigation measures, and determine the appropriate environmental review. If a Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required, the Environmental Analyst directs its preparation. The environmental document is circulated for public review and comment, as required by CEQA. If an EIR is required, the Planning Commission holds a public hearing to take public comment on the draft document and, at a later date, takes action on the project and certifies the EIR. For housing projects, affordability can be the basis for a statement of overriding considerations.

Design Review

Santa Barbara is an area rich with architectural history and was one of the first jurisdictions in the country to form an Architectural Board of Review. In addition, the City has a Historic Landmarks Commission that oversees the design of improvements to all buildings in the El Pueblo Viejo and Brinkerhoff Avenue Landmark Districts, and the designation of buildings as Landmarks or Structures of Merit. In 2007, the City created the Single Family Design Board to review single-family residences, as well as additions to existing single family residences. Most development is required to be reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR), the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC), or the Single Family Design Board (SFDB).

Building permits for new multiple-family residential, duplex units, and two or more detached residential units on one lot are subject to review by the ABR. The majority of single family residences are subject to review by the SFDB. The requirements for design review could be viewed as an impediment to the development of housing; however, the purpose of design review is to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood without placing undue restrictions on allowed uses. The design review boards help higher density affordable projects gain acceptance from the community by ensuring compatibility with the neighborhood. However, the costs for design elements can be a burden for affordable housing projects. Also, the time spent in the design review process can impact the finances for an affordable project.

The preparation of multi-family design guidelines that identify standards for unit sizes, setbacks, open space, landscaping, size, bulk and scale and site planning would serve to clarify expectations and provide consistency of project review, resulting in reduced review time and expense. An implementation action (H16.9) requiring the preparation of the Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines and Standards is included in the Housing Element Policies, Goals and Implementation section.

To expedite affordable housing projects through the development and design review process, the City encourages joint review by the Planning Commission and Design Review Boards. This allows both review bodies to evaluate the project concurrently, thereby expediting the process and potentially resulting in a monetary savings for the applicant.

Processing Time

The processing time for a residential development project varies depending on its size and complexity and the number of actions or approvals needed to complete the process, as well as community issues and concerns. Projects requiring an EIR, special zoning permits or modifications, those denied by Planning Commission and/or appealed to City Council, and those with design issues can take considerably more time than less complex projects.
In 2005, the City created a Staff Hearing Officer program to improve, simplify and streamline the discretionary review process for smaller projects that do not involve major land use policy considerations. The program has been effective in expediting the permitting process and reducing the cost and processing time for small infill housing projects that would otherwise require Planning Commission review. The Staff Hearing Officer review represents approximately 23 percent of the development review actions taken by the City, thus freeing up time on the Planning Commission agendas for major projects and policy issues, as well as reducing the processing time for smaller projects.

Appendix F, Zoning Information and Fees, *Permit Process Timelines* identifies typical processing time in the City's entitlement process. As previously noted, processing time can vary based on the scale, complexity and type of project. For example, projects that require review by the Staff Hearing Officer are smaller and less complex than those requiring Planning Commission review, and therefore generally take less time to move through the permit process. A project that is exempt from CEQA and one that requires the preparation of an Initial Study and Negative Declaration would have different timelines for environmental review. The preparation of the Initial Study and Negative Declaration would add more time to the process (4-5 months). Additionally, the process to prepare an EIR, undergo public review, and certify the Final EIR can add 6 to 8 months to the timeline.

City Staff from various departments and divisions work as a team with developers and applicants to facilitate the project through the permit process in a timely manner. This approach is intended to streamline review and avoid undue time constraints to the developer. In addition, initial design review of the project can occur concurrently with other steps, thereby reducing process time. However, some steps in the review process are dependent on the applicant. Therefore, the amount of time an applicant takes to complete these steps also affects the project processing time.

As shown in Appendix F, development applications that require Staff Hearing Officer and Planning Commission approval, including Tentative Subdivisions or Parcel Maps including Condominiums and Condominium Conversions, Planned Unit Developments, Planned Residential Developments, Variances, Coastal Development Permits, Development Plan Approval, Conditional Use Permits and Modifications generally take approximately 9 to 10 months to process. Note that 4 to 5 months of the total processing time is related to how long it takes the applicant to complete certain steps. As indicated above, the preparation of an Initial Study and Negative Declaration, or an EIR would add more time to the process.

The typical processing time for a single family unit is 3-4 months. This time frame includes approximately 3 meetings with the designated design review board. A typical multi-family unit project (rental) would take approximately 5-6 months and include 4-5 meetings with the designated design review board. Again the overall processing time is dependent on the time the applicant takes to complete materials and working drawings.

The City recognizes the effect that processing time can have on development costs. Because of holding costs and inflation, the longer the approval process takes, the higher the cost to develop the project. Implementation Actions H16.1 through H16.9 are included to expedite the development review process for residential infill and affordable housing projects. To the extent possible, the City facilitates and expedites affordable housing projects are given priority on development review agendas and receive expedited plan check reviews in an effort to reduce cost and time for such projects.

Building Codes and Enforcement

In addition to land use controls, building codes could potentially affect the cost of housing. The City has adopted and enforces the California Building, Plumbing, Mechanical and Electrical codes, which ensure that all housing units are built to specified standards. These codes are substantially determined by technically qualified professional groups and adopted by most cities and the State of California. The California Building Code was amended in 2004 to change minimum size requirements for affordable efficiency units from 400 to 220 square feet. This change to the code allowed the construction of 62 SRO units for very low-income homeless and nearly homeless individuals.

In addition, the City has adopted and enforces the California Historic Building Code, which allows some flexibility in the standards for registered historical landmarks. These standards do not significantly increase construction costs.

Code enforcement is conducted by the City to address code violations and is initiated on a complaint received basis throughout the City. In addition to inspecting and notifying residents of existing code violations, the City also provides information regarding the Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program. Building code and enforcement activities are not considered a constraint to housing development, as they contain regulations necessary to protect the public, health safety and welfare and do not interfere with the City's ability to produce housing.

Site Improvements

Site improvements typically occur in conjunction with the development of residential parcels. Through the completion of a development application, various municipal departments (public works, fire, building and safety), county agencies (flood control) and utility companies (gas, electricity) review the residential development for conformity with development standards.

On-Site

The Transportation Division utilizes standards for parking design to determine adequacy of parking layouts. The City adopted these standards in order to provide adequate space for parking and access for the users of the parking facilities. Projects that do not meet the standards must apply for a Zoning Ordinance modification of the requirement, which can add time and cost to a project.

Parking requirement reductions are allowed in certain circumstances to assist with the production of housing. For example, a development with 100 percent rental units for very low- or low-income households is allowed a reduced parking requirement of one uncovered space per unit. The requirement for senior housing is one uncovered parking space per unit, with one-half uncovered space per unit allowed if the project is for low-income seniors. Community care facilities also require only one parking space per unit.

In mixed-used projects, where residential uses occupy up to 50 percent of the development, the residential parking requirement is reduced by 50 percent and covered parking is not required. Further, in mixed-use developments located in the City's central business district, the parking requirement is reduced to one uncovered space per unit, with no required provision for guest parking. All projects developed under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program are allowed reduced parking requirements of one space per unit and no guest parking, (See Appendix F, Zoning Information and Fees, *City Parking Requirements.*). The Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program also allows density incentives of up to 63 du/ac and flexibility of certain development standards, including setbacks, open space, distance between buildings, and building heights.

Off-Site

The Public Works Department's requirements for off-site improvements are defined by standards, which have been adopted by the City. The State Department of Housing and Community Development requires that the City investigate reduction in off-site improvements as they add to the cost of residential development. Several examples of off-site improvement reductions are discussed below.

When appropriate, the Public Works Department recommends the reduction of right of way, street, and sidewalk improvements to the Planning Commission, who ultimately makes the decision. The City allows rolled curbs only in areas where they exist because they pose safety issues. No significant cost savings are associated with rolled curbs in most instances.

Sewer manholes are placed as far apart as possible, given the available City equipment, and the City allows a single water service and water meter for condominium conversions and low/moderate housing developments where multiple units have a single water heater source. Additionally, the City has allowed for the manifolding of water meters for new multiple-family and condominium developments. Manifolding allows for one service lateral with six to eight water meters. This allows for a significant cost savings because the developer only pays for one service trenching.

The City currently allows for common trenching for utilities as long as there are no health and safety violations and appropriate separations are maintained. The City has investigated reducing the size of water and sewer mains and has concluded that the majority of the cost associated with installing a water or sewer main is not in the pipe size, but in the actual trenching and replacement of the existing surface type. Reducing the size of water and sewer mains would be counterproductive, especially since a major portion of Santa Barbara is located in a high fire hazard area. It would not substantially lessen the cost to the applicant and would compromise the efficiency and effectiveness of the system, as well as public safety.

Through the Neighborhood Improvement Plan and Implementation Program, the City has committed funds to neighborhood capital improvement projects in areas serving low-income residents. Projects undertaken include street and pedestrian lighting, new curbs, gutter and sidewalks, and park expansions. These projects improved neighborhood services and infrastructure and helped support infill development.

Fees and Other Exactions

The direct cost of development review fees and building permit fees adds to the cost of housing. These fees are set at rates intended to recover the cost of permit processing, providing public service, and to mitigate certain development impacts. Appendix F, Zoning Information and Fees, *Residential Development Application and Fees* provides a general fee schedule (2014) for a ten-lot single-family subdivision, a ten-unit condominium project, a ten-unit affordable condominium project, a ten-unit apartment, duplex condominiums, a rental duplex, and a single-family residence.

The City also collects fees assessed by other governmental entities, such as school impact fees. For example, the Santa Barbara School District fee amounts to approximately 16 percent of the total fees assessed on a single-family residence. Sewer and water connection and buy-in charges, which reimburse the City for the provision of essential services for any housing project, represent another 34 percent of the total fee package for a single-family residence. The total cost of the remaining development review and building permit fees assessed on a single-family residence, which include such ministerial items as electrical, plumbing and mechanical plan review account for approximately 50 percent of the total fees.

Most development review processing fees are assessed at the beginning of the review process, with other fees due at the time of building permit application and issuance. When applicable and appropriate, some public improvement and infrastructure fees may be paid at a later time during the construction process, such as certificate of occupancy.

The City of Santa Barbara is somewhat unusual in that there are no other programmatic impact fees or exactions that are charged to all new residential projects. This is not an oversight. In the past, the City has had traffic improvement and other programmatic assessment fees to address major infrastructure deficiencies. Since the early 1990s, the City's transportation focus has been on supporting alternative modes of transportation and transit use and not road widening projects. Developing a fee program for transit operating costs is very complicated and yet to be implemented. The City does not currently impose any additional schools, parks or other fees, exactions or assessments on new residential projects.

It should be noted that the fee tables in Appendix F do not take into consideration any Inclusionary Housing Fees. Currently, the fee for each unit of inclusionary housing not provided on-site is \$345,500 (for projects with 10 or more units). For example, a 10-unit development would require two inclusionary units; therefore the development would likely consist of 12 units (10 market-rate and two inclusionary units). The City encourages construction of the unit(s), rather than payment of the in-lieu fee. Developments with less than 10 units pay \$17,725 per unit (July 2014) in the development, unless an inclusionary unit is provided on site.

It also is important to note that the fees charged by the City do not recover the full cost of processing the applications. The City currently subsidizes a considerable portion of the development review process fees. The City evaluates its fees, and if appropriate, increases development review fees periodically. As part of any City Council discussions to significantly increase development review fees, it may be appropriate to discuss the reduction, or elimination, of fees for subsidized affordable housing projects.

Inclusionary Housing Ordinance

The City adopted its Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO) in 2004. The IHO is intended to encourage housing opportunities for a broad range of households with varying income levels, promote the City's goal to add affordable housing units to the existing housing stock, and increase the availability of housing for middle and upper middle-income households. The IHO also serves to protect the economic diversity of the City's housing stock, reduce traffic, commuting and related air quality impacts, and reduce the demands placed on transportation infrastructure in the region. Further, the IHO implements Housing Element policies to encourage the development of housing for first-time homebuyers, particularly moderate and middle-income households.

The IHO requires that all residential developments of 10 or more dwelling units provide 15 percent of the total units as "inclusionary units." Inclusionary units must be offered for sale as units restricted for owneroccupancy by middle-income (up to 160% AMI) or upper-middle-income (up to 200% AMI) households. The required inclusionary units are in addition to the density allowed by right on the site, and therefore a lot area modification is not required to exceed typical density for these units.

In 2009, the IHO was amended to require in-lieu fees for projects of two to nine units rather than provide the restricted units. As of July 2014, the current in-lieu fee is \$17,725 per unit. In-lieu fees may be reduced depending on the average size of the dwelling units. Additionally, the timing of fee payment varies according to the type of development and the number of units.

Collected in-lieu fees are used for the purchase and resale of middle- and upper-middle-income affordable units that are in default, thereby preserving the long-term affordability of such units. The fees may also be used to subsidize the creation of affordable middle- and upper-middle-income units.

Rental units, replacement of units which have been destroyed by acts of nature, and residential developments that provide at least 30 percent of the units affordable to upper-middle-income (or lower-income) households are not subject to the requirements of the IHO. For more details see Appendix F, Zoning Information and Fees, *Inclusionary Housing Ordinance*.

There is concern by some developers that the IHO requirements impede, rather than promote the construction of additional workforce housing. Nevertheless, the City believes it is necessary to support the development of non-subsidized affordable workforce housing in order to offer housing opportunities to middle- and upper-middle-income households that cannot afford to purchase at market rate prices. For instance, the median price of a two-bedroom condominium unit in the City is about \$524,000. This is not affordable to most middle-income households. A two-person household with an income up to about \$93,200 is considered to be "middle-income," and such a household could not afford a unit at this price (absent a huge down payment). The price of a two-bedroom inclusionary unit is approximately \$345,500, which is much more affordable to a middle-income household.

Based on community dialogue during the General Plan Update process, there is support for non-subsidized price restricted affordable housing units. Given this community goal, Implementation Action H11.3 considers a 15-25 percent inclusionary housing provision for new residential ownership developments. Likewise in response to concerns by developers, H11.3 directs amendments to the existing IHO to allow the elimination or reduction of inclusionary housing in-lieu fees based on preferred residential development (e.g., affordable or special needs housing). It would also reduce the inclusionary housing in-lieu fee for smaller units. Recognizing the current economic climate, a provision would be included in the amended IHO that allows the suspension of the inclusionary housing requirements or in-lieu fees during times of economic downturn, if development costs prove to be prohibitive.

Although considered a development constraint by some developers, the IHO has been welcomed by others, as it provides a level of certainty to the type of affordable housing requirement that will be imposed on residential development projects. It is anticipated that the amendments to the IHO as prescribed by Implementation Action H11.3 will provide additional options and incentives that encourage the development of non-subsidized workforce affordable housing units.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities and Special Needs

Pursuant to State legislation effective January 2002, the Housing Element examined housing constraints for disabled persons and the City's efforts to make reasonable accommodations. The City enforces Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations that regulates the access and adaptability of buildings to accommodate persons with disabilities. The Fair Housing Act requires residential buildings with three or more units to incorporate design elements, including adaptive interior design features, accessible public and common use areas, and wheelchair access. The City complies with these requirements by ensuring that all plans meet Title 24 accessibility standards, which are based on the Fair Housing Act. The City does not impose special permit procedures or requirements that could impede the retrofitting of homes for accessibility. Requirements for building permits and inspections are the same as for other residential uses. The City has not identified any zoning or regulatory practice that discriminates against persons with disabilities, thereby impeding housing opportunities for disabled persons.

Reasonable Accommodation for Persons with Disabilities

In 2007, the City's Municipal Code was amended to incorporate reasonable accommodation provisions for persons with disabilities. The Ordinance ensures that persons with disabilities are provided equal access to housing. Specifically, the Municipal Code was revised to:

- Allow accessible uncovered parking spaces, access aisles, and accessibility ramps necessary to make an existing building accessible to disabled individuals to encroach into required setbacks.
- Require all parking areas, except those located in one- and two-family dwelling zones, to provide
 parking spaces which are accessible to disabled persons. The conversion of an existing parking space
 to an accessible parking space or access aisle for an accessible parking space would not require a
 modification of the parking requirement even if the conversion would result in fewer parking spaces
 than required (Municipal Code Section 28.90.070).
- Allow modifications to any zoning standard when necessary to make an existing residential unit accessible to persons with disabilities (Municipal Code Section 28.92.110).

The City uses the modification and administrative approval process to remove constraints and meet the needs of disabled persons trying to comply with Building and Zoning requirements. For example, the City administratively allows applicants to provide reduced parking when parking for disabled is provided without going through the modification hearing process. Encroachments into yard areas for access ramps for disabled persons are allowed without requiring a modification hearing process. Accessibility guidelines are distributed by City Staff to builders explaining Federal and State laws regarding accessible building codes for housing for persons with disabilities.

Definition of "Family"

The City's Municipal Code defines "family" as a residential unit or a person or group of persons living together as a domestic unit in a single residential unit. Occupancy of unrelated individuals in a residential unit or group home is not restricted by the City. This definition is consistent with current law.

Residential Care Facilities

Residential care facilities of six or fewer individuals are allowed by right. The City has no authority to approve or deny residential care facilities of six or fewer individuals, except for compliance building code requirements pursuant to State law.

Residential care facilities serving 7-12 individuals are permitted with a Performance Standard Permit (PSP) in the A, E, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4 and PUD zones, as well as the HRC-2 zone where residential uses are allowed. A PSP may be granted to those uses that are relatively minor in nature, but due to their unique features warrant consideration and review by the Staff Hearing Officer. The denial or approval of a PSP may be suspended or appealed to the Planning Commission. The Chairperson, Vice Chairperson or other designated member of the Planning Commission may take action to suspend the decision of the Staff Hearing Officer and schedule a public hearing before the Planning Commission to review the decision.

Residential care facilities serving more than 12 individuals are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the A, E, R and C zones. These facilities are approved by the Planning Commission and on appeal by the City Council. The City does not impose maximum concentration requirements for residential care facilities.

Farmworker Housing

State law⁵ requires that any employee housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees shall be deemed a single-family structure with a residential land use designation, and small employee housing developments of up to 12 units or 36 beds in group quarters be considered an agricultural use in any zone where agriculture is a permitted use. There are no agricultural zones in Santa Barbara, although agriculture is a permitted use in all single-family zones. The City will ensure that zoning regulations are consistent with state law (see Implementation Action H22.4).

Transitional and Supportive Housing

As required by State law, the City allows transitional and supportive housing as a residential use subject only to the same standards and procedures as apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. (See also the discussion of Transitional and Supportive Housing in the Needs Assessment Section.)

Emergency Shelters

In conformance with SB2, the C-M zoning district allows emergency shelters with up to 100 beds as a permitted use. The C-M zone also allows the development of residential uses, including mixed-use development and other related uses that encourage emergency shelters.

Identified opportunity sites in the C-M zone district demonstrate sufficient capacity to support the development of additional emergency shelters. The City's Available Land Inventory Summary (Appendix H) lists approximately 152 vacant or underutilized C-M zoned properties ranging in size from .08 acres to 1.56 acres. In total, the C-M zoned properties make up 35.4 acres of available land. These parcels either separately (larger parcels) or in combination (smaller parcels) could accommodate the development of emergency shelter facilities. The consolidation of smaller and underutilized parcels is supported by Implementation Action H11.19, which is intended to encourage the development of affordable residential units, including special needs housing.

Public Resources and Infrastructures

Resource availability and infrastructure capacity have been of great concern to the citizens of Santa Barbara and have been among the parameters within which both residential and commercial development potential in the City has been established. Resources such as water, clean air, land, and traffic capacity are particularly relevant to the development of housing.

Water Availability

Fresh water is a scarce resource in Santa Barbara County. The City's primary water sources are surface water supplies. During periods of extended drought, these supplies are limited and the City must rely on alternative sources of water. Over the years, the City worked to develop a diverse mix of water resources and strong water conservation program to extend water supplies during drought periods.

In 1994, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply in the Long Term Water Supply Alternatives Analysis (LTWSAA), the City Council approved the 1994 Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP). Under the 1994 LTWSP, the City's water supply was planned to meet a total water system demand of 18,200 Acre Feet Per Year (AFY). In 2011, the City updated its LTWSP with an evaluation of potential water conservation options. The currently adopted 2011 LTWSP plans for a normal demand of

⁵ Health and Safety Code Secs. 17021.5 and 17021.6

14,000 AFY plus a 10% safety margin bringing the total water supply target to 15,400 AFY. The LTWSP outlines a supply strategy to meet demand under normal conditions and a 6-year critical drought period.

The City of Santa Barbara's water supply presently comes from the following sources, with the actual share of each determined by availability and level of customer demand: Cachuma Reservoir and Tecolote Tunnel, Gibraltar Reservoir and Mission Tunnel, contractual transfers from adjacent water districts, groundwater, State Water Project entitlement and recycled water. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by displacing demand that would otherwise have to be supplied. Santa Barbara also owns a desalination plant which was constructed in 1991 in response to the severe drought from 1986 to 1991. Once the 1991 drought ended, the facility was placed into a stand-by mode. During prolonged drought periods when local supplies are limited, the City relies on short-term extraordinary conservation, imported water conveyed through the State Water Project, increased groundwater, and as needed reactivation of the desalination facility.

Due to three consecutive critically dry years (which were the driest in recorded history), the City Council declared a Stage 1 drought condition on February 11, 2014, and subsequently a Stage 2 drought condition on May 20, 2014, requiring a 20% reduction in demand through extraordinary conservation measures. While the adopted LTWSP included a planned short-term demand reduction of 10-15% during drought periods, the severity of the unprecedented State-wide drought condition required a 20% reduction in demand. Stage 2 reflects that a serious water shortage is expected in the current or impending year and includes drought-based water rates and mandatory water use restrictions that are now in effect to achieve the 20% reduction in demand.

At this time there are no restrictions on new residential development. The 2011 LTWSP includes the projected water demand from development anticipated under the City's General Plan. New development, including residential units, represents a small portion of overall water usage and incorporates the latest efficiency standards for landscaping and plumbing fixtures. Water usage reduction measures have been imposed on existing customers to help conserve water. Residential development restrictions will be considered should the City's water supply situation continue to worsen.

Sewer Capacity

The maximum capacity of the El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant (El Estero) is 11 million gallons per day (MGD) and the peak dry weather flow capacity is 19 MGD. El Estero currently operates at 73 percent of its capacity, treating approximately 8.0 MGD of wastewater.

Recently the City has spent \$12 million to upgrade the El Estero facility. The plant was originally designed to treat the wastewater for a population of 104,000, which was the anticipated population for the City in 2012. With the renovations, the El Estero is now capable of treating wastewater demands for the next 10 or more years. Sewer capacity is not expected to constrain new development.

Air Quality

Air pollution contributes to a lessening of quality of life and potential health effects. The regional South Coast Air Basin is influenced by local topographic and meteorological conditions, including variable wind flow and periodic inversion layers that may preclude dispersal of pollutants and result in air stagnation and smog. Sources of air pollutant emissions contributing to smog production include motor vehicle exhaust, stationary sources such as from industry, and offshore oil production and natural oil seepage. In addition, particulate matter, a lung irritant, results from sources such as road dust, construction and demolition, engine exhaust, and agriculture.

The largest contributor to our locally generated air pollution is on-road mobile sources (cars and trucks), which contribute over 60 percent of the reactive organic gases and 88 percent of the emissions of oxides of nitrogen (precursors that combine to form ozone). In recent decades, the number of registered automobiles in Santa Barbara County has increased at rates higher than population growth. The number of vehicle miles traveled by local motorists has also increased. The increasing use of automobiles for personal transportation makes it difficult to improve local air quality.

Air quality planning to attain required Federal and State air quality standards is based on land use and population growth projections for the region. Attaining air quality standards also depends on controlling emissions from industry. As long as the County remains in "non-attainment" status for some regulatory standards, air quality will remain a constraint to new development.

Proximity of Residential Land Uses to U.S. Highway 101

The City continues to encourage in-fill residential and mixed-use development, sometimes in close proximity to roadways, including U.S. Hwy 101, and sometime adjacent to commercial-industrial uses. Thus, future residents, particularly children living in such locations could be exposed to higher pollutant levels with associated health effects.

Based on recent studies pertaining to sensitive receptors, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has provided a recommended setback guideline for sensitive receptors of 500 feet from urban roads with 100,000 vehicles per day. City surface and arterial streets carry lower traffic volumes, making U.S. Hwy 101 the only roadway with the potential to affect sensitive receptors.

In 2009, the City conducted a special study to review potential hazards associated with development near the freeway. The analysis showed that new vehicle standards, diesel fuel reformulation, as well as CARB-adopted Diesel Risk Reduction Measures have resulted in lower diesel particulate emissions, thereby reducing potential cancer risks near freeways. Based on these changes, as well as the level of traffic volumes and meteorological conditions in the City, the analysis recommended that a 250-foot setback would be more appropriate for the City.

In response to the CARB setback guideline and the City's analysis of an appropriate setback for residential development or other sensitive receptors, new units (excluding units incorporating certain design features or having site specific climate and topographic conditions that avoid or address air quality risks from Highway 101) within 250 feet of U.S. Hwy 101 will not be allowed until the CARB phased diesel emissions regulations are implemented and diesel emission risks reduced. While this interim restriction will result in a constraint to the production of housing, it is necessary to protect public health.

Land Availability

Santa Barbara is a mature city, and not much vacant land remains for residential or nonresidential development. Most of the residentially zoned vacant land that remains is on steep slopes and is unsuitable for the density required to provide lower income housing. The City encourages infill and redevelopment to provide housing within the City, specifically in the commercial Downtown along main transit corridors, and surrounding multi-family residential zones (see Suitable Sites Inventory). In addition, the City continues to encourage mixed use incentives and increased densities to promote the production of affordable housing for its residents.

Traffic Capacity

Traffic levels are another component of quality of life. Traffic flow on urban street networks is most restricted at intersections. Intersection levels of service (LOS) are identified by letter grades of A-F, with LOS A indicating free flowing conditions and LOS F representing substantial delay from excessive volume of cars within a specified intersection capacity. As part of its General Plan Circulation Element, the City adopted a policy goal of LOS "C" for acceptable traffic levels at signalized intersections.

For purposes of environmental impact evaluation for new development, City guidelines identify significant traffic impacts with added peak-hour traffic (i.e., morning and afternoon commuter traffic) that causes intersections to exceed 0.77 volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) or contributes peak-hour traffic to intersections already impacted at 0.77 or greater V/C. Presently, the City has thirteen intersections with levels of service within the LOS C range or worse during peak-hour traffic. With the addition of cumulative traffic associated with approved and in-process projects, traffic levels would exceed the City's LOS C policy goal for some additional intersections during the peak hour.

The State is in the process of eliminating congestion as an environmental impact, which is measured in Level of Service at intersections and on freeways. In its place, the State is proposing to measure green house gas emissions, which is calculated by measuring the Vehicle Miles Traveled between housing and commercial land uses. This change will effectively remove traffic congestion as a constraint to new housing production. This switch is anticipated to take place later in 2015.

The City Council has established a commitment to the development of housing as a high priority, and has retained the option for approval of housing projects even with significant traffic impacts, through the adoption of findings of "overriding considerations" about the benefits of housing development. Nevertheless, under State law, projects with potentially significant traffic impacts must undergo an environmental review process prior to consideration for approval, which adds to the constraints of housing development.

Energy Conservation

To promote energy conservation, an ongoing goal of the City has been to achieve maximum use of conservation measures and alternative, renewable energy sources in new and existing residences. By encouraging and assisting residents to utilize energy more efficiently, the need for costly new energy supplies, and the social and economic hardships associated with any future shortages of conventional energy sources will be minimized.

Architectural Board of Review Guidelines

One of the goals of the City's ABR is to improve the general quality of the environment and promote conservation of natural and manmade resources of the City. The ABR Guidelines state that buildings shall be designed and oriented to maximize energy efficiency and conservation including the design of lighting. All feasible passive and active solar design principles are encouraged. Shading of westerly building exposures is encouraged and winter sun should be allowed on roofs, patios and buildings.

The ABR Guidelines encourage applicants to incorporate green building design principles and use energy efficiently. In 2006, the City adopted Solar Energy Guidelines and a Solar Recognition Award Program that encourage the installation of solar energy systems. Buildings that conserve resources and use renewable sources of energy, including solar, wind, and biomass are supported if the design maintains an acceptable aesthetic quality and fits into the site and neighborhood. Solar Energy Systems Awards are given out to development projects that demonstrate high-performance and aesthetically designed solar energy systems. In regards to water conservation, the ABR Guidelines require that landscaping and plant selection be planned with consideration for water conservation.

Solar Access and Design Guidelines

The City's Solar Access and Design Guidelines are utilized in the review of new residential development and subdivisions. The guidelines provide guidance on subdivision design, including street configuration and building orientation, building siting, and landscape design. Santa Barbara Municipal Code §28.11, Protection and Enhancement of Solar Access, was adopted to ensure new residential development in residential zones does not cast a shadow on neighboring residential buildings. If shadow is cast on neighboring property, additional height limits could be imposed, or roof pitch may need to be altered, to comply with the Ordinance.

Green Building Requirements

The design, construction and operation of "green" projects minimize the use of energy, water and materials while cutting waste and improving health and air quality. Reduce, reuse, and recycle are key strategies for green building. The City partners with the Santa Barbara Contractor's Association Built Green Program to promote green building techniques and practices. The "Built Green Program" has been adopted as a City standard rating that provides incentives for priority plan check review. In addition, certain single family residential units in excess of 4,000 square feet must be designed to achieve a two-star "Built Green" or equivalent rating.

Water Conservation

A significant amount of energy in California is used for water distribution. Saving water saves energy. Promoting water efficiency is the goal of the City's Water Conservation Program. As part of the program, a Water Conservation Inspector will examine homes or businesses and inspect the water system at no cost. Inspection usually includes an examination of the meter and fixtures for leaks, a performance test of the irrigation system, and specific recommendations for increased water efficiency. The City currently provides free information on water efficient use in landscaping and irrigation, indoor water efficiency, free low flow shower heads and toilet rebate program.

Energy conservation in new development is regulated by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and is enforced by the City. The City does not have a program to encourage developers to propose energy conservation measures above Title 24 requirements. The General Plan Update includes implementation actions that address water conservation practices, including the use of recycled water. Given the climate of the Santa Barbara region, building costs are not significantly increased due to the incorporation of state energy regulations.

Coastal Zone Housing

State law has special requirements for Coastal Zone jurisdictions. The following information complies with those special requirements. Over the years, this information has been placed in the Government Constraints section. City requests to increase housing opportunities in the Waterfront have been rejected by the Coastal Commission. Policies and strategies to protect and provide affordable housing in the City (including the Coastal areas) are provided in the Goals, Policies and Implementation section.

- Since January 1982, 139 new housing units have been approved for construction in the City's Coastal Zone. This includes the 40-unit Yanonali Street condominium project. None were required replacement units. Since 1982, 156 hotel rooms in El Escorial have been converted to condominiums.
- Twenty-four (24) units for low and moderate income households were required to be provided as a result of projects approved either within the Coastal Zone or within three miles of it.
- Eighteen (18) units were occupied by low and moderate income households and were authorized to be demolished or converted in the Coastal Zone since January 1, 1982.
- One (1) unit for low and moderate income households was required either within the Coastal Zone or within three miles, in order to replace those being demolished or converted.

In 2005, the Ocean-Oriented Commercial (OC) Zone was established to achieve balanced use in the City's Waterfront and maintain the small scale, local character that is unique to this area. The zone is intended to foster a vital, mixed-use neighborhood and preserve and protect the coastal environment.

After working through concerns expressed by Coastal Commission staff regarding residential uses in the OC zone, agreement was reached to limit new residential development to mixed-use projects where residential use is no more than 70 percent of the project floor area on lots north of the railroad tracks. The OC zone also exempts affordable housing projects comprised exclusively of units affordable to very, low, or moderate-income households from the mixed-use requirements. Further, the OC zone allows existing residential uses to be rehabilitated, remodeled and expanded up to 20 percent of the existing floor area.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Land Costs

Land costs are affected primarily by regional supply and demand factors. Santa Barbara is a highly desirable area due to its pleasant climate, scenic views, beautiful architecture and charming ambience. In addition, Santa Barbara is a regional center for employment, education, health care, entertainment and the arts. Therefore the demand for developable land is very robust.

Several factors limit the supply of land. Geographically, the City occupies a narrow shelf of land situated between the ocean and the mountains. The City is essentially built out, leaving little developable vacant land. Therefore, the City's desirable location coupled with very limited developable land ensures that real estate values remain high, even in periods of decline in the regional housing market (Strategic Economics 2009).

The average price of residential land in the City for residential development ranges from \$60 to \$120 per square foot depending on the zoning and density allowed. Similarly, the average price of non-residential land used for residential development ranges from \$90 to \$210 per square foot depending on zoning, density allowed by the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program and location. This high land value reflects the scarcity of developable land. The demand to live in Santa Barbara is so much greater than the supply of land

on which to build residential development that landowners are willing to hold out for extremely high prices rather than sell at prices that reflect the current decline in development or home prices (Strategic Economics 2009).

High land costs may make affordable housing development infeasible unless expected rents or sales prices are high enough to recover the additional land costs. Therefore, high land costs are a primary constraint in the production of affordable housing.

Construction Costs

Construction costs have also increased considerably. There are few means available to the City for reducing construction costs. The City encourages higher densities for affordable housing projects through the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program and state density bonus which helps produce economies of scale. The City is currently considering a 10 percent reduction in the minimum sizes required for rental units. Architects have also helped limit construction costs by creating simple, open designs and calling for less expensive but durable materials.

Financial Costs

The availability of conventional financing for affordable housing development has remained steady. Although financing generally is more difficult to secure, recent affordable housing projects have been successful in securing financing. The active nonprofit developers have excellent track records, and banks are meeting their obligations under the Community Reinvestment Act. In addition, the cost of financing has decreased, as interest rates have dropped to record lows.

Cost increases for land and construction have resulted in a dramatic increase in the amount of subsidy needed to make housing affordable to low income households. The City has increased its typical subsidy to approximately \$100,000 per unit and higher. Since the amount of funds available to the City has increased only slightly, the increased need for subsidy reduces the City's ability to produce affordable housing. During the 2008 recession, construction and land costs dropped considerably. However in more recent years, while construction and land costs have increased significantly, the cost of financing has stabilized.

Finding funds for predevelopment has always been a formidable challenge for affordable housing developers. Very few lenders are willing to finance this very risky stage of project development. The City received a tenyear \$750,000 loan in 2000 from the California Housing Financing Agency's HELP program to capitalize a revolving predevelopment loan fund. These funds assisted the construction of 163 affordable rental housing units. The HELP loan was repaid to the State in 2009. Until it was eliminated by the State, the City's Redevelopment Agency also provided predevelopment assistance.

Community opposition to the development of affordable housing has not been a severe constraint in Santa Barbara. Due to strong local community participation that is actively encouraged, Santa Barbara generally experiences less "NIMBY-ism" than other communities. High quality design and solid property management result in a product that does not match the commonly held perception of what "public housing" looks like. When neighborhood opposition does arise, Santa Barbara's Planning Commission and City Council have consistently demonstrated strong support for affordable housing.



Suitable Sites Inventory

State Housing Law Section 65583 (a)(3) of the Government Code requires that the Housing Element contain a parcel-specific inventory of appropriately zoned, available, and suitable sites that provide housing opportunities for all income segments of the community. The purpose of the land inventory is to analyze whether the City's existing residential development potential is adequate to meet the projected housing needs as identified in the 2014-2022 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) prepared by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG).

The City's share of the regional housing need will be met through a variety of ways, including units already completed or approved since the beginning of the RHNA period (January 1, 2014). In addition, available vacant and underutilized land in residential and commercial zoned areas will be included. A thorough land inventory is intended to identify whether additional governmental actions are needed in order to provide enough sites with appropriate zoning, development standards, and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the RHNA.

The evaluation of suitable development sites includes a listing of individual parcels by Assessor's Parcel Number (APN), size of parcel, zone classification, and general plan designation. Existing use, allowable residential density, and the realistic unit capacity are included to demonstrate the realistic development potential for each parcel. Existing constraints including environmental issues and the availability of existing and planned public service capacity are also provided in the analysis.

The City's land inventory was completed using GIS land use database, County Assessor's land use codes, aerial photography, field inspections and review of the Land Use Element and Zoning Ordinance. The inventory identifies opportunity sites and estimates the potential development capacity. Both residentially and non-residentially zoned parcels which are vacant or underutilized, and could be developed with residential uses were identified. The majority of residential development potential is in the multi-family and commercial zones where the highest densities are allowed. This section of the Housing Element demonstrates that the City has sufficient land inventory and zoning capacity to accommodate the City's assigned share of regional housing need within existing and proposed General Plan and zoning capacities.

REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION

Local jurisdictions are required to incorporate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) into their Housing Elements. The RHNA allocation to local agencies serves as the basis for determining if adequate sites and zoning capacity exist to accommodate the number of housing units, by income level as identified in the RHNA plan. Table H-37 provides the City's RHNA share for the 2014-2022 projection period by income group.

The State and SBCAG have determined that the City's RHNA share for the current planning period is 4,099 additional units, including 962 very low-income, 701 low-income, 820 moderate-income, and 1,617 above moderate units (Table H-37).

	•			
Income Group	Number of Units	Percentage		
Very Low Income:	962*	23%		
Low Income:	701	17%		
Moderate Income:	820	20%		
Above Moderate:	1,617	39%		
Total Units	4,099	100%		
Source: SBCAG 2014-2022 Regional Housing Needs Plan, 2013				
*Extremely low units make up 50% of the very low income unit allocation.				

Table H-37:	Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2014 – 2022)
	City of Santa Barbara

The following discussion of land inventory, zoning capacity and opportunity sites demonstrates that the City has the capacity to meet the overall RHNA number of 4,099 units. The greatest challenge will be developing financing and partnerships to develop the very low, low and moderate income housing.

SUITABLE SITE INVENTORY AND DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

To accommodate affordable housing, the land inventory focused on commercial and multi-family zones. These zones permit the highest density residential development, and have the zoning capacity and policy incentives for infill and redevelopment. It is recognized that the higher density residential and commercial zones that allow mixed-use development, provide the potential for lower construction costs because of existing infrastructure and economies of scale, and are therefore most suitable for development of housing affordable to very low- and low income households.

Sites identified in the land inventory as having the greatest potential to accommodate housing affordable to lower-income households allow increased densities ranging from 15-36 du/acre, and up to 63 du/acre in the Priority Housing Overlay areas. Higher densities, along with substantial city subsidies are required to meet the RHNA allocation for very low, low and moderate-income households. The City is also concerned about home ownership opportunities for middle income households. Given current market conditions, these opportunities are also more likely to occur in multi-family development. Multi-family developments allow the land and construction costs to be spread or shared by more units.

In 2008, the City prepared the *Development Trends Report*, which presents database information on residential and non-residential development trends over an 18-year timeframe (1990-2007). This report confirmed the increasing amount of residential development activity in the multi-family and commercial zones. It also showed that commercially zoned properties, especially in the Downtown area, largely redevelop with less commercial square footage than existed and/or maximize residential densities. This trend continues today, illustrating that it is reasonable to assume that underutilized opportunity sites, even those currently developed with non-residential structures, could be expected to redevelop with higher density residential units.

Additionally, in an effort to help the City Council and residents visualize higher density residential development, a design charrette was held in July 2011. Local architects, designers, landscape architects, developers, and land use planners designed a number of prototype housing projects using selected opportunity sites. Among the objectives of the charrette was to draft well designed residential projects that maximize economically viable "workforce" housing.

This exercise revealed that efficient use of land is important. Contiguous opportunity sites were combined to accommodate residential development. The practice of consolidating smaller parcels is regularly used to provide adequate area for development. The opportunity sites ranged between 0.05 acres (2,000 square feet) and 0.69 acres (30,000 square feet), and when combined the project sites varied in size, up to a maximum of 1.54 acres (67,000 square feet).

All the prototype housing projects were designed to accommodate the maximum density allowed by the High Density incentive program (36 units/acre) or the Priority Housing Overlay (63 units/acre) under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The design charrette demonstrated that smaller opportunity sites can realistically contribute to the production of higher density residential development, particularly new affordable multi-family rental and ownership housing.

Past residential development trends demonstrate that smaller opportunity sites can be developed with multifamily rental and ownership housing. Smaller lot development is generally more compatible with existing neighborhood development patterns, and therefore more likely to succeed.

Merging of adjoining parcels to acquire sufficient land area as well as allowing reduced development standard requirements, often play a part in providing affordable rental and ownership housing opportunities. It is not uncommon for developers to propose the merging of several contiguous parcels in order to accommodate their development. This practice allows smaller opportunity sites to be joined together, thus contributing to the overall lot area for the project. In addition, development standard incentives such as lot area and parking modifications are typically granted to facilitate the construction of affordable housing units. Lot Area modifications allow housing projects to exceed density standards provided that the over-density units are offered to households qualifying for affordable rents or purchase prices.

Parking reductions are allowed for projects that are 100 percent rental and affordable to very low and low income households. Reduced parking is also allowed for housing units intended for senior and disabled households. Further, the City permits reduced parking in certain mixed use developments and/or projects located in the City's Central Business District.

The Housing Element includes Policy H10 that supports residential development on vacant infill sites, as well as the redevelopment of residentially and commercially zoned opportunity sites with residential uses. In addition, Implementation Actions H11.7 and H11.8 specifically address the development of underutilized and smaller opportunity sites. Implementation Action H11.19 was added to encourage the consolidation of underutilized and small parcels for the development of affordable housing.

The following developed sites demonstrate that smaller lots can realistically accommodate new residential development. These residential developments were facilitated by merging parcels and/or receiving development standard incentives:

315 W. Carrillo (El Carrillo) – Three lots were merged for a total lot area of 21,740 square feet. The site is developed with 61 efficiency rental studios affordable to low income households and one manager's unit. This development received a lot area, unit size, setback, and parking modification to achieve a residential density of 124 units per acre.

- 335 W. Carrillo Street (Casa de Las Fuentes) Two adjacent lots with a combined lot area of 33,750 square feet were merged to develop 42 rental units affordable to low and moderate income households. This development received a setback and guest parking modification to accommodate the residential density of 54 units per acre.
- 416 E. Cota Street (Artisan Court) Three lots were merged for a total lot area of 39,603 square feet. The site is developed with 55 studio apartments affordable to very low income households and one manager's unit. This development received a lot area, setback and parking modification to facilitate the residential density of 62 units per acre.
- 617 Garden Street (Building Hope) Fifty-one rental apartment units affordable to very low income households are developed on a 39,444 square foot site. This mixed use project received a lot area and parking modification to accommodate the residential density of 56 units per acre.
- 712 Chapala Street (Paseo Chapala) Two lots were merged for a total lot area of 38,250 square feet. This site is developed with a mixed use project consisting of 29 for purchase condominiums (21 market rate, 3 middle income, and 5 moderate income units) and received an open space and parking modification to accommodate the residential density of 33 units per acre.
- 121 W. De la Guerra Fourteen for sale condominiums (11 market rate and 3 middle income units) are developed on this 22,500 square foot site. This development received a lot area and open space modification to accommodate the residential density of 27 units per acre.
- 328 Chapala Street (Chapala Lofts) Seventeen for sale residential condominiums (14 market rate and 3 moderate income units) are developed on a 25,000 square foot site. This development received a lot area modification to accommodate the residential density of 28 units per acre.

Suitable Opportunity Sites

Following the analysis of residential projects in the pipeline, the City assessed the commercial and multifamily zones for opportunity sites or those parcels determined to be feasible and desirable for residential redevelopment within this planning period. Increased housing development in and around the City's Downtown area and along transportation corridors is encouraged by the General Plan. In the mid-1990's, the City purposefully restricted commercial development to 3 million square feet (through December 31, 2009) and encouraged residential development on commercial properties to improve the jobs/housing imbalance. As evidenced by the City's development trends for the past 20 years, the restriction of nonresidential square footage has been successful in producing additional housing units.

Given the market and development trends illustrated by the pipeline projects, residential development in commercial zones has increased. This is consistent with the goals and policies established in the City's Land Use and Circulation Elements as well as the historical pattern of development targeting higher density development in the Downtown area near jobs, transit and recreation / cultural activities.

Unlike many other cities in the State of California, the City of Santa Barbara has a long established practice of allowing and encouraging residential development in commercial zones. Residential development is allowed throughout the City, except in the relatively small industrial area of the City (less than 1 percent of the total land area) and in portions of the City's Coastal Zone as dictated by Coastal Act land use priorities.

Residential development is allowed in most commercial zones at densities ranging from 28-36 du/acre. In addition, a Priority Housing Overlay meant to encourage affordable rental, employer sponsored and cooperative housing would allow densities from 37-63 du/acre. These densities are intended to promote small, more affordable units that provide affordable housing opportunities for the community, particularly the City's local workforce. The smaller the average size of the unit, the greater the density allowance, up to a maximum 36 du/acre (63 du/acre with the Priority Housing Overlay) in most commercial zones. Likewise, in the R-3/R-4 multi-family zones, densities ranging from 15-27 du/acre are permitted based on average unit size. This approach is designed to discourage the proliferation of large, luxurious and costly units, while concentrating densities in the most sustainable locations (e.g., near transit, access to commercial services, access to parks and open space, etc.).

As part of the General Plan Update (*Plan Santa Barbara*) process, non-residential development is limited to 1.35 million square feet to the year 2030, which is a reduction from the prior General Plan non-residential development allocation of 3 million square feet. Based on the City's past development trends, it is expected that the outcome of the non-residential growth limitation will continue past trends and result in more housing production.

Residential Development Potential in Commercial Zones

Suitable Opportunity Sites in Commercial Zones

An inventory of vacant and underdeveloped parcels in commercial zones was undertaken to identify their build-out potential. The analysis used the City's GIS land use database and the County Assessors land use codes. Aerial photography and site inspections were also used to verify the status of certain parcels. The following steps were taken and assumptions made to calculate the residential development potential in commercial zones:

- All non-residentially zoned parcels were identified in the database.
- Non-residentially zoned parcels that do not allow residential use (i.e., M-1, OM-1, HRC-1, portions of HRC-2 and C-X overlay zone) were removed from the database.
- The improvement value per square foot for each property was calculated using the County Assessor's improvement valuation for the parcel (Assessor's Improvement Value divided by the lot size).
- Public land, including parks was removed from the database.
- Parcels with historic buildings (Landmarks or Structures of Merit) or owned by the State of California and part of El Presidio were removed from the database.
- Parcels with significant environmental constraints associated with biological resources, floodplain, air quality, and creeks or slopes of 30 percent or more were removed from the database.
- Low improvement value per square foot of lot area was used to determine which non-residential zoned parcels were more likely than others to redevelop with residential uses, (generally \$27/square foot of lot area or less). The low improvement value per square foot was based on the analysis of 30 pending residential projects in commercial zones with the average improvement/area value of \$26.7/square foot.
- Commercially zoned parcels identified in the inventory fall within two land use designations, Medium High Density and High Density. The Medium High Density designation allows 15-27 du/acre and the High Density designation allows 28-36 du/acre depending on the average unit size of the residential development.
- To assess a realistic development potential for the commercial parcels designated Medium High Density (15-27 du/acre), a 20 du/acre build-out potential was assumed.

- To assess a realistic development potential for the commercial parcels designated High Density (28-36 du/acre), a 30 du/acre build-out potential was assumed.
- Development potential on these opportunity sites assumed that all existing improvements on the property would be redeveloped at their full residential potential.

The suitable sites inventory identified 806 opportunity sites with residential development potential in commercial zones. Based on the above steps and assumptions there is the potential to produce approximately 4,609 additional residential units on these parcels.

Residential Development Potential in Multi-Family Zones

Suitable Opportunity Sites in Multi-Family Zones

As stated above, the highest residential densities are allowed in the City's commercial and multi-family zones. Vacant and underdeveloped R-3 and R-4 sites were identified using the GIS land use database and County Assessor's land use codes. Aerial photography and site inspections were also used as needed.

Historically, the City has encouraged the redevelopment of aging housing stock to more intense multi-family apartment or condominium development as allowed by the zone. The Zoning Ordinance states that the R-3 and R-4 zone is intended to be "...a residential district of high density in which the principal use of land is for multiple-family dwellings..."

A recent trend has been to demolish aging housing stock and to replace it with multi-family development. In some cases, this has been supported by the neighborhood as appropriate recycling and improvement of the housing stock. In other cases, concerns have been raised about the loss of historic resources or housing that was "affordable" by virtue of its aging conditions or incompatibility with the neighborhood.

The City's General Plan Conservation Element provides policy context and direction for protection of cultural and historic resources in our built environment as well as visual resource protection in our hillside and open space areas. With respect to historic resources, existing City policies and the Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) provide guidance to protect resources. Further, the City has responded by initiating historic surveys. The City recently completed two architectural and historic resource survey areas, including the Lower Riviera neighborhood. A demolition control ordinance to preserve historically significant resources has also been adopted.

The following steps were taken and assumptions made to identified opportunity sites and calculate the residential potential in Multi-Family zones (R-3/R-4 zones):

- Vacant parcels 3,000 square feet or more were included in the inventory.
- Underdeveloped parcels are those larger than 4,900 square feet with an existing single family
 residence. For the purposes of this development potential / zoning capacity inventory, no further
 research was made into the condition, quality or historic nature of the existing residence. It was
 assumed that one existing unit on a lot in a multi-family zone was "underdeveloped." It should be
 noted that this exercise is not unlike the analysis nonprofit and for profit developers, realtors or other
 development professionals undertake to identify prospective projects.
- Parcels with significant environmental constraints associated with biological resources, floodplain, air quality, and creeks or slopes of 30 percent or more were removed from the database.

- R-3/R-4 zoned parcels identified in the inventory fall within two land use designations, Medium High Density and High Density. The Medium High Density designation allows 15-27 du/acre and the High Density designation allows 28-36 du/acre depending on the average unit size of the residential development.
- To assess a realistic development potential for the R-3/R-4 parcels designated Medium High Density (15-27 du/acre), a 20 du/acre build-out potential was assumed. For the parcels designated High Density (28-36 du/acre) a realistic development potential of 30 du/acre was assumed.

The suitable sites inventory identified 566 opportunity sites with residential development potential in multifamily zones. Based on the above steps and assumptions, there is the potential to produce approximately 932 additional residential units on these parcels.

Residential Development Potential in the Duplex Zone

The City next assessed the City's R-2 duplex zone for development opportunities. The City's R-2 zone is a Medium Density residential district (12 du/acre). The principal use of the land is for two-family dwellings.

Suitable Opportunity Sites in the R-2 Zone

Vacant and underdeveloped parcels in the R-2 zone were identified using the City's GIS land use database and the County Assessor's land use codes. The following steps were taken and assumptions made to identify opportunity sites and calculate the residential potential in R-2 zones. Identifying opportunity sites in the R-2 zones utilized a two-step process:

- Vacant R-2 parcels were identified for the inventory. Some parcels were removed from the land inventory due to their small size. Other parcels had their development potential reduced to 20 percent due to steep slopes.
- All underdeveloped parcels greater than 4,900 square feet with only one single family residence currently on site were included in the inventory. This step included parcels between 5,000 6,000 square feet that were recently made eligible for duplex development.

A total of 891 opportunity sites were identified and are dispersed throughout the R-2 zoned areas in the City. The development potential on underdeveloped opportunity sites in the R-2 zone is approximately 1,004 units.

Residential Development Potential in the Single Family Zones

The City's single family zones include the following categories:

- A-1 One acre minimum lot size
- A-2 25,000 square feet minimum lot size
- E-1 15,000 square feet minimum lot size
- E-2 10,000 square feet minimum lot size
- E-3 7,500 square feet minimum lot size
- R-1 6,000 square feet minimum lot size

The corresponding General Plan designations for these zoning categories include residential densities ranging from 1 - 5 units per acre. The General Plan also identifies many of these areas to include open space, major hillsides and visual resources. In the steeper hillside areas, the General Plan envisions significantly lower densities, as low as one dwelling unit for every 10 or more acres. Approximately 50 percent of the City's single family zones are in the High Fire District.

While vacant undeveloped land is believed to be easier to develop than infill development in the City of Santa Barbara, the majority of vacant land remaining is located in the single family zones. These vacant parcels are typically located in the hillsides and face significant development constraints such as steep slopes, proximity to creeks, poor soil conditions, and limited or expensive access to City water and sewer services.

Given the City's focus and emphasis on infill and multi-family residential development in and around the City's commercial core, the City looked at an inventory of vacant land zoned for single family residential development as the last step and least likely to develop further.

Vacant parcels in the City's residential zones were identified using the GIS land use database and County Assessor's land use codes. Aerial photography and site inspections were also used to verify the status of certain parcels. As mentioned above, significant site constraints may exist on many of these lots rendering the development potential to be limited and difficult at best. Further, the City has policies in place regarding hillside protection, conservation of open space, avoiding development in high fire areas and limiting development on steep slopes.

To develop a more realistic estimate of the development potential on single family lots for the Housing Element planning period, the City looked closely at parcel size and City's slope density requirements. The City's slope density requirements mandate that any parcel with an average slope of over 10 percent provide increased lot area requirements based on the zone. In single family zones, parcels with slopes of 30 percent or greater must provide three times the standard minimum lot size requirements. This is often difficult to achieve especially in the steeper areas and higher reaches of the City's foothills. Further, development of these constrained hilly sites often encounter geologic, biologic or other environmental constraints that often requires extra care, caution and special studies in the development and design phases.

Therefore, for the purposes of this RHNA analysis, it was assumed that only 20 percent of the entire parcel with slopes over 30 percent had realistic development potential within the 2015-2023 Housing Element planning period. Approximately 110 vacant and underdeveloped sites in single family zones were identified for the inventory. The estimated development potential on these sites is 196 units.

It should be noted that the City has a Secondary Dwelling Unit Ordinance and development standards that are highly protective of single family neighborhoods. The City ordinance prohibits second units in high fire areas (approximately 50 percent of the City's single family zones). For these reasons, very few secondary dwelling units have been built. To date, the City has permitted only 16 units. For the purposes of meeting the City's RHNA, it is not realistic to think that a substantial increase in secondary dwelling units will occur even with the passage of new state legislation streamlining the permit process. It is not the process but the development standards that make significant building of second units in single family zones unlikely.

Suitable Sites Inventory Summary

Table H-38 provides a summary of the City's vacant land and opportunity sites analysis by project status and by zone district type. Appendix H, Available Land Inventory Table, of the General Plan, provides a parcelby-parcel listing of the vacant land inventory and opportunity sites by zone.

Category	Opportunity Sites # Parcels	Total # Units	Cumulative Total # Units	% RHNA
Commercial Zones	806	4,609	4,609	112%
R-3 / R-4 Multi-Family Zones	566	932	5,541	135%
R-2 Duplex	891	1,004	6,545	160%
Single Family Zones	110	196	6,741*	164%
RHNA = 4,099 Units				
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014 *The number of total units excludes potential residential units within the 250 foot U.S. Highway 101 setback.				

Table H-38: Summary of Opportunity Sites Development Potential

Category	Opportunity Sites # Parcels	Total # Units	Cumulative Total # Units	% RH
nercial Zones	806	4,609	4,609	1129
R-4 Multi-Family Zones	566	932	5,541	1359
uplex	891	1,004	6,545	1609

City of Santa Barbara (2014)

Table H-38 above demonstrates that the City has the land and zoning capacity to meet the regional housing needs allocation for this planning period. However, given land costs, construction costs and other market conditions, simply providing higher density zoning may not result in housing affordable to very low and lowincome households in Santa Barbara. The City's experience is that it requires community partnerships and public subsidies to provide housing available to very low, low and even moderate income households. Over the past 20 years, the City has been very successful in providing and leveraging funds, developing partnerships, identifying and acting on land banking opportunities. Unfortunately, as identified in the nongovernmental constraints section, construction costs can be prohibitive.

A challenge for the 2015 Housing Element will be to identify ways to make public subsidies stretch farther, identify new sources of funding, take a closer look at what role City requirements play in the cost of construction and consider new ways to provide affordable housing. In these discussions, it will be important to recognize the positive impact the quality of design, construction and maintenance of affordable housing projects in the City of Santa Barbara has on the continued success for affordable projects. The City is fortunate to have an inventory of all types and sizes of affordable housing projects that fit well and enhance many City neighborhoods. The City has a very strong track record in partnering with nonprofit, and more recently, for-profit housing developers.

QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

State law acknowledges that total housing needs identified may exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy this need. Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not be identical to the total housing needs. The quantified objectives should estimate number of housing units by income category that are likely to be built, rehabilitated, or conserved/preserved over the 2015 - 2023 Housing Element planning period.

The quantified objectives do not represent a ceiling on development, but rather set a target goal for the City to achieve based on needs, resources and constraints. The City's best estimate of what could actually be constructed during the 2015 - 2023 Housing Element planning period is based on historical residential development trends from 1990 to 2007. Consideration must also be given to market conditions, property owners' willingness to develop or redevelop property and implementation of the 2015 Housing Element policies and programs.

Potential residential development for the eight-year planning period was estimated by extending the average annual rate of residential units and permitting activity (pending, approved and built units) that occurred between 1990 and 2007. This calculates up to 1,208 additional residential units (average rate of 151 units/year x 8 years) to the year 2023 (Table H-39). The last two decades have been characterized by economic swings and housing market cycles. Taking an annual average over this time period renders a more realistic estimate that is consistent with development trends in the City over a 20 year time span.

For the extremely low, very low, low and moderate income housing, the estimate is based on past performance and budget assumptions from affordable housing subsidy sources. Given the housing market conditions, a larger subsidy per unit is needed due to increased construction costs. Funding from the federal HOME program is not keeping pace. The City currently holds a contractual asset option on a 50-unit affordable rental project known as Presidio Park. A conservative value is estimated at approximately \$10 million. The City may assign or sell this option to fund new affordable housing units. Post RDA project funding is more complex and involves Low Income Housing Tax Credits in combination with other sources of funding. Another source of potential funds could be an allocation to Housing Development of a portion of the 12% property tax increment the City receives annually. Rental and sale prices for affordable units are established consistent with State and Federal requirements.

The City's quantified objective for construction of new units using public and/or private sources over the planning period is estimated to be 1,208. Additionally, approximately 110 existing units are expected to be rehabilitated, and 60 existing affordable units are projected to be preserved. The total number of housing units estimated to be constructed, rehabilitated or preserved during the 2015 - 2023 Housing Element planning period is 1,378 units.

Income Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	Conservation/ Preservation	Total
Extremely Low, Very Low, Low	109	110	60	279
Moderate	13	0	0	13
Above Moderate	1,086	N/A	N/A	1,086
Total	1,208	110	60	1,378
Source: City of Santa Barbara 2014				

Table H-39: Quantified Objectives (2015 – 2023) City of Santa Barbara

Appendix G contains the 2015 Housing Element Eight-Year Work Program, which identifies timeframes for implementing the goals, policies and implementation actions to achieve the City's housing objectives.

Goals, Policies and Implementation

GOALS

- *Housing Opportunities*: Ensure a full range of housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, age, marital status, sexual orientation, ancestry, national origin, color or economic status, with special emphasis on providing housing opportunities for low income, moderate, middle income and special needs households.
- New Housing Development: Encourage the production of new housing opportunities which are sustainable, and increase equity by providing a sufficiently wide range in type and affordability to meet the needs of all economic and social groups, with special emphasis on housing that meets the needs of extremely low, very low, low, moderate, middle income and special needs households.
- **Conservation and Improvement of Existing Housing**: Conserve the existing housing stock and improve its condition while minimizing displacement, maintaining housing affordability, and preventing future blight or deterioration.
- Regional Cooperation and Jobs/Housing Balance: Coordinate City efforts with those of surrounding communities towards balancing jobs and housing in the regional housing market.
- Public Education and Information: Continue public education regarding affordable housing to increase awareness of the housing needs of extremely low, very low, low, moderate and middle income and special needs households and to inform the public about existing affordable housing opportunities, available resources and programs.

Housing Opportunities Policies

- H1. **Social and Economic Diversity.** Promote new housing programs that retain and support social, economic and ethnic diversity.
- H2. **Housing Opportunities.** Promote equal housing opportunities for all segments of the community, with special emphasis given to extremely low, very low, low, moderate, middle income and special needs households.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

H2.1 <u>Special Needs Population.</u> Continue to fund a wide range of housing, human and community service programs and capital projects that strive to meet the needs of children, families, seniors, disabled persons, homeless, victims of domestic violence, and others.

- H2.2 <u>Rental Housing Mediation.</u> Continue to fund, staff and support the Rental Housing Mediation Task Force, and publicize Rental Housing Mediation Task Force services and information on tenant and landlord rights including evictions, terminations and fair housing issues.
- H2.3 <u>Promote Public Awareness.</u> Continue using CDBG funds to promote equal opportunity provisions and remedies under state and federal law.
- H2.4 <u>Enforcement Against Discrimination.</u> If budget allows, develop adequate staffing and funding to pursue and assist the State Department of Fair Employment and Housing staff in pursuing enforcement actions against discrimination in housing under Civil Code Section 52 (c) with emphasis on discrimination against families with children in rental housing.
- H3. Homelessness Prevention. Support programs and efforts designed to prevent homelessness.

- H3.1 <u>Continuum of Care Program.</u> Continue to implement the Consolidated Action Plan's Continuum of Care program in conjunction with adjacent jurisdictions and community-based organizations.
- H3.2 <u>Prevention Programs.</u> Seek funding for homeless prevention programs, such as a program to provide short-term financial assistance to households threatened by eviction due to an inability to pay rent.
- H3.3 <u>Supportive Housing</u>. Support the conversion of existing hotels and motels to sponsored residential hotels, Single Room Occupancy (SRO) projects, or apartments for the homeless.
- H3.4 <u>Recreational Vehicle Park.</u> Facilitate application for a Recreational Vehicle (RV) park through the City's permitting process. Work with the County and other local agencies to locate RV parks.
- H3.5 <u>RV Park Program.</u> Consider providing financial support for an RV park project if an application is submitted by a qualified sponsor/developer.
- H3.6 <u>RV Parking Locations.</u> Continue zoning provisions for churches and non-profits to allow overnight RV parking under limited conditions.
- H4. **Homeless Shelters and Services.** Support other agencies and nonprofit organizations in their efforts to provide shelter and services for the homeless.

- H4.1 <u>Casa Esperanza</u>. Continue to fund and support Casa Esperanza Homeless Shelter or other suitable shelter facilities, and encourage a broad range of such services throughout the region including services with year round programming.
- H4.2 <u>Operational and Service Needs.</u> Support the operational and service needs (such as child care and job training) of homeless shelter and service providers. Provide financing when possible.

H5. Transitional Housing Opportunities. Increase the supply and variety of transitional housing opportunities.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H5.1 <u>Transitional Housing</u>. Continue to fund community-based non-profit agencies, such as Transition House, to provide a range of transitional housing opportunities.
- H5.2 <u>Regional Coordination</u>. Coordinate with the County of Santa Barbara and the cities of Carpinteria and Goleta to develop, update and implement the Consolidated Plan's Continuum of Care programs.
- H6. **Housing Opportunities for Seniors**. Seek to ensure the availability of a range of housing opportunities with an emphasis on extremely, very low, low and moderate income seniors.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H6.1 <u>Senior Housing</u>. Encourage the development of a full range of senior living situations, available at market and affordable rates.
- H6.2 <u>Unit Acquisition and Rehabilitation</u>. Continue to promote and assist in the acquisition and rehabilitation of existing dwelling units for use as affordable senior housing.
- H6.3 <u>Upgrade Senior Facilities</u>. Continue to facilitate private sector efforts to upgrade existing senior housing facilities, including services for seniors with long term care needs, in order to provide improved senior housing opportunities.
- H6.4 <u>Non-Institutional Facilities</u>. Encourage small, non-institutional facilities that meet the needs of the older senior population (75+).
- H6.5 <u>Senior Advocacy.</u> Continue to work with the Area Agency on Aging.
- H6.6 <u>Support Services.</u> Encourage the expansion of support services such as house cleaning, cooking, shopping and financial advising in order to meet the needs of the older, independent senior population.
- H6.7 <u>Housing Incentives.</u> Continue to provide reduced parking incentives for senior housing projects in combination with bonus densities to encourage the development of small senior and disabled apartment projects including efficiencies and congregate care.
- H6.8 <u>Design Guidelines.</u> Adopt site and unit design guidelines for senior and disabled units, which incorporate all relevant federal, state and local laws, as well as recommendations from the Access Advisory Committee (AAC).
- H7. **Housing Opportunities for Disabled.** Seek to ensure the availability of housing opportunities for the extremely low, very low, low and moderate income disabled population.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

H7.1 <u>Congregate Care.</u> Promote and assist the development and processing of new congregate housing opportunities or board and care facilities for the extremely low, very low, low and moderate income, and physically and mentally disabled persons.

- H7.2 <u>Special Needs Housing</u>. Encourage community services groups, non-profits, and the faithbased community to create special needs housing.
- H7.3 <u>New Housing Opportunities.</u> Work with community service providers to expand their scope of services to include housing through new construction or acquisition and rehabilitation of existing dwelling units.
- H7.4 <u>Priority Status.</u> Encourage the Housing Authority of the City of Santa Barbara to continue to give priority status to disabled people with the greatest housing needs.
- H7.5 <u>Accessibility Funding</u>. Explore ways to fund accessibility improvements for dwelling units that will be made available for disabled persons who are eligible to receive HUD Section 8 certificates.
- H7.6 <u>At-Risk Affordable Disabled Units.</u> Ensure that affordable units occupied by disabled tenants at risk of converting to market rates are maintained as affordable, to the extent feasible.
- H8. Accessible Housing for Disabled. Accessibility for the disabled shall be required in new residential development and in housing to be rehabilitated.

- H8.1 <u>Accessibility Review.</u> Continue the ongoing review of residential development plans for accessibility for the disabled.
- H8.2 <u>Accessibility Guidelines.</u> Distribute guidelines to builders that explain Federal and State laws regarding accessible units. Provide specific ideas and examples (such as no steps, wider doors and hallways and larger bathroom areas).
- H8.3 <u>Accessible Housing.</u> Adhere to either the Fair Housing Act or the California Building Code, whichever is more stringent, in order to provide accessible housing.
- H9. Accessible Housing Programs. Support the creation of new programs to aid the disabled to secure accessible housing.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H9.1 <u>Accessible Housing Incentives.</u> Implement policies that give incentives for disabled accessible units to be included in market-rate projects.
- H9.2 <u>Case Management.</u> Seek funding for case managers to support the disabled in independent living situations.

New Housing Development Policies

H10. **New Housing.** Given limited remaining land resources, the City shall encourage the development of housing on vacant infill sites and the redevelopment of opportunity sites both in residential zones, and as part of mixed-use development in commercial zones.

- H10.1 <u>Early Project Consultation</u>. Continue to offer and encourage early staff predevelopment consultations for residential development of opportunity sites and mixed use projects.
- H10.2 <u>Property Profiles.</u> Continue to offer property profile services in the Planning Division that explain development potential and constraints for parcels in the City. Property profile services generally involve the review of archive, street and planning files, and the preparation of a letter report containing information regarding the property's permit history and development potential.
- H10.3 <u>Building Reuse</u>. Encourage residential reuse of existing nonresidential buildings, for both ownership and rental affordable housing.
- H10.4 <u>Housing at Shopping Centers.</u> Promote and encourage the development of mixed-use for ownership and rental housing at shopping centers such as La Cumbre Plaza shopping center, with an emphasis on affordability, by coordinating and/or partnering with property owners and housing developers.
- H11. **Promote Affordable Units.** The production of affordable housing units shall be the highest priority and the City will encourage all opportunities to construct new housing units that are affordable to extremely low, very low, low, moderate and middle income owners and renters.

- H11.1 <u>Affordable and Workforce Housing.</u> Explore options to promote affordable and workforce housing, including revising the variable density ordinance provisions to increase affordable housing (e.g., limit unit size), requiring a term of affordability, and reducing parking standards with tenant restrictions.
- H11.2 <u>Priority Housing Overlay.</u> Encourage the construction of rental housing, employer sponsored housing, and co-operative housing in the Downtown, La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area, C-M Commercial Manufacturing Zone and Milpas Street area by providing incentives such as:
 - Increased density overlays up to 63 du/ac as part of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program.
 - Higher Floor Area Ratios (FAR) when such standards are developed.
 - More flexibility with zoning standards, (e.g., reduced parking standards).
 - Expedited Design Review process.
 - Fee waivers or deferrals.
- H11.3 Inclusionary Housing. Amend the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to:
 - a. Consider a 15 25 percent inclusionary affordable housing provision in new residential ownership developments for affordable housing to accommodate workforce (middle) income earners:
 - Temporarily suspend the inclusionary housing requirements or in-lieu fees during times of economic downturn if development costs are prohibitive.

- b. Amend the payment of in-lieu fees to include the following considerations:
 - Eliminate or reduce inclusionary housing in-lieu fees based on preferred development, such as affordable or special needs housing projects; and
 - Adjust the inclusionary housing in-lieu fee rate based on unit size (i.e., lower fees for smaller units).
- c. Require a Housing Mitigation Fee Program for commercial development.
- H11.4 <u>Density Standards.</u> Develop density standards that permit greater densities for projects that provide a greater percentage of price-restricted ownership units than required by the inclusionary housing ordinance.
- H11.5 <u>Bonus Density.</u> Continue to provide bonus density units above levels required by State law, to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- H11.6 <u>Private Sponsors.</u> Continue to solicit proposals for low-, moderate-, and middle income projects from private sponsors and develop programs to assist in their implementation.
- H11.7 <u>Infill Housing</u>. Continue to assist the development of infill housing including financial and management incentives in cooperation with the Housing Authority and private developers to use underutilized and small vacant parcels of land for new extremely low, very low, low and moderate income housing opportunities.
- H11.8 <u>Opportunity Sites.</u> Assist, coordinate or partner with builders for the development of affordable housing projects by identifying in-fill and opportunity sites in the commercial zones, on public lands and under-developed R-2, R-3 and R-4 sites in the Available Land Inventory of Housing Element.
- H11.9 <u>Sweat Equity Projects.</u> Continue to support special procedures for development, permitting, construction and early occupancy of "sweat equity" projects.
- H11.10 <u>Large Rental Units.</u> Encourage the construction of three bedroom and larger rental units for low-, moderate-, and middle income families, including the Housing Authority, in efforts to develop and/or acquire three+ bedroom units.
- H11.11 <u>Condominium Conversions.</u> Continue to implement the Municipal Code's Condominium Conversion Ordinance to provide opportunities for entry-level home ownership in a variety of locations while maintaining a supply of rental housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income persons.
- H11.12 <u>Surplus Land.</u> Inventory all land in the City owned by County, State and Federal governments, the Santa Barbara School and High School Districts and public utilities, and actively pursue dedication of surplus land for development of low, moderate and middle income housing, and for qualifying employees of participating government agencies.
- H11.13 <u>Housing Opportunities</u>. Look for housing opportunities on City-owned land or over private and public parking lots.
- H11.14 <u>Public Facilities.</u> Pursue acquisition of the National Guard and Army Reserve sites in order to develop affordable housing, park, school or other public benefit facilities.

- H11.15 <u>Financial Assistance</u>. Apply for, or support others in applying for, all available public and private funding and financial assistance for affordable housing projects.
- H11.16 <u>Property Transfer Tax.</u> Increase property transfer tax to provide funding for price-restricted affordable and workforce housing in order to broaden the funding base.
- H11.17 <u>Alternative Revenue Sources.</u> Explore alternative sources of revenue for Affordable Housing to replace the Redevelopment Agency tax increment financing since it was dissolved in 2012.
- H11.18 <u>Extend Redevelopment Project Area.</u> Continue to explore and pursue potential legislative amendments or other opportunities for replacement of the Redevelopment Agency and its funding mechanism for affordable housing and other community benefit projects.
- H11.19 <u>Parcel Consolidation</u>. Encourage the consolidation of small and underutilized parcels for the development of affordable housing, if appropriate based on neighborhood compatibility.
- H12. **Above Moderate Affordable Housing.** Provide incentives for the private sector development of new housing opportunities affordable to households earning more than 120% of the Area Median Income, but not more than 200% of the Area Median Income.

- H12.1 <u>Above Moderate Housing</u>. Encourage the development of housing for first time home buyers, including moderate and middle-income households.
- H12.2 <u>Large Employers.</u> Encourage large employers to mitigate affordable housing impacts.
- H13. Non-Subsidized Rental Housing. Preserve and promote non-subsidized affordable rental housing.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H13.1 <u>Preserve Rentals.</u> Explore ways to avoid condominium conversions, or alternatively, the creation of cooperative tenant ownership of previous rentals.
- H13.2 <u>Condominium Conversions</u>. Amend section 28.88.120B of the Municipal Code to require all condominium conversions to conform to the density requirements of the General Plan.
- H13.3 <u>Rental Units.</u> Allow the reconstruction or rehabilitation of existing rental apartments at non-conforming General Plan densities and zoning standards. The loss of some rental units may be considered to meet building code requirements.
- H14. **Sustainable Housing.** Ensure that new market-rate residential development is consistent with the City's sustainability goal, including reduced energy and resource use, and increased affordable housing opportunities.

- H14.1 <u>Market Rate Housing</u>. Market-level housing projects in the multi-family or commercial zones (including mixed-use) shall be encouraged to:
 - Construct unit sizes consistent with averages and maximums set out under the City's Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program; and

- Have access to adequate public open space within a ¹/₂-mile radius, a dedication of sufficient useable open space on-site, a contribution is made toward future parks through in-lieu fees, or a combination of any of these.
- H14.2 <u>Resource Conservation</u>. Establish criteria and standards for resource use in relation to density in the project review process, to encourage reduced resource footprint projects. Residential projects that exhibit a significantly lower resource per capita footprint would be allowed bonus density providing the building remains smaller than allowed by zoning.
- H14.3 <u>Market-Rate Incentives.</u> Prepare design standards and codify incentives for market rate developers to build smaller, "affordable-by-design" residential units that better meet the needs of our community.
- H15. **Secondary Dwelling Units.** Further encouraging second units (granny units) in single family zones shall be pursued with neighborhood input to gauge level of support, but prohibited in the High Fire Hazard Zones to the extent allowed by the State laws applicable to second units. Second units may be most appropriate within a short walking distance from a main transit corridor and bus stop.

- H15.1 <u>Secondary Dwelling Unit Ordinance.</u> Amend the Secondary Dwelling Unit Ordinance to provide more site planning flexibility and affordable-by-design concepts such as:
 - Changing the existing size limitations to remove percentage of unit size and allowable addition requirements, and allowing a unit size range (300 – 700 s.f.);
 - The square footage of the secondary dwelling unit shall be included in the floor-to-area ratio (FAR) for the entire property and shall be consistent with the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance FAR;
 - Eliminating the attached unit requirement;
 - Eliminating or adjusting affordability requirements;
 - Allowing tandem parking and easing other parking requirements on a case-by-case basis;
 - Allowing one water, gas, and electric meter and a single sewer line, or reviewing requirements for meter placement and configuration to minimize the cost of individual metering of dwelling units; and
 - Developing guidelines and prototypes of innovative design solutions.
- H16. **Expedite Development Review Process.** Assist affordable housing sponsors to produce affordable housing by reducing the time and cost associated with the development review process while maintaining the City's commitment to high quality planning, environmental protection and urban design.

- H16.1 <u>Affordable Housing Projects.</u> Continue to give priority to affordable housing projects on Staff, Committee and Commission agendas.
- H16.2 <u>Affordable Housing Facilitator.</u> Continue to have a Staff-level Affordable Housing Facilitator with clearly established roles and responsibilities as defined by City Council.

- H16.3 <u>CEQA Exemption</u>. Continue to use the CEQA infill exemption for Affordable Housing projects as appropriate.
- H16.4 <u>Coordinated Project Review.</u> Address issues of coordination between the Architectural Board of Review (ABR), the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC), the Staff Hearing Officer (SHO) and the Planning Commission (PC). Identify areas where additional staff authority could be given for administrative approvals.
- H16.5 <u>Infill Project Guidelines.</u> Work with AIA, ABR and HLC members to develop guidelines and examples for small infill projects (adding 1-3 units). Consider allowing projects consistent with the guidelines to be reviewed as Consent items when appropriate.
- H16.6 <u>Water Meters.</u> Allow new apartment developments to be served by a single water meter for interior uses with sub-meters for each unit, as appropriate, or review requirements for meter placement and configuration to minimize the cost of individual metering of dwelling units.
- H16.7 <u>Expedited Review.</u> Continue working with the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC), and City departments to expedite the review of Affordable Housing Projects. As appropriate, establish joint sub-committees of design review boards and Planning Commission to offer early, consistent and timely input and problem solving during the review process.
- H16.8 <u>Multi-Family Design Guidelines.</u> Develop multi-family residential design guidelines and standards to address unit size, setbacks, open space, landscaping, building size, bulk and scale, and site planning (e.g., pedestrian-friendly design, front porches facing the street or courtyard, and parking located out of sight).
- H17. **Flexible Standards.** With the New Zoning Ordinance (ZNO) Update consider changes to development standards to be more flexible for rental, employer sponsored workforce housing, affordable housing projects, and limited equity co-operatives, where appropriate.

- H17.1 <u>Parking Requirements.</u> Consider incremental changes to the Zoning Ordinance parking requirements such as:
 - Reducing parking requirements for projects that develop under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program to 1 space minimum per unit;
 - Allowing tandem parking;
 - Providing more flexibility for constrained sites (e.g., allowing for more than one maneuver, use of car stacking devices or other space saving measures);
 - Eliminating guest parking requirements for housing in the Downtown commercial area; and
 - Rounding down when calculating parking requirements.
- H17.2 <u>Zoning Standards.</u> Consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to change how, where and the extent of outdoor living space, yard and setback requirements for housing in commercial zones.

- H17.3 <u>Expedite Environmental Review.</u> Continue to maintain a system for use of the City's Master Environmental Assessment Document as a means of expediting the environmental review process consistent with State law regarding housing.
- H17.4 <u>Development Review Process</u>. On an ongoing basis, evaluate the current development review system and make recommendations for improvements.
- H18. **Monitoring of Net Housing Gains and Losses.** The City shall monitor housing development and progress toward achieving housing goals.

H18.1 <u>Adaptive Management Program.</u> Through the Adaptive Management Program, monitor and report annually to the Planning Commission, City Council and public, the number of total and affordable dwelling units (including bonus density units) that are being constructed, and the number of units converted to commercial use or demolished and not replaced.

Conservation and Improvement of Existing Housing Policies

H19. **Rehabilitation Programs.** The City shall continue to expand its voluntary housing rehabilitation programs, and preserve existing housing in all parts of the City.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H19.1 <u>Low-Interest Loans.</u> Continue to provide low interest rehabilitation loans for housing sponsors to rehabilitate multi-family structures.
- H19.2 <u>Neighborhood Surveys</u>. Continue to survey neighborhoods that have the highest number and concentration of units in need of rehabilitation.
- H19.3 <u>Substandard Housing.</u> Continue to allow the appropriate demolition of substandard housing.
- H20. **Property Improvements.** The City shall encourage residential property owners to improve the conditions of their property(ies) to a level that exceeds the minimum standards of the California Building Code and the Uniform Housing Code

- H20.1 <u>Zoning Enforcement</u>. Continue to focus building and zoning enforcement efforts on property owners who are chronic, repeat offenders with emphasis on multi-departmental inspections and abatement orders, and prosecution of violators through the court system.
- H20.2 <u>Substandard Apartment Complexes.</u> Look for opportunities to acquire larger, substandard apartment complexes in cooperation with the Housing Authority, Peoples' Self Help Housing or other community-based organizations in order to correct health and safety problems and to provide ongoing management services.
- H20.3 <u>Bilingual Assistance</u>. Continue to provide a bilingual ombudsperson for tenants in substandard units who wish to file a housing complaint.

- H20.4 <u>Zoning Information Reports.</u> Continue to require Zoning Information Reports when residential units change ownership, excluding condominiums.
- H20.5 <u>Illegal Dwelling Units.</u> Consider ways to legalize illegal dwelling units in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
- H20.6 <u>Substandard Buildings.</u> Consider implementing a program that would require owners of buildings found by the City's Building and Safety Division to be substandard to assume the financial burden of relocating their tenants to habitable units.
- H20.7 <u>Tax Code</u>. Continue to utilize the processes of Sections 17274 and 24436.5 of the *State Revenue and Taxation Code* which prohibits a taxpayer who derives rental income from substandard housing from receiving income tax deductions for interest, taxes, depreciation or amortization paid or incurred with respect to the substandard housing.
- H21. **Preserve Affordable Housing.** Maintain the affordability of existing extremely low, very low, low and moderate income dwelling units.

- H21.1 <u>Affordability Covenants.</u> Continue to monitor and preserve affordable housing covenants before they expire.
- H21.2 <u>At-Risk Affordable Units.</u> Continue to encourage the Housing Authority and nonprofit organizations to acquire and manage units whose affordability requirements are due to expire.
- H21.3 <u>Expiring Affordability.</u> For projects with expiring affordability provisions:
 - Make a determination as to whether longer affordability is feasible under existing financing;
 - Engage in dialogue with property owners, no later than 12 months prior to the expiration of the recorded affordability covenant, to extend the affordability period. If the affordability period is not extended the City in conjunction with the property owner shall notify the tenants of the impending expiration to ensure proper and timely notification;
 - Examine funding availability for the extension of affordability covenants;
 - Explore potential for sale of project to nonprofit or the Housing Authority; and
 - Require additional affordability as a condition of subordination of an existing City loan against the property.
- H21.4 <u>Presidio Park Apartments.</u> Ensure that Presidio Park Apartments remain affordable in the interim between when their Section 8 contract expires and when the City has option to purchase (2018). Prior to 2018 develop a financial plan to purchase or preferably monetize Presidio Park Apartments and ensure they remain a long term affordable housing project.

Regional Cooperation and Jobs/Housing Balance Policies

H22. Work to Solve Regional Jobs/Housing Imbalance. The City is committed to working with neighboring jurisdictions and the private sector to solve the regional jobs/housing imbalance in a regional manner.

- H22.1 <u>Affordable Housing Task Group.</u> Continue to support and participate on the Joint Cities / County Affordable Housing Task Group.
- H22.2 <u>Shared Housing Development.</u> Explore joint housing development opportunities, with the County of Santa Barbara and the cities of Carpinteria and Goleta.
- H22.3 <u>Affordability Criteria.</u> Continue coordination with the County to maintain uniform affordability criteria.
- H22.4 <u>Farmworker Housing</u>. Encourage and support the County's efforts to address the special housing needs of farmworkers on the South Coast. Review City zoning regulations to ensure conformance with Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6.
- H22.5 <u>Affordable and Workforce Housing</u>. Continue to work with community groups in support of Affordable and "Workforce" housing on the South Coast.
- H22.6 <u>Coastal Housing Partnership.</u> Continue to participate and support the Coastal Housing Partnership, as well as explore ways to expand its role and reach.
- H22.7 <u>Employer Incentives.</u> Work with the Coastal Housing Partnership to develop incentives for employers throughout the South Coast to provide employee housing on-site or close-by off-site, and establish or expand programs that encourage employers to provide other housing benefits or financial assistance programs, such as down payments, closing costs and rental move-in fees for employees.
- H22.8 <u>Bridge Loans.</u> Encourage the Community Housing Trust Fund to explore the feasibility of providing "bridge loans" to existing property owners to add small rental units (including "granny units") to their property. The bridge loan would be for the construction period. In exchange, the rental units would be required to be affordable for a reasonable period of time.
- H22.9 <u>Affordable Student Housing</u>. Encourage UCSB and Santa Barbara City College to address affordable student, faculty and staff housing on campus and at close-by off-site opportunity sites. Discuss with SBCC or other interested organizations the potential and obstacles to development of student housing on campus or within walking distance to the campus. Provide encouragement and assistance in pursuit of any needed legislative or Local Coastal Plan Amendments for the provision of student housing.
- H22.10 <u>Regional Coordination on Affordable Housing.</u> Continue to coordinate with other South Coast agencies to identify available land for residential development and consider partnerships between local agencies to develop housing for the South Coast workforce. Inventory and consider publicly-owned sites throughout the South Coast's urban areas with good transit accessibility for such development.
H23. **Sustainable Regional Housing Solutions.** Develop regional strategies to fund and construct Affordable Housing for different need categories (e.g., senior, young families, disabled, homeless) within existing urban growth limits.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H23.1 <u>State and Federal Funding.</u> Explore opportunities for joint City/County applications for Federal and State housing assistance programs.
- H23.2 <u>Annexations.</u> At the request of the County and community, pursue joint projects, including annexations, similar to the Mercy Housing / St. Vincent's affordable housing project.
- H23.3 <u>City Resources.</u> Look for opportunities to use City funding and staffing resource for affordable projects outside the City limits as requested and appropriate.
- H23.4 <u>New Funding Sources.</u> Encourage the community-based Housing Trust Fund and the Trust for Public Lands to work together in efforts to identify new funding sources for affordable housing projects.
- H23.5 <u>Housing Authority Coordination</u>. Encourage the City and County Housing Authorities to work together to purchase sites and/or construct affordable housing.
- H24. **Cooperation on Legislative Changes**. Pursue a joint legislative platform to achieve regional housing solutions for the South Coast.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H24.1 <u>Rental Housing</u>. Encourage the passage of legislation that provides incentives for the construction of rental housing.
- H24.2 <u>Condominium Production</u>. Encourage the passage of legislation that would resolve the condominium construction defect liability problem.
- H24.3 <u>Housing for Disabled</u>. Support State legislation that would expand housing opportunities for the disabled.
- H24.4 <u>Residential Development.</u> Encourage the federal and state governments to establish policies and expand programs that will assist in the production and financing of residential development including the following:
 - Adopt legislation or regulatory changes that will result in an expanded secondary mortgage market for mixed use and affordable housing developments.
 - Revise the tax code to provide incentives for the construction and ownership of rental housing, such as accelerated depreciation.
 - Increase funding for affordable housing programs.
 - Amend the Community Reinvestment Act to require banks and savings associations to provide more financing for the production of affordable housing.
 - Adopt legislation that will facilitate the use of Mortgage Credit Certificates and tax exempt bond financing for affordable housing in higher cost areas.

- H24.5 <u>Section 8 Program.</u> To ensure the continuation of the Section 8 Housing Voucher Program the following shall be pursued:
 - Oppose any legislation that would reduce funding for the Section 8 Housing Voucher Program, including the block granting of the program to the states.
 - Support legislation that provides new incremental units of Section 8 Voucher assistance nationwide, particularly in high cost areas like Santa Barbara where the need is greatest.
 - Support legislation that ensures adequate Section 8 Voucher renewal funding so that the number of low-income families presently served is not reduced.

Public Education and Information Policies

H25. **Housing Information.** Encourage broad based support in the community for the siting and permitting of affordable housing projects, senior housing, homeless shelters, and group homes for persons with disabilities or terminal illnesses.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H25.1 <u>Housing Resources.</u> The City shall provide information to the public about housing needs and resources that exist in the community:
 - Through reports to the Planning Commission or City Council, and in coordination with the Housing Authority.
 - By public access television to provide information on affordable housing: what it is, whom it is for, and why it is necessary.
- H25.2 <u>Rental Incentive Information</u>. Provide rental incentive program information to potential developers regarding the need for large (3+ bedroom) rental units affordable to extremely low, very low, low, and moderate income households.
- H26. **Affordable Housing Information.** Inform the public of affordable housing opportunities that currently exist in the community.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- H26.1 <u>Housing Opportunities.</u> Continue to publish and distribute a resource guide to inform consumer households of available housing opportunities and community programs.
- H26.2 <u>Accessibility Regulations.</u> Continue to provide information and technical assistance to property owners concerning compliance with Title 24, ADA and Fair Housing Act regulations (the standards for accessibility by the disabled).
- H26.3 <u>Housing Achievements.</u> Support and assist efforts to publicize both public and private affordable housing achievements.

Open Space, Parks and Recreation

CONTENT OF THESE GOALS, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

Santa Barbarans have always prized the open space and recreational opportunities found within the city and in nearby Santa Ynez Mountains and coastal waters. Because the city is essentially built out, it is critical to preserve and enhance open space, parks and recreational opportunities.

The following goals, policies and implementation actions were either developed during the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan update process, carried over from the Land Use or Housing Elements in effect in 2011, or were EIR mitigation measures. These new goals, policies and implementation actions are operational with adoption of the General Plan, however, until the existing Open Space and Parks and Recreations Elements are comprehensively updated, they also remain in effect and combined with the following.



Goals, Policies and Implementation

GOAL

• **Open Space Opportunities.** Protect and enhance the city's livability, accessibility and character, and the community's health, through the generous provision of a variety of accessible public open space opportunities.

Open Space, Parks and Recreation Policies

OP1. Variety and Abundance. Provide ample open space through a variety of types, including nature reserves, parks, beaches, sports fields, trails, urban walkways, plazas, paseos, pocket parks, play areas, gardens, and view points, consistent with standards established for this city.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

OP1.1 Park and Open Space Standards and Planning. Establish or update standards for:

- The number of acres for each type of open space per increment of population (e.g., 1,000 residents) appropriate for Santa Barbara;
- Optimal walking distances to parks, recreational areas and gardens, including pocket parks and small play areas; and
- Types of open space, parks or recreational facilities to satisfy different needs, or appropriate in different locations (e.g., multi-purpose pocket park for infill vs. tot lot in single family residential neighborhood) suitable for the demographics of each neighborhood.

Using these service ratio standards, develop accessibility goals, identify facility deficiencies, establish priorities, and determine options for addressing needs, such as through joint use (and funding) of school districts' recreational facilities.

OP1.2 <u>Remaining Key Open Space.</u> Use the information in the Master Environmental Assessment Visual Resource Maps and other data to identify key areas within the City and its sphere of influence that merit long-term protection, and take appropriate actions to preserve such areas as passive open space. Focus on larger areas of contiguous open space including areas in the Las Positas Valley, Elings Park, El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historic Park, east slopes of Hope Ranch, north Mesa hillsides, the Riviera, and throughout the foothills, particularly in lower Mission Canyon and the watersheds of Arroyo Burro and Barger Canyon creeks, as well as the Atascadero and Cieneguitas creek watersheds adjacent to the San Marcos Foothills Preserve.

- OP1.3 <u>Protect Contiguous Open Land.</u> All new development within identified key open space areas shall be sited and designed to preserve contiguous tracts of open space and connectivity with open space on adjacent parcels. Connectivity includes connected habitats and wildlife corridors.
- OP1.4 <u>Public Lands</u>. As part of the next Recreation Facilities Master Plan Update and/or in each Sustainable Neighborhood Plan, identify all publicly owned vacant or underutilized property (e.g., parking lots, road rights of way, etc.) and assess the potential for conversion of all or a portion of these properties for park, open space, and recreational use, such as pocket or neighborhood park, play area, plaza, public seating area, trail or community garden, habitat restoration, and/or other publicly accessible green space as well as water quality improvement projects.
- OP1.5 <u>Community Gardens on Vacant Land.</u> Establish a program for use of vacant or underutilized properties for temporary community gardens throughout the City, to enable residents who do not have access to land to grow food, orchards or other crops. Community gardens shall not be sited within a creek setback.
- OP2. **Open Space, Park, Recreation and Trails Acquisition and Maintenance Funding.** The City shall develop a variety of ways and options to support acquisition and maintenance of public open space, and new development and re-development shall contribute commensurate with the incremental need generated. Access and connectivity between open spaces shall be considered in future acquisition and maintenance funding.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- OP2.1 <u>Acquisition Funding.</u> Establish funding mechanisms (e.g., conservation easements, assessment districts) for preservation of key open space areas including Quimby Act and Park Development Fees to reflect the actual costs of providing such facilities, and actively pursue State, Federal, and private grants to enable acquisition.
- OP2.2 <u>Maintenance Funding</u>. Develop funding mechanisms for maintaining public parks, recreational facilities and/or usable open space in the urban center. Require a contribution by all larger projects, towards public parks, recreational facilities, and/or other usable open space on site, off site, or through in lieu fees, to offset the impact of increased density/intensity of use.
- OP2.3 <u>Preservation of Regional Open Space.</u> Coordinate with the County, School District, and recreational service providers of Goleta and Carpinteria on regional open space protection in the Las Positas Valley, foothills, and other areas determined to be appropriate by the City. In particular, work with the County to consider options for:
 - Expanding the San Marcos Foothills Preserve by siting and clustering any new development south of the Preserve to set aside steep hillsides and creek corridors as additions to the Preserve. Consider potential options to expand the Preserve northward during any future proposed subdivisions of larger adjacent ranches by considering use of agricultural clustered development or other techniques to permit preservation of larger areas of contiguous open space while permitting reasonable development of such properties.

- Coordinating with the County and private property owners to restore foothills and other lands degraded by past inappropriate grading or agricultural activities.
- Recreational facilities including ball fields, sport courts, trails and bike paths.
- Providing linked open space and trail corridors through incorporated and unincorporated areas of the Las Positas Valley and eastern Hope Ranch.
- OP2.4 <u>Acquisition of Existing Buildings for Community Use.</u> Establish funding mechanisms for acquisition of existing buildings and property (e.g. Army Reserve National Guard Armory) for community use or establishment of a new community center.
- OP2.5 <u>Citizen Involvement.</u> Coordinate with interested citizen groups on appropriate conservation and passive recreational activities that should occur in existing and newly acquired open space areas.
- OP2.6 <u>Youth Involvement.</u> Work with local education institutions (e.g. high schools, colleges) and community organizations to foster youth appreciation for and participation in open space protection and management.
- OP2.7 <u>Private Open Space.</u> Coordinate with private landowners on the management and restoration of private hillside lands so that such lands are managed to preserve open space values of significant stands of native vegetation and mature trees. Explore costs and benefits of transfer of such lands to public ownership with willing property owners.



OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

The parks and recreation element of the General Plan dealt with the provisions of parks and recreation facilities within the community for the leisure use and enjoyment of the people. The open space element of the General Plan is concerned primarily with conserving, providing, and improving, as appropriate, land and water spaces significant in the Santa Barbara landscape.

For purposes of this element, an open space has, or is proposed to have, the following characteristics:

- 1. Essentially open. The open space can contain a limited amount of development, provided the land maintains the characteristic of being predominately open.
- 2. Natural. Some open spaces (e.g. Mesa bluffs and beaches) are completely natural and are proposed to be conserved in that form. Other open spaces (e.g. the freeway) are completely altered and contain significant improvements. As an open space, however, it is proposed that natural characteristics be created in such a space in order to reduce the adverse impacts of the development and activities in the space.
- 3. Significance. An open space is significant to the entire City or to a major portion of it.

Goal

The purpose of this open space element and the goal that it seeks to attain is elemental. It is to protect the character of Santa Barbara, as defined in the section of this report on principles and goals, by conserving and providing significant open and natural landforms through and around the community.

There are many overlaps between open space and other community features which share the goal of conserving the Santa Barbara character. The protection of mature trees on private property, the landscaping of major developments, the policies on architectural and sign control, and many other subjects in the General Plan serve a function parallel with that of open space. Only those segments of open space meeting the criteria of Citywide significance are discussed here.

Neighborhood parks and other smaller scale public open spaces are identified in the "Parks and Recreation" section but are, however, shown on the Open Space map.

Categories of Open Space

The open space segments fall into several categories because of the differences in their nature, manner of usage, maintenance, and methods of implementation. The "Ocean" and "Mountain" categories are perhaps so obvious as to be taken for granted and escape specific notice. To overlook them, however, would be a mistake, for they could be significantly compromised.

OCEAN

As an open space, the ocean has a profound effect on Santa Barbara and on all coastal communities. Much of Santa Barbara's activities are oriented to it. It has already been partially despoiled by oil exploration, drilling, and extraction.

It must be firmly resolved and all possible actions taken by the City to gain the reversion of the ocean to its original state and to limit uses of the ocean to those natural to it (such as fishing and boating).

As an open space category the ocean extends from the horizon into the surf and to the harbor. From there inshore, the surf, beach and quiet water areas are covered in the Shoreline category.

MOUNTAINS

On the inland side of Santa Barbara is the coastal range of mountains which is the major Santa Barbara landform. The presence of this mountain open space contributes greatly to establishing the character of Santa Barbara and is one of Santa Barbara's most important open space resources. Most of the steeper portions of the mountains which have a direct visual relationship to Santa Barbara are already in the national forest and are protected. Some steep lands, however, are privately owned. The City should encourage the Forest Service to acquire such privately owned lands for inclusion in the Los Padres National Forest.

MAJOR HILLSIDES

There are two areas within and adjacent to the City which have relatively steep topography and which are, for the most part, privately owned and contain or are subject to limited development.

The larger of the major hillside areas is in the foothills, generally in the Lauro Canyon Reservoir, upper Mission Canyon, Las Canoas Road, Mountain Drive, and Sycamore Canyon areas. There is a scattering of low-density residential development and one spot of inappropriate small-lot, single-family development (Conejo Road). The majority of the land, however, is vacant and natural and the overall effect is one of undeveloped foothill open space. As such, it is a valuable asset to the open space inventory of Santa Barbara. It can function as a transition between the residential areas of the community and the mountains. Suitable controls must be instituted to restrict the density and manner of future development in a way that would leave these foothills essentially open and unscarred.

The other Major Hillside area is the north slope of the Mesa Hills, extending from the City College at Cabrillo Boulevard westerly between the Westside and the Mesa Hills, through the Las Positas Valley and into Hope Ranch. The form and function of this open space is somewhat different from the foothill areas. While quite narrow in horizontal projection (see the Open Space map), the impact on the community as a whole is quite pronounced. The slopes involved are steep and, in some cases essentially undevelopable. The natural landform and vegetation is mostly undisturbed and forms the southerly side of the bowl into which the City of Santa Barbara has grown. The dominance of this open space as one looks across the community from the north is (because of the steep slopes) larger in scale than would be apparent from the map. As with the foothills, it should not be necessary to acquire this open space to preserve it, for much of it is practically undevelopable. It is necessary, however, to provide certain development controls so that the density is held down to an appropriate level. Also, the location of development should be controlled in a manner that will preserve the natural characteristics of the terrain and the native vegetation.

There are steep hillsides in other sections of the City which are not part of the two Major Hillside areas but which, in their natural forms, contribute to the City's open space resource. Controls should be adopted to protect the natural characteristics of all steep hillsides in the City. A good example of this is the north slope of the "Wilcox" property, southerly of Cliff Drive at Las Positas Road, which is covered with oak trees and is an important open space in the southerly portion of the Las Positas Valley. This slope can be preserved by controls which would limit development to the level land on top. The City should retain the development rights on the slopes.

CREEKS

The major drainage channels which pass through the City are San Roque, Arroyo Burro, Mission Canyon, and Sycamore Creeks. These drainage channels should remain in their natural state, providing recreation facilities as proposed in the Parks and Recreation section as well as open space corridors through the community. It is recognized that certain maintenance, clearing, and alignment work may have to be done in order to minimize flood damage. However, all such flood control work should be done in a manner that will maintain the natural qualities of the creek open space. Further artificial channelization and/or lining, in any form, must not occur.

Implementation of the creek open space category involves the City's establishment of firm policies to preserve these channels in their natural state. These policies must be enforced by the City, the County Flood Control District, and the Army Corps of Engineers. The acquisition of rights-of-way for trails, while important to the recreation system, is not essential to the protection of these corridors for open space purposes. Special regulations for development adjacent to the major creeks should be enacted to prevent construction in creek open space areas and to protect development from known flood hazards. While much of the land adjacent to these creeks is already developed, most will be redeveloped. New construction should respect the creeks as important community open spaces.

SHORELINE

The Shoreline consists of the surf, the harbor, harbor facilities, beaches, bluffs, and adjacent park areas. The shoreline complex is an actively used open space, but is also important visually to the community. The protection and development of the shoreline area is covered in the Harbor and Shoreline section. The preservation of the shoreline as an open space will require care in the types of improvements that are allowed to be sure that the natural qualities are not destroyed or obscured. The Harbor and Shoreline

discussion notes that excessive development for one particular group of users could easily deprive the community as a whole of the shoreline as an open space.

MAJOR PARKS

This category contains the major park and other park-like public and quasi-public open spaces in the community.

- 1. Montecito Golf Course, Bird Refuge, Santa Barbara Cemetery, Clark Estate and A Child's Estate. Efforts are underway, and should continue, to acquire an option or first right of refusal for the City to acquire Montecito Country Club so that it can be preserved as major park open space. The complex of which this is a part forms a beautiful entrance to the City from the south as well as containing important recreational facilities. The Clark Estate is shown as a part of this major park open space, although it would not be necessary to acquire the entire property. The northerly and westerly slopes of the Clark Estate should be acquired, leaving the upper portion of the property for private development.
- 2. Las Positas Park. This is one of the largest park properties in the City. It is also included in the Open Space plan because of its relationship to the Mesa Hills and Arroyo Burro Creek.
- 3. Municipal Golf Course and MacKenzie Park.
- 4. The Old Mission lands, Museum of Natural History, Mission Park and Rocky Nook Park. No further action is needed to protect this open space complex, save for the retention of Mission Creek, which runs through it, in its natural state.
- 5. San Roque Park, Lauro Reservoir. This is included as a major park complex because of its relation to San Roque Creek and to the foothill areas.
- 6. Skofield Park, Rattlesnake Canyon. Both of these properties represent "acquisitions of opportunity." They were offered to the City by an organization in one case and an individual in the other at a time and under terms which made it feasible for the City to acquire the property.
- 7. Botanic Garden. This is the smallest of the individual open spaces, but is significant because of the uniqueness of the gardens themselves and because of its relationship to both Mission Creek and the Foothill areas. The Botanic Garden is maintained by a non-profit corporation and is well protected.

FREEWAY

The freeway is classified as an open space because, in addition to its being indeed open and of such scale as to be significant, it must be developed in a manner that will qualify it as open space in order that the adverse impact of the traffic through the corridor of the community will be minimized. In other words, the freeway must be so developed that it runs through an open space corridor within the community rather than simply running through the community itself.

While a freeway does not fit the traditional mold of an "open space," it is obvious that the freeway has a significant impact on the community both in terms of area (300 - 400 acres) and activity (traffic, noise, air pollution, etc.). The challenge offered by including the freeway as an open space is to create a natural characteristic in the freeway corridor which will dominate the space and minimize the adverse impacts of the freeway development and activity.

To accomplish this, the City must exercise every available power and persuasion to cause the State Division of Highways to recognize that this manner of freeway development is the only one consistent with the character and quality of the City of Santa Barbara, as set forth in the principles and goals adopted by the City and included in this report.

Implementation

OCEAN

- 1. Continue efforts to prohibit new oil exploration, drilling, and production in the channel and to cause the termination of existing leases and the removal of platform structures. Permit the continuation of drilling or production only as proved necessary for remedial purposes.
- 2. Establish and enforce a high water-quality standard.
- 3. Prohibit the use of the channel as a shipping lane for oil tankers and other vessels which present a potential threat of pollution from accidents or other causes.

MOUNTAINS

- 1. Examine the County zoning of those privately owned lands in the mountain areas to see if existing regulations are adequate to preserve and protect the mountain lands for open space purposes. If inadequate regulations are found, request that the County amend its ordinances accordingly. Complete by January 1, 1974.
- 2. Examine possible programs of water importation, grass seeding, reforestation and other programs to protect and enhance the watershed and scenic functions of the mountains. Complete study before January 1, 1974. Present findings to appropriate agencies and encourage their implementation of the recommendations developed.
- 3. Encourage Forest Service to acquire privately owned steep lands for inclusion in Las Padres National Forest.

MAJOR HILLSIDES

- 1. Adopt zoning, subdivision, building, and grading regulations for the Major Hillside areas by July 1, 1973.
- 2. Adopt suitable controls similar to those above for other hillside lands by July 1, 1973.

SHORELINE

- 1. Determine need for access to the shoreline. Acquire necessary rights-of-way by January 1, 1975.
- 2. Improve all access routes to the shoreline by July 1, 1977.
- 3. Prohibit the installation of any improvements which would change the nature of the tidal beaches at the base of the Mesa bluff.
- 4. Examine methods of preventing cliff erosion and institute any programs found to be effective.
- 5. Delineate all public beach areas and dedicate them for public open space and recreation purposes by July 1, 1973.

MAJOR PARKS

- 1. Adopt a firm policy of not allowing public park lands to be used for other than park, recreation, and open space purposes.
- 2. Acquire first right of refusal, development rights, or other appropriate agreements for the Montecito Country Club and the northerly and westerly slopes of the Clark Estate.

FREEWAY

- 1. Design and adopt standards for landscaping of the freeway by January 1, 1974. This process has already begun with the work currently underway by the crosstown freeway design committee, which includes representatives of the Division of Highways.
- 2. Work with the Division of Highways to implement the adopted standards.

CREEKS

- 1. Design and adopt standards for creek development by January 1, 1974. Work with those agencies involved with the creek areas to assure that all creek developments will comply with the adopted standards.
- 2. Adopt zoning regulations and other development controls necessary to protect the Creek Open Spaces from development encroachment and to protect adjacent development from flood hazards by July 1, 1973.

GENERAL

- 1. Adopt an effective tree preservation ordinance for the entire City, with emphasis upon preservation of trees in the various open space areas, by July 1, 1973.
- 2. Initiate a charter amendment to protect public park lands against inappropriate uses.

PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT

The City of Santa Barbara, being primarily a residential community and a center of tourist activity, must consider Parks and Recreation as one of the most important elements of the General Plan. Some of the General Plan proposals relative to park and recreation facilities are far-reaching ones which involve, in some cases, the acquisition of land that is now developed for private use. The General Plan makes such recommendations because of the prime importance of this element in the environment. At one time, in the nineteenth Century, the City of Santa Barbara owned virtually all of the land in the basin. As time passed this land was gradually sold and otherwise disposed of to the extent that the City now retains much less than is needed for its orderly growth. The time to reverse the process is now as public officials and citizens recognize the ultimate need for additional lands to devote to the public use and welfare. Steps must be taken to regain some of this precious and irreplaceable asset.

The standards for Neighborhood, Community, and Regional Park facilities as adopted by the City's Planning and Park Commissions have been set forth in the Technical Appendix (Parks and Recreation Facilities and Programming Master Plan) and are reasonable for the various types of parks and recreational facilities. The Parks and Recreation Facilities and Programming Master Plan (PRFPMP), adopted by the City Council on March 31, 1981, provides an in-depth inventory of existing Parks and Recreation facilities and programs, use and participation statistics, maintenance and operational cost analysis, land and building use alternatives, and recommendations for meeting future recreation, facility and programming needs. The Local Coastal Plan (LCP) adopted by the City Council on September 2, 1981, and by the State Coastal Commission on January 22, 1982, also sets policies that relate to Park and Recreation activities in the Coastal Zone. One of the major implementation policies of the LCP is to zone for public recreation and open space publicly-owned property where recreation is the primary use.

There are eight classifications of park and recreation facilities: Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, Regional Parks, Special Use Facilities, Golf Courses, Riding and Hiking Trails, Beaches and Bikeways. These categories are explained as follows:

Neighborhood Parks

The General Plan Map indicated proposed Neighborhood Parks where no specific location is shown, existing neighborhood parks, and specific sites which are recommended. Whether or not adequate facilities exist on any of the neighborhood parks shown is not a subject for this General Plan report.

In many cases a proposed site is shown adjacent to an elementary school. This suggests a close relation-ship between park and the school as a policy that should be maintained wherever possible. The park and the school serve approximately the same type and size of service area, and it is possible for the facilities of one to efficiently complement the facilities provided by the other. They both serve the same children. They could also provide for extended neighborhood services to both children and adults. In many cases, however, this close relationship does not exist where park and school are both in existence. In these cases the General Plan has accepted the location of these facilities as being separated and makes no recommendation for the relocation of either one.

Many of the existing Neighborhood Parks are along major drainage channels. Every opportunity to utilize these wooded drainage channels for park purposes should be taken. In the Wilson area, for example, such a location represents the best available opportunity for the provision of park facilities.

In the medium- and high-density residential areas, the Neighborhood Park facilities should be supplemented by small, passive landscaped parks oriented to the older citizen. These can be quite small, providing no more than benches in addition to the landscaping. De La Guerra Plaza is a good example of this level of facility.

Community Parks

The Community Park serves an area coincident with that adjacent to a high school or a junior high school and is desirable from the standpoint of the complementary use of the facilities.

Three Community Parks are shown on the General Plan. MacKenzie Park at State Street and Las Positas Road, although very limited in size, is shown as ultimately providing for this recreational function because it is the only land available that would serve the Northside well in terms of location. There may be possibilities that the Army Reserve property which occupies a portion of this land could ultimately be devoted to park use. The acquisition of this land for park purposes could involve a trade between the City of Santa Barbara and the Federal Government for another parcel of land suitable to the Army Reserve. Such a trade would not be disadvantageous to the City from an economic standpoint, for the existing buildings which now house the Army Reserve could be used as community buildings which are a necessary part of a Community Park.

The Las Positas Park site is a highly diverse property including a sanitary land fill, rolling hills, and steep valleys with abundant chaparral, live oaks and digger pines. The park is being developed in three phases. Phase I, completed in 1972, includes six tennis courts, a practice area, shower and locker rooms, parking area, and an office. The land fill was closed for construction of Phase II, which began

in October 1980. Phase II, currently under construction, provides a multiplicity of uses including softball and soccer fields, restroom facilities, passive recreation areas, picnic grounds, hiking trails, and necessary parking and access roads. Phase III will include recreation facilities to complement those included in Phase II. This park is expected to serve the entire City for local sports events and more directly serve the Mesa, Westside, Las Positas, Braemar, Veronica Springs, and Hidden Valley areas.

Ortega Park serves the Downtown area and the Eastside. It is well located to serve the high-density residential area to the north. Its location relative to Santa Barbara High School and Santa Barbara Junior High School and its location between the high-density residential area and the Industrial Park make it an outstanding location for park uses. Acquisition of Hope School located on La Colina Road and the expansion of Spencer Adams Park located on De la Vina Street is recommended in the PRFPMP.

Regional Parks

Although much of the oceanfront park and recreation facilities provide many of the essential components of a Regional Park, this complex has not been shown as such. It is more accurately defined as an accumulation of Special Use Park and Recreational facilities. The City encourages continuing efforts by the County for a Regional Park site on the County Land Fill site near El Sueño Road and Calle Real. The Parks and Recreation Facilities and Programming Master Plan (PRFPMP) recommends future acquisition of the Clark Estate located west of the Santa Barbara Cemetery for regional park purposes and to add to the existing park system in the area (e.g., East Beach, Andree Clark Bird Refuge, Santa Barbara Zoological Gardens, "A Child's Estate" and Dwight Murphy Field). The PRFPMP recommends expansion of the Chase Palm Park north of Cabrillo Boulevard for regional purposes through the utilization of a portion of the Southern Pacific Railroad property. The City Council has approved a Specific Plan for this property which requires the dedication of 4.6 acres of park land.

Special Use Facilities

The Special Use Facilities include, but are not limited to, the Municipal Golf Course, Earl Warren Showgrounds, County Bowl, Municipal Tennis Courts, Andree Clark Bird Refuge, "A Child's Estate," Dwight Murphy Field, Cabrillo Ball Park, all of the beach areas, Harbor and related facilities, Moreton Bay Fig Tree Park, Pershing Park, Cabrillo Pavilion Bathhouse, Cabrillo Arts Center, Carrillo Gymnasium, Carrillo Recreation Center, Los Baños Pool, and the Louise Lowry Davis Center. The following are comments relative to several of these facilities. If a Special Use Facility is not commented upon it is because the General Plan does not recommend any change in the existing development or in the policy for future development.

The large area which includes "A Child's Estate," Dwight Murphy Field, the adjacent beach areas, and the Andree Clark Bird Refuge is perhaps the most important of the Citywide park areas. It is enhanced by the Montecito Country Club and Municipal Tennis Stadium to the north and the Santa Barbara Cemetery to the east, which provide additional open space to complement the park and recreation area. Additionally, the Local Coastal Plan requires that interpretive centers be provided for information on the dynamics of the Andree Clark Bird Refuge to ensure continued compatibility of recreational use and habitat preservation. The Moreton Bay Fig Tree is a major landmark in the City. The park area surrounding this unique specimen should ultimately be expanded to provide an appropriate setting and protection. The General Plan proposes that the crosstown freeway design provide an appropriate setting

and protection. The General Plan proposes that the crosstown freeway provide for grade separations at State Street, but not at Chapala Street. It is recommended that Chapala Street be terminated at points above the freeway and below the railroad tracks so that additional land can be devoted to the park area around the Moreton Bay Fig Tree.

Shoreline Drive is the primary scenic drive in the City and the existence of any private development between it and ocean effectively lessens its value. The Local Coastal Plan recognizes the need for blufftop preservation combined with passive park area. The LCP requires that the bluff areas traversed by Arroyo Burro Creek around the Wilcox property be dedicated to the City for park, habitat protection, and archaeological site protection and that a public parking facility be provided in the area north of the creek.

Golf Courses

The City of Santa Barbara now provides one publicly owned 18-hole golf course on Las Positas Road. There are four other 18-hole golf courses, privately owned, in the South Coast area, all of which are accessible to the public only through membership. In addition, two (2) privately owned 9-hole golf courses and one (1) 18-hole course are open to the public on a daily fee basis. It is apparent that this limited availability of golf courses for public recreation and enjoyment is inconsistent with the desire of the community, which depends on adequate recreational opportunities for both its residents and its visitors. Particularly in Santa Barbara, where retirement is such an important part of the economic base, the recreational opportunity provided by golf is much more important than it might be in another community where the average age is lower and the level of activity more energetic. Golfing offers opportunities for active participation in sports to the "senior citizen." Also, since a major support element of the economic base is tourism, a significant number of golf courses within easy reach of visitor accommodations will make this enjoyable sport a most rewarding community feature.

While private golf courses may, statistically, appear to provide the community with a broad angle of golfing opportunities, the fact is that these private courses, while valuable in our total recreation picture, do not provide opportunities to the majority of the population. Additional courses that are open to the public on a daily fee basis, whether publicly or privately owned, are necessary to fill this broad spectrum of need. Of these, the publicly owned courses should be controlled and managed in a manner that will offer recreational opportunities to the broadest cross-section of the community.

The General Plan recommends that the City enter into a joint venture with the County of Santa Barbara in providing a system of publicly owned golf courses in the South Coast area in sufficient quantity that Santa Barbara can compete with other recreational areas in attracting championship tournaments as well as the individual traveling or vacationing golfer. This cooperative endeavor between the City and County could be accomplished through a special recreation district established a fund, construct and operate a system of publicly owned golf courses and related facilities in the South Coast.

As the City and South Coast develop, opportunities to acquire large, appropriate pieces of land for golf course development will diminish. It is imperative, therefore, that a program for creation of the proposed public golf system be instituted as early as possible in order to take advantage of as many open land opportunities as now exist. There are, for example, several parcels or combinations of parcels of land in the low foothills which would be ideal for a fine, quality golf course. Another opportunity which should not be missed is the possibility of acquiring existing privately owned golf courses for inclusion in the public golf course system. A prime example of this is the Montecito Country Club.

The City or the joint powers organization established to operate the golf course programs should, as soon as possible, contact the owners of the Montecito Country Club with a view to assuring that this strategically located land remain as open space, preferably for golf course uses, in perpetuity, rather than being developed for alternative purposes.

Riding and Hiking Trails

The provision of trails for horseback riding is more applicable to the County areas where low-density residential and agricultural land uses are prevalent. Some activity of this nature is popular in the Sheffield, Foothill, upper Mission Canyon, and Braemar areas. Of broader interest to the majority of residents of the City is the provision of hiking trails. Happily, both activities can be accommodated at the same time, so in providing the walker with trails, riders can also be accommodated. The PRFPMP provides for future pedestrian and access trails in making recommendations for the acquisition of the following easements:

- Pedestrian easement from Portesuello Avenue through the Palm Grove to the end of Pedregosa Street in the Bel Air Subdivision;
- Access trail from La Cumbre Road to Hope School;
- Access easement from La Mesa Park to the beach;
- Access trail from Miramonte Drive to Thornbury (Hondo Valley), and Arroyo Avenue to Thornbury (Hondo Valley);
- Access trail from Hilda Ray Park to Escondido Park;
- Access trail between Parma Park and Mountain Drive and Parma Park and Coyote Road.

The primary objective of a trail system should be the provision of trails leading from the residential areas of town up to the foothills and down to the beaches. The major drainage channels shown on the General Plan provide the best locations to accomplish this. Those shown are Arroyo Burro Creek, Mission Creek, Sycamore Creek, and Cold Springs Creek. Efforts should be made to set these natural areas aside not only for the trails and the important recreational activity which they provide, but also for the preservation of the natural open space as a diversified factor in the urban scene. The modern techniques of channeling these drainage areas into a uniform and sterile concrete trough should be avoided. This intensity of urbanization is not characteristic of Santa Barbara environment.

Opportunities to link together park facilities, historical sites, riding and hiking trails, and other areas of public use and interest should be grasped as they occur. An excellent example is Skofield Park, located on Las Canoas Road and used for day camping, and Rattlesnake Canyon, which passes through Skofield Park and its route down from the mountains to join Mission Creek. The City acquired Skofield Park, which used to be owned and used annually by the Rancheros Visitadores, as a day camping facility. The Rattlesnake Canyon area above Skofield Park contains several sites of historical importance, established trails, and contacts U.S. Forest and City watershed lands. This land (approximately 450 acres) was acquired in the Spring of 1971 by joint effort of the City, County, and Federal Government and constitutes a valuable addition to the South Coast open space, parks and recreation, and historical site system.

Beaches

The City's beach system is one of its most important recreational assets. As distinguished from the overall parks and recreational system, the beaches relate closely to the basic character of Santa Barbara, being oriented primarily to the ocean and more sensitive to weather and climate. With this relationship the beaches are an important recreational focal point for the community as well as a source of attraction for visitors, who are an important element of the City's economic base.

There are approximately three miles of City-owned beaches extending from Shoreline Park on the Mesa to the Andree Clark Bird Refuge. In addition, several miles more of tidal beaches at the foot of the Mesa Bluffs offer a considerably different shoreline experience. Here the higher tides occasionally cover the entire beach to the base of the bluffs. At low tides the receding ocean exposes broad areas of smooth-packed sand, ideal for walking, and numerous shallow pools with their fascinating display of tidal marine life. Convenient access to these interesting beaches should be provided at several points, while still keeping most of the area as a secluded, quiet walking beach. Attempts to make improvements of any kind to these natural tidal areas, with the purpose of increasing the intensity of use, should be discouraged.

The City-owned multi-use beaches must be improved with facilities appropriate to the kinds and the intensities of use which each particular beach is intended to serve. In addition, all City beaches must be well maintained so that they can retain their attractiveness and realize their full recreational potential. Alterations to the natural ecological systems of the ocean shore must be avoided.

Recent studies have shown that by 1975, use of the beaches on an average summer Sunday will reach a level that can be considered the maximum desirable intensity of beach use for Santa Barbara. As the City's population grows toward the ultimate provided for by the General Plan residential densities, this intensity of beach use will exceed intensity of use now experienced on July 4th. This prospect requires that action be taken to ensure that all beach areas will be useable, and that any decision which would take beach areas for other use, such as parking and commerce, be avoided.

It is recommended that the General Plan include provisions for the retention and protection of the tidal beach at the base of the Mesa Bluff in its natural state, prohibiting the installation of any improvements which would change the nature or use of the area. Measures to prevent cliff erosion should be investigated.

To forestall any possible future misuse of the City's beaches for other than public beach purposes, the City should specifically delineate all public beaches and dedicate them for public recreation purposes. A protective charter provision should be offered for consideration by the electorate.

Bikeways

As concern for the environment increases on a national scale and as the role of the automobile in producing atmospheric pollutants is subjected to increasing criticism, the popularity of the bicycle as an alternative mode of transportation in urban areas is accelerating. This popularity has led to the recognition of the bicycle as an excellent recreational medium as well as a means of local transportation. Many beneficial advantages of bicycling, including health, economic savings and noise reduction have contributed to the increased consideration of bicycling as an important element in the circulation system in the cities.

Heretofore, emphasis has been placed on providing circulation facilities for only the automobile and the pedestrian. That is, our typical street cross-section is two or more traveling lanes for automobiles and two paths (sidewalks) for pedestrian travel. Provisions for accommodating the bicycle as a mode of transportation have not been considered. This is also true within most public recreation areas where no provision is made for bikeways.

There are two basic purposes in bicycle riding, recreation and transportation. Both of these functions can and do overlap, and bikeways which are provided specifically for one of these purposes can, in many instances, fulfill the other function.

RECREATION BIKEWAYS

Recreational bikeways should be primarily oriented in relation to areas of scenic recreational interest. Two prime "areas of interest" in Santa Barbara are: (1) The complex of the Old Mission, Museum of Natural History, and Rocky Nook Park; and (2) The shoreline, harbor, and beach area, where a bikeway has been developed. Major recreational bikeways, separated as completely as possible from automotive and pedestrian ways, should be developed in these two areas of interest. They should also be connected by a major transportation bikeway running through the heart of the community.

The setting of standards and the design of a recreation bikeway system should be an element of the specific plan for parks and recreation.

TRANSPORTATION BIKEWAYS

Transportation bikeways should be part of the circulation network, providing travel paths from one activity area in the community to another. Providing adequate transportation bikeways is more difficult than recreational bikeways, because the recreational bikeway can more easily be separated from conflict with automotive traffic, whereas the transportation bikeway must, in most cases, use the existing public street rights-of-way. A notable exception to this would be the provision of bikeways along major drainage channels, which could be both for recreation and transport. Even then, the crossing of some major arterials would be necessary. The setting of standards and design of a bikeways system for transportation should be an element of the Specific Plan for circulation.

TECHNIQUES

Various techniques will have to be employed in providing bikeways. In some cases, it may be possible to start from scratch and construct bikeways which are totally and ideally separated from vehicular and

pedestrian traffic and proceed through park-like areas in a manner both safe and pleasing to the user. In other cases, it may be necessary to utilize existing streets or specially identified areas for bicycle traffic. In the latter case, every effort must be made to create a physical and psychological separation between bicycle and the other forms of transportation which share a particular corridor. Any street re-construction or new construction should include provision for a bikeway. Where physical separation between bicycle and auto is not possible, consideration should be given to assigning the right-of-way in certain situations to the bicycle in order to maintain reasonable safety standards.

BIKEWAY PARKING

Parking space should be provided at all terminal areas, including downtown and at shopping centers. Since bicycles are classified as "vehicles," their right to use streets and on-street parking areas especially provided for them would seem reasonable.



Economy and Fiscal Health

CONTENT OF THIS ELEMENT

The Economy and Fiscal Health Element covers both local and regional economic considerations and offers policies that promote economic resiliency and equity and support green businesses, local small businesses, and employment for local residents. For implementation, a number of these policies will require a more proactive role on the part of the City through a variety of promotion, recruitment and retention efforts.

The following goals, policies and implementation actions were either developed during the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan update process, carried over from the Land Use Element in effect in 2011, were EIR mitigation measures, or relocated during the 2013 Safety Element Update. This is a new element in the General Plan that is operational with the adoption of the General Plan.



Goals, Policies and Implementation

GOALS

- **Strong, Diverse Economy.** Ensure a strong economy with a diversity of business sizes and types that provide a stable long-term revenue base necessary to support essential services and community enhancements, as well as diverse job opportunities.
- *Local Opportunities.* Enhance educational opportunities for local residents to meet local employment needs.
- Green Businesses. Encourage more "green" businesses.
- *Tourism.* Continue to support tourism and related support services for visitors to Santa Barbara.
- *Interconnected Regional Economy.* Recognize that commerce is intertwined with transportation, natural resources and housing, and together are key elements of a healthy economy that is regional in scope.
- *Minimize Impacts and Costs.* Internalize impacts to the environment of new development and redevelopment, and avoid costs to the community.

Local Economic Policies

Promote Economy and Fiscal Health goals and policy direction working with non-profits and businesses.

- EF1. **Integral Parts of Economic Development**. Promote energy efficiency, innovation, public health, and arts and culture as integral parts of economic development.
- EF2. **Environmental Effects of Commercial Growth.** Manage commercial growth to protect the City's environment and unique qualities.
- EF3. **Economic Development Plan and Special Studies.** Prepare and implement an economic development plan to focus economic development activities in desired areas to further implement economic policies. Initiate special area studies, zoning policies, or specific plans for small businesses, start-up businesses and green/sustainable businesses in the commercial areas identified in Sustainable Neighborhood Plans.
- EF4. **Existing Businesses.** Give priority to retaining existing enterprises as the best source of business expansion and local job growth, and encourage government, businesses and residents to patronize local businesses and contractors, by working with local businesses to initiate a "Buy Local" program, with the City setting the example.
- EF5. Green/Sustainable Businesses. Provide where practicable a green promotional and economic development program, to support businesses that:

- Develop or provide "green/sustainable" products, such as recycled building materials, alternative transportation vehicles, alternate energy sources, organic agriculture, etc.;
- Enhance the natural environment, conserve energy, water or materials, prevent pollution, reduce waste;
- Provide environmental education to the community about City programs.

Continue to support the *Green Business Program Santa Barbara County* by publicly recognizing businesses that promote environmental responsibility and community concern.

- EF6. **Minority Businesses.** Support minority-owned/operated businesses to assist in preserving cultural diversity through focused promotional programs.
- EF7. **Eco-Tourism.** Support eco-tourism, such as bicycle tours, that takes advantage of existing hotels and resources such as the beach, ocean, and foothill trails.
- EF8. **Livable Wages.** Recruit or retain businesses which provide livable wage employment as defined by the City, and provide support through promotional programs.
- EF9. **Infrastructure Improvements.** Identify, evaluate and prioritize capital improvements that would assist in business retention or expansion, such as increased public transit, a rail/transit transfer center, city-wide wi-fi, sidewalk improvements, or consolidated customer parking facilities.
- EF10. Incentivize Business Development. Work with business organizations such as the Downtown Organization to develop specific strategies to provide incentives for business development and recruitment to the area.
- EF11. **Technology.** Encourage the use of and investment in technology that supports local enterprises and attracts new businesses to the City.
- EF12. **Re-Use of Commercial Space.** Provide incentives for adaptive re-use of vacant commercial buildings.
- EF13. Partnerships. Encourage public/private joint venture partnerships as an economic development tool.
- EF14. Local Needs. Encourage enterprises that serve the needs of existing local residents, workers, and businesses.
- EF15. **Protect Industrial Zoned Areas.** Preserve the industrial zones as a resource for the service trades, product development companies, and other industrial businesses not precluding priority housing in the C-M, Commercial Manufacturing Zone.
- EF16. Industrial Uses. Ensure that there is sufficient land available for industrial uses.
- EF17. **Connect College Students and Employers.** Advocate for and support a program to link UCSB and Santa Barbara City College graduating students with local employers.
- EF18. Arts, Crafts, and Culture. Recognize the contribution to the City's economy played by the arts, crafts, and cultural events, and continue to support and promote these endeavors.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

EF18.1 <u>Arts District</u>. Continue to support venues, facilities, events, and public artwork within the cultural arts district informally recognized as the area bound by Carrillo, Micheltorena, Anacapa and Chapala streets as well as surrounding areas within the Downtown.

- EF18.2 <u>Master Plan</u>. Develop and implement a Public Art and Cultural Arts Master Plan. Work with the private and non-profit sector to develop the Public Arts, Crafts, and Cultural Arts Master Plan.
- EF19. **Coordinate with SBCC.** Encourage closer ties with SBCC, recognizing its role in providing a skilled and knowledgeable labor pool and contemporary concepts or ideas for business and government.
- EF20. **Child and Senior Care for Working Families.** Recognize and promote the provision of child and senior care as a necessary complement of employment.
- EF21. **Small Businesses.** Continue to recognize the economic importance of small business in the community and promote programs to encourage their continued economic vitality and flexibility in future expansion.
- EF22. **Creation of Higher Wage Jobs**. Emphasize programs, incentives, and land use changes that would prioritize creation of high wage jobs in order to improve the balance between low-, middle-, and high-income wage employment opportunities.

Regional Economic Policies

EF23. **Regional Economic Strategy.** The City shall pursue an economic development strategy that sets a regional jobs/housing balance as a goal, and recognizes the need for affordable housing to support a diverse and healthy local economy.

Possible Implementation Action to be Considered

- EF23.1 <u>Cooperative Strategy.</u> In cooperation with other area governments, prepare an economic strategy to define regional economic needs, and a practical and realistic regional goal for a jobs/housing balance. Identify actions that can be taken:
 - By each jurisdiction toward achieving the job/housing goal;
 - By each jurisdiction toward addressing other regional economic needs; and
 - By several jurisdictions together.
- EF24. **Coordinate with UCSB.** Develop closer ties with UCSB, recognizing its role as a major source of stimulus for growth on the South Coast and as an employment base and source of start-up businesses.
- EF25. **Jobs within the Region for Local Residents.** Recruit and retain businesses in the City that employ local residents, and encourage South Coast Region employers to recruit local residents to reduce commuting and increase local purchasing power.

Fiscal Health Policy

EF26. **Development Impact Fees.** To the extent applicable, in order for the community to function more sustainably, new commercial and market-rate residential development and redevelopment shall either avoid impacts on community services and facilities, or contribute financially to the City or other community organizations to mitigate such impacts and costs of providing increased services and facilities.

EF27. **City Services and Facilities.** City services and facilities shall be built, maintained and operated in a manner to provide adequate services to all residents and coexist compatibly with surrounding land uses.

Possible Implementation Action to be Considered

- EF27.1 <u>Service and Facility Performance</u>. Monitor services and facilities and report status regularly to the Planning Commission.
- EF28. **Financing Capital Improvements.** The City shall pursue a variety of financing sources for the maintenance and enhancement of capital improvement projects.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

EF28.1 Fees. Investigate increasing fees to finance the cost of capital improvements.

- EF28.2 <u>Bonds.</u> Pursue voter approval of general obligation bonds for major capital improvements.
- EF28.3 <u>Impacts to City-Wide Service</u>. Individual projects shall be evaluated for their impacts on the City's ability to provide adequate services and facilities.
- EF28.4 <u>Timing</u>. Services and facilities shall be available for developments prior to approving projects and/or issuing occupancy or use certificates.

Historic Resources Introduction

"The old landmarks and the most charming characteristics of Santa Barbara are disappearing before the march of 'improvement', and though our practical people cannot move the mountains, nor change the scenes, nor spoil the climate, they are doing all they can to despoil the quaint beauty of the place and make it just a commonplace American town." (Santa Barbara Morning Press editorial, January 3, 1874)

To a first-time visitor to Santa Barbara, even the most cursory observation reveals the predominant role historic resources play in the identity and character of this City. That visitor cannot help appreciating a remarkable characteristic of this unique place: that most anywhere the eye falls it beholds something esthetically pleasing, framed by scenery similarly pleasing. Often that tableau of notable features harkens to an earlier time.

It is no accident that Santa Barbara has preserved so much of its past, and accommodated it so tastefully and seamlessly into the city's modern day incarnation. The city has had the benefit of an active and enduring preservationist spirit, which has been supported by foresighted leaders. The purpose of this Historic Resources Element is to perpetuate this tradition in the years and decades ahead.

By climate and geography alone, Santa Barbara ranks as one of the most attractive places on earth. This attractiveness quotient poses significant challenges to preservation efforts, since it engenders pressure for development. Any number of similarly attractive places, as a result of such pressures, have lost much of their identifiable relationship to their past, and are hardly recognizable from what they were only a few decades ago. The fact that Santa Barbara has retained so much of its identity is testimony to the commitment to its preservationist tradition.

In spite of having succeeded in retaining so much of the city's historical essence and identity, increased diligence is necessary. As this is written in 2012, a prolonged recession has abated some of the development pressures that, as they beget change, threaten the historical resources of this, one of the country's eminent smaller historical cities. Within the past generation, Santa Barbara has become a household name, synonymous with idyllic appeal, and this only exacerbates the challenge as more people wish to locate here. The inevitable swing of the economic pendulum will unleash renewed pressures for development, severely testing our ability to preserve the part historic heritage plays in the character of our city.

This Historic Resources Element is intended to help forearm, as well as to assist in the delicate balancing of property rights and the public interest that is inherent in historic preservation. Given that historic resources are so instrumental in the local economy, and so great a contributor to property values, this Element's key role in enlightening those balancing decisions is obvious.

This Element serves to pull together existing preservation rationale, policy and implementation priorities into a single foundation piece, bringing historic resource preservation into parity with other city concerns and priorities. It is intended to help foster and insure coordination of all city preservation efforts, public and private.



Santa Barbara's Tradition: Planning with History in Mind

"The preservation movement has one great curiosity. There is never retrospective controversy or regret." (John Kenneth Galbraith, The Economic and Social Returns of Preservation)

MAJOR MILESTONES

For many decades interested citizens, community groups, neighborhood associations and preservation organizations have actively participated in the planning and development of the city. After passage of a State enabling law in 1959, the City of Santa Barbara responded to citizens' suggestions and adopted the "El Pueblo Viejo Ordinance" on March 8, 1960. The ordinance established El Pueblo Viejo (EPV) as a design control district and set restrictions upon the alteration or demolition of historic buildings. It was named for the City's core, which developed around the Spanish Royal Presidio, founded in 1782. In May 1960, the City Council created the Advisory Landmark Committee (ALC), which was charged with making "an inventory of Historic Sites and Structures in Santa Barbara" as well as other resources of significance. The Committee acted in an advisory capacity to all agencies of the City regarding historic buildings and the design of structures within El Pueblo Viejo. Soon the ALC produced a list of significant structures and adobes. Subsequently, the Council designated City Landmarks via the ordinance amendment process. As a result, a number of historical sites and structures were preserved, including some of the oldest adobe buildings. In 1969 Mission Santa Barbara (founded in 1786) and the area around it was included in EPV. The ALC received staff assistance from the Planning Division beginning in 1974 and a regular meeting schedule was established. Work began on a revised Historic Structures chapter for the Municipal Code. The expanded ordinance was adopted in 1977. Its purpose was strengthened and the designation process was clarified. Since then many more designations have been made. This ordinance and the later adoption of the City Coastal Plan created an El Pueblo Viejo that included the waterfront and major entrances to the city. In 1978, the Landmarks Committee began a major program of architectural and historic resources surveys. In 1993, city voters approved a City Charter amendment to establish a Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC).

Requiring specific architectural styles within EPV compatible with its Hispanic tradition allows for the further protection of historic resources and perpetuates the City's renowned tradition of Hispanic architecture. For design review outside of HLC's purview, the Architectural Board of Review is charged with reviewing applications. The ABR's function includes protecting and preserving the natural charm and beauty of Santa Barbara, including the historical style, qualities, characteristics of the buildings, structures, and architectural features associated with and established by its long, illustrious and distinguished past. The City relies on its scenery, physical beauty, historic character and design consistency to attract tourists and commerce. These are vital to its economy. The City has enacted stringent controls over time to protect its views and character by limiting the size, location and visibility of signs.

ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

There are many economic advantages to the use or reuse of older buildings versus new construction. Preservation of historic resources has been shown to increase property values, community appeal, and tourism. Tourism is one of California's largest industries and historic properties are a major factor in its growth. Heritage Tourism generates economic benefits for local businesses: visitors spend money on lodging, food and drink, transportation, attractions and events, among other things. Other benefits include historical education, awareness of cultural sites, and community identity for both local residents and visitors. Numerous studies throughout the country have conclusively shown that property values in local historic districts increase at higher rates than non-historic properties, and remain more stable in times of recession. Integration of preservation strategies into the planning process assures preservation of the traditional scale and visual interest of the City.

Historic Resources and Sustainability Goals

Investment in established neighborhoods at any scale is a form of reinvestment in inherently sustainable communities that are generally smaller in scale, walkable, transit-accessible and may feature mixed uses. The use of older structures and the adaptive reuse of buildings serve to lower the carbon footprint of the entire community and avoid the environmental effects that come with demolition and reconstruction. It has been estimated that a significant amount of the material being added to landfills is demolition and construction waste. Historic buildings contain significant embodied energy whereas new construction requires energy to extract, manufacture, transport and assemble building materials. Adaptive re-use or rehabilitation of a building normally requires construction on site and changes the ratio of labor and material breakdowns, thereby generating local construction jobs.

Preserving historic resources is not only economically beneficial but also provides layers of history and visual interest in the city. This ineffable benefit to the richness and vitality of a community contributes to the sustainability of the community. Preservation considers not only a resource, but its surrounding environment as well, and any changes to that environment, such as solar exposure or drainage patterns. Such diligence ensures that development occurs in a way that respects and protects the fabric of the resource. This holistic approach to preserving historic resources supports community sustainability.

FUTURE ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

Survey Completion and Funding

The city continues to face the preservation challenge of ensuring that future development fits into the environment and does not negatively impact the city's scenic character and historic resources. The worldwide reputation of Santa Barbara as a historic city and a tourist destination remains a vital factor in the economy of the city. Because the city is almost fully built-out, growth in Santa Barbara continues to shift from building on open land to redevelopment of existing sites. As a result, historical and cultural resources will be increasingly viewed as sites with redevelopment opportunity especially in the downtown core and established neighborhoods. This development pressure could result in the loss of historical buildings, structures, landscapes, and archaeological resources. The challenge remains to fund and complete historic resource surveys. These surveys are essential tools for identifying historical significant properties, archaeological sites and potential historic districts and providing relevant historical information. The completed surveys serve to inform property owners as well as the city residents of the importance of historic buildings, landscapes and neighborhoods. They serve as a guide for assisting property owners as well as the city in making changes to property that respect its historic integrity.

The overarching consideration for historic preservation is to identify, designate and protect historic resources. Informed decision-making is essential to address these priorities. Funding support is critical to make progress. The effectiveness of the city's historic preservation program is directly correlated to the amount of funding and staffing provided. For example, funding is needed for:

- Maps indicating areas with a high potential for archaeological resources from specific time periods to be continually updated and quickly made available for review.
- Completion of surveys, listings, designations and accurate updates to city records critical to the protection of historic resources.

Municipal Code Ordinance amendments to create additional historic districts will require:

- Public education regarding the importance of protecting distinctive historic properties representing architectural periods in the City's development.
- Public hearings to explain district creation procedures and legal issues.
- Support from local citizens and City Council to designate these historic areas even when faced with potential objections from individual property owners.
- A balance to be struck between private property rights and the public interest (public good) that attaches to property that has historic significance to a community. It is important to remember that Santa Barbara is a city in which historic resources play a central role in its identity and its property values, thus one in which the balance may weigh more on the side of public interest.

Future land use decisions which affect the community's heritage, as reflected in the historic, architectural, and archaeological resources, must recognize the irreplaceable nature of these resources. The value of these resources is to be given equal weight to other factors being considered in the decision-making process.




Goals, Policies, and Implementation

GOALS

- Protection and Enhancement of Historical Resources: Continue to identify, designate, protect, preserve and enhance the City's historical, architectural, and archaeological resources. Ensure Santa Barbara's "sense of place" by preserving and protecting evidence of its historic past, which includes but is not limited to historic buildings, structures, and cultural landscapes such as sites, features, streetscapes, neighborhoods, and landscapes.
- Increased Awareness and Appreciation: Increase public awareness and appreciation of Santa Barbara's history and pre-history, its historical, cultural and paleontological resources, their value and the need to protect them. Recognize that historic resources are necessary contributors to attaining sustainability, environmental and economic vitality, and preservation of the city's quality of life.
- *Governmental Cooperation:* Incorporate preservation principles as a valid and necessary component in decision-making, at every phase of City government, and secure cooperation from all levels and agencies of government in these efforts.
- Neighborhood Historic Preservation: Protect the significant contribution made by Santa Barbara's neighborhood historic resources to the City's charm and sense of historical context.

Protection of Buildings, Structures, Sites and Features Policies

HR1. **Protect Historic and Archaeological Resources.** Protect the heritage of the City by preserving, protecting and enhancing historic resources and archaeological resources. Apply available governmental resources, devices and approaches, such as the measures enumerated in the Land Use Element of this Plan, to facilitate their preservation and protection.

- HR1.1 <u>Use all available tools</u>. Consider specific preservation strategies and land use regulation mechanisms, including those listed in the Land Use Element, such as revised development standards, buffer protection, overlay zones, Design and Historic Districts, Landmark, and Structure of Merit designations.
- HR1.2 <u>Adopt historic preservation guidelines</u>. Develop and adopt guidelines for maintenance and changes to historic resources. The guidelines will apply to historic properties and areas. The guidelines will also assist property owners in understanding the important character-defining elements of buildings and historic architectural styles, and in planning exterior alterations,

additions, or rehabilitation of existing buildings, structures and landscaping, as well as ways to maintain them.

- HR1.3 <u>Adopt user-friendly codes and regulatory procedures</u>. Reorganize existing code provisions relating to demolitions to coordinate the various provisions, make them more understandable, and clarify their applicability and enforcement procedures. Change ordinances and interpret codes, whenever and to the degree possible, to favor adaptive reuse.
- HR1.4 <u>Interpret regulations flexibly</u>. In order to ensure that a historic resource will be perpetuated, even if its historical use becomes obsolete or is discontinued, avoid the application or strict interpretation of regulatory codes and ordinances which might erode or alter its traditional or historical character. In accord with the spirit and the intent of the California State Historical Building Code, interpret and apply such codes so that flexible yet equally safe alternatives can be substituted that promote the future vitality of the historic resource.
- HR1.5 Protect archaeological resources from potential damage or destruction.
 - a. In the environmental review process, any proposed project which is in an area indicated on the map as "sensitive" shall receive further study to determine if archaeological resources are present and in jeopardy. Consider notification/consultation of most likely descendants of Barbareño Chumash whose names appear on the City of Santa Barbara archaeological monitors list; and local Native American associations and individuals for comment. A preliminary site survey (or similar study as part of an environmental impact report) shall be conducted in every case where archaeological resources could be threatened.
 - b. When making land use decisions, potential damage to archaeological resources shall be given consideration along with other planning, environmental, social, and economic considerations.
 - c. Publicly accessible areas known to contain significant archaeological resources should be preserved by limiting access and/or development which would involve permanent covering or disturbance of sub-surface artifacts.
- HR2. **Ensure respectful and compatible development.** Seek to ensure that all development within the City respects rather than detracts from individual historic and archaeological resources as well as the neighborhood and the overall historical character of the city. Assure compatibility of development, respect for the historical context of historical resources, and consideration of sustainable design alternatives where compatible.

- HR2.1 <u>Protect historic resources from harmful development</u>. Development on parcels in proximity to historic resources shall be designed, sited and scaled to be compatible with their historic neighbor and with public enjoyment of the historic site. Construction activity in proximity to historic resources shall not damage or adversely impact the historic resources, and new structures themselves shall not pose a threat of either short or long-term damaging effects upon the historic resources.
- HR2.2 <u>Consider impacts to historic resources comprehensively</u>. Require the identification and analysis of potential impacts to historic resources as an integral component of the review

process of all development applications. Evaluate the impacts of proposed development in proximity to historic resources. Review bodies shall not consider other existing incompatible development as a justification for additional potentially incompatible development.

- HR2.3 <u>Assess potential damage</u>. Ensure that construction activities in proximity to a historic structure do not damage the historic resource. For projects involving substantial demolition and/or grading adjacent to such a resource, include any necessary measures as determined in consultation with the City Urban Historian, or in accepted Cultural Resources or Historic Structures Report recommendations. Such measures should include participation by a structural engineer and/or an architect knowledgeable in historic resources and their treatment, such as a historical architect.
- HR2.4 <u>Analyze potential long-term damage</u>. Where appropriate, require an evaluation for potential environmental damage to historic resources (e.g., older adobe buildings and structures), such as when development and landscaping in proximity might result in a change in microclimate of the affected historic resource. The goal is to ensure that there are no significant long-term negative impacts to the condition or environment of the historic resource. The evaluation study shall include a comparative assessment of potential harmful impacts to the exterior or interior of a structure. Impacts to be studied may include air circulation, humidity, temperature, heating and cooling dynamics, noise, vibration, air quality, and light and shade conditions.
- HR2.5 <u>Use appropriate measures</u>. Measures to be implemented shall include assurances that such development is appropriately scaled, designed and sited, and provided with well-located open space and landscaping. Proportionately scale construction (addressing height, size, bulk, volume, etc.) adjacent to historic resources.
- HR2.6 <u>Use available interim protections</u>. Interim protection measures shall be pursued, including revised development standards, buffer protection, overlay zones, special design districts, and related measures.
- HR2.7 <u>Secure permanent protection</u>. Continue to adopt measures such as establishment of Historic Districts, architectural compatibility, stepping back of buildings within buffer areas, and other development standards.
- HR2.8 <u>Employ historic resource buffers</u>. Use the following measures to establish buffer zones to further protect historic resources:
 - a. Require that all parcels within 100 feet of a historic resource be identified and flagged for scrutiny for impacts on those resources, prior to either approval of any development application.
 - b. All development proposed within 250 feet of historic adobe structures, El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historic Park and areas inclusive of the original footprint of the Presidio and other City Landmarks to be selected may be subject to measures for additional protection. Such protection may require adjustments in height, bulk, size, and setbacks.
- HR3. **Discourage Demolition.** Develop effective measures to discourage and curtail the demolition of historic resources.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- HR3.1 <u>Prevent egregious neglect</u>. Explore feasibility of an ordinance that protects historic resources from "demolition by neglect". Enable the City to take appropriate action in cases of historic properties or properties in proximity to historic properties being allowed to deteriorate.
- HR3.2 <u>Review demolitions of older buildings</u>. Expand procedures for review of applications for demolition or relocation of buildings citywide to prevent the loss of buildings or structures that may have historic or architectural significance and to provide the time necessary to initiate designation or to consider alternatives to demolition of the building.
- HR3.3 <u>Require project design alternatives</u>. Require development proposals that request demolition of historic resources to present preservation alternatives, such as adaptive reuse, rehabilitation or relocation rather than demolition.
- HR4. **Pursue Adaptive Reuse.** Encourage the adaptation of historic buildings or structures for uses other than the original intended use when the original use is no longer viable.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- HR4.1 <u>Provide Incentives</u>. Provide incentives for the adaptive reuse of historic buildings. Support zoning modification approvals for parking and setbacks to allow more change of uses for historic properties and allow more flexible building code compliance alternatives. For example, employ the California State Historical Building Code to allow more flexibility in code compliance.
- HR4.2 <u>Facilitate financing loan program</u>. Create a restoration and rehabilitation loan program specific to historic resources.

Neighborhood Policies

HR5. **Protect Neighborhood Historic Resources.** Identify neighborhoods in the city that have substantially maintained historical character, and pursue measures to preserve that character. Protect such neighborhoods, especially those in close proximity to the downtown and commercial cores, from development that might transform their historic character.

- HR5.1 <u>Help preserve neighborhoods that have retained historical character</u>. Adopt mechanisms, such as ordinance amendments, that secure protection for neighborhoods and streetscapes that have substantially maintained their character of the period of their initial development, as well as later periods of historical interest that reveal the historical evolution of the neighborhood or streetscape.
- HR5.2 <u>Provide guidelines that facilitate protection</u>. Adopt design guidelines that seek to ensure that new and remodeled buildings and structures will be compatible with surrounding historical development, that seek to prevent the unnecessary loss of a structure or historical features, and that ensure appropriate compatible design.
- HR5.3 <u>Provide property owner support</u>. Encourage upgrading and revitalization compatible with the character of the neighborhood, and provide homeowners with incentives, technical assistance and support.

- HR5.4 <u>Prioritize documented candidates</u>. Fast-track adoption of interim or permanent protection measures—such as historic district status or other appropriate measures—for those neighborhoods that have been adequately documented to contain historic resources.
- HR5.5 <u>Establish zoning that conforms to the character of neighborhoods</u>. Identify incompatibilities between the traditional historic development patterns of existing neighborhoods that have substantially preserved their historic character and existing zoning, and seek to reconcile the conflicts in ways that help insure perpetuation of the neighborhood's traditional development patterns. Review and revise, as appropriate, existing zoning that allows inconsistent development that would adversely affect or erode its historic character.

Cultural Landscapes Such as Streetscapes, Public Features, and Pedestrian Amenities Policies

HR6. **Protect Traditional Public Resources and Streetscapes.** Identify and preserve significant public resources and streetscapes and ensure a public review process in order to protect their historical features and attributes.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- HR6.1 <u>Preserve and protect traditional public resources and streetscapes</u>. Pursue measures to preserve and protect historical features such as trees, stone curbing, hitching posts, and sidewalk imprints.
- HR6.2 <u>Prioritize documented features</u>. Target features that have been identified in historic resource surveys as historically significant for specific protection measures, such as landmark or structure of merit designation, as well as state and federal designations.
- HR6.3 <u>Promote streets that accommodate pedestrians</u>. Since traditional streetscapes accommodated pedestrians, require that all projects in historic areas involving street design pursue options that advance and enhance pedestrian friendliness.
- HR7. Protect Cultural Landscapes. Identify and preserve historic landscapes.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- HR7.1 <u>Identify and designate historic cultural landscape features</u>. Require that historic surveys include identification of historic trees, specimen trees, gardens, landscapes, streetscapes and landscape features. Include landscape features worthy of protection as part of historic designation boundaries.
- HR7.2 <u>Protect landscapes that contribute to historic resource context</u>. Require that reviews of all development applications consider impacts upon cultural landscapes and landscape features that contribute to the integrity of a historic resource.

Identification, Documentation and Designation of Historic Resources Policies

HR8. **Survey and Document All Historic Resources.** Continue to identify, document, and designate individual historic resources, as well as historic areas.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- HR8.1 <u>Accelerate surveys</u>. Prioritize the existing program for city historic resource surveys. Continue and broaden the citywide program of architectural and historical resources surveys to identify and document information about significant buildings, structures and sites.
- HR8.2 <u>Identify substantially original development patterns</u>. Identify the older residential streets, blocks or neighborhoods in the city that have substantially maintained their original and historical character, and that could be subject to incompatible development and transformation.
- HR8.3 <u>Retain all survey documents permanently</u>. Retain original survey documents and organize them into a format that facilitates public access and review.
- HR8.4 <u>Designate identified resources expeditiously, at least annually</u>. As soon as possible after the identification of significant eligible resources, process designations of historic resources to have the applicable structure of merit, landmark or historic district designation.

Public Education Policy

HR9. Increase Awareness of Santa Barbara's Heritage. Promote recognition that conservation of historic and cultural resources is a necessary contributor toward economic vitality, attaining sustainability and preservation of quality of life. Increase public awareness and appreciation of the significance of Santa Barbara's history. Promote awareness, appreciation and understanding of the early inhabitants of Santa Barbara.

- HR9.1 <u>Generate programs</u>. Develop and expand programs that educate the public about the importance of preserving archaeological, prehistoric, historical, and cultural resources.
- HR9.2 <u>Reach out</u>. Promote programs, awards and events to heighten public awareness and promote tourism.
- HR9.3 <u>Coordinate promotion</u>. Integrate promotional efforts of various agencies and organizations that utilize local history such as, walking tours, brochures, fairs, festivals, public events and awards.
- HR9.4 Enhance recognition. Consider programs that enhance recognition of historic resources.
- HR9.5 Improve awareness. Encourage and participate in partnerships between the City, developers, landowners and representation from most likely descendants of Barbareño Chumash; and local Native American associations and individuals to increase the visibility of Chumash history and culture by:
 - a. Supporting public displays or exhibits of Chumash arts, culture and history,
 - b. Encouraging the incorporation of elements from Chumash art and culture into public and private development,
 - c. Supporting the creation of a permanent Chumash archaeological museum and interpretive center in addition to those of the Santa Barbara Natural History Museum.

Governmental Facilitation Policy

HR10. Assure Governmental Effectiveness. Provide adequate resources to enable implementation of the goals and policies within this Element. Ensure coordination between agencies and review bodies at all levels of government by every means, including provision of easy access to all relevant information and materials.

- HR10.1 <u>Assure technical know-how</u>. Re-examine the City's current review process to ensure that issues and projects involving historical considerations that come before the various review bodies receive appropriate expertise to address the historical considerations.
- HR10.2 <u>Provide needed expertise</u>. Provide the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) with adequate appropriate staff support for its review of projects, and to effectively carry out its mandate to identify and protect historic resources.
- HR10.3 <u>Educate board members</u>. Ensure that HLC members are adequately oriented with respect to the expertise and technical knowledge required to carry out the HLC mission.
- HR10.4 <u>Establish partnerships</u>. Encourage cooperative efforts between individuals, private organizations and government agencies concerned with preservation of the city's historic resources.
- HR10.5 <u>Seek assistance for privately owned historic resources</u>. Explore adoption of all available forms of governmental incentives toward preservation and protection of privately owned historic resources, such as tax relief (Mills Act, etc.), covenant and contractual arrangements, and technical assistance.
- HR10.6 <u>Assure eligibility</u>. Investigate and pursue state and federal legislation, procedures and grants enacted to aid in the preservation of historic buildings, sites and structures. Pursue any local prerequisites to participation in such federal and statewide assistance, such as designation as a Certified Local Government (CLG).
- HR10.7 <u>Pursue additional funding sources</u>. Consider the creation of a fund to assist in historic preservation efforts; seek sources of non-tax funding to supplement city historic preservation efforts.
- HR10.8 <u>Enforce ordinances</u>. Provide adequate funding support for enforcement of all aesthetic and historic preservation ordinances.
- HR10.9 <u>Ensure uniformity of regulation application</u>. Ensure that the requirements and restrictions administered by the Historic Landmarks Commission and the Architectural Board of Review shall be as equally applicable to projects undertaken by the city or other public agencies as they are to private projects.
- HR10.10 <u>Coordinate reviews</u>. Coordinate with other authorities so that County, State and Federal projects receive early concept reviews by the City as a consulting party.



Definitions

Adaptive re-use - The reuse of a building or structure, usually for a purpose different from the original. The term implies that certain structural or design changes have been made to the building or structure in order for it to function in its new use. Examples might include a factory building now used for loft apartments, or a house now used as an office.

Archaeological - Pertaining to the scientific study of the life and culture of earlier peoples by survey and excavation of sites and relics.

Archaeological resources - Any material remains of human life or activities which are of archaeological potential.

Archaeological site - An archaeological site is the location of a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing building or structure.

Architectural - Pertaining to the science, art or profession of designing and constructing buildings and structures.

Architectural significance - The importance of a property based on physical aspects of its design, materials, form, style, or workmanship.

Buffer (or buffer zones) - An area, developed or undeveloped, that separates a resource from potentially incompatible development, that serves to soften, mitigate or resolve potential conflict or incompatibility.

Compatibility - Compatibility for any development at its fundament requires an understanding and respect of the distinctive character, identity and history of the city as well as the established building patterns, styles, scale, aesthetic qualities and character of the immediate neighborhood. In the context of development in proximity to a historic resource, compatibility is the creation of a respectful relationship between proposed development and the existing historic resource (both its individual character-defining elements and its overall composition as a building or structure and part of a site). Compatibility requires development to strive to protect and enhance the integrity of a historic resource at every level.

Cultural - Pertaining to the concepts, habits, skills, arts, instruments, institutions, etc. of a given people in a period.

Cultural landscape - A geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein), associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. Refer to the *Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* for further definition of this term.

Cultural resource - Something that has acquired significant associations with human activities and human events.

Demolition by neglect - Allowing a building or site improvements to fall into such a state of disrepair that it becomes necessary or desirable to demolish it.

Enhance - To facilitate the comprehension, enjoyment, and accessibility of the subject or object in question, be it a historic building, structure, site, features, streetscape, neighborhood, or landscape.

Historic - For purposes of this Historic Resources Element, the adjective "historic" shall mean having temporal significance because of age, importance in history or culture, architectural quality, relative degree of preservation or authenticity, popular nostalgic attraction, or other consideration that may merit the application of measures for preservation or protection. Historic is often used in a more technical sense having more limited definition, but for purposes of understanding this Element, the preceding definition will be used unless the context indicates the term's use in a more technical sense.

Historic area - For purposes of this Historic Resources Element, groupings or concentrations of historic resources, an historic streetscape, resources in an older neighborhood which has maintained its original or historic character, or historic blocks that have interest or value as part of the heritage of the City, State, or Nation, and temporal significance due to factors such as age, importance in history or culture, architectural quality, identification with a person or persons who contributed to the culture and development of the City, State, or Nation, relative degree of preservation or authenticity, popular nostalgic attraction, or other consideration that may merit consideration or application of measures for preservation protection. For purposes of this Historic Resources Element, protected historic resource areas include designated, eligible and potential historic resources, defined below, and resources considered significant according to CEQA.

Historic district - A delineated geographic area of the city (or a noncontiguous grouping of real properties within the city) where most of the properties within the district are thematically architecturally related and possess historical significance, special character, or aesthetic value, including, but not limited to, a distinct section of the city possessing a significant concentration of cultural resources which are united historically or aesthetically either by plan or by physical development, designated by the City Council, acting by resolution or ordinance, as being worthy of protection.

Historical features - Structures, objects or elements that originated during a particular historical period. Also an element that contributes to a resource's identification, understanding or interpretation as an example of architecture attributable to a particular historical period.

Historic preservation - Encompass a broad range of activities related to preservation and conservation of the built environment by physical and intellectual methods. By the late twentieth century its principles also contributed to protection of prehistoric archaeological sites.

Historic resource - designated - A City designated "Landmark" or a City designated "Structure of Merit", or a State or National Landmark or National Register of Historic Places.

Historic resource - eligible - A historic resource which has been identified by the Historic Landmarks Commission or a historian to meet the criteria for a designated historic resource.

Historic resource - individual - For purposes of this Historic Resources Element, historic resources include any building, structure, feature, site, property, artifact, object, landscape, on public or private property that has interest or value as part of the heritage of the City, State, or Nation, due to factors such as temporal significance because of age, importance in history or culture, architectural quality, identification with a person or persons who contributed to the culture and development of the City, State, or Nation, relative degree of preservation or authenticity, popular nostalgic attraction, or other consideration that may merit consideration or application of measures for preservation protection. For purposes of this Historic Resources Element, protected historic resources are designated, eligible and potential historic resources, defined in this list of definitions, and resources considered significant according to CEQA.

Historic resource - potential - A historic resource which has been listed by the Historic Landmarks Commission as being a potentially significant historic resource.

Historic resources survey - A field investigation and documentation of buildings, structures, sites, or natural features within a certain area or neighborhood of the City, undertaken by the City for the purpose of identifying potential historic resources.

Historic structure - 1. A structure or building that is famous because of its association with a historic event or the history of a locality. 2. Any structure or building listed (or eligible to be listed) in a national, state, provincial/territorial, or local register or inventory of historic places. 3. Any structure or building that contributes to the historical significance of a historic district, a neighborhood, a streetscape, or possesses physical characteristics that represent or contribute to an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood.

Historical - Belonging or relating to history or historians; a generally more inclusive term than historic.

Historical architect - A licensed architect who specializes in the preservation of historic buildings and structures; typically has special expertise about early building techniques and materials; prepares historic structure reports, coordinates the work of other specialists involved in a project, such as an architectural historian, archaeologist, engineer, historic interiors specialist, and landscape architect, and produces the construction documents for the architectural conservation, restoration, or rehabilitation work.

Historical significance - The evaluation for importance of an element, building, or site due to its association with a significant event, person, or time period, or as an example of a past architectural style.

Landmark - A structure, natural feature, site or area having historic, architectural, archaeological, cultural or aesthetic significance and designated as a landmark.

Landmark district - Any area of the City of Santa Barbara containing a number of buildings, structures, natural features or sites having historic, architectural, archaeological, cultural or aesthetic significance and designated as a city landmark district under the provisions of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code.

Line of sight - Identified as to height, width, and distance - looking toward an object of interest (e.g., ridgeline, river, historic building, etc.).

Neighborhood - For purposes of this Historic Resources Element, an area possessing a sense of cohesiveness, because of physical features suggesting boundaries and/or concentrations of shared architectural or cultural characteristics, which distinguishes it from surrounding areas.

Paleontological - The branch of science concerned with fossil animals and plants.

Prehistory - Information gained through resources as well as human history in the period before recorded events, known mainly through archaeological discoveries, study, research, etc.

**Preservation* - A historic building treatment that places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through conservation, maintenance and repair. It reflects a building's continuum over time, through successive occupancies, and the respectful changes and alterations that are made.

**Reconstruction* - A historic building treatment that establishes limited opportunities to re-create a nonsurviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object in all new materials.

^{*} Definitions are consistent with National Park Service definitions. See the *City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines* appendix for more information about how this term is implemented for specific preservation projects.

**Rehabilitation* - A historic building treatment that emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but more latitude is provided for replacement because it is assumed the property is more deteriorated prior to work. (Both Preservation and Rehabilitation standards focus attention on the preservation of those materials, features, finishes, spaces, and spatial relationships that, together, give a property its historic character.)

**Restoration* - A historic building treatment that focuses on the retention of materials from the most significant time in a property's history, while permitting the removal of materials from other periods.

Special design district - A delineated area of the city which, because of buildings, structures, natural features or sites within or near it, has been so designated by ordinance primarily for the purpose of defining and preserving its unique character.

Streetscape - The visual elements of a street, including the road, adjoining buildings, parkways, street furniture, trees and open spaces, etc, that combine to form the street's character.

Structure of merit - A structure not designated as a landmark but deserving official recognition as having historic, architectural, archaeological, cultural or aesthetic significance and designated as a Structure of Merit under the provisions of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code.

Transfer of development rights (TDR) - A mechanism that allows the transfer of development rights from certain properties to certain other properties within the city. Also known as "Transfer of Development Credits," a program that can relocate potential development from areas where proposed land use or environmental impacts are considered undesirable (the "donor" site) to another ("receiver") site.

Viewscapes - The sight or prospect of views from a point. A visual connection that occurs between a person and the spatial arrangement of urban and/or natural landscape features.

View corridor - The visually unimpeded area in the periphery of a linear view from a specific vantage point (can be narrow, wide, pyramid in shape or rectangular, etc.).

^{*} Definitions are consistent with National Park Service definitions. See the *City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines* appendix for more information about how this term is implemented for specific preservation projects.

Environmental Resources

CONTENT OF THESE GOALS, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

The following Environmental Resources goals, policies and implementation actions address most of the City's natural resources including air quality, biology, surface and ground water resources, noise, and visual resources. Historic and archaeological resources are covered in the existing Conservation Element and the new policies developed through the 2011 General Plan Update (see Historic Resources Section) but will eventually be incorporated into the new Historic Resources Element.

Several new policy areas are included in the yet to be completed Environmental Resources Element: Climate Change, Energy Resources, and Food and Agriculture. These policy areas are part of the new sustainable focus of the General Plan addressing the City's ecological footprint and acknowledgement of the connection between the physical urban setting and people's health. Together they reflect all three aspects of sustainability: environment, equity and economy.

The following goals, policies and implementation actions were either developed during the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan update process, carried over from the Conservation Element in effect in 2011, were EIR mitigation measures, or were relocated during the 2013 Safety Element Update. These new goals, policies and implementation actions are operational with adoption of the General Plan, however, until the existing Conservation Element and Noise Element are comprehensively updated and become the Environmental Resources Element, they also remain in effect.



Goals, Policies and Implementation

GOALS

- *Sustainable Resource Use.* Protect and use natural resources wisely to sustain their quantity and quality, minimize hazards to people and property, and meet present and future service, health and environmental needs.
- *Reduce Greenhouse Gases.* Reduce where practicable greenhouse gas emissions contributions to climate change, and to air pollution and related health risks.
- *Reduce Fossil Fuel Use.* Reduce fossil fuel use through increased efficiency and conservation, and by developing renewable energy sources.
- *Climate Change Adaptation.* If applicable, incorporate adaptation to climate change in proposals for new development, redevelopment and public infrastructure.

Climate Change Policies

ER1. **Climate Change.** As applicable, private development and public facilities and services may be required to incorporate measures to minimize contributions to climate change and to adapt to climate changes anticipated to occur within the life of each project.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

ER1.1 <u>Comprehensive Climate Change Action Plan</u>. Prepare a comprehensive climate action plan, toward compliance with AB32, to address climate change concerns including reducing green-house gas emissions, green-house gas absorption, and adaptation to climate change. The climate action plan will include evaluation of community energy use (i.e., energy used by buildings and infrastructure); waste and recycling; water and wastewater systems; transportation; and community design. Include objectives and indicators to monitor greenhouse gas emissions, and natural phenomena related to climate change, such as oil seeps, sea-level rise, weather patterns, and wildlife behavior.

All elements of the General Plan will identify which specific policies contribute towards the reduction of green house gases. (Green house gases include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, sulfur hexafluoride, hydrofluorocarbons and perfluorocarbons, among many others.)

ER1.2 <u>Greenhouse Gas Emission (GHG)</u>. Require new development, redevelopment and substantial remodels to demonstrate how the project will support the City in attaining regional GHG vehicular emissions reduction targets. The Santa Barbara region has targets of zero net increase (from 2005 levels) in per capita GHG vehicular emissions in 2020 and 2035. These regional targets were adopted in 2010 by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) pursuant to SB 375.

- ER1.3 <u>Urban Heat Island Effect</u>. Improve carbon sequestration and reduce the urban heat island effect by:
 - a. Amending the Zoning Ordinance to establish standards that decrease impermeable surfaces and building areas relative to lot size;
 - b. Providing incentives such as expedited permitting for building projects that incorporate green roofs; and
 - c. Exploring possibilities for reducing standards for impermeable surfacing required by the Transportation Division and Fire Department.
- ER2. **Emergency Response Strategies and Climate Change.** The City shall incorporate into its response strategies for emergency preparations, the potential effects of climate change, including from extreme weather, sea level rise, or epidemics, on humans, and the built and natural environments.
- ER3. **Decrease City's Global Footprint.** In addition to promoting reduced unit size, building footprints and GHG emissions, and energy conservation, promote the use of more sustainable building and landscaping materials and methods.

Possible Implementation Action to be Considered

- ER3.1 <u>Locally-Harvested Renewable Materials</u>. Establish additional green building incentives for the use of locally harvested, renewable building or manufacturing materials.
- ER4. **Incorporation of Adaptation in Development.** New public and private development or substantial redevelopment or reuse projects shall estimate the useful life of proposed structures, and, in conjunction with available information about established hazard potential attributable to climate change, incorporate adaptation measures in the design, siting and location of the structures.

- ER4.1 <u>Adaptation Guidelines</u>. The City shall prepare adaptation guidelines for development projects, and to the extent of information available to the City, provide information about potential climate change hazards to developers. (See also Safety and Public Services Element policies, Hazard Avoidance.)
- ER4.2 <u>Sea Level Rise</u>. Identify policy options, costs, and consequences for addressing sea level rise issues, including:
 - Techniques to minimize wave energy and damage from storm surges, while minimizing disruption of coastal activities and habitats.
 - Review of City public improvements and utilities for potential consequences of sea level rise, and consideration of means of adaptation such as measures to protect in place, raising facilities above projected flood heights, and managed retreat or relocation of facilities.
 - Coordination with private property owners along the waterfront on techniques for structural adaptation and new design.

Energy Conservation Policies

ER5. **Energy Efficiency and Conservation.** As part of the City's strategy for addressing climate change, minimizing pollution of air and water, depleting nonrenewable resources and insulating from volatility of fossil fuel prices, dependence on energy derived from fossil fuels shall be reduced through increased efficiency, conservation, and conversion to renewable energy sources when practicable and financially warranted.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

ER5.1 <u>Energy Efficient Buildings</u>. Encourage all new construction to be designed and built consistent with City green programs, the California Green Building Code, policies, and the goal of achieving "carbon neutrality" by 2030 in all buildings.

Further reduce energy consumption over time to "carbon neutrality" by 2030 in new building and through suggested retrofits. Establish a voluntary program and time line for increasing the energy efficiency and carbon neutrality of new buildings or additions, and of existing building stock. Provide:

- a. Information on current energy use and conservation options;
- b. Incentives for voluntary upgrades;
- c. Voluntary incremental upgrades may be encouraged at time of sale, and/or other methods for greening the existing building stock; and
- d. Tools for self-assessment financing for energy efficiency upgrades and on-site solar and wind power generation through property taxes (in conjunction with AB 811).
- ER5.2 <u>Retrofitting of Systems</u>. Continue to implement programs through Sustainable Santa Barbara for retrofitting of municipal systems with energy efficient equipment, systems, and programs.
- ER6. Local and Regional Renewable Energy Resources. Provide both within the city, and regionally through working with the County and other local jurisdictions or parties, opportunities to preserve, promote and participate in the development of local renewable energy resources such as solar, wind, geothermal, wave, hydro, methane and waste conversion.

- ER6.1 <u>Community Choice Aggregation</u>. Conduct a feasibility study to include a cost benefit analysis and carbon footprint assessment for a Community Choice Aggregation arrangement as either a bulk purchaser or producer of energy from alternative resources. Change codes to support and promote examining the feasibility of Community Choice Aggregation.
- ER6.2 <u>Alternative/Advanced Fuels</u>. Support and implement the California Energy Commission and State Air Resources Board goal for alternative/advanced fuels set forth in AB1007 for non-petroleum fuel use of 20% by 2020 and 30% by 2030.
- ER6.3 <u>Incentives for Alternative/Advanced Fuel Infrastructure</u>. Give priority through expedited processing to projects providing infrastructure for alternative/advanced fuels.

- ER6.4 <u>Obstacles for Small Wind Generators.</u> Identify and study regulatory obstacles to installing small individual or community wind generators, and prepare standards for siting, design, maintenance and operation to ensure compatibility with adjoining land uses and protect environmental resources.
- ER6.5 <u>Facilitate Renewable Energy Technologies.</u> Promote flexible design review standards and facilitate use of renewable energy technologies through streamlined planning and development rules, codes, processing, and other incentives.
- ER6.6 <u>Solar Energy.</u> Encourage the use of solar photo-voltaic arrays on new construction, redevelopment, and significant remodel projects, as appropriate, taking into consideration project scale and budget, building size, orientation, roof type, and current energy use.
 - a. For multi-residential projects of 3 or more units, require provision of a minimum 2 kw system per unit consistent with the City's Solar Energy System Design Guidelines, if physically feasible.
 - b. For 1 or 2-unit residential projects require provision of 300 sq. ft. rectangular unobstructed roof area free of mechanical equipment and vents facing south, east or west in a manner that future photovoltaic installation would be consistent with the City's Solar Energy System Design Guidelines, if physically feasible.
 - c. For commercial and industrial projects provide a minimum of 5 watts of photovoltaic panel systems for every new square foot of building net floor area; or a photovoltaic system sized to meet a minimum of 30% of the average projected energy demand for the structure, whichever is lower.

Air Quality Policies

ER7. **Highway 101 Set-Back.** New development of residential or other sensitive receptors (excluding minor additions or remodels of existing homes or one unit on vacant property) on lots of record within 250 feet of U.S. Hwy 101 will be prohibited in the interim period until California Air Resources Board (CARB) phased diesel emissions regulations are implemented and/or until the City determines that diesel emission risks can be satisfactorily reduced or that a project's particulate exposure level is sufficiently reduced. The City will monitor the progress of CARB efforts and progress on other potential efforts or measures to address diesel emissions risks.

- ER7.1 <u>Review Criteria.</u> Prepare project review criteria for the set-back area.
- ER7.2 <u>Barriers and Sound Walls.</u> Pursue funding and installation of sound walls, trees and shrubs along unprotected areas of U.S. Hwy 101 to create a barrier to reduce particulate transmissions. Barriers and sound walls to be consistent with the Highway Santa Barbara Coastal Parkway Design Guidelines.
- ER8. Low-Emission Vehicles and Equipment. Expand infrastructure and establish incentives for use of lower emission vehicles and equipment (e.g., parking priority, electric vehicle plug-ins). Support the amendment of speed limit restrictions to permit the wider use of electric vehicles.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- ER8.1 <u>Electric Vehicles.</u> Monitor electric car development, including the projected availability of new vehicles and the types of charging stations that will serve those vehicles. Require the installation of the most commonly used types of electric charging stations in all major new non-residential development and remodels as appropriate, based on increases in the electric vehicle fleet and the availability of suitable charging technology. Provide expedited permitting for installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in residential, commercial, and industrial development. Consider changing the Building Code to require pre-wiring for electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new and substantial remodels of residential units.
- ER9. Marine Shipping Emissions. Support regional and State efforts to reduce marine shipping emissions.
- ER10. **Development Mitigation.** Establish ordinance requirements to apply standard air-quality mitigation measures for new development and construction projects. These include measures to minimize construction dust and vehicle emissions; provide landscaping; conserve energy and reduce vehicle trips.

Biological Resources Policies

ER11. Native and Other Trees and Landscaping. Protect and maintain native and other urban trees, and landscaped spaces, and promote the use of native or Mediterranean drought-tolerant species in landscaping to save energy and water, incorporate habitat, and provide shade.

- ER11.1 <u>Tree Protection Ordinance</u>. Update ordinance provisions to protect native oaks and other native or exotic trees. New development shall be sited and designed to preserve existing mature healthy native and non-native trees to the maximum extent feasible.
- ER11.2 <u>Oak Woodlands.</u> Site new development outside of oak woodlands to the maximum extent feasible. Within and adjacent to oak woodlands:
 - a. Avoid removal of specimen oak trees;
 - b. Preserve and protect oak saplings and native understory vegetation within areas planned to remain in open space;
 - c. Provide landscaping compatible with the continuation and enhancement of the habitat area, consisting primarily of native species and excluding use of invasive non-native species;
 - d. Include conditions of approval for habitat restoration of degraded oak woodlands where such development creates direct or indirect impacts to the affected habitat;
 - e. Minimize or avoid installation of high water use landscaping (e.g., lawn) under the dripline of oak trees.
- ER11.3 <u>Urban Tree Protection and Enhancement.</u> Create a City-wide enforcement and mitigation program for removal, severe pruning without a permit, or neglect, of protected trees (street trees, trees in front yards, and historic or otherwise designated trees).

ER12. Wildlife, Coastal and Native Plant Habitat Protection and Enhancement. Protect, maintain, and to the extent reasonably possible, expand the City's remaining diverse native plant and wildlife habitats, including ocean, wetland, coastal, creek, foothill, and urban-adapted habitats.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- ER12.1 <u>Designate Habitats.</u> Map and designate important City upland habitats and wildlife corridors that merit long term protection, enhancement, and preservation for habitat and wildlife values. Include criteria and monitoring objectives such as largest areas of contiguous coastal sage scrub (generally five acres or greater), oak woodlands (generally one-half acre or greater), perennial grasslands (generally 0.25 acres or greater), annual grasslands (generally five acres or greater), and important wildlife movement corridors.
- ER12.2 <u>Multi-Use Plan for Coast and Native Habitat Restoration</u>. Develop updated multi-use plans and monitoring guidelines for publicly owned beaches and other coastal areas to provide for both recreational uses and protection of coastal habitats and wildlife/native plant species. Incorporate as part of the Multi-Use Plan, a Waterfront habitat and wildlife management program that provides measures to improve the extent and quality of native coastal habitats within the City Waterfront, with the following goals:
 - a. Restoration and protection of remnant coastal sand dune habitat along the City Waterfront, including the removal of non-native and/or invasive plants.
 - b. Restoration and enhancement of the estuaries of Mission and Sycamore creeks and the Laguna Channel, including appropriate revegetation and removal and control of invasive species. Measures should be considered to improve these estuaries where feasible to maximize biological productivity and ecological function taking into consideration the dynamics of ocean waves and currents and ongoing movement of sand along the City coast.
 - c. A public access management plan that maintains public access to and along the shoreline, but channels the public to appropriate access locations as needed through sensitive habitat areas of the beach.

ER12.3 Coastal Bluff Habitat Restoration Program and Protection

- a. <u>Coastal Bluff Scrub Protection</u>. Site and design new development or major remodels/expansions along the City coastal bluffs (including access, drainage, and landscape improvements) to:
 - minimize impacts to coastal bluff scrub habitat;
 - include provisions for habitat restoration of coastal bluff scrub habitats where development creates direct or indirect impacts to the affected habitat;
 - provide compatible landscaping within 10 feet of the edge of the bluff or on the bluff face, consisting of appropriate native coastal bluff scrub species.
- b. <u>Coastal Bluff Restoration</u>. Establish a goal to restore 5.0 acres of coastal bluff habitat over the 20-year life of Plan Santa Barbara.

- c. <u>Restoration on Publicly Owned Lands.</u> Work to increase the acreage of coastal bluff scrub through restoration projects on publicly-owned lands along Shoreline Park and the Douglas Family Preserve, and through providing education and assistance to private land owners to encourage the restoration of such habitats.
- ER12.4 <u>Native Species Habitat Planning</u>. Protect and restore habitat areas for native flora and fauna, and wildlife corridors within the City, including for chaparral, oak woodland, and riparian areas. In particular, provide land use/design guidelines to:
 - a. Require buildings and other elements of the built environment, and landscaping to be designed to enhance the wildlife corridor network as habitat.
 - b. Ensure that the City and new development preserve existing trees within identified wildlife corridors, and promote planting new trees, and installing and maintaining appropriate native landscaping in new developments within or adjacent to important upland wildlife corridors and all streams. Ensure that efforts are made to minimize disturbance to understory vegetation, soils, and any aquatic habitats that are present below the trees in order to provide movement of species that utilize the habitat.
 - c. Ensure that new development and redevelopment projects will not result in a net reduction or loss in size and value of native riparian habitats.
 - d. Increase riparian habitat within the City and / or its sphere of influence by 20 acres or more, and 1 linear mile or more, over the 20 year life of Plan Santa Barbara. Priorities for restoration include perennial reaches of the major streams, reaches of creek on publicly-owned land, and degraded areas of the City's three major creeks.
- ER12.5 <u>Riparian Woodland Protection</u>. Site new development outside of riparian woodlands to the extent feasible. Within and adjacent to riparian woodlands:
 - a. Avoid removal of mature native trees;
 - b. Preserve and protect native tree saplings and understory vegetation;
 - c. Provide landscaping within creek setback compatible with the continuation and enhancement of the habitat area, consisting primarily of appropriate native species and excluding use of invasive non-native species;
 - d. Include conditions of approval for habitat restoration of degraded oak woodlands where such development creates direct or indirect impacts to the affected habitat;
 - e. Include water quality protection and enhancement measures consistent with the adopted City Storm Water Management Plan.
- ER13. **Trail Management.** Existing and future trails along creeks or in other natural settings shall be managed for both passive recreational use and as native species habitat and corridors.
- ER14. Integrated Pest Management Program. To the extent allowable under state health and safety laws, establish ordinance provisions to apply integrated pest management requirements to development permits.

Water Supply

- ER15. Long-Term Water Supply Plan. The City shall update and maintain the currency of the City Long-Term Water Supply Plan to accommodate needs for the next 20-year period, including all of the following measures:
 - 1. State Water Project (SWP): The State is updating its reliability analysis on SWP deliveries. The completed document should be reviewed as a part of updating assumptions on the City's expected SWP deliveries. Particular attention should be given to estimates of SWP delivery impacts from sea level rise, as this aspect of climate change was not included in the previous reliability analysis. A conservative assessment of the likelihood, timing, costs, and benefits of Delta improvements should be included. Opportunities to increase the delivery reliability of existing SWP Table A amounts should continue to be explored.
 - 2. Groundwater Banking: Opportunities for groundwater banking exist on the local, regional, and inter-regional level. With reduced snowpack related to climate change, and the potential that replacement capacity in proposed new reservoirs will fall short of replacing this lost storage capacity, banking can provide a valuable means of firming up SWP deliveries and improving the reliability of the City's overall water supply. Legal, technical, and financial issues will need to be considered.
 - 3. Sedimentation Projections and Management Opportunities: Gibraltar Reservoir and Lake Cachuma will continue to experience sedimentation, with potential accelerated sedimentation resulting from wildfires. Periodic bathymetric surveys should continue. Methods for minimizing sedimentation should be assessed, including sedimentation trapping measures and a controlled burn program in conjunction with the U.S. Forest Service and local fire agencies. The City should work with other affected agencies to consider options for removal of sediment from reservoirs, including the potential to implement passage of sediment downstream to preserve reservoir capacity while providing sediment flow to mimic natural river conditions and contribute to beach nourishment.
 - 4. Gibraltar Yield Under Pass Through Agreement: Operations under "pass through" mode have not occurred and there is uncertainty as to the level of deliveries that can be expected. Modeling currently underway should be integrated with overall supply estimates to give a firmer estimate of long term availability.
 - 5. Desalination: The future role of desalination should be evaluated, considering issues such as: State policy encouraging development of desalination capacity, reliability, rate impacts and capital cost for reactivation, energy use, environmental impacts, and value during extended drought and other water supply emergencies.
 - 6. Groundwater Management Analysis: A more sophisticated modeling of groundwater resources should be used to evaluate new opportunities for optimizing the conjunctive use of groundwater. Improved tools for tracking the current state of groundwater basins should be developed, particularly with regard to managing seawater intrusion. Local groundwater recharge, including direct and in-lieu recharge, should be assessed for economic, regulatory, and technical feasibility.
 - 7. Additional Conservation Opportunities: Ongoing efforts to assess the technical and economic merits of the next generation of conservation measures should be used to identify an updated target for demand reduction under the new plan. A rate study should be

conducted to identify opportunities to improve conservation pricing signals and update revenue requirements. Existing City ordinances should be reviewed for appropriate updates given changes in technology and statewide water supply conditions.

- 8. Recycled Water Expansion Opportunities: Opportunities exist to expand recycled water use ranging from increased irrigation uses to industrial uses of recycled water and implementation of broader use of recycled water for toilet flushing. Economic issues and available capacity should be assessed to identify an optimal target for expanded recycled water use under the new plan. Opportunities to partner with neighboring agencies should be explored.
- 9. Climate Change Monitoring: The LTWSP update process should assess and plan for potential water supply effects of climate change and identify feasible means of tracking the development of such impacts.
- ER16. **Analysis of Water Savings**. As part of the Long Term Water Supply Program update, perform a comprehensive analysis of water savings from specific conservation measures, including a cost benefit analysis, to determine which potential new water conservation measures will be most feasible and cost effective for the City to pursue. The City shall incorporate identified measures into the water conservation component of the LTWSP update.
- ER17. **Water Conservation Program.** The use of water conservation practices shall be both encouraged and required, as appropriate, for all development projects.

- ER17.1 <u>Water Conservation Programs.</u> Continue and expand the City programs to require or encourage water conservation measures such as services to water customers (e.g., free water check-ups, smart irrigation controller program, rain sensor rebate); public information and education,(web site, elementary students, Green Gardener training, public brochures, videos, and advertising); water-conserving landscape design standards, City building conservation standards, and inverted block rate billing to promote conservation. Work with the County and other jurisdictions to develop regional water conservation programs and projects as appropriate.
- ER17.2 <u>Recycled Water</u>. Expand existing programs for use of recycled water for irrigation at parks, schools, golf courses and new development near supplies. Evaluate methods to optimize the feasible use of recycled water in place of potable water, including potential system extensions, and additional uses such as toilet flushing in major commercial, industrial and recreational facilities.
 - Evaluate, and implement as feasible, a requirement for dual plumbing to provide recycled water for flushing all toilets and urinals in new commercial and industrial buildings in proximity to existing or planned recycled water lines.
 - Investigate incentives for all new development and major remodels adjacent to existing recycled water lines to install dual plumbing and utilize recycled water for toilet flushing.
- ER17.3 <u>On-Site Storage and Reuse.</u> Identify more detailed guidelines for use of cisterns and grey water in new development and retrofitting existing development.

ER18. **Regional Cooperation on Water Supply Reliability.** Work with the County and other jurisdictions to develop regional programs and projects to improve water supply reliability.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- ER18.1 <u>Gibraltar and Cachuma Reservoirs.</u> Work with the County and other jurisdictions to investigate watershed management plans with the purpose of protecting and extending the useful life of the Gibraltar and Cachuma reservoirs.
- ER18.2.<u>Groundwater Banking.</u> Investigate agreements with other water purveyors that have available groundwater storage capacity to store surplus water for later use during drought.
- ER18.3 <u>Dry Weather Purchase Agreements.</u> Work with the County and/or other jurisdictions on a regional approach to agreements with the agricultural industry or other potential sellers of water in times of drought.
- ER18.4 <u>Montecito Water District.</u> Pursue establishing a process to coordinate with the Montecito Water District on the availability of water to service new development and redevelopment on Coast Village Road, ensuring adequate supplies to that portion of the City until such a time as the Montecito Water District can more readily provide additional service.

Hydrology, Water Quality and Flooding Policies

ER19. Creek Resources and Water Quality. Encourage development and infrastructure that is consistent with City policies and programs for comprehensive watershed planning, creeks restoration, water quality protection, open space enhancement, storm water management, and public creek and water awareness programs.

- ER19.1 <u>Comprehensive Creek Action Plan.</u> Prepare a comprehensive long term action plan for protecting and enhancing creek water quality, riparian area, and steelhead use, and maintaining or enhancing flood management.
- ER19.2 <u>Master Drainage Plan</u>. In coordination with watershed planning, develop a comprehensive drainage plan that identifies the existing system, policies and development standards to better address drainage and water quality issues, areas appropriate for drainage retention/detention, future capital improvements, and funding plan to finance the projects.
- ER19.3 <u>Pharmaceutical Waste Education and Collection</u>. Continue coordination with the County of Santa Barbara and other agencies to establish and maintain an ongoing public education campaign and periodic drop-off collection days, focusing on proper disposal of pharmaceutical materials and other emergent contaminants of concern, to reduce the contaminants entering wastewater, storm drain, and solid waste systems.
- ER19.4 <u>Beach Water Quality Improvement.</u> Consider actions for further improving water quality at East Beach, which could include: (1) a restoration plan for Lower Mission Creek/Laguna Channel, including the potential for a constructed wetland at the creek/ocean interface and/or (2) an ultraviolet treatment system to disinfect the flow within Laguna Creek during low flow periods (e.g., May-September) prior to entering the channel and discharging to the beach.

- ER19.5 <u>Watershed Action Plans.</u> Continue work toward completion of Watershed Action Plans for Mission Creek, Sycamore Creek, Arroyo Burro Creek, and Laguna Watersheds.
- ER20. **Storm Water Management Policies.** The City's Storm Water Management Program's policies, standards and other requirements for low impact development to reduce storm water run-off, volumes, rates, and water pollutants are hereby incorporated into the General Plan Environmental Resources Element.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- ER20.1 <u>Storm Water Guidelines.</u> The City's Storm Water Management Guidelines provide information on implementation measures such as ground water recharge, pervious surfacing, bioswales, detention basins, and green roofs. Update measures for street sweeping, stormdrain stenciling, and public outreach for inclusion in conditions of approval or as mitigation measures. Encourage the conversion of excess street paving between sidewalks and streets to bioswales.
- ER20.2 <u>Wash-Down Policies</u>. Prepare or update regulations to limit the practice of hosing down driveways, to conserve water and reduce pollutants carried through urban run-off and conserve water per State Water Resources Control Board regulatory guidelines for storm water management.
- ER20.3 <u>Floodplain Mapping Update</u>. Update the Flood Insurance Maps (FIRM) floodplain boundaries for Special Flood Hazard Areas such as the Mission and Sycamore creek drainages and Area A near the Estero.
- ER21. **Creek Setbacks, Protection, and Restoration.** Protection and restoration of creeks and their riparian corridors is a priority for improving biological values, water quality, open space and flood control in conjunction with adaptation planning for climate change.

- ER21.1 <u>Creek Setback Standards.</u> Establish updated creek setback and restoration standards for new development and redevelopment along all creeks, and prepare or update guidelines for restoration, increase of pervious surfaces and appropriate land uses within designated creek side buffers.
 - a. Develop setback standards of greater than 25 feet from the top of bank for new structures and hard surfaces adjacent to creeks and wetlands.
 - b. At a given site, creek buffers should be adequate for protection from flood, erosion, and geologic hazards, and to provide habitat support.
 - c. In developing creek setback and restoration standards, consider applicable creek standards in surrounding jurisdictions and the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District general recommendation for new development setbacks of 50 feet from the top of bank of major creeks with natural creek banks, with a reduction up to 25 feet where "hard bank" protection is present.

- d. For new development that is closer than 50 feet to the top of the bank of any major stream, creek bank stabilization shall be provided through planting of native trees and shrubs on creek banks and along the top of banks to minimize erosion and the potential for bank failure.
- e. When the City determines that a structure must be constructed within proposed creek setbacks or where a project would be exposed to unusually high risk of bank erosion or collapse, non-intrusive bank stabilization methods such as bio-engineering techniques (e.g. revegetation, tree revetment, native material revetment, etc.) shall be used where feasible rather than hard bank solutions such as rip-rap or concrete.
- ER21.2 <u>Creekside Development Guidelines.</u> Establish design guidelines for development and redevelopment near creeks, such as measures to orient development toward creeks, and better incorporate creeks as part of landscape and open space design. Utilize native riparian palettes for landscaping along creeks, and prohibit the use of non-native invasive plants. Encourage public creekside pedestrian paths where appropriate to increase connectivity and provide pocket parks and signage to improve public awareness and enjoyment of the City's creeks.
- ER21.3 <u>Creek Naturalization</u>. Prohibit the placement of concrete or other impervious material into, or piping of, major creeks and primary tributaries except for water supply projects or flood control projects that are necessary for public safety, or to maintain or repair a structure that protects existing development. These protection measures shall only be used for water supply or flood control purposes where no other less environmentally damaging method is available and the project has been designed to minimize damage to creeks, wetlands, water quality, and riparian habitats. Whenever feasible, existing concrete lining shall be removed from creek channels, and reaches of drainages that have been previously under-grounded shall be "daylighted."
- ER21.4 <u>Surface Water Drainage Restoration</u>. Set a goal to restore or daylight a total of at least .5 miles of surface water drainages over the life of Plan Santa Barbara. Priority areas for restoration include segments of Mission Creek consistent with sound flood control practices, the reach of Arroyo Hondo Creek through City College, the tributary to Arroyo Burro Creek west of Las Positas Road, and the segment of Arroyo Burro Creek adjacent to La Cumbre Plaza.

Waste Management, Recycling and Disposal Policies

ER22. Solid Waste Management Programs. Continue and expand City recycling programs for resource reduction, reuse, and recycling of solid waste.

- ER22.1 <u>Construction/Demolition Materials Reuse and Recycling.</u> Upgrade standard development requirements for recycling of construction/demolition debris or architectural salvage and incentives for use of renewable, or reused or recycled materials.
- ER22.2 Local Recycled Materials. Promote the use of recycled carpeting, furnishings, wall coverings, and architectural salvage or other building materials per LEED or comparable standards in new construction and major renovations. Promote and/or support local stores for reusable and recycled building materials.

- ER22.3 <u>Design and Space Requirements for Waste Management for Private Development</u>. Provide more detailed guidance on space needs and designs for recycling in both new development and to retrofit existing development.
- ER22.4 <u>Waste Management Options.</u> Continue to coordinate with and provide support to the County in its existing partnership with other South Coast agencies to facilitate construction of a waste-to-energy facility at the Tajiguas Landfill, and to explore and establish waste disposal capacity.
 - Monitor progress on the waste-to-energy facility and provide annual reports to the City Council to permit prompt action to move this project forward expeditiously. If a new waste-to-energy facility is not anticipated to be operational by 2015, coordinate with other South Coast agencies or proceed independently to identify and implement an alternative waste disposal strategy.
 - Continue to coordinate with the County of Santa Barbara on efforts to identify and establish additional replacement landfill capacity, including potential increased permitted level at Tajiguas.
 - Explore and quantify options for disposal at alternative nearby regional waste disposal facilities, including sites in the North County and Ventura County. Several regionally located landfills exist with additional capacity to handle most or all of Santa Barbara's waste.

ER22.5. Increase Diversion. Continue to work with businesses to recycle, reduce or eliminate waste.

Waste Reduction.

- Business Processes. Initiate a program for businesses to optimize business processes that focus on reducing or eliminating waste, which may include City program development and outreach to business, and support of non-profit and community-centered efforts.
- Packaging and Disposable Items: Enact programs to discourage single-use items or eliminate packaging. Such efforts currently include voluntary industry-supported reduction efforts coupled with access to reusable bags.

Expanded Recycling and Organics Programs.

- Textiles, Wood, Film Plastics. Explore the feasibility of adding textiles, wood, film plastics and other materials to recycling or organics stream. This would largely stem from reinitiating recommendations from the South Coast Material Recovery Facility Feasibility Study, providing local control of recycled materials and ensuring that a greater percentage of collected materials would be recovered.
- Shingles and Carpet. Provide market development assistance for recycling of asphalt shingles and carpet by local construction waste recycling operations. Increase capture rate of currently divertable materials
- Unscheduled Hauling. Monitor compliance to the Unscheduled Hauling Ordinance to ensure that the vast majority of construction debris is recycled.
- Increased Sorting. Include a requirement for increased sorting of residual materials through recyclables processing contracts, allowing for increased diversion capture.

• Education and Incentives. Implement an enhanced education and outreach program to maximize the use of existing curbside recycling and organics containers and to convey economic incentives to separate greenwaste, recycling, and construction debris from trash for self-haul customers.

Increase number of customers using diversion services.

- Curbside Rate Structures. Implement progressive rate structures for curbside services to encourage diversion through low cost recycling and composting.
- Directives and Fines. Increase recycling and composting through mandatory ordinances, fines, and/or directives.
- Residential Composting. Extend food scraps composting program to the residential sectors where substantial additional material for composting is available.

Reduce Waste Through Reuse.

- Support Reuse Enterprises. Encourage the patronage of current reuse enterprises through education, outreach, and promotion.
- Education and Promotion. Adjust all educational material to promote reuse before recycling, and promote reuse as part of a waste reduction program for businesses.

Protect Recycling Markets.

- City Purchases. Implement a City procurement plan to buy items made from recycled and composted materials.
- Business Purchases. Develop a waste reduction program for businesses to purchase items made from recycled and or composted materials.

Food and Agriculture Policies

- ER23. **Farmers Markets.** Continue to support local farmers markets, and expand locations to include neighborhood locations consistent with Sustainable Neighborhood Plans, expand infrastructure to support them, and expand hours of operations.
- ER24. **Gardener Education.** Continue to support the City/County/SBCC Green Gardener training program, and expand community and school educational programs for producing gardens year-round using sustainable gardening practices. Encourage the use of fruit trees in landscaping where appropriate.
- ER25. Food Scrap Recovery and Composting Program. Continue and expand the City program for diversion of food scraps from landfill disposal, to be composted for use as soil amendments so long as economically viable.
- ER26. Public and Private Food Gardens. Provide for infrastructure to support local community gardens. With neighborhood support, develop publicly-available edible landscaping in existing and new parks. Reserve space for public gardening within the urban core area to be maintained by the community. Design for green roofs and urban rooftop gardens in residential development Downtown.

- ER27. **Food Gardens for Schools**. Work with the Santa Barbara School Districts to develop organic gardens at schools and a healthy and waste-free lunch program:
 - a. To educate students about where food comes from, and the nutrient and energy cycles from garden to table and back again;
 - b. To encourage the development of healthy eating habits, and;
 - c. To provide healthy local food.
- ER28. **Regional Agriculture.** Support regional coordination toward expanding local sustainable food sources. Support incentives for maintaining and establishing additional agricultural farms and farm stands within the City, the South Coast, and tri-county areas. Support directing local food to our schools, cafeterias, groceries, convenience stores, and restaurants.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources Policies

ER29. **Visual Resources Protection.** New development or redevelopment shall preserve or enhance important public views and viewpoints for public enjoyment, where such protection would not preclude reasonable development of a property.

- ER29.1 <u>Document Public Views.</u> Conduct a study to identify and document important public views of the ocean, the mountains or other highly-valued views, establish a list of important public view points, and provide a photo record. Prepare related development standards to protect the views seen from the public view points.
- ER29.2 <u>Evaluation Criteria</u>. In evaluating public scenic views and development impacts at a particular location, the City shall consider:
 - a. The importance of the existing view (i.e., whether a view contains one or more important visual resources, has scenic qualities, and is viewed from a heavily used public viewpoint, such as public gathering area, major public transportation corridor or area of intensive pedestrian and bicycle use);
 - b. Whether a proposed change in the existing view would be individually or cumulatively significant (i.e., substantially degrade or obstruct existing important public scenic views, or impair the visual context of the Waterfront area or designated historic resource);
 - c. Whether changes in the proposed action could be avoided or adequately reduced through project design changes (such as site lay-out, building design, and landscape design).
- ER29.3 <u>Site-Specific Coastal Bluff Analysis.</u> Any mapped illustration, description of, or reference to, a "coastal bluff" in the Plan Santa Barbara planning, background, or environmental documents should trigger the requirement for professional site-specific coastal bluff location analysis as part of the application for development on a parcel, rather than to be a conclusive determination that a "coastal bluff" now exists, or at any time during the historic record has existed, on that parcel.

- ER29.4 <u>Vegetation Protection</u>. Prepare guidelines and standards for removal of significant trees and for planting replacement or additional trees, and protect significant natural vegetated areas from inappropriate development.
- ER29.5 <u>Scenic View Protection</u>. Further protect public scenic views of the coast, hillsides, open spaces, creeks and historic resources by incorporating visual guidelines as part of project design guidelines and environmental review guidelines.
- ER30. Enhance Visual Quality. Not only retain, but improve visual quality of the city wherever practicable.

Possible Implementation Action to be Considered

ER30.1 <u>Underground Utilities.</u> Cooperate with developers and utility companies to underground as many as possible overhead utilities in the city by 2030. Establish a listing of priority street segments with realistic target dates in the capital improvements program and continue to support neighborhood efforts for undergrounding.

Noise Policies

ER31. Noise Policies for New Residential Uses. Take into consideration the surrounding existing and future legal land uses in establishing exterior noise policies for new residential uses.

- ER31.1 <u>Residential Exterior Ambient Noise Levels in Non-Residential and Multi-Family Zones.</u> An average ambient outdoor noise level of 65 dBA Ldn or CNEL or less is established as the level considered normally acceptable for required outdoor living areas of residential units located within non-residential and multi-family zones. This policy amends the General Plan Noise Element Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for residential units in non-residential and multi-family zones.
- ER31.2. <u>Residential Exterior Ambient Noise Levels in Single Family Zones.</u> An average ambient outdoor noise level of 60 dBA Ldn or CNEL or less is established as the level considered normally acceptable for required outdoor living areas of residential units located within single-family zones except for areas subject to higher ambient noise levels, for which a 65 dBA Ldn or CNEL standard is established. This policy amends the General Plan Noise Element Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for residential units in single-family zones that already experience average ambient noise levels above 60 dBA.
- ER31.3 <u>Subdivisions in Single-Family Zones.</u> Subdivisions may be permitted in areas where the existing average ambient noise level exceeds 60 dBA Ldn or CNEL only if it is demonstrated that required outdoor living areas can be provided with an exterior noise level of 60 dBA Ldn or CNEL or less.
- ER31.4 <u>Construction Noise</u>. Establish different construction noise standards for mixed-use urban and suburban residential areas, including standards for days, hours, and types of construction.

- ER31.5 <u>Non-Residential Noise Affecting Residential Neighborhoods.</u> To further General Plan policies for maintaining quiet, high quality neighborhoods, require more detailed noise assessments for proposed special, conditional, and institutional uses with episodic activities and events that may cause noise effects to residential neighborhoods.
- ER32. **Sound Barriers**. The City supports and will assist in the provision of sound barriers along the Hwy 101 transportation corridor.

- ER32.1 Local Share Funding. The City should pursue funding toward the extension and connection of the sound attenuation wall along the entire U.S. Hwy 101 and Union Pacific Railroad corridor within City boundaries. Barriers and sound walls to be consistent with the Highway Santa Barbara Coastal Parkway Design Guidelines.
- ER32.2 <u>Noise Monitoring and Reduction.</u> The City shall periodically monitor freeway noise level increases through the year 2030 and if necessary work with neighborhoods, the California Department of Transportation, and Union Pacific Railroad to identify and implement specific measures to reduce future freeway noise increases affecting expanded areas of existing residential neighborhoods with noise levels of 65 dBA or more. Noise attenuation measures may include added sound walls along portions of the freeway and/or local measures.
- ER32.3 <u>Environmental Justice Populations</u>. The City should establish a financial incentive program designed to provide low-interest loans to allow environmental justice populations located in high noise areas to construct noise control improvements to reduce indoor noise levels below 45 dBA CNEL.



CONSERVATION ELEMENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Conservation Element was prepared for the City of Santa Barbara.

City Council

David Shiffman, Mayor Hal Conklin Patricia Fillippini Jeanne Graffy Sheila Lodge Francis Lopez Lyle Reynolds

Planning Commission

Jerry Holt, Chairman Nicholas Dumas Michael Gray Judith Orias Virginia Robinson Hubert Twibell Kathryn Woolson

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation and invaluable assistance extended to us by the City of Santa Barbara's Department of Community Development, Planning Division staff.

Dave Davis, Principal Planner John Helmer Mary Lou Days

This report was prepared by the following:

Envicom Corporation

Joseph G. Johns, President Mim McFarland, Project Manager Donald O. Asquith, Vice President and Geologist Patricia Caldwell, Cartographer Patti Hollingsworth, Secretary Terri Immekus, Secretary Suzanne Keesler, Secretary Peter Rowlands, Biologist Duane Vander Pluym, Biologist

Interface Planning and Counseling Corporation

John Jostes, President Meredith Getches, Environmental Analyst Ken Marshall, Environmental Analyst Cindy Wornham, Environmental Analyst Betty Lattimer, Secretary

Independent Consultants

Orrin Sage, Jr., Environmental Geologist Cindy Sage, Environmental Scientist

Our thanks to Patricia Caldwell for plates and report layout and the following for illustrations:

Lencho Auchstetter - sketches Community Environmental Council - sketch Kim Kavish - photos Karen Lytle - sketches and photos Steve Malone - photo Santa Barbara Botanic Garden - photo Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District - photo Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History - sketch *Santa Barbara News-Press* - photo

(Note: These illustrations and plates are not included in the 1994 reprint of the General Plan.)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	
Legislative Authority	
Purpose and Approach	
Contents and Use of This Document	
General Description	
This section has been replaced by the Historic Res	ources Element
adopted by City Council October 2, 20	012.
CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES	
Cultural and Historic Resources	
Significance of Resources	
Archaeological Resources	
HISTORIC Resources	
Architectural Resources	చచ ంగ
VISUAI RESOURCES	
Hillsides	
Shoreline	
Specimen and Street Trees	
Open Space	
Air Quality	
All Quality	
MajarCanaidaratiana	
Viajor Considerations	
Factors Affecting All Quality	
Dellutents and Local Air Quality	
Politionship Potwaan Air Quality and Vahiala Usa	
Improving Air Quality	
Riological Pasouroas	
Introduction	
Native Terrestrial Resources	
Biotic Communities	
Relationship to Ecosystem Preservation	
Rare Endangered or Threatened Wildlife	
Rare and Endangered Plant Species	۲+ ۸۷
BioticCommunity	۰۰۰۰۰۰۰ ۲۸
Estuarine and Marine Resources	
Intertidal and Nearshore	51
Fisheries	52
1 101101100	

Goleta Slough	54
Agricultural Resources	54
Inventory of Crop Production	54
Farmer's Market	56
The Future of Agriculture in the City	
Other Urban Biotic Resources	57
Santa Barbara Harbor	57
Urban Resources	
Drainage and Flood Control	
Introduction	
Major Creeks	59
Mission Creek	
Sycamore Creek	60
Arroyo Burro Creek	60
San RogueCreek	60
Airport Area Creeks	60
Flood Hazards	60
Mission Creek Flood Hazard	61
Sycamore Creek Flood Hazard	61
Arroyo Burro Creek Flood Hazard	61
San Roque Creek Flood Hazard	61
Airport Creeks Flood Hazard	
Water Resources	62
Introduction	62
Supply/Demand Relationships	62
Existing Supplies	62
Existing and Future Demand	64
Future Supplies	65
Water Quality	68
Quality of Existing Supplies	68
Groundwater Quality	68
Harbor Water Quality	69
This section has been replaced by the Historic Resour	ces Element
adopted by City Council October 2, 2012	
GOALS, POLICIES, IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES	
Organization of Recommendations	
Cultural and Historic Resources	······································
Goals	······································
Policies	
Implementation Strategies	
Visual Resources	
Goals	
Air Quality	
Goals	74
Policies	74

Implementation Strategies	76
Biological Resources	77
Goal	77
Subgoals	77
Policies	77
Implementation Strategies	78
Drainage and Flood Control.	82
Goals	82
Policies	82
Implementation Strategies	82
Water Resources	83
Goal	83
Policies	83
Implementation Strategies	84
REFERENCES	R-85
This section has been replaced by the Historic Resou	irces Element
adopted by City Council October 2, 201	2.
APPENDIX A: CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES	A-91
APPENDIX B: VISUAL RESOURCES	A-96

INTRODUCTION

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In making city and county governments responsible for the preparation and implementation of a Conservation Element in their General Plans, the California Legislature has recognized the need for a comprehensive planning program which protects the land and water resources under the jurisdiction of local and regional governmental entities.

Specific authority for this Element of the General Plan is contained in Government Code Section 65302(d) which requires the following:

A conservation element for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources including water and its hydraulic force, forests, soils, rivers and other waters, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals and other natural resources. That portion of the conservation element including waters shall be developed in coordination with any countywide water agency and with all district and city agencies which have developed, served, controlled or conserved water for any purpose for the county or city for which the plan is prepared. The conservation element may also cover:

- 1. The reclamation of land and waters.
- 2. Flood control.
- 3. Prevention and control of the pollution of streams and other waters.
- 4. Regulation of the use of land in stream channels and other areas required for the accomplishment of the conservation plan.
- 5. Prevention, control and correction of the erosion of soils, beaches and shores.

PURPOSE AND APPROACH

As a mandated part of the General Plan, the Conservation Element is intended to serve as the City's official policy guide in public and private development matters related to the preservation and enhancement of natural resources. The basic goal of this Element is to outline a comprehensive program to achieve and maintain a healthful natural environment which reflects a balance between human activities and natural processes. The intent of this Conservation Element is to identify, evaluate, and analyze the natural and cultural resources present in the City and establish policies which reflect not only the uniqueness of Santa Barbara, but also those which are responsive to the need to preserve the City's resources for future generations. This Element has been prepared in a manner which reflects the relationship between Conservation and the Land Use, Open Space, Safety, and Circulation Elements of the General Plan.

CONTENTS AND USE OF THIS DOCUMENT

Given the urbanized nature of the City of Santa Barbara, this Element covers only those resources which are present within the City. Subject areas such as forests and minerals are not assessed due to their absence within the City. This Element therefore focuses on Cultural and Historic Resources, Visual Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Drainage and Flood Control, and Water Resources. Agricultural Resources are addressed briefly, as the supply of prime agricultural soils and agricultural activity is limited. Estuarine

and Marine Resources are also discussed, but not at great length due to the pending completion of the City's Local Coastal Program.

Goals, policies, and implementation strategies for each resource are combined in a separate section at the end of the Element.

This document should be viewed as a flexible policy guide rather than an exhaustive inventory of all natural and environmental resources. It has been prepared to highlight key conservation issues and recommend implementation strategies. As conditions change and issues are resolved, this Element should be revised to reflect future conditions and community concerns related to the conservation of Santa Barbara's natural and non-renewable resources.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The City of Santa Barbara is widely known as a beautiful and prosperous community. The physical setting of the City has shaped its past and will have important implications for its future. Sheltered from severe weather by the Channel Islands which lie parallel to the coast, the City has matured in a basin located at the approximate center of a narrow east-west trending coastal shelf. The Santa Ynez Mountains to the north and the Mesa hills to the southwest provide a topographic envelope which opens to the ocean at the southeast. The City, situated in and limited by this visually dramatic juncture of land and sea, possesses both sandy beaches and coastal bluffs.

The climate of Santa Barbara is Mediterranean, as is most of coastal southern California, with cool, wet winters and relatively hot, dry summers. The local extremes of temperature range from over 100 degrees to below freezing, with 72 degrees to 48 degrees being the average annual temperature range. Although its southerly location enables it to avoid the direct impact of harsh northwest storms, Santa Barbara is far enough north to receive precipitation from such storms as their fury diminishes. The average annual rainfall is approximately 18 inches and the growing season averages 342 days per year. Occasional fogs and blustering Santana winds are elements which add diversity to the City's climate.

Encompassing 10,741 acres, the predominant land use within the City is residential. The distribution of uses is indicated below.

LAND USE IN THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA (1975)

		% of
Land Use	Acres	City Land
Residential		
Single-Family	3,718	35
Multiple-Family	636	6
Other Residential	43	*
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	4,397	42
Commercial	510	5
Industrial	161	1
Public & private Facilities	1,274	12
Vacant & Private Facilities	2,640	25
Circulation Routes	1,759	16
TOTAL	10,741	100

* Less than 1 percent

SOURCE: Henningson Durham & Richardson, Downzoning EIR

The population, approximately 72,238 according to the 1975 Special Census, depends primarily upon property, pensions, and tourism for basic income. The percent of per capita income coming to Santa Barbarans from the City's basic economic sources in 1970 was as follows:

Property and Pensions Income	31%
Tourism - Visitor Expenditures	29%
Manufacturing - Research and Development	20%
University of California	8%
All other Elements	12%
Source: Keisker, 1969	

The relationship between these income sources remained stable over the 1960-1970 period, and there is no reason to doubt that these relationships will continue into the future (Planning Task Force, 1974).

Attracted by the beauty of the physical setting, pleasant climate, attractive architecture, and "Old World" charm, tourists and visitors generate substantial income for the community. The Chamber of Commerce makes annual estimates of the volume of local business sales brought in by tourists and attendees at conferences held in the area. For 1975, the estimate was about \$81 million. In 1976, the total came to about \$87 million.

The influence of Spanish, Mexican, and Indian heritage produces a unique cultural environment to complement the City's physical setting. The annual Fiesta celebration recalls Hispanic traditions, and local architecture of compatible styles is encouraged and, in the central business district, required. Lectures, concerts, exhibits, and other events are routinely available, many at no charge to the public. The extensive

Continuing Education Program, several museums, a symphony orchestra, and a number of institutions of higher education contribute to the City's reputation as a cultural center.

Although its population has grown gradually through most of its history, Santa Barbara experienced a surge of growth after both World War I and World War II and again during the decade between 1960 and 1970. Since 1970 the population increase has declined, and the trend for the future indicates a relatively slow rate of growth. The City's policy of limiting the zoned residential capacity to approximately 85,000 persons, as well as a general decline in birthrate, are contributing factors to this future trend.

The community is now almost wholly urbanized, and the utilization, preservation, and maintenance of natural and cultural resources is of paramount concern. Much of what Santa Barbara is, a community with a distinct sense of place, depends upon how these resources are treated in the future. The constraints implicit to these resources are more clearly felt as their limited nature is recognized. Because the resources are limited, the potential for conflict relative to future development and preservation of these resources is magnified.

This section has been replaced by the Historic Resources Element adopted by City Council October 2, 2012.

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES

CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

Introduction

Santa Barbara's heritage combines centuries of Indian culture with years of Spanish, Mexican, and American influence. This blending of cultures manifests itself in the style, character, pace, and appearance which have made our City one of the most widely acclaimed centers of archaeological, historical, and cultural significance in the State. Those structures and remnants of settlement which remain are cherished not only as links to our colorful and varied past but also as irreplaceable components of the City's ambiance. These "pieces of the past" add texture to the fabric of our community, giving it that special charm in appearance which draws tourists from around the world and contributes to the unique sense of place experienced by residents.

The City's commitment to the conservation of its archaeological, historic, and architectural resources is reflected in existing protective legislation and public policy, past and present activities of concerned individuals and groups, and, of course, the continued and respected presence of these resources within the community. However, the potential for loss or degradation of these resources exists and increases as pressure for new development increases.

In years past, valuable archaeological sites and significant architectural landmarks have been destroyed to make way for new developments that, at the time, signified "progress." Examples of resources which have been lost to such pressure include:

- Archaeologically significant Burton Mound, site of a Chumash Indian settlement, was developed into residential uses;
- Most of the Spanish Mexican era adobes, including the unique Packard Winery Adobe and the Goux Adobe, have been razed (today only 19 of approximately 200 adobes remain);
- <u>"La Barranca," the sprawling Hopi style pueblo home of celebrated artist Ed Borein, was</u> torn down to make room for a housing development;
- The Gaspar Orena Mansion on upper Laguna Street was leveled in 1923 to provide the playground for Roosevelt School.

Santa Barbara has learned from what it has lost and has sought to protect the remaining significant resources in a manner which respects their irreplaceable nature.

Significance of Resources

Historic and cultural resources encompass a wide variety of properties which were and are significant in American history, regional architecture, archaeology, and culture. The Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has set forth the following criteria to assist in determining what constitutes historic significance:

"Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of State and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feelings, and association and:

- That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad
 patterns of our history; or
- That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or,
- That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or,
- _____ That have yielded, or may be likely to yield information in history or prehistory.

Once historical or archaeological areas have been identified, steps should be taken to preserve them and if necessary restore them. It is not necessary that they be converted to public uses such as museums, but the public should be able to see, use, and enjoy these resources." (National Study by the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation).

In light of these criteria, many structures and areas in Santa Barbara can be considered to have significance. Not all of these resources have yet received official recognition of their significance.

Archaeological Resources

The Cultural and Historic Resources map indicates the locations of known and suspected sites of archaeological significance. The mapped locations are purposely vague so as not to be helpful for those who would seek to despoil and/or pilfer artifacts from the sites. More precise maps are on file at the Santa Barbara County Planning Department. Several of the areas delineated on the map (i.e., adjacent to creeks, on the perimeter of Goleta Slough, and in the Burton Mound area of the waterfront) are noted because of their relation to the Chumash habitation.

Indian culture, appearing along the channel coast over 10,000 years ago, provides a distinctive foundation for the Santa Barbara area. Numerous villages of the Chumash were found to have flourished in the coastal plains and creekside areas that are now encompassed by the City. It was the Chumash's well-developed material culture and their advanced social organization that significantly influenced the Spanish and Mexican cultures that were to follow.

Archaeological research indicates that the historic Indian population in Santa Barbara was the most advanced Indian group in California. Artifacts from coastal and interior sites are an integral part of current research into theories of cultural evolution. The preservation and conservation of these sites of prehistoric Chumash habitation is very important to future research. The archaeological resources in the Santa Barbara area include cave archaeology and rock art in the interior, and middens containing artifacts such as ornaments, tools, and shells along the more extensively inhabited coastal areas.

Archaeological resources are particularly vulnerable to urban development (e.g., residential and industrial construction, road improvements, etc.). Also, public access to, and vandalism of valuable sites are major sources of damage and destruction. In order to avoid conflicts arising between land-modifying development and the preservation of non-renewable archaeological resources, the incorporation of a study of archaeological resources into the planning process from the earliest planning stages is necessary. Before construction is begun on a project, it must be ascertained what archaeological resources are present which

might affect or be affected by the project. Such planning involves the systematic identification of archaeological resources via preliminary site surveys, evaluation of these resources, and formulation of means for their protection, relocation, or their scientific study prior to possible disturbance. Some sites, such as the one identified in the area of the old motorcycle track near the Airport, could be preserved entirely to remove the threat of future damage.

Historic Resources

Several of the sensitive historic resource areas noted on the Cultural and Historic Resources map relate to habitation during the 18th and 19th centuries and are delineated due to their proximity to the Mission, the Royal Presidio, and other adobes. Specific structures of significance are also referred to individually on the map.

The City began in 1782 as a Spanish presidio, or fortress, which was constructed of adobe buildings with tile roofs. A cluster of adobe residences around the presidio formed the heart of what is now the downtown area. The site of the Spanish Royal Presidio is of archaeological and historical importance. Portions of it are contained within El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historic Park. The Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation and the State of California are cooperating in efforts to acquire the remainder of the site, protect certain features, study the archaeological remains, and reconstruct the fortress as an historic, cultural, educational, and civic resource.

The Mission Church, known as the "Queen of the Missions" was begun in 1786 on a gentle knoll away from the town's center. The Mission has been altered through the years by four major earthquakes but remains much the same as the 1820 version.

Historic landmarks in Santa Barbara have been recognized in a variety of ways. The federal government provides for registration as "National Historic Landmarks" and in the "National Register of Historic Places." The State of California registers "State Historic Landmarks." These various designations can afford some degree of protection by requiring review of developments

or modifications that could damage these resources. Additionally, registration can make property owners eligible for some forms of tax relief and can also make possible grant monies for preservation. A list of historic landmarks, their particular designations, and their addresses are included in Appendix A.

Local protection of historic landmarks is provided by the "Historic Structures Ordinance." The ordinance officially declares that it is the City's policy to recognize, preserve, enhance, perpetuate, and use structures, natural features, sites, and areas which have historic, architectural, archaeological, cultural or aesthetic significance (Chapter 22.22, Municipal Code, City of Santa Barbara). Landmarks designated under the provisions of this ordinance cannot be altered (on the exterior), relocated, or demolished. The Landmarks Committee, established under this measure, recommends to the City Council landmarks of historical significance to be designated. The current listing of Designated Landmarks is included in Appendix A. "Structures of Merit" are also listed. Although these structures do not receive the protection of the ordinance, they have received official recognition.

Architectural Resources¹

The variety of architectural styles which are comprised by the City's built environment are a significant cultural resource. These buildings reflect a rich heritage and are evidence of the different influences that have shaped the City since the mid-nineteenth century. By that time, American and English settlers had introduced wood-frame and brick construction, and Santa Barbara had taken on the typical appearance of a California town. Victorian styles: Italianate, Queen Anne, Stick and Eastlake, and Gothic revival prevailed through the mid-1870s. During the 1880s and 1890s, styles reflected the influence of San Francisco. In the mid-1890s, through the early part of the twentieth century, Mission Revival buildings were erected (the railroad station remains as an example).

In the early years of the twentieth century, the community began to strive to establish the Hispanic image of the City. The incorporation of the De la Guerra Adobe into the "El Paseo" shopping/office complex was a major step in this direction. The need to control the planning and design of buildings produced a planning commission in 1923 and an Architectural Board of Review two years later. The destructive 1925 earthquake afforded the opportunity to rebuild large parts of the central City in Spanish Colonial style. The influence of the Architectural Board of Review was dramatic during the months following the earthquake. This group was disbanded after operating for nine months and processing over 2,000 designs. Although architectural controls were not included in the City's ordinances, in the 1930s it became understood that Spanish style was a "must" for the central City. The Plans and Planting Committee unofficially worked to make sure that the City would be rebuilt in the Hispanic tradition.

After World War II, the Architectural Board of Review was re-established and was given design control over all commercial and apartment developments. The goal of conserving and protecting the community's architectural heritage by requiring good design and neighborhood compatibility in new development continues to be implemented by the Architectural Board of Review.

In order to give special protection and attention to the central core area which developed around the Royal Presidio, the "El Pueblo Viejo" landmark district was established in 1960. Preserving and enhancing the unique historic and architectural character of this area is the express purpose of this district. Refined in its geographical extent in recent years, El Pueblo Viejo requirements demand that any structure built or modified in the district be compatible with the Hispanic tradition. Emphasis is placed upon California Adobe, Monterey Revival, and Spanish Colonial Revival styles. The Landmarks Committee administers the requirements of the El Pueblo Viejo district.

Supported by widespread community sentiment, and bolstered by the economic reality that the architectural, historical, and archaeological resources are a primary focus of the City's tourism, efforts to perpetuate these resources must continue. Santa Barbara's wealth of styles has produced architecturally heterogeneous neighborhoods which contribute immeasurably to the comfortable character of the City. Both the Architectural Board of Review and the Landmarks Committee carry on the protective traditions begun over half a century ago.

Recognition of significant historical and cultural amenities, however, does not ensure preservation. The fate of the central core and those structures protected as Designated Landmarks is much brighter in this regard than are those structures and areas which, although important, are relatively common. Several of the areas currently zoned for the most intensive land uses are also of remarkable architectural/historic/cultural value. As pressure for new development grows, it will become more difficult to conserve these older values. The residential neighborhoods of Oak Park, Laguna, and West Downtown, are examples of this situation.

¹ This section is intended to be a brief overview of the architectural history of the City. Readers desiring a complete inventory and explanation of architectural styles of Santa Barbara are referred to Santa Barbara Architecture, which was invaluable in the development of this section.

Zoned for higher densities, the visual and historic/cultural amenities provided by such neighborhoods will probably be lost unless protective policies are adopted. Brinkerhoff Avenue, which is lined with relatively modest late 19th century cottages now in residential/commercial use as an "antique shop row," is also afforded no special protection.

The Landmarks Committee is currently conducting an architectural and historic survey of structures throughout the City. The survey is partially funded by a State grant from the Office of Historic Preservation in the Department of Parks and Recreation. It is intended that this inventory provide an architectural catalogue of the City's buildings. Nominations for the Designated Landmark and Structures of Merit distinction will eventually be forthcoming from this effort. This survey, by identifying the range of building types, architectural styles and periods, and documenting facts about the buildings, could be a major step in the future of historic preservation in Santa Barbara. The list of "Noteworthy Buildings of Importance" included in Appendix A is an informal roster of structures which, while they have not been recognized under the City's protective ordinance, may be likely candidates for designation in the future.

Future land use decisions which affect the community's heritage, as reflected in the historic, architectural, and archaeological resources, must recognize the irreplaceable nature of these resources. The value of these resources are to be given equal weight to other factors being considered in the decision-making process. Goals, policies, and implementation strategies for the conservation of these resources can be found in the last chapter of this Element.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Introduction

The aesthetic qualities of the City of Santa Barbara vary as widely as the nature of the topography and the land uses. The manner in which the City's visual resources are perceived is two-fold: first, those areas possessing aesthetic qualities attributable to natural or structural amenities; and second, those places from which scenic areas can be viewed. The close proximity of beach and mountain land forms offer a unique visual setting for Santa Barbara. The City, nestled amid mountain backdrops and surrounding foothills, contrasts with the ocean's expanse to create a unique visual quality unparalleled in California.

Natural land areas possessing aesthetic attributes include the creeks and their riparian environment, hillsides and their native vegetation, the shoreline and its related amenities, and the remaining open space within the City. When considered in conjunction with the natural surroundings, the architectural character also becomes an important visual resource which contributes to the quality of life in Santa Barbara. These and other cultural resources are discussed in the previous section.

On one hand, it is important that land areas which are high in scenic value be conserved. On the other hand, it is just these scenic values which attract both tourism and residential development in areas of high visual sensitivity. Hillside developments provide vistas for residents who inhabit those structures. Yet, residential developments render hillsides less natural as topography and vegetation are modified. The ocean becomes increasingly harder to see from more and more locations as low-lying buildings are replaced by taller ones. The General Plan serves not only to identify these visual resources, but also to recommend policies that will conserve and enhance those resources for all segments of the population.

Inventory of Resources

CREEKS

Mission, Arroyo Burro, San Roque, and Sycamore creeks constitute the major creek systems within the City. The creeks which provide drainage from the mountains and hills to the sea are largely natural in appearance and thus contribute significantly to the aesthetic quality of the City. In addition, they function as an important ecological resources while providing connecting linear open space links from the hillsides to the shoreline. The creeks also provide the potential for aesthetic enhancement of recreational, residential, and commercial areas.

Due to its central location with the City's creek network, Mission Creek is a predominant natural feature which bisects the City. As open space, the creekside environment of Mission and other creeks contributes to meeting the spatial and spiritual needs of the community residents by offering visual relief from the built environment. The Scenic Resources map indicates the extent and location of these riparian/creekside open space resources.

The absence of creek management in the past has resulted in alteration of creek environments through practices such as concrete channelization, defoliation of riparian vegetation, and dumping of debris into creeks. These actions and some creekside construction activities severely detract from the creek's visual value and indirectly contribute to degradation of the coastal environment as well.

HILLSIDES

Major hillside topography does much to accentuate the visual contrast of Santa Barbara. Foothill open space provides a transition zone between residential development and the natural mountain areas. The Scenic Resources map includes delineation of hillsides which have a slope of 30% or greater. Due to the steepness of these slopes, they are especially prominent in the overall community landscape and provide a significant visual resource, as reflected in the City's Slope Density Ordinance. The natural character of the hillsides is aesthetically attractive in and of itself, with the real beauty of these hillsides lying in the scenic vistas they provide for residents and tourists alike. The areas of higher elevation provide views of both the ocean and the mountains.

The higher elevations also provide a visual resource to hillside residents of surrounding valleys and the ocean. For example, the Riviera provides views of the ocean and the Channel Islands. The Foothill neighborhood in the northeastern portion of the City also provides dramatic views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and the ocean. The Mesa area possesses magnificent scenic vistas of the City and its environs. The steep, wooded hillside of the Mesa's north slopes provides a visual backdrop for much of the City's downtown area while also providing for a 350-degree panoramic view. However, hillside development also creates scars on the landform which require many years to revegetate. This condition most affects those residents who view the hills from lower elevations.

SHORELINE

The shoreline, harbor, and waterfront areas are key aesthetic assets which provide diverse recreational opportunities and passive enjoyment of the sea, sand, and scenic views. From the beaches, views of the ocean and the islands, with sailboats in the harbor, are the dominant visual elements. Cabrillo Boulevard, a designated scenic highway, has views of not only the ocean and Palm Park, but also of the Bird Refuge, Child's Estate, Montecito foothills, and the Santa Ynez Mountains. (See the Scenic Highways Element for a further description of Cabrillo Boulevard. Other scenic routes include parts of Sycamore Canyon Road, Stanwood Drive, Mission Ridge Road, and Mountain Drive.) The importance of the harbor and the shoreline as scenic resources cannot be overestimated, as the City's location at the juncture of land and sea is fundamental to

the charm and character of the community. The significance of this resource is reflected by the designation of "unique visual sensitivity" on the Scenic Resources map.

Scenic corridors providing views of the hills and mountains, as seen from the beach and Cabrillo Boulevard, are valuable resources. Despite the presence of a substantial number of tourist-oriented developments on the inland side of Cabrillo Boulevard, view corridors continue to exist. If development is allowed in these remaining open areas without proper height, set back, and design limitations, the visual corridors could be blocked and inland views impaired, thereby causing a decline in the aesthetic amenities of the shoreline. Palm Park and the beachfront are particularly sensitive to such "filling in" of view corridors.

SPECIMEN AND STREET TREES

The presence of trees throughout the City is invaluable in the preservation of the rustic, visually pleasing appearance of Santa Barbara. Widely distributed along many streets, the trees provide needed greenery and shade while concealing some buildings and unsightly utility lines and poles.

While it is not feasible to map all the trees in the community which contribute to this general visual resource, the Scenic Resources map does indicate the outstanding Stone Pine street trees (*Pinus pinea*) along Anapamu Street, as well as those historic and specimen trees protected by City ordinance. The Stone Pines which line the 300-800 blocks of East Anapamu Street are a prime example of the outstanding contribution that trees can make to the appearance of a neighborhood, and from higher elevations form a striking green belt in the heart of the City.

When integrated into landscaping plans for commercial and residential uses, trees make for more attractive development. Although there appears to be adequate tree coverage throughout the City, additional new trees and preservation of existing tree cover is needed to maintain and enhance this visual resource. According to the City Arborist, those areas most in need of additional street trees are the business/commercial districts and the major thoroughfares. Santa Barbara Beautiful is the primary, privately sponsored organization that aids in planting new street trees throughout the City. This street tree planting program provides trees through donation of funds by members of the public. Currently, the goal is to add 5,500 trees to the City. This type of promotion for new tree plantings is a significant step toward preserving and enhancing Santa Barbara's scenic quality.

In response to the need for the protection of trees from removal during construction, Chapter 15.24 of the Municipal Code, "Preservation of Trees," of the Tree Ordinance, was instated. Under this ordinance, it is "unlawful to cut down or otherwise destroy or authorize the destruction or cutting down of any tree that has been designated as an historic or specimen tree by the City Council..." (See Appendix B for a list of trees which currently receive protection under this ordinance.) The presence of trees is perhaps taken for granted, but if the tree population were allowed to diminish in an uncontrolled manner, their absence would undoubtedly be noticed, and Santa Barbara would be deprived of a valuable aesthetic amenity. Continued

protection and enhancement of trees is an important consideration in maintaining the visual resources of the City.

OPEN SPACE

The Open Space Element (adopted in 1972) provides for the protection of "significant open and natural landforms through and around the community." This Element includes the ocean, the mountains, and the major hillsides as categories of open space. The Wilcox Property, major creeks, the shoreline, Montecito Golf Course, Andree Clark Bird Refuge, Clark Estate, and Child's Estate are included as significant areas of open space and/or visual features. These areas are indicated on the Scenic Resources map as is the "Kim Nursery" property on the westside. The Kim property, visible from the foothills and many downtown locations, is presently being developed for residential use, but some parts are to remain relatively undisturbed.

City Parks also provide significant open space within the community. Although they are not all indicated on the Scenic Resources map, the parks are valuable visual amenities and are considered as such, as well as recreational resources.

The Goleta Slough is a significant ecological resource and also provides open space. Infringement on the open character of this wetland is not compatible with maintenance of this habitat. Protective policies and regulations which ensure the continued preservation of the Slough as open space will be forthcoming in the City's Local Coastal Program. Further discussion of the Goleta Slough is found in the Biological Resources section.

Threats to Visual Resources

Vigorous planning and management of our visual resources is essential in order to prevent the eventual degradation of these resources which contribute substantially to the aesthetic, environmental, and economic well-being of the City.

Threats to the creekside environment are not as evident as those to other visual resources. There is presently a lack of local policy which recognizes the value of the creekside environment from a visual resources perspective. While creek setbacks are currently being proposed by the City and the County, there are no standards with regard to the appearance, design, or site layout of new development adjacent to or within the riparian environment. Presently, concrete retaining walls and artificial filling are the primary structural improvements for creekside development. As remaining vacant land along Mission Creek, for example, is developed, creekside vegetation, topography, and access are reduced or eliminated from the visual environment. This trend will continue until objectives, policies, and implementing regulations are adopted which recognize the major creeks within the City as visual amenities which provide opportunities for restoration and enhancement of urban resources.

The same type of unchecked development that has resulted in the degradation and artificial channeling of once natural, free-flowing streams and creeks, has also had a direct effect on the hillside regions of the City. Areas such as the Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood have been the site of conversion of natural hillsides into building sites. The extensive cutting and grading of hillsides that accompany residential development can cause irreversible environmental damage, thus diminishing the aesthetic character of the City. Development has also impaired scenic vistas from open, publicly accessible sites on the hills themselves. Natural constraints to development such as excessive steepness of slopes have been overcome by environmentally damaging engineering practices throughout the hillside areas. In response to this trend, a Slope Density Ordinance was incorporated into the City's land use controls in 1975. The intent of this ordinance was to

prevent the unnecessary scarring of hillsides through regulation of density on various slopes. However, this ordinance has not been effective, as is evidenced by major scarring on the north facing slopes of the Mesa Hills and other areas of the City. It is therefore suggested that the location of development in the hillside areas should be controlled in a manner which guarantees the preservation of the natural characteristics of the terrain and vegetation, even if revised ordinances prohibit development in certain areas altogether.

The conservation of the harbor, shoreline open space, and natural features that contribute to the beachfront character should be a major focus of the City's future planning policy. The Local Coastal Program, for example, is presently refining the City's policies in this regard. Sand build-up at the harbor entrance has forced closure of the harbor in the past, and constant dredging is required to keep it open. The harbor itself is threatened by potentially serious damage from southeasterly storms. Because future development in the shoreline area could enhance or damage existing aesthetic qualities, great care and thoughtfulness must precede major alterations within the coastal zone.

Unfortunately, the City's visual and aesthetic resources are most vulnerable to the pressures of increased land development and population growth. Through the years, the need for protection of these remaining amenities has become a vital concern of those wishing to maintain the essence of Santa Barbara's character and beauty. In response to this need, goals, policies, and implementation strategies have been formulated to conserve and protect the creeks, trees, hillsides, and shoreline, and are contained in the final chapter of this document.

AIR QUALITY

Introduction

Perception of air quality varies from person to person. Some people perceive air pollution as a haze of particulate matter which impairs the range of vision, while others experience burning eyes or difficulty in breathing. Still others do not consider Santa Barbara to have an air pollution problem at all, or blame the air quality on the larger metropolitan areas to the southeast.

Santa Barbara has been designated by the California Air Resources Board as a non-attainment area. This designation reflects the area's failure to meet certain national air quality standards. The air within the South Coast Air Basin, of which the City of Santa Barbara is a part, presently exceeds State and Federal standards for concentrations of oxidants, carbon monoxide, and suspended particulate matter. Air quality standards have been established as benchmarks for concentrations of potentially harmful pollutants. Standards are set at the lowest concentration found to cause harmful effect(s) (Brodine, 1977). These air pollution problems manifest themselves in the form of reduced visibility, eye irritation, impairment of plant growth, added cleaning and maintenance costs, accelerated deterioration of buildings, and, particularly for those with respiratory difficulties, a serious health threat.

Major Considerations

Santa Barbara's air quality, like other natural resources, is limited. That is, at a given point in time, the local air-environment has a limited ability to dilute contaminants and remain clean enough for the population to breathe without experiencing adverse effects. Although local air quality appears to be very good when compared to some communities in Southern California, Santa Barbara is experiencing substantial locally generated air pollution.

FACTORS AFFECTING AIR QUALITY

Air quality varies with the amount of pollutants emitted and the subsequent dispersion of the pollutants into the atmosphere. When the rate of dispersion does not equal the rate at which pollutants are added to the atmosphere, air quality problems arise. Inversions, light winds, and inland mountain ranges are factors which limit the local air environment's capacity to disperse pollutants.

An inversion acts as a "lid" obstructing the vertical diffusion of pollutants. The inversion layer in the coastal areas of Santa Barbara County is quite persistent in trapping pollutants and "is lower than that measured to the north or to the south" (Norsieck and Eschenroeder). The winter months are apt to be accompanied by frequent surface-based inversions (radiation inversion), and during the summer months higher-altitude inversions persist (subsidence inversion).

Local wind conditions are another factor which affect the dispersion of pollutants. Light winds accompanied by inversion thwart the scattering of primary pollutants. December, January, and February exhibit extreme surface stability with almost no mixing. Such stability is more prevalent during late evening and early morning hours. This stagnation functions to trap the primary pollutants while complex photochemical reactions take place, resulting in the production of secondary pollutants (e.g., smog). Local air quality problems are closely linked with these meteorological conditions.

Topographic features also affect local air circulation and, in the case of mountain ranges, encourage the build-up of pollutants by restricting air movement.

Over and above the atmospheric and topographic conditions which affect air quality, auto use is the single most determining factor of air quality in the South Coast. In addition to the increased reliance upon the automobile for transportation, Santa Barbara has recently experienced widespread proliferation of drive-though facilities which cater to convenience-oriented auto use. Autos idling in such facilities cause a substantial build-up of carbon monoxide, which can create health hazards. Convenience-oriented auto use results in low auto occupancy rates, single purpose auto trips, and foregone opportunities for public transit use, all of which add auto-related pollutants to the air. With approximately 70-95% of pollutant emissions having the automobile as their source, the prevention of further air quality degeneration must be based on strategies to reduce overall automobile use and vehicle miles traveled.

JURISDICTION AND STANDARDS

Air quality control involves several levels of government. The Clean Air Act (1970) is the major Federal legislation addressing air quality. The Act deals with both vehicular and stationary emission sources. Pursuant to this Act, the Environmental Protection Agency has the vested authority to set air quality standards and to oversee State implementation of those standards. California's Air Resources Board is responsible for establishing implementation plans for the attainment and maintenance of Federal State ambient air quality standards. The final authority for the actual implementation plans is vested with the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District which enforces Federal and State rules and regulations.

A recent amendment to the Clean Air Act includes provisions for identifying and dealing with areas which do not meet and/or are not expected to meet the national air quality standards. Santa Barbara is one of those areas of non-compliance and therefore must develop an Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) to demonstrate how the area intends to attain national standards in the future. The plan delineates the degree and manner in which the emission rates must be "rolled back" or reduced in order to meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards by 1982.

National standards have been established to indicate concentration levels at which pollutants will have a harmful effect upon humans. These standards are displayed in Table 1. An area is not in compliance with the standards if it experiences pollutant concentrations in excess of the amount or frequency designated in Table 1. Although exceedance of such standards has long-term significance for the entire population, it can have particularly adverse health effects on those segments of the population designated as "sensitive receptors." Sensitive receptors are those who are most vulnerable to air pollution, including persons with respiratory and heart ailments, the very young (under five years), and the elderly (over 65 years) (Office of Environmental Quality, 1977). Factors such as age, location of residence, income, mobility, and sex are also closely linked to pollutant sensitivity. (See Air Quality map for generalized locations of sensitive receptors.)

TABLE 1

	Carbon		Particulate	
	Monoxide	Oxidants	Matter	
FEDERAL STANDARDS:				
Primary	8 hr9 ppm	1 hr12 ppm	Annual average 75 ug/m ³ 24 hr. 260 ug/m ³	
Secondary	Same	Same	60 ug/m 150 ug/m	
Pollutant	Mobile source	Secondary	Mineral extraction and	
Source South	emissions	photochemical product from reactions of	production, demolition, burning of fossil fuels, oil	
Coast:	Incineration	hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides	with high sulfur content	
	Oil/gas produc-			
	tion operations			
	Power generation			
T 11	plant operations		172.2 / 3	
Locally Recorded	Santa Barbara:	South Coast:	172.3 ug/m ³	
Pollutant	2/74 – 32 ppm	9/7525 ppm		
nigii:	peak	max. hr. avg.		
	29 ppm max.	6/7632 ppm		
	hr. average	instantaneous		
		peak		
Pollutant	Harmful effects	From mild eye	Reduces visibility and	
Effects	from headaches,	irritation to possible	if particles are small	
	fatigue, and slowed	impairment of lung	enough can be carried	
	reactions, to death.	function. Aggravation	to lungs. Many of the	
	Can cause	of respiratory and	suspended particulates	
	interference with	cardiac diseases,	are toxic and are	
	oxygen transport	pulmonary	deposited on the food	
	in blood.	dysfunction. Damage	stuffs of animals and	
		to vegetation	humans.	
		(ornamental plants to		
		commercial food		
		crops).		
Source:	Adapted from Metho	dology Development for C	Coordinated Air	
	Quality/Land Use Pl	anning, Office of Environ	mental Quality, County of	
	Santa Barbara, Revis	sed November 1977, p. 22.		

STANDARDS, SOURCES, LOCAL EXCEEDANCE, EFFECTS

POLLUTANTS AND LOCAL AIR QUALITY

While there are natural sources of pollutant emissions in the environment, the human population contributes quite significantly to localized concentrations of certain pollutants. Transportation, the generation of energy, manufacturing of goods, household heating, and waste disposal all contribute to the emission of contaminants into the air. Pollutants are generally classified into two distinct categories: primary and secondary pollutants. Primary pollutants are defined as those pollutants that are emitted directly from a source. This class of pollutants includes carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, sulfur dioxide, hydrocarbons, and particulates. Secondary pollutants are those pollutants formed by chemical and photochemical reactions in the atmosphere such as photochemical oxidants. Ozone is the predominant component of the photochemical oxidant complex.

<u>Oxidants</u> are produced by complex reactions involving nitrogen oxides (NO_x) , reactive hydrocarbons, and oxygen in the presence of sunlight. Locally, the primary source for both nitrogen oxides and reactive hydrocarbons is the motor vehicle. In 1975, it was estimated that all such mobile sources accounted for over 92% of NO_x and over 76% of hydrocarbons (Office of Environmental Quality, 1977). By 1985, it is anticipated that off-shore oil production and transport in the South Coast area will have increased to the extent that the major proportion of reactive hydrocarbons will be emitted from various phases of these oil operations (local AQMP).

Oxidants can reduce pulmonary functions in healthy individuals, irritate the eyes, decrease lung elasticity, and aggravate respiratory ailments (e.g., emphysema, asthma). The "smog" which is visible in the Santa Barbara area is photochemical oxidants (NO_x produces the familiar brownish color).

The monitoring data of the Air Pollution Control District confirms that the standard for oxidants is exceeded on a regular basis in the South Coast between the months of May through September. In 1975 and 1976, serious concentrations of oxidants resulted in first stage health alerts. Future projections indicate that the standard for oxidants (measured as ozone) will not be met in 1982 unless drastic reductions are achieved in emissions of reactive hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides.

<u>Carbon monoxide</u>, 90% of which is emitted from motor vehicles, is the greatest single pollutant by volume in the atmosphere (Office of Environmental Quality, 1977). This pollutant can be lethal in high concentrations. In lesser concentrations it can be "especially dangerous for people with heart disease, anemia, emphysema, asthma, and other respiratory ailments," (Terry, 1975). Exposure to concentrated doses of carbon monoxide can produce headaches and distortion of both time and vision in healthy persons.

Concentrations of this pollutant are found in close proximity to busy streets, congested intersections, drive-through facilities, and other areas where vehicles idle for prolonged periods. The Air Quality map indicates such "hot spots" of carbon monoxide concentrations. The proximity of sensitive receptors to these "hot spots" is indicative of potentially harmful health effects for that population. The eight-hour standard for carbon monoxide is exceeded at the downtown monitoring station for many days each year. The standard is probably exceeded at a variety of other locations, but in the absence of monitoring data, this has not been confirmed.

<u>Particulates</u> range in size from microscopic to large enough to be seen with the naked eye. Fires, agricultural processes, power plants, and transportation are the major sources for particulates. Motor vehicles accounted for over 71% of the local particulate inventory in 1975 (Office of Environmental Quality, 1977). Particulates floating in the air are carried directly into the lungs where they can cause irritation of the pulmonary system and/or aggravation of respiratory ailments. Some types of particulate matter (i.e., photochemical aerosols) reduce visibility and consequently have an adverse impact on Santa Barbara's visual quality. The disposition of particulates on buildings, clothing, etc., results in added burdens to cleaning and maintenance requirements and the associated costs.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AIR QUALITY AND VEHICLE USE

Motor vehicles are the source of approximately 70% to 95% of the total amount of each of the major pollutants emitted locally. Despite the fact that substantial reductions in auto emission have been brought about by federally mandated improvements in emission controls, significant violations of air quality standards still occur and are predicted to occur in the future. "...By 1985 all pollutant reductions achieved as a result of technological advances would be offset by increases in vehicle miles traveled" (Office of Environmental Quality, 1977). In the complex relationship of vehicle use and air pollution, the City of Santa Barbara only has effective jurisdiction over land use practices. Land use controls can affect the nature and distribution of commercial and residential uses which generate auto trips and can affect the supply and utilization of parking facilities.

Land use controls must internalize air quality considerations which are aimed at minimizing the need for auto use, minimizing auto trip length, and maximizing the use of alternative forms of transportation. Because the auto is the focus of the existing transportation system, the present land use pattern is oriented toward scattered residential and commercial development. This type of spatial distribution serves to make public transit ineffective and bicycle and pedestrian travel inadequate, leaving the auto as the only means of providing convenient transport for necessary work, shopping, and personal trips.

The City can utilize its control over the nature, location, and intensity of land uses in a manner which applies strong disincentives to developments which would encourage single occupant and/or single purpose auto trips. Similarly, incentives can be employed to promote developments which concentrate and/or mix uses in a manner which would result in decreased miles traveled and a reduction in auto dependency. Public parking, on-street parking, and off-street parking requirements can also be manipulated to discourage auto use (particularly by commuters) and foster the use of public transit. Car pooling and intracity "people movers" have been discussed in recent years as methods for decreasing traffic congestion in the downtown area. These additions are not likely to be successful unless accompanied by measures which make the status quo (i.e., the single-occupant auto trip) significantly less convenient. While applying disincentives to automobile use, it is essential that alternative forms of transportation (e.g., bus, bicycle) be made more convenient. As it becomes more expensive and inconvenient to use automobiles, alternate means of transportation must be encouraged.

Improving Air Quality

The costs of air pollution include loss of tourist income, increased and additional cleaning costs, increased costs for medical treatment, loss of income due to sickness and decreased function, and damage to ornamental and food crops. Another cost directly associated with air pollution could be federal sanctions which are scheduled to be applied if the Santa Barbara area does not demonstrate, through its Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP), how local air quality is to achieve standards. Sanctions could include the withholding of federal highway construction funds and federal grants for sewage treatment and other public facilities.

Plans for improved air quality must recognize that pollutants do not respect political boundaries, and, as such, air quality within the City will be determined by the success of pollution controls imposed throughout the entire region. The Air Quality Attainment Plan currently being developed by Santa Barbara County will demonstrate how this area proposes to attain air quality standards in the future.

Because the South Coast air environment has a limited capacity to dilute pollutants, strategies aimed at limiting emissions must be geared to ultimate thresholds established for problem pollutants. The Air Quality Attainment Plan should address the air resource "holding capacity" or "budget." This

complicated technical problem involves defining an area's threshold for pollutants in order to determine allocation of the remaining capacity. In this regard, local agency cooperation with these efforts is needed to ensure optimum land-use/air quality planning. In the interim, until the region's "holding capacity" has been defined, major development proposals should be thoroughly evaluated for adverse air quality effects.

The land use policies and implementation framework included in the air quality portion of the Goals, Policies, and Implementation Strategies section is intended to ensure community cooperation in regional efforts to improve air quality. The strategies included will not be easily accomplished as they will require change, cause some inconvenience, and have associated costs.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Introduction

The primary and overriding issue affecting biological resources is the conflict which has developed between urban land use and the preservation of a productive Citywide ecosystem. Urban uses exist in the City of Santa Barbara at least in part because the area is pleasant and in many ways a unique place to live. However, a part of the attractiveness of the region is the degree to which the ecosystem has been maintained in the past.

Provision for both urban use and the preservation of biological resources is dependent on the determination of land use suitability. Conflicts arise between land use capability, which only considers the physical structure of the environment, and land use suitability, which considers the biotic characteristics as well as the physical structure of the environment. Land use suitability must also reflect the value and sensitivities of the general public as expressed through City goals and policies.

Two major concerns have developed in the City because of the conflict between urban use and ecosystem preservation: urban encroachment into ecologically sensitive resources and current degradation of resources. Urban encroachment particularly affects City hillsides, streams, and marine resources.

Current degradation of resources is exemplified by the gradual deterioration of City streams, the Andree Clark Bird Refuge, and the Goleta Slough. As these and other important habitats in the City are lost, the general environmental quality of the City is reduced, thus making Santa Barbara a less attractive place to live and visit.

Native Terrestrial Resources

BIOTIC COMMUNITIES

An ecosystem is composed of biotic communities and the physical and chemical environment with which the communities are interrelated. A biotic community consists of all the populations of living organisms in a particular area. These populations can be divided into three classes: producers (plants), which capture and store energy and materials from the environment; users (animals), which redistribute energy and materials; and decomposers (bacteria), which break down complex organic molecules and return nutrients to the environment.

All living organisms have four basic needs for survival: food, water, shelter and space. The term "habitat" is generally used to define those areas of the environment that supply these basic needs. Because the physical environment provides these needs in different amounts and in different ways, a large variety of habitats is available. Each habitat or group of habitats has a distinctive biotic community associated with it. For convenience, a habitat or its associated community is generally described in terms of a dominant feature, such as a vegetation or soil type.

Terrestrial biotic communities in the City of Santa Barbara can be distinguished by the vegetation type found within them (see Biotic Communities map). The following is a synopsis of the major characteristics of these communities. (More specific information will be found in the Master Environmental Assessment for the City of Santa Barbara.)

<u>Coastal Strand / Beach</u> - Vegetation in this community consists of low-growing (two feet) perennial shrubs and herbs found on the loose sand above the high-tide line at the beach. The loose sand, sea salt, fog, and strong winds make this a particularly harsh habitat, and few species are adapted to survive and flourish here. The strand community has very few resident reptiles or mammals and no year-round resident bird species. Invertebrates are also relatively sparse, with only a few forms abundant at any time. Of these, most are inclined to drastic population changes due to the rapidly changing environment. Recreational use of the beach areas has created further disturbances and limited vegetation growth to small areas along Palm Park and at the toe of the coastal bluffs.

<u>Coastal Bluff</u> - This community is limited to the steep bluffs below Shoreline Drive. Sparsely distributed perennial shrubs and hardy annuals vegetate the slopes. Many of the plants are reduced to a mat form by prevailing winds and are often succulent species. Wildlife is limited to a few birds and arthropods.

<u>California Annual Grassland</u> - Annual grasses and weedy herbs introduced by Europeans have become naturalized in habitats formerly occupied by native perennial grasses. The grassland community is found on the gently rolling hillsides of the City, particularly in areas disturbed by people. Wildlife found here includes primarily grazers and seed-eaters, many of which are ground-burrowers. Decomposers are an important aspect of this community, as their activity maintains the fertility of the soil.

<u>Coastal Perennial Grassland</u> - Native bunchgrass can be found in two areas of the City, on a hillside in Parma Park and at the northeast end of Anapamu Street. These two sites are not considered pristine stands of *Stipa* species because the bunchgrass exists as scattered clumps in a largely annual grassland. While many wildlife species are able to exist in either type of grassland, the native grasses are the only food plants for several insect species.

<u>Coastal Sage Scrub</u> - Vegetation of this community is comprised primarily of low (one to four feet), drought-deciduous, aromatic, semi-woody shrubs and subshrubs, with some larger evergreens and annual or perennial grasses. This community is often referred to as "soft chaparral" and is limited to the lower, dry slopes of undeveloped hillsides in the City. A surprising number and variety of

animals are found in this community, most of which are permanent residents. This is due to the diversity of forage plants and availability of cover.

<u>Chaparral</u> - The organisms which compose this community are illustrative of the way in which the physical environment and the biotic community are interrelated. The community is found on hot, dry slopes, ridges and mesas within the City, and generally on thin, rocky soils. The vegetation consists of many varieties of shrubs, most showing similar adaptations to summer drought, such as stiff, thick, heavily cutinized and generally evergreen leaves. Several of the shrubs are also capable of condensing fog, thereby creating more moist conditions for growth. Organisms within the community are generally adapted to periodic wildfire. Good examples of this community are found in the northeastern sector of the City.

The diversity of shrubs is reflected by the many invertebrate species found in the community. Many vertebrate species nest in the almost impenetrable stands of shrubs. Decomposer species are somewhat lacking in chaparral communities because the drought adaptations also inhibit organic breakdown and soil conditions are generally unfavorable. Periodic fires aid in the decomposition of dead organic matter in this community.

<u>Southern Oak Woodland</u> - Coast Live Oak is the predominant tree type of this community in the City. The oak trees control the micro-environment around them as their extensive shade produces significantly lower summer temperatures and their leaf litter creates acidic soil conditions. The oaks provide shelter, food, and space for many animals. Pristine stands can be found along Las Canoas Road and west of Calle de Los Amigos.

<u>Riparian Woodland and Creeks</u> - Water is the major limiting factor to the abundance and diversity of terrestrial organisms, and, within the City, the creeks are the major natural supply of readily available water. Because of this, riparian areas are very important as they provide water to wildlife from several communities. Riparian woodlands provide a balanced combination of the four basic needs in a terrestrial habitat, but these areas have been altered greatly by urban development within the City. Extensive riparian woodlands and natural creek areas are now limited to the upper portions of Mission and Sycamore Creeks and along most of Arroyo Burro.

<u>Freshwater Marsh</u> - Vegetation in this community is composed of floating, emergent, and submerged herbaceous perennials with little or no woody tissue. Most of the wildlife associated with this community are intimately dependent on water, with many species having aquatic larval forms. The only extensive freshwater marsh in the City is contained in the upper end of Goleta Slough, though elements of this community are found in reservoirs, creeks, and ditches throughout the City.

<u>Coastal Saltmarsh</u> - This community is distinguished by salt-loving herbaceous plant species lying in the intertidal zone of Goleta Slough and, to a small extent, at the mouth of Mission Creek. The saltmarsh community is further considered in Marine and Estuarian Resources.

Relationship to Ecosystem Preservation

Because the biotic community is closely interrelated with the physical environment, it reflects changes within the ecosystem that may not be measured in other ways. Many organisms are sensitive to minor changes in their environment, and these species can be used to index the environmental quality of an ecosystem. Often these "index" species are rare because they depend on precise environmental characteristics. When people alter environmental characteristics on a massive scale, these species become increasingly scarce and may become extinct.

RARE, ENDANGERED OR THREATENED WILDLIFE

The continual expansion of human development has created conflicts between activities and the survival of wildlife. Though extinction is a natural result of a changing environment and continued evolution, the rate at which species are disappearing has increased dramatically in the last few centuries. It has been estimated that the current extinction rate among most groups of mammals is about a thousand times greater than the "high" rate that occurred at the end of the last glaciation, when the geologic record suggests that there were massive extinctions of large birds and mammals (Ehrenfeld, 1972). The rate may be even higher for other animals, particularly invertebrates. Federal and State governments have recognized this problem and enacted legislation protecting wildlife determined to be endangered, rare, or threatened. Under the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, an animal may be determined to be endangered or threatened (rare) because of any of the following factors:

- The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range;
- Over-utilization for commercial, sporting, scientific, or educational purposes;
- Disease or predation;
- The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; or
- Other natural or man-made factors affecting its continued existence.

Species are considered endangered if they are liable to become extinct in most of or throughout their range. Species are considered threatened if they are likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future. The California Endangered Species Act of 1970 has made similar findings, but uses the word "rare" or "threatened." The following rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife species may be found in the City of Santa Barbara (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1976, 1977, 1978; CA Department of Fish and Game, January, 1976. All of these species are found on both lists except the last two.)

<u>American Peregrine Falcon</u> (*Falco peregrinus anatum*) - this falcon is endangered due primarily to food chain contamination by persistent pesticides and other pollutants, and to illegal taking by falconers. Human disturbance and occasional shooting are also factors contributing to its decline. The bird has been sighted at Goleta Slough (City of Santa Barbara, February, 1978).

<u>Southern Bald Eagle</u> (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus leucocephalus*) - this endangered eagle occurs statewide, particularly along the coast near wetlands, reservoirs, and large lakes. It is endangered due to irresponsible shooting, removal of nest trees, human encroachment into breeding and feeding habitat, power line electrocution, environmental pollution, and persistent pesticides. Migrants occasionally occur around Goleta Slough and the Andree Clark Bird Refuge (Santa Barbara County Planning Department, 1978).

<u>California Brown Pelican</u> (*Pelicanus occidentalis californicus*) - this large shorebird became endangered due to reproductive failure cause by environmental pollution and persistent pesticides. Their population has been increasing in recent years, and nesting sites have been established on Santa Cruz Island. Several birds frequently roost in the harbor area and other coastal wetlands, but feed primarily offshore (Western Marine Laboratory, 1974).

<u>California Least Tern</u> (*Sterna albifrons browni*) - this small bird formerly nested in large numbers along sandy beaches throughout Southern California. Destruction of its nesting sites and feeding areas, along with human disturbance, has endangered it. While it has not nested recently in the Santa Barbara Region (Atwood, 1977), it is capable of re-establishing former nesting sites if disturbances are limited and an adequate supply of small fish (generally in estuaries) is nearby.

<u>Light-footed Clapper Rail</u> (*Rallus longirostris levipes*) - development of coastal wetlands throughout Southern California has limited this endangered species to a few remnant saltmarshes. Goleta Slough is one of only ten areas identified in the state as appropriate habitat (California Fish and Game, 1976); the population at the Slough has been small and the 1977 census failed to find any clapper rails there (Wilbur, 1978). The Slough currently lacks extensive stands of cordgrass (*Spartina foliosa*), which are the primary habitat of the Light-footed Clapper Rail.

<u>Belding's Savannah Sparrow</u> (*Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi*) - this endangered sparrow (State list only) is a year-round resident of coastal saltmarshes in Southern California and is restricted almost entirely to pickleweed (*Salicornia sp.*) marshes. Continued development of these wetlands has eliminated essential habitat of Belding's Savannah Sparrow. While Goleta Slough was estimated to contain 28 nesting pairs in 1977, this is considered very small in proportion to the Slough's size and is a substantial reduction from 50 pairs in 1973 (Massey, B.W., 1977).

<u>Black Rail</u> (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*) - this small bird is listed as rare by California Fish and Game because its habitat, coastal and inland wetlands, has been largely destroyed. Because it is highly secretive and occurs only in limited numbers, it is rarely seen. The actual distribution and abundance of this species is as yet undetermined (City of Santa Barbara, February, 1978).

RARE AND ENDANGERED PLANT SPECIES

The Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 includes authority for establishing rare and endangered plant species, and the Smithsonian Institute (1974) was asked to provide a list of candidate species. To date, of the plant species which have been listed as endangered on the Federal list, only one occurs in the City. At the State level, the Fish and Game Commission designated 29 native plants as endangered or rare on October 6, 1978, in accordance with the provisions of the Native Plant Protection Act. None of these plants occur in the City. A private group, the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), has published a rare and endangered species list which may be used to identify sensitive plants in the City. Table 2 lists those plants which do or may occur in the City, along with the Society's endangerment code and local habitat.

TABLE 2

SENSITIVE PLANTS WHICH MAY OCCUR IN THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

Scientific Name	Common Name	CNPS REVD	Smithsonian Code**	Habitat in City
		Codes*		
Cordylanthus mariti-	Saltmarsh bird's	3-2-2-2	E+	Found in Coastal Saltmarsh
<u>mus spp. Maritimus</u>	beak			at Goleta Slough
Dicentra ochroleuca	Yellow dicentra	1-2-1-3	Е	Dry, disturbed places in
				Chaparral below 3000'; no
				known location in City
Pholisma arenarium	Pholisma	2-2-2-2-	Ν	Coastal Strand; no known
				location in City
Sanicula hoffmannii	Hoffman's sanicle	2-2-1-3	Ν	Coastal Sage Scrub,; no
				known location in City
Lasthenia conjugens	Contra Costa Bueria	3-2-2-3	Т	Possibly found in
				ephemeral ponds in Goleta
				Slough – probably
				introduced from northern
				California; has not been
				recorded in Santa Barbara
				region since 1950

Nomenclature and habitat according to Munz, P.A. 1974; "A Flora of Southern California", and Smith, C., 1976; "A Flora of the Santa Barbara Region."

* Status, as defined by the California Native Plant Society (Powell, 1974):

First Number: Rarity

- 1 Rare, of limited distribution, but distributed widely enough that <u>potential</u> for extinction or extirpation is apparently low at present.
- 2 Occurrence confined to several populations or one extended population.
- 3 Occurs in such small numbers that it is seldom reported; or occurs in one or very few highly restricted populations.

P.E - Possibly extinct or extirpated.

- Second Number: Endangerment
- 1 Not endangered
- 2 Endangered in part
- 3 Totally endangered

Third Number: Vigor

- 1 Stable or increasing
- 2 Declining
- 3 Approaching extinction or extirpation

Fourth Number: General Distribution

- 1 Not rare outside California
- 2 Rare outside California
- 3 Endemic to California

** Status, as defined by the Smithsonian Institute

(1974):

- E Endangered; those species of plants in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their national ranges.
- + Recognized as endangered by the Federal government, 28 September 1978.
- T Threatened; those species of plants likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of their national ranges.
- N Not included in Smithsonian list.

Biotic Community Sensitivity

The loss of rare species from a community indicates possibly detrimental, environmental changes are affecting the entire ecosystem. The extent to which a biotic community can withstand these changes is dependent on the type of environmental stresses which naturally occur in the habitat and the ability of the organisms to change their environment. Communities which cannot adapt to new environmental stresses can be considered relatively sensitive to development activity. These communities often require an extensive amount of time to recover through the process of ecological succession. This aspect of the City of Santa Barbara's terrestrial communities is illustrated in Table 3.

TABLE 3

SENSITIVITY AND RECOVERY TIME OF TERRESTRIAL COMMUNITIES IN THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

Biotic Community	Sensitivity	Recovery Time*
Coastal Bluff	Very High	Indeterminate
Coastal Strand/Beach	Very High	Indeterminate
California Annual Grassland	Low	1-2 years
Coastal Perennial Grassland	Very High	Indeterminate
Coastal Sage Scrub	Medium	5-10 years
Chaparral	Medium	8-12 years
Southern Oak Woodland	High	100 years
Riparian Woodland/Creeks	Medium	20-30 years
Freshwater Marsh	High	5-10 years
Saltwater Marsh	High	5-10 years

* The time necessary for the community to recover if all vegetation is removed, but no other environmental changes are made.

Urban growth has depleted several biotic communities within the City's boundaries. The following major resource areas are considered particularly sensitive to continued growth:

<u>Goleta Slough</u> - Landfilling for the construction of Santa Barbara Airport has limited the wetland habitats available for saltmarsh and freshwater marsh communities. Sedimentation from upland sources is a critical problem as small changes in elevation affect tidal flushing within the saltmarsh. Littoral drift of sediments continually closes the mouth of the Slough, limiting tidal flushing and causing oxygen depletion of Slough waters.

<u>Coastal Perennial Grassland</u> - native grasslands were largely replaced by exotic annual grasslands during the last 400 years, primarily as a result of grazing pressure. In the recent past, grassland habitat was converted to urban areas because of the ease of developing the coastal plains. Only a few stands of bunchgrass (*Stipa spp.*) remain in the City, interspersed with annual grassland; however, none are in pristine condition.

<u>Riparian Woodland/Creeks</u> - urban development has encroached on City creeks, substantially altering the creek environment. This has caused increased bank erosion coupled with downstream siltation, abundant growth of noxious algae, and loss of many organisms formerly associated with the creeks, such as steelhead trout. Continued streamside development will further damage this resource.

While the preceding resource areas contain the most sensitive communities in the City, other areas also contain valuable terrestrial habitats which should be considered in the development of land use policies. These include undisturbed stands of Southern Oak Woodland and Coastal Sage Scrub which contain elements unique to the City of Santa Barbara. An example would be the stand of oaks located on the north slope of the Wilcox property.

Estuarine and Marine Resources

The immediate coastal waters and tidelands have long been recognized as critical habitats of especially high biological productivity. This productivity is due, in part, to the relatively stable environment of the ocean, the influx of nutrients from land, and tidal activity which transports wastes and nutrients within this system. The California Coastal Act of 1976 acknowledges the value of these lands, and requires local jurisdictions to adopt a Local Coastal Program establishing goals and policies regarding use of the Coastal Zone. The City has developed draft portions of its program, including reports on Water and Marine Resources: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat; and Diking, Dredging, Filling and Shoreline Structures (City of Santa Barbara, February, July, August, 1978). Because the Local Coastal Program takes precedence over the Conservation Element in the Coastal Zone, this portion of the Element should be reviewed to incorporate the City's program when it is adopted.

INTERTIDAL AND NEARSHORE HABITATS

Intertidal communities within the City of Santa Barbara include the rocky shores of the western mesas and the open coast beaches. Rocky shore organisms as shown on Figure 1 are fairly abundant in three locations. These organisms are extremely hardy because they must withstand wave action, and current recreational use of the area has not significantly affected them (City of Santa Barbara, July, 1978). Most invertebrates associated with the open shore of the sandspit and public beaches are adapted to burrowing, which decreases wave shock. This habitat is much harsher than the corresponding rocky shore habitat, and few organisms can adapt to it.

Both the rocky shore and beach communities support significant numbers of shorebirds that forage in these habitats.

Kelp bed and reef habitats are particularly important because of their high productivity (Figure 1). Kelp beds provide forage and shelter for many fish and invertebrate species. Some regulated kelp harvesting has been allowed in the area, but it has not adversely affected this important resource. Reefs provide shelter and breeding areas for local fish populations. Currently, the Santa Barbara sewage outfall discharges wastes at the west end of the One-Mile Reef (Figure 1), but no harmful effects from the waste discharge have been found in recent tests (City of Santa Barbara, July, 1978).

Future growth within the City may have substantial effects on these habitats. Development above the cliffs can increase rates of cliff retreat which is adverse for local biotic populations. Coastal plain development affects intertidal and near-shore habitats by increasing run-off with higher contaminant loads, altering sedimentation patterns, and increasing sewage waste disposal into coastal waters.

FISHERIES

The reefs and kelp beds off the coast provide important fishery areas, with rockfish, English sole, petrale sole, and other flatfish being the most common commercial landings (Smith, E.J., 1976). The rocky intertidal and subtidal areas below the mesas provide habitat for spiny lobster and abalone. Both of these species are currently declining for many reasons, particularly overfishing and environmental disruptions (City of Santa Barbara, July, 1978).



Figure 1. Intertidal and nearshore habitat.

GOLETA SLOUGH

Estuaries are partially enclosed coastal waters with a free connection to the sea. Fresh water flows into these areas, carrying nutrients, while the tidal action transports nutrients and wastes in the system. Because food, shelter, and water are relatively abundant, estuaries are highly productive habitats and many fish species and free-swimming invertebrates use the estuary as nursery grounds. Goleta Slough is the only significant estuarine habitat in the City, as urban encroachment and landfills have reduced the El Estero to a few remnant saltmarsh patches along the Central Drainage Channel.

Two important vegetative communities are present at Goleta Slough: coastal saltmarsh and freshwater marsh. Coastal saltmarsh vegetation is generally composed of extensive stands of a limited number of species because of the environmental stresses associated with abrupt changes in salinity, temperature, ion concentration, and water level. However, these species grow rapidly because of the ample water supply, nutrient mixing by tidal action and reduction of competition with other species. Much of the marsh vegetation dies back during the winter and is decomposed by various bacteria and fungi and eaten by small invertebrates. This decomposing organic matter is washed into the tidal channels and the ocean by tidal action, and provides the primary food source for coastal animals in the nearshore area.

The freshwater marsh also benefits from an ample water supply, and is a highly productive habitat. Many animal species are found in this habitat, which is becoming increasingly rare in the southern coastal region.

An inventory of the Slough's biotic resources (City of Santa Barbara, February, 1978) shows that the area supports a large and highly diverse flora and fauna. The City's Local Coastal Program emphasizes the importance of the Slough, and recommends a management plan for this resource.

Agricultural Resources

Agriculture has historically been important to the economy of the cities and south coast of Santa Barbara County. As the City has urbanized, however, commercial agricultural uses have gradually been replaced by other uses of the land. Today, the primary pursuits are related to avocado orchards, specialty crops, nursery stock and ornamental plants.

The location of prime soils (Class I and II soils as defined by the Soil Conservation Service) is scattered throughout the City, with substantial prime acreage in the La Cumbre Road vicinity. However, a majority of the City's prime soils have already been converted for urban uses. There is little, if any, prime land still in large, undivided tracts.

Continued commercial agriculture on the remaining pieces of prime land is deterred by some basic conflicts with adjacent land uses. For the farmer/rancher, urban neighbors create problems of trespass, vandalism, and pilferage. For residents adjacent to farmland within the City, noise, dust, odors, operation of heavy machinery at sleeping hours, and chemical spraying constitute nuisances which may interfere with daily living and could present health hazards. For these reasons, and the problems of substantial parcelization, high land costs, high property taxes, and no option for Land Conservation Act contracts (Williamson Act of 1965), commercial agriculture within the City of Santa Barbara will, for the most part, continue in a transition to small home orchards and community gardens or to urban uses.

INVENTORY OF CROP PRODUCTION

In 1990, there were 133 parcels in the single-family zones of the City which are more than three acres in size (74 parcels, three to five acres in size; 34 parcels, five to ten acres; 25 parcels, over ten acres), excluding parcels containing present or future parks or institutional uses (i.e., schools, reservoirs, seminaries). This

accounts for a total of a little over 1,000 acres or about five percent of the City. Many of these parcels are developed with single-family residences and related accessory uses, including agricultural uses. Some parcels, particularly along the northern edge of the City, are developed exclusively with agriculture. Other parcels remain vacant and have potential for residential or agricultural uses or both.

<u>Ornamental and Nursery Stock</u> - There are two remaining growing grounds in the City for ornamental plants and nursery stock. They are located on Yankee Farm Road off Cliff Drive and on Calle Canon on the northern edge of the Mesa.

Many of the large growing areas for ornamental plants and nursery stock are found just outside the City limits, in Goleta and in Carpinteria. Substantial production from orchards, potted plants and other greenhouse-grown plant materials contribute to the economic base of the South Coast in general.

<u>Avocado Orchards</u> - The foothill areas above the coastal plain are prime areas for avocado production. Hass, Fuerte, Bacon, Zutano and other avocado varieties are all suited to the mild climate of Santa Barbara. In addition, this high-cash crop can be grown on steeper slopes and less fertile soils than Class I or Class II prime soils. Although handicapped by heavy clay soils and fungal root rot in some areas, avocado orchards are currently a crop which generates considerable interest locally.

In 1978, there were about 190 acres of avocados grown within the City limits (Rich, personal communication, 1978). From 1978 to 1994, the total number of acres appears to have changed very little, although the distribution has changed. Several parcels are 30-40 acres in size, but the typical orchard is only 1-5 acres. These orchards are scattered throughout the City. Some orchards are located on Braemar Drive, others on the western City boundary, with many also along the northern edge of the City in the foothills. The high cash value of avocados makes small family orchards economic to harvest and merchandise. The larger undeveloped parcels (½ acre to 5+ acres) in the foothill and Mesa portions of the City may see increased conversion to small, private avocado orchards. This would be encouraged by maintenance of the slope density ordinance or additional slope constraints on foothill development for residential uses. Where additional building sites for homes are improbable on these larger parcels, owners may attempt to offset property taxes and supplement income by removing natural vegetation and planting avocado orchards.

Clearing hillside brush for avocado orchards can be far more unsightly and environmentally damaging (siltation, drainage alteration and flooding aggravation) in the short-term than creating individual hillside homesites, one at a time. However, avocado orchards do result in buffer areas that slow wildfire progress by eliminating highly flammable ground cover and replacing dry natural vegetation with irrigated trees.

<u>Lemon and Orange Orchards</u> - There are no commercial citrus orchards still maintained in the City of Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara Lemon, Goleta Lemon Association, personal communication, 1978). The agricultural lands of the South Coast are highly suited to citrus production, but encroaching urban development and variable cash returns on citrus produce have eliminated the local commercial crop. Goleta and Carpinteria still have citrus crops harvested and shipped, but there is no longer any commercial contribution from the City. There are many family orchards, however, which are picked for home use.

<u>Contemporary Community Gardens</u> - There has been a major trend back to "urban gardens," similar to the victory gardens of World War II. Intense interest in development of backyard and community gardens is evident throughout the United States.²

² Results of a 1977 Gallup Poll on Home Gardening showed that six million households (currently without land to garden upon) would participate in community gardens, if available. Nationally, one-third of all community gardens in 1977 were city-sponsored.

Santa Barbara has had several community gardens in the recent past which have served as models for other communities (Chapala Street garden, El Mirasol garden, the Mesa garden and the Yanonali Street garden, all operated by the Community Environmental Council of Santa Barbara, and the Pilgrim Terrace garden operated by the residents of Pilgrim Terrace). In addition, there are numerous private fruit, vegetable and flower gardens which are found scattered throughout the City. Many of these provide a recreational outlet for people, as well as edible and saleable produce. The Rancheria garden, near City College, and El Mirasol garden, in the Lower Eastside, each offer about one-half acre of land for community gardening primarily for the residents in those areas. The Pilgrim Terrace garden provides land for gardening primarily by the residents of Pilgrim Terrace Homes.

FARMER'S MARKET

In 1980, the first certified Farmer's Market was established in Santa Barbara. It was held in several locations throughout Santa Barbara until it settled into its present location in 1985. This event occurs on Saturday mornings in the City Commuter Parking Lot at Cota and Santa Barbara Streets. It is operated by Santa Barbara Certified Farmer's Market, Inc. It has proven to be very successful in its sale of fruits, vegetables, flowers and similar products.

In 1988, the Old Town Merchants Association and the operators of the earlier Farmer's Market received permission to close the 400 block of State Street on Tuesday evenings in order to establish a second Farmer's Market. The purpose of the Old Town Market was to return lost business to the lower Downtown Area during the closure of State Street due to Crosstown Freeway construction. The location was later moved to the 500 block of State Street. The Old Town Market sells similar produce to the Saturday market. When the Crosstown Freeway construction was completed and the State Street Underpass opened in mid-1991, the continued existence of the Old Town Market was reassessed. The Planning Commission reviewed the Old Town Market in late 1993, determined that it was still an appropriate use on State Street and issued a Conditional Use Permit. It was also expanded to include both the 500 and 600 blocks of State Street. At the same time, a Conditional Use Permit was granted for the continuance of the Saturday Farmer's Market at the City Commuter Parking Lot. In 1994, the Planning Commission approved a third Farmer's Market location on Coast Village Road that operates on Friday mornings.

The majority of the sellers at the Farmer's Market are residents of Santa Barbara County with most of the rest from Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties. A few sellers also come from the Central Valley. The Farmer's Market provides an alternative shopping source to area residents and tourists, generally at prices that are lower than available at the local supermarket. At the same time, the Farmer's Market provides an outlet for growers who are able to sell at prices which are higher than wholesale and with reduced packing costs, which improves their profit. It also draws people to the Downtown at times when they might not otherwise come and creates a community gathering place (Mark Sheridan, Santa Barbara Certified Farmer's Market, Inc., personal communication, September 1990).

The Future of Agriculture in the City

As the City becomes more urban, the larger parcels are likely to be subdivided into smaller lots and developed with residential uses. However, on the northern edge of the City, in particular, the land is steep (slopes in excess of thirty percent) and, even after subdivision, parcels are likely to remain larger in size. These parcels will continue to be likely locations for agricultural uses, particularly avocado orchards.

In other areas of the City, smaller parcels will continue to be used to grow specialty food crops. Many of these crops will be grown organically or with minimal pesticides and sold locally, especially through the Farmer's Market.

Generally speaking, agriculture in the City is not important on a state or national level, although avocados are one of California's leading agricultural cash crops. However, agricultural production does contribute in several ways to the area. Agriculture provides a living to a small portion of the City's residents. The crops grown contribute to the variety of produce available to local consumers and provide competition to major growers. Mature orchards often contribute to the aesthetics of the community through variation in texture, color and the break up of suburban areas of the City. Agricultural areas serve as animal habitat and provide green corridors for animals to travel from one natural habitat area to another. More importantly, agriculture provides fire protection by removal of dense, flammable ground cover and replacement with irrigated vegetation with high moisture content which slows all but the most powerful wildfires. Dispersal of agriculture in the City fringe will help reduce the fire hazard for the entire City.

Because, first and foremost, the City is an urban area with emphasis on a high quality of life for its residents and visitors, the types of agriculture allowed should be limited. Commercial dairying and commercial animal and poultry husbandry should not be allowed due to the production of noxious odors and flies. Agricultural accessory uses such as canning would also be incompatible with adjacent residential uses. Pesticide and heavy equipment use should be restricted in order to minimize their effects on neighbors, as well. Neighborhood compatibility is very important in determining what types of agricultural operations are acceptable.

Another important aspect of the City is its interest in protection of the environment, both natural and manmade. Grading and irrigation for agricultural purposes should be closely reviewed to assure that water use is limited, environmentally sensitive habitats are protected, viewsheds are preserved and downstream flooding, siltation and erosion are prevented. Particular emphasis should be placed on preservation of oak groves, riparian and bunchgrass habitat and skyline trees. Issues such as noise, dust, odors, operation of heavy equipment and chemical spraying must also be addressed.

Other Urban Biotic Resources

SANTA BARBARA HARBOR

Four biotic communities are associated with the harbor: a quiet bay community, formerly found on the pilings and floats of the marinas and now located only on Stearns Wharf; a bottom community; an open water community; and a rocky intertidal community on the breakwater. The bay community is probably the most biologically productive of the harbor communities; however, most of these organisms are considered nuisances because they eventually destroy the pilings and floats and damage boat bottoms. The harbor communities are not as productive or stable as natural communities because of continual environmental stresses caused by poor water circulation, periodic dredging, and intense human activity (Western Marine Laboratories, 1974).

A critical problem within the harbor is the dumping of waste materials and the use of toxic compounds to prevent boat fouling which have contributed to the harbor's low water quality. Proposed harbor expansion should consider this potential impact.

While most of the organisms found within the harbor are common forms, the Brown Pelican and California Least Tern, both endangered species, occasionally forage for fish in the harbor (Western Marine Laboratories, 1974. See section on Rare, Endangered, and Threatened Wildlife.). The possible effects of harbor pollution on local individuals of these species is unknown.

URBAN RESOURCES

The urban biotic community generally lacks a major necessity for the survival of organisms, which is space. The primary constituent of the community is the human population, and other organisms within the community are dependent on the manipulation of energy by humans. Because of this, individuals of common wildlife species are often widely separated, and maintenance of breeding populations is difficult. Those species which are highly mobile, such as birds, insects, and annual plants with wind-borne seeds, are the most successful in an urban community. There are four important biotic resource areas of the urban community in the City.

Wilcox Property - This property contains a large, landscaped garden of native plant species.

<u>Andree Clark Bird Refuge</u> - This brackish pond was created especially for migratory waterfowl; however, the lack of management, misuse of the park, and gradual eutrophication has diminished its habitat value (City of Santa Barbara, August 1978).

<u>Horticulture Plantings</u> - Landscaping within the City has been influenced by several noted horticulturists and includes many unique and rare species. An inventory of Santa Barbara's trees has been published (Beittel, 1976; Muller, Broder & Beittel, 1974), with particularly important plantings listed, such as those in Franceschi Park, Alameda Plaza, Orpet Park, and around the County Courthouse. An area of special interest is the grounds of the old Verhelle Kentis nursery in the areas of Manitou and Chuma roads, where Kentia palms have established a breeding population.

<u>Golf Courses</u> - These areas function similarly to annual grassland communities, and many species found normally in grasslands also occur here.

Goals, policies, and implementation strategies for biological resources are discussed in the last chapter of this document.

DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL

Introduction

San Roque, Arroyo Burro, Mission, and Sycamore Canyon creeks are the four major drainages in the City of Santa Barbara. Of these, Mission and Sycamore creeks pose significant flood hazards where they pass through urbanized portions of the City. The Central Drainage Area in the lower east side of the City is a separate 1,600 acre watershed which lies between Mission and Sycamore creeks. There has been frequent flooding of the Central Drainage Area due to inadequate local drainage. This condition, however, has been substantially reduced with completion of the Eastside Storm Drain. Near the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport are the drainages of San Pedro, Las Vegas, Carneros, and Tecolotito creeks. The Airport is shown within the boundary of the 100-year standard project flood.

Santa Barbara's major flooding threat results from high-intensity rainfall which produces heavy runoff in a short period of time. Often, flood waters are laden with channel debris, especially after fire has denuded chaparral vegetation in the foothills, or where stream channels have not been recently swept clean of accumulated debris by creek runoff. Narrow, crooked stream channels with steep gradients such as are found on the South Coast are especially prone to rapid runoff.

Brush, trees, and other debris are often washed downstream and caught, obstructing the flood flow. As the flow increases, these barriers too are swept loose, creating a wall of water and debris which can be highly destructive downstream. Debris which collects around bridges and culverts can create a damming effect
which is capable of washing out structures if their structural capability is exceeded. When this debris is finally deposited downstream, flood waters may reach elevations higher than they would otherwise.

Damaging floods occurred in 1862, 1875, 1877, 1883, 1888, 1907, 1909, 1911, 1914, 1918, 1938, 1941, 1943, 1952, 1967, 1969 and 1978. Although flood control improvements have substantially alleviated the conditions leading to flooding in the downtown area (channelization and realignment of portions of Mission Creek, Eastside Storm Drain project, etc.,) there is still a major hazard to structures and to lives from flooding in the City (Corps of Engineers, 1975).

An evaluation of the 100-year standard project flood limits for San Roque, Arroyo Burro, Mission, and Sycamore creeks shows that there are approximately 2,725 permanent structures within, or partially within, these limits which could be subject to flooding (HUD, 1978). It is not possible to forecast dollar costs and loss of life from future flood episodes, but the number of structures currently exposed to hazard by their location within the 100-year flood limits is an indication of the large magnitude of this problem. Implementation of land use regulations which promote wise floodplain management can substantially alleviate future flooding in areas which will be urbanized in the future. Such management strategies include creek setbacks, regulation of creekside land uses by the Zoning Ordinance, participation in the Federal Flood Insurance program, construction of additional fixed-work flood prevention structures where necessary, and continued refinement of flooding and floodway fringe area maps.

Development of creekside areas is more difficult to manage. Areas bordering lower Mission Creek and Sycamore Creek have already been substantially urbanized, and it is also in these areas that the greatest areal extent of flooding is projected to occur. Obviously, structures cannot be removed solely because they lie in flood hazard zones. However, measures can be taken to require that replacement of such structures be prohibited if they are severely damaged or lost to floods. This approach can be modified to allow rebuilding if it can be demonstrated that the structure has been satisfactorily "flood proofed" and that no increase in flood height is induced by replacement of the structure, or that subsequent flood control fixed works have altered the limits of the 100-year standard project flood. Flood-proofing is defined as a combination of structural provisions, changes, or adjustments to properties and structures subject to flooding primarily for the reduction or elimination of flood damages to properties, water sanitary facilities structures, and contents of buildings in a flood hazard area (ASPO, 1972).

(Insert)

Source: Adopted HUD, 1978.

Major Creeks

MISSION CREEK

A 4.4-mile section of Mission Creek traverses the City from the northern City limits to the Pacific Ocean. It flows from Mission Canyon to Oak Park, then parallel to U.S. Highway 101 from Junipero to Gutierrez Streets, and finally to the ocean directly east of Stearns Wharf at the foot of State Street. Its drainage area is approximately 11.5 square miles.

Mission Creek poses the most substantial flooding problem to the City in terms of hazard to existing structures. About 2,380 of the 2,725 structures within the limits of the 100-year flood are subject to flooding from Mission Creek and its overflow.

SYCAMORE CREEK

Sycamore Creek runs a 2.7-mile course through the City between the Stanwood Drive/Sycamore Canyon Road intersection and the ocean at East Beach. Its drainage area is about 4.0 square miles. It constitutes a substantial watershed from which flooding frequently occurs. Sycamore Creek is heavily urbanized through the Eastside and East Beach neighborhoods. Areas along Milpas, Salsipuedes, and Cacique Streets experience minor flooding after even moderate rainfall.

Through the Eastside neighborhood, Sycamore Creek is reported to be polluted by animal wastes flushed down from upstream. High coliform bacteria counts during low water periods are evident, posing a potential health hazard (Planning Task Force, 1974).

ARROYO BURRO CREEK

This creek flows 4.5 miles through the City from the northern City limits to the ocean. It passes through the Hope Avenue neighborhood, under U.S. Highway 101 east of La Cumbre Road, along Las Positas Road, and to the ocean at Arroyo Burro Beach Park. Its drainage area is about 9.5 square miles.

Overbank flows result in sheet flow outside the main stream channels along both Arroyo Burro and Mission Creeks. These flows break out during the 100- and 500-year floods and can inundate large areas with depths up to three feet. Due to the wide areal extent of these breakouts, and because they occur in residential areas, they would be responsible for substantial flood damage (HUD, 1978).

SAN ROQUE CREEK

San Roque Creek joins Arroyo Burro Creek just southwest of the YMCA on Hitchcock Way, south of Upper State Street. It runs a 1.2-mile course within the City limits from Foothill Road to its confluence with Arroyo Burro Creek and has a drainage area of about 4.7 square miles.

Historic records show negligible evidence of serious flooding along San Roque Creek. This creek passes through older residential areas, and it appears that structural protection is adequate since there is little evidence of serious flood damage from previous floods in Santa Barbara.

AIRPORT AREA CREEKS

The reaches of Tecolotito, Las Vegas, San Pedro, and Carneros creeks within the City limits were studied for their relationship to airport flood hazard (HUD, 1978). These creeks drain from the steep, mountainous reaches of the Goleta watershed into the relatively flat coastal plain and then to the Goleta Slough. San Pedro and Las Vegas Creeks lie immediately east of the airport and are shown as a single drainage course. Tecolotito and Carneros creeks converge at Goleta Slough west of the airport.

Flood Hazards

Flood boundaries have been mapped for all major creeks in the City. The 100-year flood has been adopted by the Federal Insurance Administration as the base flood for purposes of floodplain management measures (HUD, 1978). Limits of the 100-year flood are shown in the Flood/Fire Hazard and Tsunami Run-up map for Mission, Sycamore, Arroyo Burro, and San Roque creeks. This map also shows the limits of the 100-year flood which affect the City airport area (Tecolotito and Carneros creeks, and San Pedro and Las Vegas creeks).

The 100-year flood boundary includes the *floodway* and the *floodway fringe*. The floodway is the channel of the stream, plus any adjacent flood plain areas, that must be kept free of encroachment in order that the 100-year flood be carried without substantial increase in flood heights. The area between the floodway and the boundary of the 100-year flood is termed the floodway fringe.

In cases where the boundary of the floodway and the 100-year flood coincide, only the floodway boundary is shown, and is the basis for floodplain management (HUD, 1978).

MISSION CREEK FLOOD HAZARD

The Flood Insurance Study shows a narrow area of floodway above Alamar Avenue and State Street. This widens rapidly to a nine-block corridor between San Pascual Street and Mountain Avenue just south of U.S. Highway 101 between Mission and Islay Streets. This is primarily from overflow of Mission Creek where it would break out of its banks at about Pueblo Street.

The floodway corridor narrows again as it crosses U.S. Highway 101 at Carrillo Street until it reaches the downtown area of the City. A second outbreak of the creek is shown from Ortega Street through the State Street signals on U.S. Highway 101, across the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks and to the ocean. A six-block area between Chapala and Santa Barbara streets is shown as inundated by the 100-year storm.

In addition, limited drainage of the lower central City area could create inundation of a six-block area bounded by Ortega, Santa Barbara, and Quarantina Streets to U.S. Highway 101, and below U.S. 101 to the Southern Pacific Railroad. Castillo Street above the harbor is also a significant inundation area. Leadbetter Beach west of the harbor is also within the fringe.

SYCAMORE CREEK FLOOD HAZARD

Sycamore Creek is confined to a narrow floodway with no flood fringe for a major portion of its run through the City. At about Cacique Street on the lower Eastside, a 100-year storm would flood a section several blocks wide near the Old Coast Highway, Salinas Street, portions of East Beach, and the Child's Estate.

ARROYO BURRO CREEK FLOOD HAZARD

The floodway and floodway fringe for Arroyo Burro Creek are mapped as a narrow corridor through the Hope neighborhood. An overflow of the creek is shown below U.S. Highway 101 and also below the confluence of San Roque Creek with Arroyo Burro Creek. This covers the area along Palermo Drive from north of Amalfi Way to Barcelona Drive. Las Positas Road north of Portesuello Avenue is also shown as flood fringe for about 1,000 feet.

SAN ROQUE CREEK FLOOD HAZARD

San Roque Creek does not pose flood hazards to so widespread an area as do Mission and Sycamore creeks. Above its point of confluence with Arroyo Burro Creek, its flood plain is confined to a narrow creek bed. About 750 feet above Foothill Road, at the large meander, San Roque Creek has its widest flood fringe. It is roughly 500 feet in width.

No major areas of outbreak from San Roque Creek are indicated for a 100-year flood (Impacts of Growth).

AIRPORT CREEKS FLOOD HAZARD

The four creeks which empty into the immediate vicinity of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport pose substantial flooding hazard to the Airport during a 100-year flood.

Floodway limits (within the creek bed and floodplain of the 100-year flood) include everything from just north of Hollister Avenue down to Moffett Lane at Ward Memorial Freeway for Las Vegas and San Pedro creeks. Hollister Avenue, Firestone Road, and Arnold Street are all within the floodway from Carneros and Tecolotito creeks, as is the Goleta Slough.

The flood fringe of the four creeks includes all portions of the Airport facility, including each runway, terminal buildings, parking lots, and access roads.

The last section of this Element contains goals, policies and implementation strategies which ensure that adequate drainage and flood control is provided for the City.

WATER RESOURCES

Introduction

A major issue in the determination of how best to approach the future use of City water resources is the significant difference between the City's need for new sources and that of the County. The City has in the past established a water system capable of supplying its needs for the present and the near future. Many County areas, on the other hand, have grown beyond the capability of various districts to supply adequate water, and future growth cannot be accommodated. Various alternatives have been proposed to solve this Countywide problem with the principal concern being the supply of the needed water at the least possible cost to the consumer. Unfortunately, the most efficient solution for the County may not be the most efficient solution for long-term City needs.

A somewhat related issue is the tendency of an assured future supply to induce growth. All water supplies must include some "excess" capacity to accommodate increased demand during prolonged dry periods. The smaller this margin of safety, the more likely it will also function as a constraint on growth. Therefore, some individuals or groups may well oppose development of an increased water supply, not because they are against adequate water, but because they oppose growth. This approach has been tried by some jurisdictions in California in the past, and with near-disastrous results during the recent drought.

Supply/Demand Relationships

EXISTING SUPPLIES

Existing sources of supply are shown diagrammatically on Figure 2. Gibraltar Reservoir via the Mission Tunnel has been the primary source (60%) for the City with deliveries averaging approximately 10,000 acre-feet in recent years (Don Owen, 1976). However, the usable storage in the reservoir has been declining at an average rate of 275 acre-feet per year due to siltation, and is now at a capacity of approximately 8,000 acre-feet (Figure 3).

(insert Figure 2)

Figure 2. Sources of the Santa Barbara City water supply (from City of Santa Barbara, 1977).

Cachuma Reservoir has also been a major source of water for the City, accounting for 23% from 1952 to 1975 (Don Owen, 1976). This source will increase in importance as the City's entitlement increases. The present contract value is 6,800 acre-feet per year, which is expected to increase to approximately 8,950 acre-feet per year (based on revised project yield) in 1990.

Jameson Lake has been an additional source of Santa Ynez River water with supply being via the Montecito County Water District (Figure 2). However, this source has averaged less than 3% of the total supply, and is expected to remain relatively small.

The only significant local source of water is the Santa Barbara groundwater basin. This source was heavily pumped during the 1960s and supplied an average of about 2,500 acre-feet per year for this period. However, this level of use resulted in an overdraft (i.e., extraction exceeding replenishment) of the basin, and pumping has since been reduced. The safe yield of this basin has been estimated at approximately 2,000 acre-feet per year; however, a program of monitoring wells and stream gauges has been underway for the past two years to refine this estimate. Preliminary results will be forthcoming in early 1979 and the study is expected to require an additional five years to complete. The current extraction rate is 1,700 acre-feet per year.

(insert Figure 3)

Figure 3. Historic and projected usable storage at Gibraltar Reservoir. (Source: Don Owen & Associates, 1976).

The interrelationship of the sources discussed above is shown diagrammatically in Figure 4. Groundwater has been a more significant source only during the 1960s; Cachuma has been a relatively constant source over the period shown; and Gibraltar has been primarily the source that has met increasing demand. However, unless the desilting program can be implemented in the near future, Gibraltar will decline as the primary source of City water. Increasing entitlements from Cachuma can maintain the level of supply for a time, but in the absence of alternative sources, the supply will decline significantly after 1990.

(insert Figure 4)

Figure 4. Historical and projected water supplies and projected water demand. (Source: Don Owen & Associates, 1976).

EXISTING AND FUTURE DEMAND

The future demands for water in the City have been estimated by Don Owen & Associates (1976) based on past use and projected future populations. Past rates of use are estimated from known and interpolated population data combined with actual water use for the years 1960 through 1974. Based on this analysis, consumption has varied from a low of 163 gallons per day per person to a high of 203 gallons per day per person, depending primarily on rainfall during the year. The consumption for a normal year is estimated at 180 gallons per day per person.

Estimates of future water demand have been based primarily on land use zoning or future population levels. Assuming 2.3 persons per dwelling unit, 80 gallons per day per person for household use, and 1.6 acre-feet per year per acre for outside use, the zoning approach to estimating ultimate water demand yields a value of 17,200 acre-feet per year. However, because actual land use densities do not follow directly from planned densities, the City Water Commission has requested that future water requirements be based on the population goals of 85,000 which is the "planning objective common to both water and land use planning programs" (Don Owen & Associates, 1976). Based on this approach, the Owen report estimates future water requirements for the Santa Barbara Water Service Area as follows:

		Normal	Dry	Wet
Year	Population	Year	Year	Year
1980	73,900	14,900	15,500	13,400
1990	78,800	15,900	16,500	14,300
2000	83,100	16,800	17,400	15,100

Demand (Acre-feet per year) for:

These estimates of future demand are for the City Water Service Area which presently includes the Mission Canyon area of the County and a part of the Goleta County Water District served by the City, but does not include that part of the City served by the Goleta County Water District.

In 1976, the District terminated the agreement with the City in these "overlap" areas effective June 30, 1979. While all the problems related to the termination of this agreement have not been settled, the City and the District have agreed to certain principles summarized as follows:

- 1. The overlap areas will be detached from the Goleta County Water District, and the City will assume the responsibility for water service.
- 2. The City will sell 240 acre-feet per year to the District for the next ten years, and up to 63% of surplus water as determined by the City.
- 3. The airport area will be supplied by the Goleta County Water District but with water from the City's Cachuma entitlement.
- 4. The City may utilize the Goleta groundwater basin to store up to 2,500 acre-feet per year for five years. Return of the stored water is to be at a rate of up to 1,250 acre-feet per year. (This aspect of the agreement will provide storage for excess water pumped from the Santa Barbara groundwater basin during the testing of the basin for the conjunctive use program).

To allow time to implement the principles summarized above, the existing agreement has been extended for one year. Implementation of these principles will increase the population to be served by the City by about 8,500 (based on data from the Don Owen report), and will increase the demand on City supplies by about 2,000 acre-feet per year (Michael Hopkins). The projected water requirements of the City, not including this demand, are shown on Figure 5 along with projected supplies based on existing facilities and programs. These relationships indicate a balance between supply and demand will occur about 1985 to 1990. However, with the 2,000 acre-feet increase, demand could exceed supply before 1985.

Additional factors that may influence the supply/demand relationship are increased supplies for nearby County areas and additional annexations to the City. The latter could increase demand, while the former would likely reduce development pressure in the City. Also, water conservation techniques are estimated to reduce demand by approximately 400 acre-feet per year by the year 2000. (Don Owen & Associates, 1976.) This aspect of the conservation of City resources has been implemented by resolution of the City Council which required installation of low-flow shower heads, toilet installations, etc., in all new developments.

FUTURE SUPPLIES

Steps are now underway to expand City water supplies by three methods: desilting of Gibraltar Reservoir, conjunctive use of the Santa Barbara groundwater basin, and wastewater reclamation.

<u>Desilting of Gibraltar Reservoir</u> - The Gibraltar desilting program consists of two phases. Phase I is a pilot program to test the feasibility of an air-driven dredge pump not yet used for this purpose in this country, and Phase II is an implementation program that would proceed if the pilot program is successful (City of Santa Barbara, 1977). Phase I, Stages A and B, would extend over a period of approximately ten years and cost about \$2,200,000. A federal EPA grant of \$1,000,000 on a 50/50 cost-sharing basis has been obtained to implement this test phase of the program. If the new type of pump and the procedure generally prove to be feasible, then the Phase II implementation program would be undertaken. This program is expected to extract about 1,000,000 cubic yards of silt, adding 620 acre-feet of storage capacity per year at an annual cost of \$875,000 (1977 dollars). This rate of extraction would be in excess of twice the average siltation rate of 225 acre-feet per year, so that the 20-year operation of this program would return Gibraltar to near its capacity of approximately 15,000 acre-feet (with the raised height of the dam).

<u>Conjunctive Use of the Groundwater Basin</u> - The conjunctive use of the groundwater basin as proposed in the Don Owen report is based on the use of this natural resource as a "water bank." Excess flows on the Santa Ynez River would be diverted and stored in the basin during wet years. During dry years, the stored water could be pumped to meet demands in excess of those normally available.

The basin has produced an average of approximately 14% of City supplies. This production, however, has been quite variable, and may have, at times, exceeded the safe yield of the basin. Figure 5 shows the relationships between groundwater production in excess of about 2,000 acre-feet per year results in a lowering of water levels during years of normal rainfall, whereas reduced extraction (e.g., during the years 1971-1975) results in a rise in the water level. Water-bearing rocks within the basin include alluvium of various ages (alluvium of Muir, 1968, and younger alluvium, older alluvium and terrace deposits of Upson, 1951) and the Santa Barbara Formation. The older rocks of Tertiary age are considered non-water-bearing, but may yield small quantities of water locally. These water-bearing rocks are offset by faults that form barriers or partial barriers to the movement of groundwater. The most important of these is the Mission Ridge fault (Figure 6).

(insert Figure 5)

Figure 5. Groundwater elevation and production for the Santa Barbara basin, 1950 through 1975. (Source: Don Owen & Associates, 1976).

The Mesa fault is probably of lesser importance as a groundwater barrier because differences in water levels across the fault appear to be minor. However, this fault is generally considered the boundary between storage units 1 and 2 of the Santa Barbara basin. A third fault, unnamed by Muir (1968) and located just offshore of the City, is important as a barrier to the intrusion of seawater into the basin.

Conjunctive use of the basin would involve intentionally lowering the water table so that potential problems such as seawater intrusion can be carefully monitored and evaluated. A storage location is needed for the pumped water so that it is not wasted during this step of the process. A solution for this problem is found in the principles for resolution of "overlap" areas discussed above which provide for the use of the Goleta groundwater basin to store pumped water during the testing and evaluation of this potential source.

Figure 6. Santa Barbara groundwater basin.

Legend

Fault; hatchured where forms boundary of groundwater basin; dashed where approximately located.

Fault; may affect levels within groundwater basin.

Boundary of water-bearing rocks; hatchured on water-bearing side; dashed where approximately located.

Major stream supplying surface flow to recharge basin.

Minor source of surface runoff to recharge basin.

(Adapted from Michael F. Hoover, Geologic Hazards Evaluation of the City of Santa Barbara, October 27, 1978.)

<u>Wastewater Reclamation</u> - A third project for the conservation of City water resources is the use of reclaimed wastewater, now discharged to the ocean, for irrigation of landscaping at various parks, schools, and along freeways in the City.

These potential uses of wastewater amount to approximately 660 acre-feet per year (Don Owen & Associates, 1976). Problems related to the implementation of such a project are disrepair of the existing collecting system and a high salt content of influent attributed to seawater infiltration and water softeners (Don Owen & Associates, 1976). Projects are underway to correct the majority of these problems, and a grant which provides up to $87\frac{1}{2}$ % Federal funding is available as a result of a joint powers agreement between the City and other South Coast agencies.

<u>Alternative Supplies</u> - In addition to these ongoing programs, alternative supplies include the utilization of local runoff by constructing dams on coastal streams. The construction of dams on coastal streams has been investigated, and is not cost effective in comparison to other alternatives. The issue of importing State Project water was rejected by County voters in March, 1979.

<u>Summary of Future Supplies</u> - Desilting of Gibraltar Reservoir offers the greatest potential for maintaining and increasing City water supplies. If the project proves to be feasible, storage would be increased by approximately 345 acre-feet per year. If reversal of the present trend of reduced storage is included, the overall increase would be about 620 acre-feet per year. In a ten-year period, half the life of the project, the increased storage would amount to more than 6,000 acre-feet.

Other projects could provide smaller but significant increases in supply. The conjunctive use program is expected to provide an average of 2,050 acre-feet per year, and 650 to 700 acre-feet of reclaimed wastewater could be used in place of domestic water for irrigation of landscaping at parks, schools and along the freeway. Continued enforcement of existing water conservation measures could provide an additional 400 acre-feet per year by the year 2000.

Of these potential sources, the most significant are Gibraltar desilting which would increase storage by 12,000 acre-feet by the year 2000, and the conjunctive use program with a potential yield of approximately 2,000 acre-feet per year. The desilting and the conjunctive-use programs will both require testing to establish their feasibility. The ability to meet future demand is, therefore, primarily dependent on the results of these testing programs.

Water Quality

QUALITY OF EXISTING SUPPLIES

The quality of existing City water supplies is dependent primarily on the quality of the flow in the Santa Ynez River and facilities available for transmission and treatment for domestic purposes. Biologic contamination is not a problem in the City, and the principal measure of water quality is the total of dissolved solids or salts in the water. The salts in City water are approximately 650 mg/l (milligrams per liter), and the hardness component is 340 mg/l. The value for total dissolved solids exceeds the Federal standard of 500 mg/l, but is well within the State standard of 1000 mg/l.

Some hydrogen sulfide enters the water supply during transport, primarily from highly mineralized water seeping into Tecolote Tunnel. This very undesirable component is removed during treatment at the Cater Filtration Plant by conversion to sulfate, a common "salt" component. The capacity of this plant is presently ten million gallons per day (nominal capacity), and plans are being prepared for increasing capacity to approximately 24 million gallons per day.

GROUNDWATER QUALITY

The quality of water in the Santa Barbara groundwater basin is affected primarily by the quality of water that percolates into the basin directly from rainfall and indirectly from runoff from the mountains to the north of the City. Since the rock and soil terrain of this source area are similar to those of the Santa Ynez River, the quality of runoff into local basins is similar. The quality of the stored groundwater is slightly higher because of the better quality of the component of direct infiltration from rainfall.

Areas with high concentration of septic tank systems tend to degrade groundwater quality because of the increased content of dissolved solids, particularly nitrate, in the effluent. Further expansion of the use of septic tanks in the city should be discouraged.

Potential effects of a conjunctive-use program are difficult to quantify, but are expected to be minimal (SBCWA, 1978, VII-7). A lowered water table may result in an increased mineral content, but the quality of the groundwater will reflect primarily the quality of the replenished water. Therefore, a slight increase in mineral content from 625 mg/l to approximately 650 mg/l may accompany a conjunctive use program.

The use of reclaimed water for irrigation purposes is expected to "eventually have a deleterious effect on local groundwater mineral quality" (SBCWA, 1978) because the salts normally carried to the ocean would be returned to the basin. The precise amount of salt increase, however, will depend on the degree of treatment and level of desalination. The Water Agency (1978) has estimated that the salt concentration of groundwater will increase at a rate of 20 mg/l/year with use of reclaimed water with partial desalination at a rate of 750 acre-feet per year.

HARBOR WATER QUALITY

The water quality of the Santa Barbara Harbor is also a subject of concern. Currently, Marina 1 has no sanitary facilities (i.e., marine heads) for use by boat owners or visitors although other marina sections do have facilities. Bilge and head pumping is prohibited within the harbor and the three-mile limit. However, some boats may be discharging directly into the harbor. These factors, along with the animal wastes of the pets of visitors and persons who live aboard their boats within the harbor, contribute to the potential for degraded water quality within the harbor.

The following chapter contains goals, policies, and implementation strategies which ensure the proper maintenance and protection of water resources for the City.

This section has been replaced by the Historic Resources Element adopted by City Council October 2, 2012.

GOALS, POLICIES, IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

ORGANIZATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, general planning goals, policies, and implementation strategies are recommended for the City of Santa Barbara. These recommendations constitute the plan for the conservation, development, and utilization of resources within the City and are the heart of the Conservation Element.

The recommendations comprise general planning goals, general policies, and suggested implementation strategies. The general goals provide statements of the basic purpose of the Conservation Element so that consistent planning is possible. They are necessary guidelines which can be held up against future proposals to determine their effect on the community. The general policies complement the planning goals and define specific directions for the City to take in conserving, developing, and utilizing resources. The implementation strategies are suggested refinements of the general policies. Methods for implementation of the goals and policies need not be limited to those listed in this section, as other effective strategies may become apparent in the future.

While it would be desirable to fully implement each of the implementation strategies, it is recognized that there are competing demands for preservation, enhancement, development, and conservation of resources and the City's economic resources are limited. Therefore, priorities for the implementation of these strategies shall be determined by the City Council after consideration of economic, social, and environmental concerns weighted according to balance and priority.

A finding of project consistency with this Element shall be made to the goals and policies only.

CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

Goals

- Sites of significant archaeological, historic, or architectural resources will be preserved and protected wherever feasible in order that historic and prehistoric resources will be preserved.
- The Hispanic tradition of architecture reflected in the El Pueblo Viejo district of the central City shall be perpetuated.
- Selected structures which are representative of architectural styles of fifty or more years ago (pre-1925) will be preserved wherever feasible.

Policies

- 1.0 Activities and development which could damage or destroy archaeological, historic, or architectural resources are to be avoided.
- 2.0 The Designated Landmark distinction shall continue to be extended to those structures and sites which have recognized significance.
- 3.0 The establishment of historic districts should be encouraged as a method to provide for historic and cultural resources which warrant protection.
- 4.0 The requirements and restrictions administered by the Landmarks Committee and the Architectural Board of Review will apply to City and other public agencies as well as private projects.

Implementation Strategies

- 1.0 Activities and development which could damage or destroy archaeological, historic, or architectural resources are to be avoided.
 - 1.1 In the environmental review process, any proposed project which is in an area indicated on the map as "sensitive" will receive further study to determine if archaeological resources are in jeopardy. A preliminary site survey (or a similar study as part of an environmental impact report) shall be conducted in any case where archaeological resources could be threatened.
 - 1.2 Potential damage to archaeological resources is to be given consideration along with other planning, environmental, social, and economic considerations when making land-use decisions.
 - 1.3 Publicly owned areas known to contain significant archaeological resources should be preserved by limiting access and/or development which would involve permanent covering or disruption of the sub-surface artifacts.
- 2.0 The Designated Landmark distinction shall continue to be extended to those structures and sites which have recognized significance.
 - 2.1 The current list of Noteworthy Structures of Importance should be scrutinized for nominees for becoming Designated Landmarks.
 - 2.2 Results of the architectural survey of the City should be examined specifically for potential nominees for becoming Designated Landmarks.
- 3.0 The establishment of historic districts should be encouraged as a method to provide for historic and cultural resources which warrant protection.
 - 3.1 Brinkerhoff Avenue and the Laguna, Oak Park, Upper Eastside, and West Downtown neighborhoods should each be examined for suitability as special preservation/design review districts.

- 3.2 In any neighborhood districts designated as special preservation/design review districts, replacement structures, new construction, and exterior remodeling should be carefully evaluated by the Landmarks Committee for neighborhood compatibility.
- 3.3 Within the boundaries of preservation/design review districts, special attention should be given to height limitations in order to prevent blockage and/or other aesthetic degradation of significant structures or areas.
- 4.0 The requirements and restrictions administered by the Landmarks Committee and the Architectural Board of Review will apply to City and other public agencies as well as private projects.
 - 4.1 Municipal Code Chapters 22.22 and 23.68 should be reviewed and revised to assure that both public and private projects are reviewed by the Landmarks Committee and the Architectural Board of Review.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Goals

- Restore where feasible, maintain, enhance, and manage the creekside environments within the City as visual amenities, where consistent with sound flood control management and soil conservation techniques.
- Prevent the scarring of hillside areas by inappropriate development.
- Protect and enhance the scenic character of the City.
- Maintain the scenic character of the City by preventing unnecessary removal of significant trees and encouraging cultivation of new trees.
- Protect significant open space areas from the type of development which would degrade the City's visual resources.

Policies

- 1.0 Development adjacent to creeks shall not degrade the creeks or their riparian environments.
- 2.0 Development on hillsides shall not significantly modify the natural topography and vegetation.
- 3.0 New development shall not obstruct scenic view corridors, including those of the ocean and lower elevations of the City viewed respectively from the shoreline and upper foothills, and of the upper foothills and mountains viewed respectively from the beach and lower elevations of the City.
- 4.0 Trees enhance the general appearance of the City's landscape and should be preserved and protected.
- 5.0 Significant open space areas should be protected to preserve the City's visual resources from degradation.

6.0 Ridgeline development which can be viewed from large areas of the community or by significant numbers of residents of the community shall be discouraged.

Implementation Strategies

- 1.0 Development adjacent to creeks shall not degrade the creeks or their riparian environments.
 - 1.1 Setbacks, as required by the Federal Flood Insurance Program, should be enforced (see Drainage and Flooding section).
 - 1.2 Examine undeveloped parcels having creek frontage for possible purchase and retention as open space.
 - 1.3 Developments which require retaining walls or other topographic modifications of the creekside environment should not be permitted unless consistent with sound flood control management and soil conservation techniques.
 - 1.4 Develop a creek beautification ordinance.
- 2.0 Development on hillsides shall not significantly modify the natural topography and vegetation.
 - 2.1 Development which necessitates grading on hillsides with slopes greater than 30% should not be permitted. The Slope Density Ordinance and Grading Ordinance should be so amended.
 - 2.2 Performance Bonds should be required to ensure achievement of revegetation of graded areas.
 - 2.3 Use of native or naturalized and fire retardant vegetation should be encouraged for landscaping on major cut and fill slopes where development occurs on hillsides.
 - 2.4 All development on hillsides should be required to landscape the downslope side so as to hide or break up large surface area views of structures facing down slope.
 - 2.5 Height restriction ordinances should be changed to allow for "step-down" development design on hillsides to hide or break up large surface area views of structures facing down slope.
- 3.0 New development shall not obstruct scenic view corridors, including those of the ocean and lower elevations of the City viewed respectively from the shoreline and upper foothills, and of the upper foothills and mountains viewed respectively from the beach and lower elevations of the City.
 - 3.1 In the absence of Local Coastal Program policies, develop a design overlay zone to limit building heights.
 - 3.2 The northerly side of Cabrillo Boulevard from Castillo Street to Los Patos Way should be designated a special design review district. Restrictions should be developed for this district which establish setbacks and height limitations formulated to ensure the preservation of views and view corridors from the beach toward the mountains.

- 3.3 When the Local Coastal Program is finalized, this element should be revised, as needed, to preserve and enhance the harbor, shoreline, and other coastal resources.
- 4.0 Trees enhance the general appearance of the City's landscape and should be preserved and protected.
 - 4.1 Mature trees should be integrated into project design rather than removed. The Tree Ordinance should be reviewed to ensure adequate provision for review of protection measures proposed for the preservation of trees in the project design.
 - 4.2 All feasible options should be exhausted prior to the removal of trees.
 - 4.3 Major trees removed as a result of development or other property improvement shall be replaced by specimen trees on a minimum one-for-one basis.
 - 4.4 Private efforts to increase the number of street trees throughout the City should be encouraged.
- 5.0 Significant open space areas should be protected to preserve the City's visual resources from degradation.
 - 5.1 The City should consider purchase or the obtainment of development rights of significant open space where no other means can be found to protect visual resources from degradation.
 - 5.2 Parks and other public lands which provide panoramic views or scenic vistas, especially those at higher elevations, shall be protected and maintained for the enjoyment by the public.
- 6.0 Ridgeline development which can be viewed from large areas of the community or by significant numbers of residents of the community shall be discouraged.
 - 6.1 Develop a comprehensive analysis of the ridgeline areas of the City to review zoning and development regulations related to protecting the visual qualities of the community.

AIR QUALITY

Goals

- Maintain air quality above Federal and State ambient air quality standards.
- Reduce dependence upon the automobile.

Policies

1.0 Reduce single occupant automobile trips and increase the utilization of public transit.

- 2.0 Improve the attractiveness and safety of bicycle use as an alternate mode of travel for short- and medium-distance trips.
- 3.0 Promote the use of car pooling through special provisions for the priority use of parking facilities and other employee disincentives to auto traffic in commercial areas (per TMIS) as an alternative to construction of additional parking facilities.
- 4.0 Discourage and, where possible, prohibit land uses which unnecessarily contribute to air quality degradation.

Implementation Strategies

- 1.0 Reduce single occupant automobile trips and increase the utilization of public transit.
 - 1.1 Institute appropriate traffic and parking implementation measures (from TMIS and WATS studies) as soon as possible.
 - 1.2 Cooperate with M.T.D. to improve bus zones and routes throughout the City.
 - 1.3 Investigate providing for bus pre-emption of traffic signals.
- 2.0 Improve the attractiveness and safety of bicycle use as an alternate mode of travel for short- and medium-distance trips.
 - 2.1 Revise the zoning ordinance to require the installation of secure bicycle storage facilities for all new commercial development and redevelopment.
 - 2.2 Encourage the construction of off-street bikeways or the payment of in lieu fees in all new developments, and improve bikeways on public streets wherever feasible.
 - 2.3 Seek State, Federal, or other funds for use in providing a bicycle fleet for short-distance City business trips of short duration.
 - 2.4 Update the Bicycle Master Plan to better reflect the desires and needs of the community.
 - 2.5 Resurface streets and roadways with relatively high levels of bicycle use.
- 3.0 Promote the use of car pooling through special provisions for the priority use of parking facilities and other employee disincentives to auto traffic in commercial areas (per TMIS) as an alternative to construction of additional parking facilities.
 - 3.1 Encourage City employees to car pool through the construction of park-and-ride, carpool parking lots on the downtown fringe.
 - 3.2 Provide incentives for employers and employees of private business to encourage car pooling by using park-and-ride lots offering reduced or free rates.
 - 3.3 Exhaust all reasonable parking management strategies prior to the construction of new public off-street parking lots.
- 4.0 Discourage and, where possible, prohibit land uses which unnecessarily contribute to air quality degradation.
 - 4.1 Prohibit the construction of, and/or conversion to, drive-through facilities.
 - 4.2 Develop a program to equitably phase out all existing drive-through facilities.
 - 4.3 Institute controls that will address the construction of any new facilities which add significantly or will cumulatively result in a significant increase in air quality degradation.
 - 4.4 Encourage cooperation between City and County jurisdictions to develop additional air quality monitoring stations to obtain better information regarding air quality.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Goal

• Enhance and preserve the City's critical ecological resources in order to provide a highquality environment necessary to sustain the City's ecosystem.

Subgoals

- Develop a permanent park, recreation, and open space system which maintains important ecological systems while providing open space and recreational needs.
- Maintain, protect, and enhance marine resources within the City boundaries.
- Increase public understanding of the relationship between the maintenance of the City ecosystem and the welfare of the general public.
- Encourage the conservation of existing tracts of agricultural land and provide for expansion of agricultural land uses in a manner which maximizes compatibility with adjacent land uses.

Policies

- 1.0 A set of land use suitability guidelines shall be developed for use in land planning and the environmental review process.
- 2.0 Redevelopment and renovation of the central city shall be encouraged in order to preserve existing resources.
- 3.0 Goleta Slough shall be preserved and restored as a coastal wetland ecosystem.
- 4.0 Remaining Coastal Perennial Grasslands and Southern Oak Woodlands shall be preserved, where feasible.
- 5.0 The habitats of rare and endangered species shall be preserved.
- 6.0 Intertidal and marine resources shall be maintained or enhanced.
- 7.0 Prime agricultural lands shall be conserved wherever possible and expansion of agricultural uses shall be allowed subject to maximizing compatibility with adjacent land uses and restricting effects on the environment.
- 8.0 The use of City-owned vacant properties for community gardens shall be encouraged.
- 9.0 The biotic resources of the Harbor shall be maintained, so far as possible within the framework of the LCP and other Harbor Restoration plans.
- 10.0 Programs shall be developed to maintain a productive urban biotic community.
- 11.0 Where Biological Resources policies conflict, the policy most protective of the natural environment shall prevail.

Implementation Strategies

- 1.0 A set of land use suitability guidelines shall be developed for use in land planning and the environmental review process.
 - 1.1 Develop criteria to evaluate and assess the ecological significance of biotic communities found to exist within the City. This information would be used to identify healthy, abundant communities, as well as rare or endangered communities.
 - 1.2 Conduct a study to recommend suitable land uses and/or acquisition priorities for pristine or near-pristine communities previously inventoried by the City (Santa Barbara Planning Task Force, 1974).
 - 1.3 Where not preempted by the Federal Flood Insurance Program, land use regulations will be developed for the creek influence zones of Mission, Sycamore, San Roque, and Arroyo Burro creeks.
 - a. Assign the task of conducting a biological study of the creek influence zones to the Community Development Department. This study is to determine the general land uses within the zone which would be compatible with the maintenance of the existing biological communities of the creeks, and is not intended to consider the development of public recreation facilities within the creeks.
 - b. Enact a flood control and creek ordinance which would include provisions to restrict channelization in natural creek bottoms and structural developments within the 100-year floodplain in natural creek areas.
 - c. Conduct a feasibility study on the replacement of concrete bottoms of channelized creek sections with natural bottoms and/or the use of mitigation measures to increase the habitat diversity of channelized creeks.
 - d. Increase fines under Municipal Code Chapter 14.56, which restricts dumping into creeks, and charge the Santa Barbara Flood Control District with reporting violations and the City Police Department with investigating such reports.
- 2.0 Redevelopment and renovation of the central city shall be encouraged in order to preserve existing resources.
 - 2.1 Develop a program of tax incentives and transferable redevelopment rights to encourage the rehabilitation, restoration, or redevelopment of deteriorating neighborhoods.
 - 2.2 Modify existing subdivision requirements and performance standards to provide adequate landscaped area where housing is being replaced with higher-density housing.
 - 2.3 Identify trees of horticultural value within the City and institute a program to replace such trees on a one-to-one basis if they are lost (due to causes other than non-compatibility with Santa Barbara's climate).
- 3.0 Goleta Slough shall be preserved and restored as a coastal wetland ecosystem.
 - 3.1 Develop a master plan for the ecological management of the Slough. The plan should provide for maintenance of the wetlands by natural physical and biological actions as much as possible. The Master Plan should make provision for educational facilities in the Slough region, but not within the Slough, to be developed and administered by the City in

cooperation with the University of California at Santa Barbara. All areas of the Slough and airport land extending north to Hollister Avenue, exclusive of the airport facilities, should be included in the Master Plan.

- 3.2 Continue to restrict pedestrian and vehicular access in order to reduce adverse environmental impact to the Slough.
- 3.3 Rezone the Goleta Slough, as defined by the City, as open space.
- 3.4 Initiate a study to consider the environmental and economic impacts of replacing and/or relocating sewage facilities currently degrading the Slough.
- 4.0 Remaining Coastal Perennial Grasslands and Southern Oak Woodlands shall be preserved, where feasible.
 - 4.1 Conduct a study to determine whether access should be restricted into the remaining grasslands and what types of limited recreational uses, in conjunction with educational and scientific use, would be compatible with their preservation. In the interim, access should be restricted, if possible, to only carefully monitored scientific studies.
 - 4.2 Develop guidelines and regulations which protect, preserve and enhance Southern Oak Woodlands habitat and individual oak trees.
- 5.0 The habitats of rare and endangered species shall be preserved.
 - 5.1 Require that a complete vegetation survey be conducted at an appropriate time of the year for any proposed action which would cause large-scale changes in vegetation patterns in Coastal Strand, Coastal Sage Scrub, and Chaparral communities, and the Goleta Slough. The survey should be funded by those proposing the potential environmental change. If any rare and endangered plants are located, mitigation measures will be required to maintain and preserve the plant's habitat in the area in which it has been found.
 - 5.2 Include provisions in the Goleta Slough master plan to aid in the recovery of the Light-footed Clapper Rail.
 - 5.3 Include an analysis in the Goleta Slough master plan of the current reduction of Belding's Savannah Sparrow and implement such measures as necessary and feasible to reverse this trend, provided that such measures do not affect populations of other rare and endangered organisms.
 - 5.4 Prohibit the use of long-term, persistent pesticides by the City and conduct a study of the use of other pesticides by City parks, schools, and other agencies with the intention of developing limits on such use.
- 6.0 Intertidal and marine resources shall be maintained or enhanced.
 - 6.1 Post Fish and Game laws on the taking of intertidal organisms at beach access points and encourage vigorous enforcement of those laws by the appropriate agency.

- 6.2 Restrict clifftop developments on the Mesa by appropriate setbacks (determined by site specific geologic surveys required as a part of subdivision) to prevent acceleration of cliff erosion. Mitigation measures to prevent cliff-face "weeping" should also be instituted.
- 6.3 Prohibit off-shore dumping of sediments near kelp beds or reefs.
- 6.4 Conduct a study to determine disposal sites for dredged material such that the material can aid in beach replenishment without significantly impacting major marine resources.
- 6.5 Continue monitoring of organisms at the sewage outfall in conjunction with the Coastal Water Research Project. Such monitoring will be used to determine the environmental impact of Santa Barbara's sewage outfall over a long term.
- 6.6 Conduct a feasibility study on the construction of wastewater reclamation facilities, provided this can be accomplished without significant degradation of the groundwater basin.
- 7.0 Prime agricultural lands shall be conserved wherever possible and expansion of agricultural uses shall be allowed subject to maximizing compatibility with adjacent land uses and restricting effects on the environment.
 - 7.1 Develop a zoning mechanism for agricultural land uses which includes performance standards in the Municipal Code which maximize compatibility with adjacent land uses, including but not limited to pesticide use and storage, drainage, habitat protection, noise, operation of heavy equipment and employee parking.

One performance standard shall require that specified grasses shall be seeded in all cleared orchard areas between October 1 and November 15 after clearance. Such seeds shall be hand broadcast according to specified formulas and mowing shall occur after the seeded grass has matured each spring in order to allow continued perpetuation. Compliance shall be monitored by City staff.

- 7.2 Develop a program of incentives and regulations which would encourage the retention of prime agricultural land.
- 8.0 The use of City-owned vacant properties for community gardens shall be encouraged.
 - 8.1 Encourage the provision of small areas of community gardening where new multiple housing units are planned.
 - 8.2 Inventory those City-owned lands which are vacant and have water service to the site.
 - 8.3 Notify interested persons of the number, size, and availability of vacant, City-owned lands which are suitable for use as new community gardens.
- 9.0 The biotic resources of the Harbor shall be maintained, so far as possible within the framework of the LCP and other Harbor Restoration plans.
 - 9.1 Construction which would substantially decrease the current rate of tidal flushing in the Harbor should be avoided if feasible alternatives are available.

- 9.2 Continue the study of littoral sand drift with the objective of developing feasible alternatives to additional breakwater construction to reduce sand deposition in harbor channels.
- 9.3 Evaluate the feasibility of onshore boat storage and pull-out facilities as an alternative to harbor expansion.
- 9.4 Provide for onshore disposal of toxic wastes from shipyard facilities.
- 10.0 Programs shall be developed to maintain a productive urban biotic community.
 - 10.1 Prepare a Master Plan for the Andree Clark Bird Refuge. The Master Plan shall include:
 - a. Determination of existing biotic conditions in the Refuge.
 - b. A detailed management plan for restoration and maintenance of the Refuge.
 - c. Provisions for development of educational programs run by volunteers.
 - 10.2 Require the City Parks Department and Animal Control to investigate the advisability of trapping dogs which are currently running loose in the Andree Clark Bird Refuge. These animals would be returned to the owners only after payment of fines imposed under Section 6.08.030 of the Municipal Code.
 - 10.3 Develop an ecological reserves program in conjunction with land-use suitability guidelines to acquire and/or preserve parcels within the City large enough to represent natural biotic communities.
 - 10.4 Encourage the use of native or fire retardant shrubs or trees, particularly those that provide food for wildlife, in landscaping of golf courses, and as a mitigation measure for land development.
 - 10.5 Develop a program to regulate off-road recreation vehicle use within the City. The program should include:
 - a. Restrictions on ORV use to land already damaged by current use or areas of low ecological value as determined through land use suitability criteria.
 - b. License private property owners to develop ORV parks which are managed such that the deleterious impacts of ORV use (including wind and water erosion and sedimentation) are limited to those licensed areas.
 - c. Approve an ordinance designating ORV use on private and public lands (other than those area licensed as ORV parks) a nuisance subject to fines if that use causes significant environmental impacts. A study should be made prior to ordinance approval to determine the amount of ORV use which causes significant environmental impact.
- 11.0 Where Biological Resources policies conflict, the policy most protective of the natural environment shall prevail.

DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL

Goals

- Ensure that human habitation of the City's floodplains does not adversely affect public health, safety, and welfare.
- Encourage recreation, conservation and open space uses in floodplains.
- Provide Federal Flood Insurance for structures already built within flood hazard zones.³

Policies

- 1.0 The City shall participate in the Federal Flood Insurance Program so that property owners may receive disaster assistance.³
- 2.0 Floodplain management programs shall be implemented through the Building Officer of the Division of Land Use Controls, and the Flood Control Division.
- 3.0 Hazard reduction programs shall be implemented in urban sections of the City already built in hazardous flood-prone areas.
- 4.0 Goals and policies of this element are interrelated with those of the Safety and Open Space Elements and shall be considered together in land use planning decisions.

Implementation Strategies

- 1.0 The City shall participate in the Federal Flood Insurance Program so that property owners may receive disaster assistance.⁴
 - 1.1 Adopt the provisions of the Program and make application to the Federal Flood Insurance Administration.⁴
 - 1.2 Maintain records of future peak-flow conditions.
 - 1.3 Provide for update and revision of floodway/flood fringe maps as specified in the Federal Flood Insurance Program.
- 2.0 Floodplain management programs shall be implemented through the Building Officer of the Division of Land Use Controls, and the Flood Control Division.
 - 2.1 Prohibit the construction of new structures in stream channels (except stream measurement or flood control-related facilities).
 - 2.2 Encourage light-intensity use in the floodway or floodway fringe with the requirement that such uses shall not impair the flood-carrying capacity of the stream.

³ The City is participating in the Federal Flood Insurance Program as of December 1978.

⁴ The City is participating in the Federal Flood Insurance Program as of December 1978.

- 2.3 Require adequate setbacks from flood channels of any new development as defined under the Federal Flood Insurance Program, for those properties within the identified flood hazard area.
- 2.4 Encourage the use of permeable or pervious surfaces in all new development to minimize additional surface runoff.
- 3.0 Hazard reduction programs shall be implemented in urban sections of the City already built in hazardous flood-prone areas.
 - 3.1 Restrict the replacement of old structures within the floodway fringe unless the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that the structure will not impair flood flow, and has proved that the floodway fringe boundaries as designated by the HUD maps should be adjusted.
 - 3.2 Regulate buffer zones along creeks to protect against bank erosion from public or private practices including grading, brush cleaning, trail maintenance, dumping or construction of private structures such as bridges or walkways across creeks. Routine debris removal by the City for flood reduction is exempted.
 - 3.3 Undertake flood control work projects as rapidly as possible where necessary to protect existing structures.
- 4.0 Goals and policies of this Element are interrelated with those of the Safety and Open Space Elements and shall be considered together in land use planning decisions.
 - 4.1 Encourage the use of natural building materials for flood control channels such as stone, heavy timber, erosion control shrubs, and wire revetment with plantings of native or naturalized flora wherever they provide a comparable degree of flood protection.
 - 4.2 Creeks and their banks constitute a scenic open space resource within the City in their natural state; thus, the Open Space Element also recognizes the importance of keeping structures out of the stream channels for preservation of City resources.
 - 4.3 The Safety Element recognizes the hazard to lives and property of encroachment of structures into stream channels and on stream banks; thus, it also supports the findings of this Element on the basis of hazard reduction.

WATER RESOURCES

Goal

• To maintain existing and protect future potential water resources of the City of Santa Barbara.

Policies

1.0 Provide for a continued supply of water to the City which meets all Regional, State, and Federal health standards.

- 2.0 Develop plans for implementation of water conservation regulations.
- 3.0 Implement monitoring program of groundwater resources in the Santa Barbara basin.

Implementation Strategies

- 1.0 Provide for a continued supply of water to the City which meets all Regional, State, and Federal health standards.
 - 1.1 Work with the County, the State, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards, and other agencies directly involved in land use policies within the Santa Ynez River drainage to ensure that this major water supply is not significantly degraded.
 - 1.2 When deemed necessary, channelization of major creeks within the City should be conducted in such a manner as to retain as much of a natural state along the creeks as possible. The use of concrete channelization shall be discouraged in order to maximize groundwater recharge.
 - 1.3 Encourage innovative use of permeable or pervious surfaces such as turfblocks or other materials in all new development in order to maximize groundwater recharge.
 - 1.4 Prohibit the expansion of the use of septic tank systems.
 - 1.5 Provide sanitary facilities for use by boat owners or visitors at Marina 1.
 - 1.6 Enforce restrictions on bilge and head pumping within the harbor and within the three-mile limit.
- 2.0 Develop plans for implementation of water conservation regulations.
 - 2.1 Require all new development to incorporate water conservation features and devices into project design in order to minimize future increases in water demand.
 - 2.2 Encourage new development and redevelopment to consider innovative water conservation techniques such as gray water recycling.
 - 2.3 Conduct further study on the cost-effectiveness of Wastewater Reclamation for use in landscape irrigation.
 - 2.4 Institute a public information program with the objective of achieving installation of watersaving devices in 50% of the existing dwelling units by the year 2000.
- 3.0 Implement monitoring program of groundwater resources in the Santa Barbara basin.
 - 3.1 Monitor groundwater basin pumping and continue testing program to determine the safe yield of Santa Barbara basin.
 - 3.2 Develop long-term strategies for the extraction, use, and replenishment of water from the basin.

REFERENCES

CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES

This section has been replaced by the Historic Resources Element adopted by City Council October 2, 2012.

Costello, J.G. *The Royal Presidio of Santa Barbara, Phase VII – Archaeology of the Padre's Quarters*. 1976. Fagan, B.M. *The Royal Presidio of Santa Barbara – Archaeology of the Chapel Site*. 1976.

Gebhard, David and Robert Winter. A Guide to Architecture in the Los Angeles and Southern California. Peregrine Smith, Incorporated, 1977.

King, T.F. Recommended Procedures for Archaeologic Impact Evaluation. Undated (circa 1974).

Livingston and Blayney. Santa Barbara County Conservation Element Draft. Santa Barbara County. 1974.

Society for American Archaeology. Archaeology and Archaeological Resources - A Guide for Those Planning to Use, Affect, or Alter the Land Surface. Undated.

Young, Noel I. Santa Barbara Architecture. Capra Press. 1975.

VISUAL RESOURCES

City of Santa Barbara General Plan, as amended on Feb. 8, 1977.

City of Santa Barbara. Municipal Code.

Community Land Use Associates. EIR, Central City Redevelopment Plan. 1977.

Santa Barbara Planning Task Force. Santa Barbara Impacts of Growth, Neighborhood Fact Book: Volume 2. 1974.

AIR QUALITY

Brodine, Virginia. Air Pollution: Environmental Issues Series. Scientist's Institute for Public Information. 1971.

Community Land Use Associates. EIR Central City Redevelopment Plan. 1977.

- Norsieck, R.A. and A.Q. Eschenroeder. Air Quality Impact of a Regional Transportation Plan for Santa Barbara County, California - Preliminary Draft. Undated.
- Office of Environmental Quality. *Methodology Development for Coordinated Air Quality/Land Use Planning*. County of Santa Barbara. 1977, revised.
- Santa Barbara County-Cities Area Planning Council. Clean Air for Santa Barbara County Planning Requirements. May 1, 1978.
- Terry, C.A. A Survey of Air Pollution Damage to Santa Ynez Crops in 1974. Office of Environmental Quality, County of Santa Barbara. December, 1975.
- Veigela, Wm. J. Projected Air Pollutant Concentrations, Rollbacks, and Strategy Evaluation for the AQAP of Santa Barbara County. Mission Research Corporation: Report #7827-1- 878. July 31, 1978.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

People and Organizations Contacted:

Dave Davis, Principal Planner, City of Santa Barbara.

M. L. Days, Planning Division, City of Santa Barbara.

Robert Fraker, Local Coastal Plan staff.

John Helmer, Office of Land Use Controls.

Paul Kelly, 12/01/78; California Department of Fish and Game: Head of Least Tern Recovery Team.

- Nan Lawler, 12/12/78; private citizen who did work on tarantulas in Coastal Perennial Grassland.
- Sandy Wilbur, 12/11/78; Research Biologist for U.S. Fish and Wildlife; Team Leader, Light-footed Clapper Rail Recovery Team.

Bibliography:

- Atwood, J.L., P.D. Jorgenson, R.M. Jurek, and T.D. Manolis, *California Least Tern Census and Nesting Survey*, 1977. State of California Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game. December 1977.
- Biettel, W. Trees of Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara Botanic Garden. 1976.
- California Department of Fish and Game, *At the Crossroads A Report on California's Endangered and Rare Fish and Wildlife.* State of California Resources Agency. January 1976.
- Ehrenfeld, D.W. Conserving Life on Earth. Oxford University Press: New York. 360 pp. 1972.
- Massey, B.W. A Census of the Breeding Population of the Belding Savannah Sparrow in California, 1977. State of California Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game. September 1977.
- Muller, Broder, and Beittel. Santa Barbara's Trees. Santa Barbara County Horticultural Society. 1976.
- Powell, W.R. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California: Special Publication No. 1, California Native Plant Society. 1974.
- Santa Barbara, City of. Draft Report Environmentally Sensitive Habitat: Local Coastal Program. 59 pp. February 1978.
- Santa Barbara, City of. Draft Report Water and Marine Resources. 67 pp. July 1978.
- Santa Barbara, City of. Draft Report Diking, Dredging, Filling, and Shoreline Structures. 16 pp. August 1978.
- Santa Barbara, City of. Shoreline Master Plan (Draft). 105+ pp. July 14, 1977.
- Santa Barbara County Planning Department, Draft Conservation Element of Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan. 290 pp. 1978.
- Santa Barbara Planning Task Force. Santa Barbara The Impacts of Growth: Volume I Citywide Effects. 1974.
- Smithsonian Institute. Report on Endangered and Threatened Plant Species of the United States: House Miscellaneous Documents, Volume 1-1. 94th Congress, 1st session, December 15, 1974.
- Smith, E.J. Jr., D.H. Fry Jr., H.W. Frey, J. Speth, A. Rutsh and L. Fisk. *Coastal County Fish and Wildlife: Resources and their Utilization*. University of California Sea Grant Advisory Program in Cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Game. 258 pp. June 1, 1976.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants Republication of the List of* Species. Federal Register. October 27, 1976; August 11, 1977; April 24, 1978; and September 28, 1978.
- Western Marine Laboratory. Santa Barbara Marina #1 Environmental Impact Report, Marine Biological Aspects. 22 pp. June 5, 1974.

DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL

- ASPO Planning Advisory Service. *Regulations for Flood Plains, Report No. 277.* American Society of Planning Officials: Chicago. 1972.
- Livingston and Blayney. Santa Barbara County Conservation Element (Draft). 1974.

Santa Barbara Planning Task Force. Impacts of Growth. 1974.

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Santa Barbara Stream Group, Flood Plain Information. 1975.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Flood Insurance Study, City of Santa Barbara: (Proof Copy).* 1978.

WATER RESOURCES

Don Owen & Associates. City of Santa Barbara, Optimum Water Use Study. August 1976.

- Jones and Stokes Associates. Draft Environmental and Water Resources Reconnaissance Study for State Water Project, Water and Alternatives. October 11, 1978.
- Muir, S.K. Groundwater Reconnaissance of the Santa Barbara Montecito area, Santa Barbara County, California. U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 1859-A. 1968.
- Santa Barbara City of. Gibraltar Lake Restoration Project, Application to U.S. EPA. May 27, 1977.
- Santa Barbara City of. Ordinance No. 3908 Pertaining to Water Conservation. Adopted June 7, 1977, effective July 7, 1977.
- Santa Barbara City and Goleta County Water District. Principals for Resolution of Water Service Areas and Responsibilities Between the City of Santa Barbara and the Goleta County Water District. 5 p. Undated.
- Santa Barbara County Water Agency. Adequacy and Economics of Water Resources Development Alternatives. March 13, 1978.
- Upson, J.E. Geology and Groundwater Resources of the South Coast Basins of Santa Barbara County, California. U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 1108. 1951.

This section has been replaced by the Historic Resources Element adopted by City Council October 2, 2012.

APPENDIX A

CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

APPENDIX A: CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

Designated Landmarks¹

- 1. Arlington Theatre, 1317 State Street (1929-30)
- -2. Arrellanes/Kirk Adobe, 421 E. Figueroa Street (ca. 1860)
- -3. Botiller/Grand Adobe, 1023 Bath Street (ca. 1850)
- 4. Buenaventuro Pico Adobe, 920 Anacapa Street (ca. 1850)
- -5. Caneda Adobe, or Whittaker Adobe, 123 E. Canon Perdido Street (1788)
- 6. Carrillo Adobe, or Hill-Carrillo Adobe, 11 E. Carrillo Street (1826)
- 7. Santa Barbara County Courthouse, Anacapa at Anapamu Street (1929)
- -8. Covarrubias Adobe, 715 Santa Barbara Street (1817)
- 9. De la Guerra Adobe, or Casa De la Guerra, 11 E. De la Guerra Street (1819-26)
- 10. El Paseo, E. De la Guerra, State, and Anacapa Streets (1922-23+)
- 11. El Cuartel, 122 E. Canon Perdido Street (1788)
- 12. Fernald House, 414 W. Montecito Street (and Carriage House) (1862 & 1877)
- 13. Guard House, E. De la Guerra Street at Presidio Avenue (ca. 1830)
- 14. Gonzalez/Ramirez Adobe, 835 Laguna Street (1825)
- 15. Historic Adobe, 715 Santa Barbara Street (ca. 1830)
- 16. Hunt/Stambach House, 821 Coronel Street (1879)
- 17. Lugo Adobe, 114¹/₂ E. De la Guerra Street (ca. 1850)
- 18. Miranda Adobe, Presidio Avenue (ca. 1840)
- 19. Mission Santa Barbara, Upper Laguna Street (1786)
- 20. Orena Adobes, E. De la Guerra and Anacapa Streets (1849, 1858)
- 21. Refugio Cordero Adobe, 820 Santa Barbara Street (1850?)
- 22. Rochin/Birabent Adobe, 820 Santa Barbara Street (1856)
- 23. Santiago De la Guerra Adobe, 110 E. De la Guerra Street (ca. 1812?)
- 24. Tree of Light, NW Corner Chapala and Carrillo Streets (ca. 1878)
- 25. Trussell/Winchester Adobe, 412 W. Montecito Street (1854)
- 26. Savoy Hotel, 409 State Street (1888-89)

STRUCTURES OF MERIT DESIGNATED BY LANDMARK COMMITTEE

- 27. Old Physicians Building, 1421 State Street (1920, 27, 29, 30)
- 28. Upper Hawley Block, 1227-1233 State Street (ca. 1888)
- 29. Sherman House, 625 Chapala Street (1876)

STATE HISTORIC LANDMARKS IN SANTA BARBARA CITY²

- Burton Mound, E. Mason Street & Burton Circle
- (9) Casa de la Guerra, 11 E. De la Guerra St.
- (8) Covarrubias Adobe 715 Santa Barbara St.
- (19) Mission Santa Barbara, Upper Laguna St.
- Lobero Theatre, 33 E. Canon Perdido St.
- (25) Trussell-Winchester Adobe (Hastings), 412 W. Montecito St.
- (6) Carrillo Adobe, 11 E. Carrillo St.
- Santa Barbara Presidio, E. Canon Perdido, Anacapa, Santa Barbara Streets

LISTED ON NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES²

- (19) Mission Santa Barbara, Upper Laguna Street
- (14) Gonzales-Ramirez Adobe, 835 Laguna Street
- (10) El Paseo and Casa de la Guerra, 11 E. De la Guerra St. to State St. and Anacapa St.

Santa Barbara Presidio Includes ruins in vicinity of E. Canon Perdido, Anacapa, Santa Barbara Streets and historic buildings, i.e., Caneda Adobe (5), El Cuartel (11), Rochin-Birabent Adobe (22), Pico Adobe (4), Cota-Knox House, chapel site.

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS³

- (19) Mission Santa Barbara
- (14) Gonzales-Ramirez Adobe

NOTEWORTHY STRUCTURES OF IMPORTANCE

Royal Presidio remains	
Cota-Knox Building	914 Anacapa Street
Former Church	-2020 Chapala Street
Old Mission Waterworks and grist mill	
Railroad Station	- 209 State St., and Roundhouse E. Cabrillo Blvd.
Upham Hotel	1404 De la Vina Street
Lobero Theatre	E. Canon Perdido St., and Anacapa St.

Meridian Studios	114 E. De la Guerra Street	
Mortimer Cook House		
House	501 Chapala Street	
Edwards House	1721 Santa Barbara St.	
Orella Adobe (incorporated portion of Copper Coffee Pot Restaurant)		
Redwood Inn	124 W. Cota Street	
House of Paintings (Darling House)	Rancheria Street	
Old Courtroom	25 E. De la Guerra Street	
Streetcar Stop	Alameda Padre Serra at Lasuen Road	
Fithian (Park) Building	600 Block State Street	
Hitching Posts, stepping blocks, cut sandstone curbs, and old streetlights		
Moreton Bay Fig Tree and Portola Site	E. Montecito Street	
House	1822 Santa Barbara Street	
House	31 E. Pedregosa Street	
Rice House		
House	422 W. De la Guerra Street	
Tinker House	Modoc Road and Mission Street	
House		
House	15 E. Valerio Street	
Hernster House	136 W. Cota Street	
House	535 N. Quarantina Street	
The Tea House Restaurant	301 E. Canon Perdido Street	
Cottage		
Yellow House at the Bird Refuge	50 Los Patos Way	
Former Grocery Store	800 De la Vina Street	
House	302 W. Micheltorena Street	
Brinkerhoff Avenue Cottages		
Knights of Columbus Hall	925 De la Vina Street	
Peshine House	925 San Andres Street	
El Caserio Studio Cottage	900 block Garden Street	
S. side 300 blk. E. Canon Perdido Street (portion)		
Historical Society Museum	136 E. De la Guerra Street	

El Presidio office building	800 Anacapa Street
San Marcos Building	State at Anapamu Streets
Museum of Art (former Post Office)	1130 State Street
St. Anthony's Seminary	2300 Garden Street
Little Town Club	27 E. Carrillo Street
Mihran Studios	-17-21 E. Carrillo Street
Masonic Temple	-16 E. Carrillo Street
News-Press Building	De la Guerra Plaza
House	-20, 30 to 36 W. Valerio Street

Plaza Rubio homes
APPENDIX B

VISUAL RESOURCES

APPENDIX B: VISUAL RESOURCES

TREES DESIGNATED BY THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA AS "HISTORIC TREES" AND "SPECIMEN TREES" UNDER MUNICIPAL CODE

Historic Trees

Moreton Bay Fig Tree

Moreton Bay Fig Tree (Ficus macrophylla)	Chapala & E. Montecito Streets	Sept. 1, 1970
Arlington Silk Oak (Grevillea robusta)	309 State Street	Sept. 1, 1970
Four Large Olive Trees (Olea europea)	NE Garden & Los Olivos Streets	Sept. 1, 1970
S. B. Orchid Tree (Bauhinia forficata)	NE Garden & Carrillo Streets	April 20, 1976
Sailor's Sycamore (Platanus racemosa)	SW Milpas & Quinientos Streets	April 20, 1976
Arroyo Burro Sycamore (Platanus racemosa)	315 N. Ontare Road	April 20, 1976
Specimen Trees		
Indian Laurel Fig Tree	100 E. Constance Avenue	

1816 Santa Barbara Street

NOISE ELEMENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Noise Element was prepared for the City of Santa Barbara.

City Council

David Shiffman, Mayor Hal Conklin Patricia Fillippini Jeanne Graffy Sheila Lodge Francis Lopez Lyle Reynolds

Planning Commission

Jerry Holt, Chairman Nicholas Dumas Michael Gray Judith Orias Virginia Robinson Hubert Twibell Kathryn Woolson

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation and invaluable assistance extended to us by the City of Santa Barbara's Department of Community Development, Planning Division Staff.

Dave Davis, Principal Planner John Helmer Mike Montoya

This report was prepared by the following:

Envicom Corporation

Joseph G. Johns, President Mim McFarland, Project Manager Donald O. Asquith, Vice President Patricia Caldwell, Cartographer Patti Hollingsworth, Secretary Teri Immekus, Secretary Duane Vander Pluym, Environmental Analyst

Interface Planning and Counseling Corporation

John Jostes, President Ken Marshall

Our thanks to Lencho Auchstetter for his illustrations, and to Patricia Caldwell for plates and report layout. (Note: These illustrations and plates are not included in the 1993 reprint of the General Plan.)

NOISE ELEMENT TABLE OF CONTENTS

POLICY REPORT	95
Introduction	95
Legislative Authority	95
Purpose and Approach	96
Relationship to Other	
General Plan Elements	97
Noise Exposure	97
General	97
Existing Conditions	98
Future Conditions	101
Effects of Noise in the City	
of Santa Barbara	101
Noise Control	102
Noise Regulations	102
Alternative Noise Control	103
Goal and Policy Recommendations	106
Organization of	
Recommendations	106
Goal	107
Policies	107
Implementation Strategies	107
LIST OF FIGURES - POLICY REPORT	
Figure 1 - Typical L _{dn} Noise Ranges	109
Figure 2 - Land Use Compatibility	
Guidelines	110
LIST OF TABLES - POLICY REPORT	
Table 1 - Potential Noise	
Conflict Areas	100
Table 2 - Summary of Noise Levels	
Identified as Requisite to Protect Public	
Health and Welfare with an	
Adequate Margin of Safety	102
Table 3 - Existing Federal and State	
Noise Regulations	105
TECHNICAL REPORT	113
Foreword	113
Introduction to Noise	113
Sound Mechanics	113
Hearing	115
Noise	119
General	119
Noise Element	119
Road Traffic Noise	119
Rail Traffic Noise	121
Air Traffic Noise	122

Methodology	123
Philosophy of Analysis	123
Measurement Scheme: Day-Night	
Noise Level	
L _{dn}	125
CNEL	125
Direct Measurement	126
Mathematical Modeling	126
General	126
Input Data	127
Road Traffic Data	128
Rail Traffic Data	128
Future Noise Projections	129
General	129
Road Traffic	129
Rail Traffic	
Air Traffic	
Noise Contouring	
Noise Environment	
Noise-Sensitive Land Uses	
Noise Conflict Areas	
Noise Exposures	
Conclusions and Assumptions	
Conclusions	
Assumptions	
References	141
APPENDIX A-1 Glossary	
APPENDIX A-2 Effects of Noise	
*APPENDIX B Traffic Data Compilations	
*APPENDIX C Distances to L_{dn} Noise	
Levels for Existing and Future Traffic	,
*APPENDIX D Summary of Noise Measurer	nent
*APPENDIX E Field Record of Noise	
Measurements	(t
*APPENDIX F Health Care Facilities (mappe	ea)
and Guest/Rest Homes (not mapped)	
*Available through Santa Barbara City Planning Departr	nent
LIST OF FIGURES TECHNICAL REDOD	т
Figure 1 Diagram of Simple Sound	1
Wayes	114
waves	114
Figure 2 - Chart for Combining Sound	
Levels by "Decibel Addition"	115
Figure 3 - Simple Functional Diagram	
of the Human Ear	

NOISE ELEMENT TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED

Figure 4 – Frequency-response Characteristics in the American National Standard Specification for
A, B, and C Scales in Sound Level
Figure 5 - Generalized Spectrum of Typical
Passenger Automobile at 50 mph
Speed and at 50 feet
Distance
Figure 6 - Generalized Spectrum of Typical
Level Beedway et
Highway Cruising Speeds 121
Figure 7 - Idealized Time History of Train
Passby. Illustrating Locomotive
and Freight Car Components 122
Figure 8 - Average Maximum Passby
Noise Levels of Automobiles (at
50 feet) for Current and Forecast
Years
Figure 9 - Average Maximum Passby
Noise Levels of Heavy Trucks (at 50 fact) for Current and Forecast
Vears 131
10415
LIST OF TABLES - TECHNICAL REPORT
Table 1 - Sound Levels and
Human Response118
Table 2 - Change in Airport Noise
Exposure Expressed in CNEL 132
Table 3 - Summary Land Use
Compatibility Standards
Conflict Arous 126
Table 5 - Major Noise Sources 137
1010 0 111000 101000
LIST OF MAPS

Current Noise Contours, 1978 Future Noise Contours, 1990 Airport Noise Contours, S.B. Municipal Airport

ABBREVIATIONS

ADTAverage Daily Traffic for a 24-hour day ANSIAmerican National Standards Institute (formerly USASI)
dBAA-weighted deciber (decibels). Also written dB (A)
EPAEnvironmental Protection Agency
HzHertz or wave cycles per second
Lee Equivalent A-weighted sound level over a
given time interval
$L_{eq(8)}$ Equivalent A-weighted sound level over eight hours
$L_{eq(24)}$ Equivalent A-weighted sound level over twenty four hours
I Day might average sound level the 24 hours
L_{dn} Day-might average sound level - the 24 hour
A-weighted equivalent sound level with
a 10 decider penalty applied to
L_d Daytime equivalent A-weighted sound level
between the hours of 0/00 and 2200
L_n Nighttime equivalent A-weighted sound level between the hours of 2200 and 0700
I
time interval or event
NIDTS Noise Induced Dermanent Threshold
Shift
NITTS Noise Induced Temperature Threshold
Shift
OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Act
SENEL Single Event Noise Equivalent Level

POLICY REPORT

- **INTRODUCTION** Noise affects man and his environment in a number of important ways. Some sounds cannot be heard or are not noticed, yet the human body reacts involuntarily to them. Other sounds are intense and quick to rupture the eardrum. However, all sound is not destructive. The point should be emphasized that sound is vital to communication and necessary for the maintenance of life.
- Legislative In making city and county governments in California responsible for a Noise Element Authority In their General Plans, the Legislature has recognized the steady escalation of outdoor noise as a significant environmental hazard. Unlike other hazards faced by California residents, such as earthquakes or floods, noise is generated primarily by man's own activities. Considering noise in the planning process, then, is essential to controlling its impact on the community. Specific authority for this Element of the General Plan is contained in Government Code Section 65302(g), which was revised by Senate Bill 860 (Bielenson, 1975). The amendment became effective January 1, 1976, and requires the following:

A noise element which shall recognize guidelines adopted by the Office of Noise Control pursuant to Section 39850.1 of the Health and Safety Code, and which quantifies the community noise environment in terms of noise exposure contours for both near- and long-term levels of growth and traffic activity. Such noise exposure information shall become a guideline for use in development of the land use element to achieve noise compatible land use and also to provide baseline levels and noise source identification for local noise ordinance enforcement.

The sources of environmental noise considered in this analysis shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *1. Highways and freeways.*
- 2. Primary arterials and major local streets.
- *3. Passenger and freight on-line railroad operations and ground rapid transit systems.*
- 4. Commercial and general aviation; heliport, helistop, and military airport operations, aircraft overflights, jet engine test stands, and all other ground facilities and maintenance functions related to airport operation.
- 5. Local industrial plants, including, but not limited to, railroad classification yards.
- 6. Other ground stationary noise sources identified by local agencies as contributory to the community noise environment.

The noise exposure information shall be presented in terms of noise contours expressed in community noise equivalent level (CNEL) or day-night average level (L_{dn}). CNEL means the average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. and after addition of ten decibels to sound levels in the night before 7 a.m. and after 10 p.m. L_{dn} means the average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of 10 decibels to sound levels in the night before 7 a.m. and after 10 p.m.

The contours shall be shown in minimum increments of 5 dB and shall continue down to 60 dB. For areas deemed noise sensitive, including, but not limited to, areas containing schools, hospitals, rest homes, long-term medical or mental care facilities, or any other land use areas deemed noise sensitive by the local jurisdiction, the noise exposure shall be determined by monitoring.

A part of the noise element shall also include the preparation of a community noise exposure inventory, current and projected, which identifies the number of persons exposed to various levels of noise throughout the community.

The noise element shall also recommend mitigating measures and possible solutions to existing and foreseeable noise problems.

The state, local, or private agency responsible for the construction, maintenance, or operation of those transportation, industrial or other commercial facilities specified in paragraph 2 of this subdivision shall provide to the local agency producing the general plan, specific data relating to current and projected levels of activity and a detailed methodology for the development of noise contours given this supplied data, or they shall provide noise contours as specified in the foregoing statements.

It shall be the responsibility of the local agency preparing the general plan to specify the manner in which the noise element will be integrated into the city or county's zoning plan and tied to the land use and circulation elements and to the local noise ordinance. The noise element, once adopted, shall also become the guideline for determining compliance with the State's Noise Insulation Standards, as contained in Section 1092 of Title 25 of the California Administrative Code.

Purpose andAs a mandated part of the General Plan, the Noise Element is intended to serve as the
local government's guide to public and private development matters related to outdoor
noise.

The basic goal of the Element is to outline a comprehensive plan to achieve and maintain a noise environment that is compatible with a variety of human activities in different land uses. To achieve this goal, the Element provides a quantitative estimate of noise exposures, land use noise standards, and policies and implementation measures for controlling noise. This information is intended for use in conjunction with other adopted policies of the General Plan, particularly those of the Circulation, Land Use, and Housing Elements.

This Noise Element has been prepared in two sections for the City of Santa Barbara. The first section, the Policy Report, is concerned with the implications of the technical findings for noise control. The second section, the Technical Report, and the Appendices, contain the quantitative estimates of existing and forecasted noise levels in the City, and document the methods used in computing noise exposure. Together, these two sections constitute the Noise Element.

The Noise Element is one of the more technical Elements of the General Plan. However, the approach of this report is to present discussions of noise primarily in qualitative form and to rely on the use of figures in presenting certain mathematical concepts. Those wishing a more detailed technical explanation are referred to the works listed in the General References.

Relationship to
Other GeneralThe Noise Element is most closely related to the Circulation, Land Use, Housing and
Conservation Elements. The principal noise sources evaluated in the Element are
transportation noise sources, which are road, rail, and air traffic. Noise generated by
these sources depends primarily on the number and type of vehicles in operation as
planned for in the Circulation Element.

Inseparable from the circulation considerations in the General Plan are the locations and types of land uses throughout the City. The locations of circulation routes in relation to different land uses can be a major determining factor of noise exposure. It is important that consideration be given in the Land Use Element to separating the most sensitive land uses from the sources of high noise levels. Land use noise standards are recommended as a part of this Element to assist in these considerations.

The Housing Element is related to the Noise Element in that both the location and insulation requirements of housing are, in part, determined by noise exposures.

The Conservation Element identifies passive areas such as open space along creek beds, where low noise levels should be maintained.

NOISE EXPOSURE

General

The existing and forecasted noise levels in the City of Santa Barbara are presented in graphic form on the Noise Contours Maps and in tabular form in Appendix C of the Technical Report. These noise levels are expressed in A-weighted decibels in terms of Day-Night Noise Levels (abbreviated L_{dn}). Detailed explanations of L_{dn} noise levels and the methods used to compute them are presented in the Technical Report. The following brief discussion is intended to provide a basic understanding of the terms to facilitate use of the Noise Contours Maps and Appendix C. Appendix A of the Technical Report provides a glossary with additional discussion of some of the more technical language.

Common noise experienced by each of us daily may range from a whisper to a locomotive train passing by. The range of sound <u>energy</u> represented by these two events is so large that it cannot be represented mathematically without using numbers in the millions and billions. To avoid this inconvenience, sound levels have been compressed in a standard logarithmic scale called the decibel (dB) scale. The reference level for the scale, O dB, is not the absence of sound, but the weakest sound a person with very good hearing can detect in a quiet place. The most important feature of the decibel scale is its logarithmic nature. An increase from 0 to 10 dB represents a tenfold increase in sound energy, but an increase from 10 to 20 dB represents a hundredfold increase, and from 20 to 30 dB represents a thousandfold increase over 0 dB.

The average range of sounds that we are commonly exposed to generally falls in the 30 to 100 dB range. However, not all sound waves affect us equally. The human ear is more sensitive to high pitch sounds, such as a whistle, than it is to low pitch sounds, such as a drumbeat.

To account for this effect in noise measurements, it is necessary to use an electronic filter in sound level meters which acts as the equivalent of the human ear in filtering out some of the lower frequencies of sound. This filter is called the A-scale weighting network, and is abbreviated by the A in the notation dBA.

A-scale decibel measurements can be taken at any time in the community to record the sound levels of various noise sources. However, to develop an indicator of varying sound levels occurring over the 24-hour day, it is necessary to average the sound occurring at each moment throughout the day. The Day-Night Noise Level is the result of this procedure, and gives a general, single-number index of noise exposure over an average 24-hour day. In computing the L_{dn} levels, it is also necessary to apply weighting to noise that occurs at night to account for the greater sensitivity that people have to noise at night. L_{dn} noise levels can be developed for road traffic, as well as for rail and air traffic for which the measure has been used traditionally. As examples of typical L_{dn} noise level ranges, Figure 1 gives ranges of L_{dn} decibel exposures ranging from quiet rural areas to an area under the flight path of a major airport.

FIGURE 1



Existing Conditions

The existing noise environment in the City of Santa Barbara is composed of sounds from many sources. Under the scope of this Element, the noise sources evaluated were road, rail, and air traffic. Parks, schools and hospitals were also monitored as noise sensitive land uses to determine if potentially incompatible noise levels impinged on them. The following are summary conclusions regarding the existing noise environment in the City:

- 1. In general, the City of Santa Barbara may be considered a relatively quiet environment. Ten potential major noise conflict areas were identified from a list of 98 possible problem areas within the City. An additional 12 potential minor conflict areas were also identified, based on the estimated locations of noise contours. Monitoring conducted at locations of noise sensitive uses revealed three more potential minor conflict areas. Of the more than one hundred road segments evaluated for traffic noise, segments on four principal roadways were associated with L_{dn} noise levels of 70 dBA or higher. This is not to say that the City is without noise problems. Rather the major noise sources are few in number and of limited impact.
- 2. The most significant source of noise in the City is road traffic, followed by rail and air traffic. Of the roads evaluated for noise exposure, the following were found to be associated with L_{dn} noise levels of 70 dBA or higher: U.S. 101, State Street, Cabrillo Boulevard, and Las Positas Road. Table 5 of the Technical Report lists roads with L_{dn} noise levels of 65 dBA or higher.
- 3. Rail traffic on the Southern Pacific line is infrequent, but creates intense noise events such that the total sound energy associated with the railroad is nearly equivalent to that of U.S. 101. Noise sensitive areas potentially impacted by railroad noise include Wilson School, Bohnett Park, Palm Park, A Child's Estate, Andree Clark Bird Refuge, Dwight Murphy Field and the Moreton Fig Tree.
- 4. The Municipal Airport is a source of local noise. Most of the land within the 60 dB CNEL contour is under the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara. Noise complaints are received from various areas within the County, including the University of California, Hope Ranch, and University Village. Land uses in areas immediately adjacent to the Airport, within the City limits, are primarily non-residential.
- 5. Table 1 contains a partial list of those noise sensitive uses which were found to be exposed to potentially incompatible noise levels according to the land use standards recommended in this Policy Report. The incompatibility is termed potential because the land use was evaluated only at a general level. Site acoustic analysis is necessary to determine the nature and extent of a noise problem, should one be confirmed to exist. Sources of the noise impinging on the land use or facility are also listed. Appendix F contains a list of rest homes and approximate noise levels at each location.

TABLE 1 POTENTIAL NOISE CONFLICT AREAS

Heavily Impacted Areas¹

Oak Park Convalescent Hospital Santa Barbara Convalescent Hospital Wilson School Bohnett Park A Child's Estate Andree Clark Bird Refuge Dwight Murphy Field Moreton Fig Tree Municipal Tennis Courts Palm Park Residential areas adjacent to major noise sources

Slightly Impacted Areas¹

Oak Park Las Positas Park Adams School McKinley School Monroe School Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara Jr. High West Beach East Beach Ambassador Park Vera Cruz Park Municipal Golf Course Residential areas adjacent to minor noise sources

Additional Potential <u>Conflict Areas²</u>

Lincoln School Santa Barbara High School Plaza del Mar

Local Noise Source(s)

Highway 101 Highway 101 Highway 101 & Railroad Highway 101 Cabrillo Blvd. & Railroad Highway 101, State St., Las Positas, Cabrillo Blvd. & Railroad

Local Noise Source(s)

Highway 101 & Railroad Las Positas Road Las Positas Road Cliff Drive Cliff Drive Cliff Drive Milpas Street Cabrillo & Railroad Cabrillo Cabrillo Haley Street Highway 101 See Table 5 of Technical Report for noise sources

Local Noise Source(s)

Anacapa Anapamu Castillo & Cabrillo

¹ Based on estimated contours for 1978.

² Based on noise monitoring.

Future In planning for noise control, it is necessary to estimate what the future noise environment may be like. Accordingly, noise level forecasts for the year 1990 were included as part of the technical analysis. In general, the future noise environment will be controlled by three factors:

- 1. The expected increase in the number of noise sources (i.e., traffic volumes).
- 2. The application of noise control technology to various sources.
- 3. Noise mitigation measures applied to exterior walls and exterior areas to decrease interior noise levels and noise levels in recreation areas.

It is reasonable to assume that noise control technology will be applied to some noise sources, and that this will counterbalance the increase in traffic, resulting in the same noise levels as currently exist or in decreased noise levels. No major technological breakthrough is foreseen for other noise sources, however, such as light aircraft, and the expected increase in volumes of these sources will mean an increase in noise levels. Even with the application of technology, high noise levels are expected to persist in some areas of the City, particularly along Highway 101. There are limits to what can be accomplished by technology alone, and this makes land use control a necessary component of successful noise control strategies. Summary conclusions regarding the expected future noise environment are as follows (see Section D, Future Noise Projection of Methodology Chapter of the Technical Report, for further discussion):

- 1. Forecasts of road traffic noise assume that noise control technology will be applied (as required in the California Vehicle Code, Section 21760), and that this will counteract the expected increase in road traffic in most, but not all, cases. Thus, road traffic noise is projected to remain the same or decrease somewhat by 1990 on most roads.
- 2. Current noise levels generated by the Southern Pacific Railroad are assumed to persist for at least the intermediate future, based on the assumption that existing levels of railroad traffic remain constant. If railroad traffic increases, noise levels will correspondingly increase.
- 3. The improvement in aircraft noise exposure resulting from compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation 36 may be partially offset by increased airport activity. Therefore, no dramatic reductions in aircraft engine noise are anticipated in the near future unless there is a major technological breakthrough. In the absence of accepted projections of air traffic growth for the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, the noise contours projected by Bolt, Beranek and Newman are considered as adequately describing the 1990 noise exposure.

Effects of
Noise in the
City ofHealth and welfare criteria have been published by the federal Environmental
Protection Agency, and these criteria can be compared to the noise levels quantified in
this Element to draw some general conclusions. The basic criteria are given in Table 2,
and utilize the Sound Equivalent Level (Leq) and Day-Night Noise Level (Ldn). The Leq
is the basis for the Ldn noise level, but does not include a weighting for nighttime noise.
It should be noted also that an "adequate margin of safety" has been built into these
criteria.

Near Highway 101, the Southern Pacific Railroad, and the Municipal Airport, these criteria indicate that a certain level of activity (i.e., sleep, speech) interference and stress can be expected. However, it is unlikely that any resident's hearing is threatened unless he is spending unusually long periods of time in close proximity to these major sources.

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF NOISE LEVELS IDENTIFIED AS REQUISITE TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE WITH AN ADEQUATE MARGIN OF SAFETY

EFFECT	LEVEL	AREA
Hearing Loss	$L_{eq}(24) \ge 70 \text{ dB}$	All areas
Outdoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{dn} \ge 55 \text{ dB}$	Outdoors in residential areas and farms and other outdoor areas where people spend widely varying amounts of time and other places in which quiet is a basis for use.
	$L_{eq}(24) \ge 55 \text{ dB}$	Outdoor areas where people spend limited amounts of time, such as school yards, playgrounds, etc.
Indoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{dn} \ge 45 \text{ dB}$	Indoor residential areas.
	$L_{eq}(24) \ge 45 \text{ dB}$	Other indoor areas with human activities such as schools, etc.

(Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1974)

Explanation

- L_{eq}(24) Equivalent A-weighted Sound Level over a 24-hour period.
- L_{dn} Day-Night average sound level the 24-hour A-weighted Equivalent Sound Level, with a 10-decibel penalty applied to nighttime levels.
- dB decibels.

NOISE CONTROL

Noise Regulations Heightened concern in recent years for "environmental quality" has led to greater attention by the legislative and administrative branches of government to the problem of excessive noise. This attention has resulted in the enactment of a number of laws and regulations regarding noise. To provide the legal and planning contexts within which the recommended goals and policies of the Element would be implemented, this section summarizes the current noise laws and outlines possible noise control strategies. Unfortunately, there has been little coordination among the agencies responsible for noise control, and this has resulted in the use of different noise evaluation techniques and standards in noise regulations. This non-uniform approach makes comparison and use of standards and regulations a confusing matter for both the general public and those government officials responsible for compliance at the local level. Table 3 provides a summary list of existing noise regulations which pertain to the City of Santa Barbara. In addition to those laws shown in the table, both the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEOA) require environmental analysis of certain developments including an analysis of potential noise problems at the project site.

The most significant of the laws listed in Table 3 is the Noise Control Act of 1972. This law essentially authorizes the EPA to coordinate noise regulation at the national level. It also authorizes the EPA to set noise emission limits for major noise sources including aircraft, motor vehicles, and trains. These emission standards can be expected to have an important effect on future noise levels in the City. In addition, health and welfare criteria for noise exposure limits have been published in compliance with the Act, and these criteria have been incorporated into the recommended land use compatibility standards. In publishing these criteria, the EPA has selected and recommended the L_{dn} measurement scale for use as a uniform noise evaluation scheme. If nationwide use of this measurement becomes a reality, much of the existing confusion regarding noise should diminish. This should enable the city to enact noise control regulations and measurements consistent with other cities and counties as well as with the State and Federal government.

Any action to control noise will work on either the source of the noise, its transmission path, the receiver of the noise, or any combination of these facets of sound. As noted Control in the preceding section, source controls are primarily the responsibility of the Federal government, and to a lesser degree, the State government. Control of the reception of noise, however, has its roots in local government's traditional authority over land use control.

> The basic goal of this Element is to achieve and maintain a noise environment that is compatible with a variety of human activities. This clearly calls for cooperation among all levels of government. Source controls are the most effective means of reducing noise, but there are limits to what can be accomplished through technology alone. A need for land use controls, coupled with source controls, will probably be necessary for overall noise reduction in many cities for the foreseeable future.

> The purpose of this section of the Noise Element is to outline some of the land use and other types of noise reduction alternatives that are available for implementation by the City These various strategies form the basic planning framework for the recommended goals and policies of the next sections.

> Generally, noise control strategies may be thought of as belonging to one of five approaches. These strategies are: 1) to encourage voluntary noise reduction measures by property owners and developers; 2) to mandate compatible land use through zoning and planning powers; 3) to require noise reduction based upon environmental performance standards; 4) to encourage and require noise attenuation through a housing rehabilitation program; and 5) to enact noise control through government ownership of the affected property.

Alternative Noise

The first approach would include providing information to builders and the general public regarding the importance of noise reduction and different construction and site development techniques for noise compatibility. Various means of achieving this objective would include review of proposals by an architectural review board, design services by government staff during the permit application process, and maintenance of an acoustical information library for developers and the public. Education of the public is an important aspect of this approach since public awareness of noise problems can affect the marketability of developments. Such an approach can be successful in solving noise problems provided there is a degree of cooperation between the local government and developers or if the development market is a buyer's market and there is a demand for noise compatibility.

If these conditions do not exist, it may be necessary to use the local government police powers of zoning and planning to ensure that the public is protected from excessive noise. These measures can be an important influence on future development, but may be of little help in resolving existing noise problems. The basic approach is the exclusion of noise sensitive land uses from areas of high noise levels, such as along the Southern Pacific Railroad and Highway 101. If development is permitted in noise-impacted areas, zoning performance and development standards can regulate the details of the development such as building height, buffer areas, and noise barrier construction. Special types of development, such as cluster housing and planned unit developments, can be regulated to prevent unnecessary noise problems from occurring. Building codes may be enforced under this approach as well to limit the transmission of sound into and out of buildings.

One concept being implemented in a number of cities in California and across the country is the adoption and enforcement of environmental performance standards or a noise ordinance which sets quantitative limits on the level of noise permitted in different zones in the City.

A zone can be established in areas heavily impacted by noise (i.e., along Highway 101 and the Southern Pacific Railroad) which designates these areas as "blighted" due to high noise levels. A housing rehabilitation program can be instituted in these zones to provide low interest loans for modifying housing units to comply with acceptable noise levels. These noise "blighted" areas may also qualify for redevelopment funds.

	Responsible Agency	Regulation/Standard	Noise Source Regulated	Summary
FEDERAL	Environmental Protection Agency	Public Law 92-574 (Noise Control Act of 1972)	All	Gives EPA responsibility to identify noise sources, set standards for limiting emissions, publish health and welfare criteria, set product labeling standards, and recommend aircraft standards.
	Federal Aviation Administration	FAR Part 36	Aircraft	Sets emission limits for aircraft under specified flight conditions for type certification.
	Federal Highway Administration	PPM 90-2	Highways, outdoor noise environment	Sets land use compatibility requirements for developments adjacent to Federal-aid highways.
	Department of Housing and Urban Development	Policy Circular 1390.2	Airports, outdoor noise environments	Sets noise acceptability requirements for developments requesting Federal Loan assistance.
	Department of Labor	Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970	Outdoor/Indoor noise environments	Specifies maximum noise exposure levels for workers.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA	Department of Aeronautics (Caltrans)	California Administrative Code, Title 4, Sub-Chapter 6	Airports, aircraft	Specifies maximum noise exposures for sensitive uses near airports; sets standards for aircraft operations.
	Department of Motor Vehicles	California Vehicle Code Section 23130	Motor vehicles	Sets noise emission limits for motor vehicles under specified operating conditions.
	Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	Streets and Highways Code	Highways	Requires corrective action when noise levels from new freeways exceed set limits in nearby schools.
	Commission of Housing and Community Development	California Administrative Code, Title 25, Article 4	Outdoor/Indoor noise environments	Limits interior noise levels resulting from outdoor levels in new multi-family units.
	Council on Intergovernmental Relations	California Government Section 63502(g) Amended by Senate Bill 860 (Beilenson, 1975)	Outdoor noise environment	Requires quantitative Noise Elements in all City and County General Plans.
	Department of Health, Office of Noise Control	Noise Insulation Standards	Indoor noise environment	Sets Statewide noise insulation standards for housing.

 TABLE 3

 EXISTING FEDERAL AND STATE NOISE REGULATIONS

City ownership of noise-impacted land, the most restrictive approach, makes the regulation of its use a simpler matter. Purchase or the use of the power of eminent domain which fully compensates the property owner should be used rather than the purchase of an easement regulating the land without transfer of ownership.

Which of these approaches is used depends in large measure on the severity of the noise problem. The Technical Report of this Element concludes that, on the basis of the Noise Contour Map, most of the City of Santa Barbara is not heavily impacted by high noise levels except in close proximity to certain major sources such as U.S. 101, the Municipal Airport, and the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks (other noise sources are listed in Table 5 of the Technical Report). It is unlikely, then, that the City needs to consider the most restrictive approach, and can rely on zoning and planning to prevent major noise problems from occurring near these sources.

Most of the above strategies deal primarily with reducing future noise problems rather than existing ones. Where a noise problem already exists, one or more of five general solutions are available: 1) the noise can be reduced at the source; 2) the noise can be blocked by an insulating barrier; 3) the source can be removed from people and other receivers; 4) the receiver can be removed from the source; or 5) the time exposure to the noise can be minimized. As is true with most environmental hazards, preventing or reducing the cost of the future hazard is easier and less expensive than resolving existing problems.

GOAL AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Organization of Recommendations

The previous sections of this report provide a summary of the technical analysis of noise in the City of Santa Barbara, and a synthesis of the legal and planning frameworks for noise control. In this section, general planning goals and policies are recommended for the City of Santa Barbara. These recommendations constitute the noise control plan for the City and are the heart of the Noise Element.

The recommendations comprise a general planning goal, general policies, and more specific policies termed implementation strategies. The general goal provides a statement of the basic purpose of the Noise Element so that consistent planning is possible. It is a necessary guideline which can be held up against future proposals to determine their effect on the noise environment. The general policies complement the planning goal and define specific directions for the City to take in controlling noise. The implementation strategies are suggested refinements of the general policies and will be carried out through the development of City ordinances and regulations. Methods for implementation of the goals and policies need not be limited to those listed in this section, as other effective strategies may become apparent in the future.

While it would be desirable to fully implement each of the implementation strategies it is recognized that there are competing demands for preservation, enhancement, development, and conservation of resources, and the City's economic resources are limited. Therefore, priorities for the implementation of these strategies shall be determined by the City Council after consideration of economic, social, and environmental concerns weighted according to balance and priority.

Goal	To ensu sounds provided noise let	To ensure that the City of Santa Barbara is free from excessive noise and abusive sounds such that: a) sufficient information concerning the City noise environment is provided for land use planning; b) strategies are developed for abatement of excessive noise levels; and c) existing low noise levels are maintained and protected.		
	In defir public f the mini	ining this goal, primary emphasis should be placed on protecting the ger from noise levels which may be hazardous to hearing. Second in important nimization of noise induced stress, annoyance, and activity interference.		
Policies	1.0	Land us planning	se noise compatibility standards should be established for general g and zoning purposes.	
	2.0	Provisio noise pr	on should be made for the identification and evaluation of potential oblem areas.	
	3.0	Existing reduced enforcer	g and potential incompatible noise levels in problem areas should be through land use planning, building and subdivision code ment, and other administrative means.	
	4.0	Existing reduced responsi	g and potential incompatible noise levels in problem areas should be through operational or source controls where the City has ibility for such controls.	
	5.0	A progr nature a	ram should be developed for the education of the community in the nd extent of noise problems in the City.	
	6.0	Noise conjurisdict	ontrol activities should be coordinated with those of other responsible tions.	
	7.0	Provisio Element	on should be made for periodic review and revision of the Noise t.	
Implementation Strategies	1.0	Land upper lanning	se noise compatibility standards should be established for general g and zoning purposes.	
		1.1	Adopt the noise compatibility standards provided in Figure 2 for use in identifying potential noise problem areas, and in reviewing environmental impact documents.	
		1.2	Incorporate noise performance standards to mitigate peak noise levels into zoning and other appropriate ordinances.	
		1.3	Enforce noise compatibility standards for the mixed uses in the Lower East Industrial Area.	
		1.4	Require the City Redevelopment Agency to incorporate noise performance standards into the Land Use Standards, Regulations, and Restrictions outlined in Section 507 of the First Amended Redevelopment Plan.	

- 2.0 Provision should be made for the identification and evaluation of potential noise problem areas.
 - 2.1 Using the noise compatibility standards provided in Figure 2, review existing land uses to identify potential noise problems.
 - 2.2 Establish an ongoing noise monitoring program to identify and evaluate noise levels in locations identified as conflict areas on the Noise Contour Map.
 - 2.3 Conduct noise conflict mapping for land use categories not included in this analysis, particularly residential land uses.
- 3.0 Existing and potential incompatible noise levels in problem areas should be reduced through land use planning, building and subdivision code enforcement and other administrative means.
 - 3.1 Locate proposed developments in the City on the Noise Contour Map to determine if there is a potential impact on the development or, conversely, if the development will increase noise levels in a relatively quiet area. The development review and environmental review processes should include a further analysis in areas of potential impact.
 - 3.2 Discourage development of noise sensitive uses in incompatible noise-impacted areas, particularly adjacent to Highway 101, the Municipal Airport, and the Southern Pacific Railroad.
 - 3.3 Strictly enforce all existing noise control regulations, including building and subdivision laws.
 - 3.4 In existing or future development in noise-impacted areas, especially surrounding the Municipal Airport, encourage or require through ordinance that proper site planning and insulation measures be taken to reduce noise to establish levels.
 - 3.5 Require public housing constructed in noise conflict areas to incorporate noise attenuation measures in site design and construction techniques and materials such that HUD guidelines are met.
- 4.0 Existing and potential incompatible noise levels in problem areas should be reduced through operational or source controls where the City has responsibility for such controls.
 - 4.1 Establish routes for use by heavy trucks away from noise sensitive land uses.

FIGURE 2

Land Use Compatibility Guidelines

LAND USE CATEGORY	Maximum Interior Exposure, Ldn*	INTERP Ld: 55 6	RETATION N VALUE	NFOR 58	5
Residential - Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes	45				
Residential - Multiple Family Dormitories, etc.	45		/////	5.4 6 7.77	
Transient Lodging	45			///	
School Classrooms, Libraries, Churches	45		////		
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	45			*	
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Music Shells	35		11	3. 9 -0.00	
Sports Arenas, Cutdoor Spectator Sports			////		
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	Ť		////	ter pe	
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Rcc., Cemeteries				11	
Office Buildings, Personal, Business and Professional	50				
Commercial - Retail, Movie Theaters, Restaurants	50				
Commercial - Wholesale, Some Retail, Ind., Mfg., Util.				×//	
Manufacturing, Communications (Noise Sensitive)				X/A	
Livestock Farming, Animal Breeding					
Agriculture (except Live- stock), Mining, Fishing					
Public Right-of-Way					////
Extensive Natural Recrea- tion Areas	19 V				

*Due to exterior sources (Source: Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, Inc., 1974)



- 4.2 Undertake a specific study to establish a land use compatibility plan based on current and future noise projections. This plan should include an assessment of the potential for modifying aircraft operations, including hours and flight patterns and land uses around the airport operations, and to reduce excessive noise levels. In addition, the study should evaluate the effect of increased air traffic on surrounding County impacted areas as discussed in Implementation Strategy 6.3.
- 4.3 Seek to restrict the type of aircraft allowed to operate at the Municipal airport if certain aircraft are found to emit excessive noise.
- 4.4 Implement operational controls (e.g., flight path modification) for specific aircraft if those aircraft emit excessive noise.
- 4.5 Encourage the Southern Pacific Transportation Company to control its operations to reduce noise impacts on the City.
- 4.6 Consider noise abatement of stationary sources in cases of excessive noise emissions.
- 5.0 A program should be developed for the education of the community in the nature and extent of noise problems in the City.
 - 5.1 Develop an information release program to familiarize residents of Santa Barbara with the Noise Element and noise problems in general. Special attention should be paid to identifying and informing those people now residing or working in noise problem areas.
 - 5.2 Provide developers and builders with specific design information to reduce noise levels in new and existing developments. (See publication entitled "Evaluation of Outdoor to Indoor Noise Reduction of Building Facades and Outdoor Noise Barriers," by Russell B. DuPree, 1975.)
 - 5.3 As part of the permit application process, inform developers and building contractors about potential construction noise problems and measures to reduce construction noise.
 - 5.4 Maintain a noise information library for both the general public and those with technical backgrounds involved in noise control.
- 6.0 Noise control activities should be coordinated with those of other responsible jurisdictions.
 - 6.1 Encourage the State Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) and the County Engineer to incorporate noise reduction methods, such as barrier walls, in new road construction and improvements to existing roadways.

- 6.2 Coordinate noise monitoring activities with those of Caltrans with regard to Highway 101 and other major State roadways, and with the County of Santa Barbara with regard to acceptable noise levels surrounding the Municipal Airport and the County Bowl, and with the County Health Department in all other identified conflict areas.
- 6.3 Evaluate the effects of increased air traffic on surrounding County impacted areas such as Hope Ranch and University Village.
- 6.4 Coordinate with the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Noise Abatement Committee in its efforts to encourage working relationships between all interested parties in order to establish consistent and constructive methods of control over arriving and departing aircraft at the airport.
- 6.5 Encourage the development and use of a uniform noise evaluation scheme at all levels of government.
- 6.6 Coordinate the land use compatibility study referred to in implementation Strategy 4.2 with that of the County of Santa Barbara with regard to acceptable noise levels and land use planning.
- 7.0 Provision should be made for periodic review and revision of the Noise Element.
 - 7.1 Review the Noise Element at least every two years and comprehensively revise it every five years or whenever major changes in the noise environment occur.
 - 7.2 The Noise Element should be reviewed when revisions or preparation of the following plans or elements occur: Airport Land Use Plan, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Housing Element and Conservation Element.
 - 7.3 Integrate the task of implementing the policies of the Noise Element into the responsibilities of the Current Planning Division and the City Building Official.

TECHNICAL REPORT

FOREWORD This Technical Report is the second of two sections which together constitute the Noise Element for the City of Santa Barbara. The first section, the Policy Report, will be submitted with this report to the City Council for adoption as one of the state-mandated Elements of the General Plan. It is intended that, once adopted, the Noise Element will be updated on a regular basis.

The purpose of this portion of the Noise Element is to provide the necessary technical back-up for the recommendations contained in the Policy Report. The technical nature of some of the information contained in this section necessitates a scientific discussion. However, because of the diverse audience of the Noise Element, the approach has been to minimize the use of detailed mathematical presentations and scientific terminology. Rather, this Report relies for the most part on qualitative descriptions of methodology and noise exposure.

Those wishing a more detailed discussion of noise evaluation techniques are referred to the works listed in the References Section.

INTRODUCTION TO NOISE

Sound Fundamental to any discussion of environmental noise is an understanding of sound phenomena. Such an understanding is interdisciplinary in that the generation of sound waves is within the traditional domain of physics while the perception of sound is primarily a concern of physiology and psychology. In this section, the emphasis is on the source of sound waves. The next section deals with the reception of sound, and is followed by a discussion of sounds that are defined as noise in the Element.

Sound can be defined as a mechanical form of radiant energy which is transmitted by longitudinal pressure waves in air or another medium. To illustrate this definition, consider a tuning fork in vibration after being struck. As a tong of the fork moves in one direction, it compresses the air particles in its path producing an area of <u>condensation</u>. As the tong reverses direction, the air particles left in its wake spread out resulting in an area of <u>refraction</u>. This movement of air particles is a form of wave motion in which the displacements are <u>along</u> the direction of the wave motion and is termed <u>longitudinal</u> wave motion. This is in contrast to <u>transverse</u> waves, such as those in a vibrating string, in which the displacements are perpendicular to the direction of wave motion.

Sound waves emitted by a source have two major dimensions: <u>frequency</u> (or pitch) and <u>amplitude</u> (or intensity). Frequency is measured by the number of sound waves passing a point in one second. This measure is termed "cycles per second" or "Hertz" (abbreviated Hz). In general, humans can hear sounds with frequencies from about 16 to 20,000 Hz, although those limits may be decreased or increased somewhat depending on the individual and the intensity of the sound. Sound waves below 16 Hz are in the realm of <u>infrasonics</u>, and cannot be heard. <u>Ultrasonics</u> refers to sound waves above 20,000 Hz which generally cannot be detected by the human ear either.

Amplitude is a measure of the height or depth of sound waves above and below a median line on a diagram or a sound wave (Figure 1). It is the intensity or magnitude of the sound, and is measured in decibels (abbreviated dB). The decibel system is a relative logarithmic scale of sound pressure which is based on human hearing. The scale has a number of important features. Its basic reference point is the weakest sound which a person with very good hearing can detect in a quiet place. This quantity of sound is assigned the value 0 dB. Since the range of sound pressure which the ear can detect is so great, it is necessary to mathematically compress that range on a logarithmic scale of 0 to about 180. The most important aspect of this scale is that it does not progress arithmetically or linearly. That is, while a 10 dB sound is ten times as intense as a 0 dB sound, 20 dB sound is 100 times as intense as 0 dB (rather than 20 times), and 30 dB is 1000 times as intense as 0 dB (rather than 30 times).

Another important feature of the decibel scale is that sound levels are not directly combined when they are added. For example, if one truck emits 65 dB while idling, parking another truck producing 65 dB next to it does not generate a total noise level of 130 dB. Rather, the total noise level would be 68 dB. The basis of this is the logarithmic nature of the decibel scale, and it is an important feature to remember when considering an area exposed to more than one source of noise. A convenient graphic method for combining decibels is provided in Figure 2.

FIGURE 1



Figure 1. Diagram of Simple Sound Waves

FIGURE 2



Figure 2. Chart for combining sound levels by "decibel addition".

Hearing

"If a tree falls in the woods and no one hears it, is there a sound?" This is an old question, and it serves to emphasize the three major facets of sound: generation, transmission and perception. The following gives a brief description of the perception of sound, or what happens when someone hears the tree fall.

The ability to hear involves a highly complex process and mechanism. The diagram in Figure 3 is a simplified picture of the ear which illustrates its three major parts: the outer, middle, and inner ear. The outer ear may be thought of as an air-filled funnel ending in a membrane, the eardrum. Sound waves travel down the funnel and impinge on the eardrum causing it to vibrate. This vibration mechanically transmits the sound wave to the middle ear which consists of a set of three connected bones. These small bones act as levers to amplify the vibrations on the ear drum, and to distinguish sound waves from the eardrum from those coming through other head tissues and bones. This part of the ear ends in a sound membrane called the oval window which separates the air-filled middle ear from the liquid-filled inner ear or cochlea. The window transmits the mechanical vibrations into liquid waves which travel through the spiral, parallel tubes of the cochlea. A basilar membrane separates two of these tubes; and, as it is distorted by the liquid waves, hair-like cells (cilia) are bent and trigger nerve cell endings by mechanical, chemical and electrical processes. These signals are transmitted to the brain through the auditory nerve.

It is interesting to note that the ear is sensitive to a wide range of acoustic stimuli, but has not evolved involuntary response mechanisms to protect it from very loud noises without temporary or permanent loss of hearing acuity. This contrasts with the eye, which has evolved the dilation mechanism to protect it from overstimulation by light. It is thought that an analogous mechanism to dilation has not developed in the ear because the environmental stimulus, i.e., frequent exposure to loud noise, has not been present. Whether existing levels of noise in large cities are sufficient to initiate natural selection processes is difficult to say, but in any event such adaption in man would take a long time. The human ear, then, is not well adapted to high levels of noise. This highlights the need to control loud noise before it reaches the ear.

There are a number of important aspects of the hearing process that enter into the evaluation of noise exposure in this Element. One is that the ear does not perceive all frequencies of sound equally. Generally, people are more sensitive to sounds in the higher frequencies than lower frequencies. This means that it takes a greater magnitude low frequency sound to be perceived as equal in loudness to a high frequency sound. This fact is accommodated in noise measurement by the use of an electronic filter in sound level meters that enables a meter to approximate the response of the human ear. Such measures are made by using the A scale of a meter, and are noted by the letter A in the abbreviation dBA. Other measurement scales are the B and C scales which discriminate less against the lower frequencies, and therefore show somewhat higher decibel readings than the A scale (Figure 4).

Another characteristic of human perception of sound is that it takes much more than twice a reference sound energy level to perceive a doubling in loudness. The average person can detect a difference in sound level at 2 dB, but laboratory hearing tests indicate that it takes about a 10-decibel increase for most people to perceive a doubling of loudness. Field experimentation with aircraft noise indicate that the doubling of loudness can be perceived over a wide range, but the 10 dB increase per doubling of loudness is an acceptable rule of thumb.

To give a better idea of the everyday meaning of some of the above concepts, Table 1 provides a number of examples of sound sources, their approximate decibel output, their relative energy content, and the human response to those sounds.



Figure 3. Simple functional diagram of the human ear. (After Kryter, 1970).



Standard Specification for A, B, and C scales in sound level meters. (Source: Peterson, 1972)

Relative Sound Energy	Noise Level, dBA	Example	Response	Relative Loudness (Approximate)
1 quadrillion	150	Carrier Deck Jet Operation		32,768
100 trillion	140		Initial Pain Threshold	16,384
10 trillion	130		Initial Discomfort Threshold	8,192
1 trillion	120	Jet Takeoff (2,000 feet) Auto Horn (3 feet)	Maximum Vocal Effort	4,096
100 billion	110	Riveting Machine Jet Takeoff (2,000 feet)		2,048
10 billion	100	Garbage Truck		1,024
1 billion	90	Heavy Truck (50 feet)	Very Annoying Hearing Damage (8 hours)	512
100 million	80	Alarm Clock	Annoying	256
10 million	70	Freeway Traffic (50 feet)	Telephone Use Difficult Intrusive	128
1 million	60	Air Conditioning Unit (20 feet)		64
100,000	50	Light Auto Traffic (100 feet)		32
10,000	40	Bedroom, Library	Quiet	16
1,000	30	Soft Whisper (15 feet)	Very Quiet	8
100	20	Broadcasting Studio		4
10	10		Just Audible	2
1	0		Threshold of Hearing	1

TABLE 1SOUND LEVELS AND HUMAN RESPONSE

Noise

General	At what point does sound become noise? The answer to this question is difficult primarily because of the subjective nature of noise. The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) defines noise as 1) any erratic, intermittent, or statistically random oscillation; or 2) any unwanted sound. It is the definition of noise as unwanted sound that causes difficulty in specifying what is noise and what is not. A common example of the difficulty is music. What may be rock and roll to some is noise to others. Resolution of this problem at the community level requires a large measure of public participation in defining "acceptable sound."
Noise Element	The sources of noise may be thought of as either indoor or outdoor sources. Indoor noise includes all of those devices and machines in homes, offices, and factories that can create sounds loud enough to damage hearing, interfere with speech communication, and arouse a person from sleep. The concern of this Element, however, is outdoor noise. While both indoor and outdoor noise sources are regulated at the Federal level by the EPA and the Occupational Health and Safety Administration, control of outdoor noise is also a function of local government.
	Outdoor noise can be considered in five categories: transportation, construction work, industrial operations, the individual human being (shouting, playing radio too loudly), and miscellaneous noises such as air conditioning units attached to windows or the banging of garbage cans and lids. Of these different categories, noise generated by transportation is the most serious. Transportation accounts for the most continuous and, in many areas, the loudest noise in urban centers. The emphasis of this Element is on evaluating and planning for transportation noise.
	Transportation noise sources are considered in this report in three categories: air, road, and rail traffic noise. It should be noted that noise produced by aircraft in flight is regulated by the Federal government, and that much of the land within the 60 dB CNEL for the Municipal Airport is under the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara. However, the CNEL contours for the Airport are included as a mandated part of this Element to assist in land use planning for the area immediately adjacent to the Airport which is within the City limits.
Road Traffic Noise	Within the City of Santa Barbara, road traffic is the most significant source of noise in terms of continuity and the size of the impacted area. This results simply from the fact that there are greater volumes of road traffic than air or rail traffic, and from the fact that roads exist in areas where there is no airport or rail line.
	Road traffic noise is generally dominated by emissions from automobiles and heavy diesel trucks. There are five other categories of vehicular noise sources: motorcycles, sport cars, light trucks, large gasoline-engine trucks, and buses. Generally, motorcycles and sport cars are noisier than automobiles because of higher engine speeds and less adequate muffling. Light trucks emit noise levels that are similar to automobiles, while the larger gasoline-fueled trucks are noisier than cars but quieter than diesel-fueled trucks of equal size. Buses are much noisier than automobiles on city streets, but are quieter than diesel trucks on the highway because they are usually better muffled and maintained. As a group, these five types of vehicles normally comprise only a small percentage of the total daily traffic flow. Since their noise emissions are within the range defined by auto and truck emissions, their noise is generally assumed to be contained within the mix generated by cars and trucks.

The principal components of both automobile and truck noise are three: the engine, exhaust and tires. Fans operating as part of the cooling system are a major contribution to engine noise; hot gases escaping out of the exhaust pipe create noise in that area of the vehicle; and the escape of air from between tire treads and the road surface is the source of tire noise. Four major factors control the noise level of vehicles: speed, acceleration, road grade and road surface. Generally, vehicular noise levels increase directly with increases in speed, acceleration, and road grade, and with rougher road surfaces. Figures 5 and 6 show the generalized noise spectra of an auto and a truck operating on level, average road surfaces at highway speeds.





Figure 5. Generalized spectrum of typical passenger automobile at 50 mph speed and at 50 ft. distance. (Source: Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, Inc., 1973)



FIGURE 6

Rail Traffic Noise There is only one active rail line in the City of Santa Barbara -- the Southern Pacific Transportation Company's line which runs near U.S. 101. At one time, the railroad was the principal transportation mode in the County (and throughout the State), but with the age of the internal combustion engine, railroad passenger service has declined almost to extinction. Freight traffic is now the railroad's principal income producer, but even freight operations must compete with trucking and air cargo operations. Southern Pacific's line in the City is little used, except for two Amtrak passenger trains and an average of 12 freight trains per day.

Noise produced by rail traffic in the City consists of events which are widely separated in time, but which are intense. Unlike road traffic, train noise is not considered as continuous. When a train passes through, however, it produces a very intense noise, often exceeding 100 dB (at 100 feet from the track centerline). The two major components of rail traffic noise are locomotive noise and passenger or freight car noise. The locomotive produces the most intense noise which is generally thought to be a function of speed and track bed gradient. The relationship between speed and noise output is less well established, however, than the relationship between grade and noise output. Locomotives pulling upgrade generate significantly more noise than those operating under level or downgrade conditions.

In contrast, car noise is dependent upon velocity and increases directly with increases in speed. The wheel-track interaction is also a primary factor in noise output. Jointed track, frogs and grade crossings, and tight radius curves all act to increase the noise output of rail cars. Figure 7 shows an idealized noise history for a train-passby illustrating the locomotive and car components of train noise.





Duration, Seconds

Figure 7. Idealized time history of train passby illustrating locomotive and freight car components. (Source: Wyle Laboratories, 1973)

The type of noise generated by air traffic is directly related to the type of propulsion system used in the aircraft. The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is used by a variety of aircraft ranging from private single-engine piston-powered propeller aircraft to commercial turbofan jet aircraft.

The majority of aircraft using the Airport are general aviation propeller types. Noise emissions from these aircraft are produced primarily by engine exhaust and the intersection between the rotating propeller and the air. The amount of noise generated by light aircraft is primarily a function of the throttle setting. Thus, aircraft under full power on takeoff make a great deal more noise than aircraft under low power on the landing approach. The tip of the rotating propeller is constantly breaking the sound barrier, and the greater this "bite" of the propeller, the higher the noise level. The amount of bite is related to the rate of climb which is greatest on takeoff when the

Air Traffic Noise plane is pulling its greatest load. There are a number of combinations of propeller pitch, flap settings, air speeds and other parameters which can be adjusted to achieve a rate of climb. Therefore, the same aircraft can be much noisier in the same flight pattern depending on the pilot's selection of takeoff parameters. Thus, "low noise" modes can be achieved with light aircraft under certain operating conditions. These operational characteristics are generally controlled by gross weight of the aircraft and ambient weather conditions. As a result, propeller aircraft exhibit a wide range of noise levels.

In contrast to the buzzing noise of propeller aircraft, jets produce noise by high velocity exhaust and compressor machinery. The exhaust nozzle discharges a fast moving, hot air mass which meets the cool, relatively motionless ambient air and creates turbulence. This results in the loud blowtorch type noise heard at takeoff. The compressor blades are responsible for the high-pitched whine dominant in landings.

The turbofan jet aircraft which service the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport have fan stages which significantly reduce the exhaust velocity. These fan stages, however, are a major noise producing component in the turbofan engines. The human ear is very sensitive to the particular sounds produced by these engines. Consequently, the jet aircraft which service the Airport have less jet roar but higher intensity jet whines.

The engines of a small percentage of the Boeing 727 aircraft which use the airport have been treated with sound absorbing material to comply with Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) 36. The remainder of Boeing 727s and 737s and DC-9s which serve the Airport do not comply with FAR 36 at this time.

Total operations at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport amounted to 228,384 in 1977. Of these, 5,923 were air carrier movements using jet aircraft. Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contours were estimated for the Airport in 1972 by Bolt, Beranek & Newman, based on 201,115 annual operations, including 6,570 jet air-carrier movements. The Santa Barbara County Planning Department recently collected noise measurements at five locations near the Airport to determine the accuracy of these projected CNEL contours. Their results lead them to conclude that the CNEL contours projected in 1972 provide a reasonably accurate description of existing noise exposure from current levels of aircraft activity at the Airport. Therefore, these CNEL contours which were incorporated into Santa Barbara County's Noise Element are also included in the Noise Contour Maps for the City's Noise Element.

METHODOLOGY

Philosophy of Analysis When evaluating noise exposure, it is necessary to account for a number of diverse parameters. These include not only sound wave amplitude and frequencies, but also the time characteristics of the noise, reverberation and attenuation by structures and other barriers, the hearing ability of individuals exposed, and their activity during exposure. Such a description entails the use of several numerical indicators and would be specific to a particular site and situation. However, when evaluating noise exposure on a regional and community basis, such a complete description would be impractical. It is necessary then to choose a less detailed but reliable indicator of noise exposure and potential noise problems. This is the approach taken in this Noise Element. The rating scheme used in this Element to describe transportation noise is the Day-Night Noise Level which results in a generalized single-number indicator of noise exposure. While the establishment of a completely valid single-number noise exposure index has been the goal of psychoacoustic experts for many years, no indicator has proven to be a fully adequate substitute for more complex descriptions. With that qualification in mind, it can be said that the single-number indices are useful tools in defining noise exposure for general planning purposes.

One other qualification regarding the noise exposures described in this report should also be noted. The noise levels were defined by use of mathematical models which rely heavily on the validity of the input data. In a number of instances, these data were incomplete or not available, and it was necessary to make reasonable estimates. In developing these estimates, a conservative approach was taken at each stage of data analysis. The end result of this process is that the noise exposures computed in this analysis may be somewhat high and could be considered to contain a "margin of safety." The intent of this approach is to ensure that any error introduced into the process is on the side of public benefit.

Measurement Scheme: Day-Night Noise Level

L_{dn}

In recent years, there has been a proliferation of noise rating schemes or techniques, and different agencies of the Federal and State governments have adopted different techniques. The result has been a general confusion by both government administrators and the public. A resolution to this problem has yet to be found in a uniformly accepted, single-number index of noise exposure that can be applied to all types of noise sources and that accurately reflects human response to sound.

To date, the most promising noise exposure index to be developed is the Day-Night Noise Level (abbreviated L_{dn}).

This index is based on two premises regarding human response to sound. The first is that humans will respond to a <u>steady</u> noise over a given period of time in the same way that they will respond to a <u>time-varying</u> noise with an equivalent

amount of sound energy as the steady noise. The second premise is that humans are generally more sensitive to noise during the night than during the day.

The dominant characteristic of transportation noise is that it is not steady. There are constant fluctuations which may or may not be widely separated in time. At any given moment near a freeway or rail line, it may be quiet, but when traffic volumes or speeds increase that quiet is quickly displaced by high noise levels. Therefore, it is not appropriate to measure noise at any given moment and call that the noise level of the source. A statistical approach is required to account for the time-varying nature of the sound. Such an approach, however, would yield a large number of statistics to show the day, night, weekday, weekend, fair and foul weather differences in noise levels. Such a large number of parameters make baseline noise level mapping and noise control enforcement extremely difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish on a community-wide basis.
The problem of time-fluctuating noise levels is further complicated by the fact that people are exposed to different sources of noise as they move from place to place in the community. For example, a typical factory worker spends time in a relatively quiet residential setting during the night, drives to work in high noise traffic, works around loud machinery all day, except for a quieter period at lunch, and then returns home. This pattern of exposure to different noise levels increases the number of descriptive parameters needed to evaluate the total noise "dosage" of people as they move through the day, and complicates the task of setting standards to protect human health and welfare.

To avoid a large number of noise indices, it became necessary for acousticians to develop single-number indicators. As the basis of such indicators, it has been shown that humans respond to steady noises in generally the same way as to fluctuating noises with equal energy content. The level of a constant sound which has the same sound energy as does a time-varying sound is termed the <u>Equivalent Sound Level</u> (abbreviated L_{eq}).

The L_{eq} concept was first introduced in Germany in 1965 to evaluate aircraft noise and has since received wide use in many countries. It has been adequately demonstrated that the L_{eq} can be used to describe the noise levels which cause annoyance and lead to permanent hearing loss.

The Day-Night Noise Level is based on the L_{eq} and the premise that noise at night is more annoying than daytime noise. This is primarily a reflection that most people sleep during the night. The L_{dn} uses the A-scale weighted L_{eq} as the basic expression of noise levels, over a 24-hour period, but applies a 10-dB penalty to the noise which occurs during the night hours (defined as 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). This means that the method makes noise levels measured at night 10 dB higher than they actually are. The summary definition of L_{dn} is: the A-weighted average sound level in decibels during a 24-hour period with a 10-dB weight applied to nighttime sound levels.

The considerations discussed above form the basis of the rationale for selecting the L_{dn} as the primary noise evaluation scheme for the Noise Element. In summary, the L_{dn} has the following desirable characteristics:

- 1. The L_{dn} utilizes A-scale measurements of noise corrected for time-variance and nighttime exposure and, therefore, is a reliable single-number index of human response to noise.
- 2. The measure can be applied to any source of environmental noise, thereby providing a common scale to compare (and add) noise exposure from different sources.
- 3. The measure can be easily calculated from sound level meter recordings.
- 4. The measure can be used in predictive methodologies to estimate future noise levels.
- CNEL The L_{dn} represents an evolution of a noise measurement scheme called the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The CNEL is virtually identical to the L_{dn} , but for one parameter. Rather than dividing the 24-hour day into two parts, the CNEL scheme adds a third period, the evening, which is defined as 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Noise events during this evening period are assigned an additional 5 dB weighting.

L_{dn}

CNEL and L_{dn} noise levels usually agree within plus or minus 1 dB for the same noise. The evening noise weighting has not been shown to yield a better indicator of human response to sound, and is considered an unnecessary complexity in the scheme. Therefore, it was dropped when the L_{dn} was developed. However, the CNEL scheme was used to compute noise exposures of aircraft in flight in the analysis conducted in 1972 by Bolt, Beranek & Newman for the County of Santa Barbara. This analysis was conducted to meet the requirements of California Administration Code, Title 4, Subchapter 6, which mandates the use of the CNEL scheme in evaluating noise around airports. Therefore, the air traffic noise levels indicated on the Noise Contours Map for this Element are expressed in CNEL. The contours were obtained from Santa Barbara County's Planning Department.

It is important to remember for the purpose of this Noise Element that there is no significant difference between the L_{dn} and CNEL noise levels. They may be compared directly and combined using "decibel addition" to estimate the total noise exposure of a site.

Direct Noise levels at parks, schools, hospitals, and industrial sites were determined by direct measurement in accordance with amended requirements for Noise Elements. Measurements were made with a Pulsar Instruments Model 40 Sound Level Meter. Sound levels at these sites are described in terms of statistical noise levels, termed L_{10} and L_{50} sound levels. The L_{10} level is that level exceeded 10 percent of the measurement time period, and the L_{50} level is the level 50 percent of the time. For example, the notation $L_{10} = 68$ dBA means that for six minutes of each hour, the noise level exceeds 68 decibels as measured on the A-scale of a sound level meter. An $L_{50} = 55$ dBA means that for 30 minutes of each hour, the noise level exceeds 55 decibels as measured on the A-scale of a sound level being measured is constant, that is, a sound of an intensity which does not fluctuate widely with time.

Mathematical Modeling

General

Noise environments around roads and railroads were computed according to mathematical models of road and rail traffic noise developed by Wyle Laboratories. Specifically, the models used are published in <u>Development of Ground Transportation</u> <u>Systems Noise Contours for the San Diego Region</u> (Wyle Research Report WCR 73-8; for road traffic), and <u>Assessment of Noise Environments Around Railroad Operations</u> (Wyle Research Report WCR 73-5; for rail traffic). These models are based on a large sample of field noise measurements of road and rail traffic, and predict L_{dn} noise levels as a function of specified traffic data.

A modeling approach was taken in developing the noise contours for two reasons: (1) collection of input data for the models was more practical than collection of field measurements under the time and budget constraints of the study, and (2) modeling techniques for L_{dn} noise levels have been shown to be just as reliable as calculations based on field measurements. As a basis for this second reason, it should be remembered that the L_{dn} is not measured directly, but is calculated from measurements. These calculations require making estimates and developing averages that are subject to the same limits of error as mathematical modeling.

The exact expression of L_{dn} levels is found in integral calculus. For applications to road and rail traffic, however, it is possible to approximate the L_{dn} by expressions which avoid computation of the integral, and are accurate to within less than plus or minus 1 dB. The basic expression is:

$$L_{dn} = SENEL + 10 \log N - 49.4$$

where,

SENEL	=	Average Single Event Noise Exposure Level
Ν	=	Number of road or rail operations
49.4	=	A normalization factor equal to 10 log (3600 x 24)

and where,

SENEL = $L_{max} + 10 \log_{10} t_{ea}$, dB

with,

L _{max}	=	maximum noise level as observed on the A scale of a standard
		sound level meter

 t_{ea} = effective time duration of the noise level in seconds. It is about equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the "10 dB down duration" or the duration for which the noise level is within 10 dB of L_{max}

and,

$$N = N_D + 10N_N$$

with,

N _D	=	Number of operations between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m.
N _N	=	Number of operations between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

The value of the modeling procedure is that the SENEL has been defined through sample measurements and correlated to such factors as vehicle speed and acceleration. This kind of information then, along with the number of operations, can be used to predict the L_{dn} noise levels. Other factors, such as existing noise barriers, can also be accounted for through modeling in estimating the propagation of noise into the community.

Input Data The importance of the input data in mathematical modeling cannot be understated. The accuracy of the final noise level estimate relies heavily on this information as a description of the "real world." The following lists of information describe the kind of input data used in calculating the noise levels of transportation sources. Specific compilations of these data for the City of Santa Barbara are contained in Appendix B.

Road Traffic	1.	List of roads selected for evaluation.				
Data	2.	Road segment identification as defined by the following parameters (no. 3 through 9). When one of these parameters changes, a new road segment is defined.				
	3.	Average Daily Traffic (ADT) broken down into hourly flows for the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and the nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.).				
	4.	Lane configurations: number of lanes and average width of median strip divides, if any.				
	5.	Percentage of diesel truck traffic on the road segment.				
	6.	Representative speeds for road segments as determined by the posted speed limit and observations of variations to that limit.				
	7.	Road grade conditions: mild (0 to 2 percent), moderate (3 to 5 percent), and severe (greater than 6 percent).				
	8.	Lane distribution of road traffic by vehicle class; i.e., if the road has more than two lanes, what percent of total cars (and trucks) are in each lane.				
	9.	Road sideline terrain characteristics; i.e., is the sideline elevated, depressed, or level with the roadbed.				
Rail Traffic	1.	Line segment identification.				
Data	2.	Representative train speeds.				
	3.	Average train lengths.				
	4.	Grade conditions. Grades are considered in three categories: Level (within \pm 0.75 percent), upgrade (greater than + 0.75 percent) and downgrade (greater than - 0.75 percent).				
	5.	Sideline characteristics.				
	6.	Identification of track characteristics:				
		a. Mainline welded or jointed track.				
		b. Low speed classified jointed track.				
		c. Presence of switching frogs or grade crossings.				

- d. Tight radius curves
 - i. radius less than 600 feet
 - ii. radius 600 to 900 feet
 - iii. radius greater than 900 feet
- e. Presence of bridgework
 - i. light steel trestle
 - ii. heavy steel trestle
 - iii. concrete structure
- 7. Number of operations broken down into the number of day and night operations.

The information describing road traffic in the City was provided by the City's Department of Transportation, Santa Barbara County Transportation Study, and CALTRANS. Rail traffic data were provided by the Southern Pacific Transportation Company and obtained from Santa Barbara County's Draft Noise Element. The References section lists the sources of published and unpublished data used in computing noise exposures.

Future Noise Projections

General In planning for noise control at the local government level, it is necessary to consider what the future noise environment may be like. For the most part, two factors will control environmental noise levels over the next 20 years. These are (1) the level of use transportation facilities will receive, based on estimates of demand; and (2) advances in noise reduction technology and better application of existing technology. It is safe to assume that noise emissions will be reduced at the source to a certain extent. That reduction may be counter-balanced, however, by an increase in the number of sources, specifically, the volume of traffic. In addition, there are limits to what can be achieved in technological solutions to the noise problem. For example, a major contributor to road traffic noise is tire noise. Reductions in tire noise are limited, at least in existing technology, by safety considerations in tread design. Because of the limitations of technology and the expected increase in traffic, land use regulation will be a necessary part of noise control over the next 20 years. Through a combination of noise source control by the Environmental Protection Agency and land use control by local governments, a noise environment compatible with a variety of activities can be achieved.

Road Traffic In forecasting 1990 noise levels from road traffic, it has been assumed that automobiles and trucks will still utilize rubber tires on asphalt and concrete surfaces. This assumption limits the amount of noise reduction which can be expected from technological means alone. Even if engine and exhaust noise could be eliminated, the interaction between tire tread and road surface would continue to emit high noise levels. The characteristics of automobile noise are expected to remain the same as existing vehicles, but the level of noise is forecast to decrease by about 3 dB over the typical range of operating speeds (Figure 8). This level of noise reduction assumes enforcement of legal constraints and application of currently available technology.

Noise emissions from heavy trucks are also assumed to decrease for the forecast year. This will require application of current "state-of-the-art" technology at the production level. Such technology indicates that maximum noise levels of 70 dBA at 50 feet are attainable. This represents a noise level reduction of 10 to 15 dB from some models currently in use (Figure 9). Levels much below 70 dB do not seem to be feasible at this time because of economic and safety considerations in tire design.

Overall noise levels from road traffic, then, are assumed to decrease at the source for purposes of this Element. If legal constraints go unenforced, or if adequate noise control technology is not applied, noise levels will, of course, increase. Conclusions from the Santa Barbara County Transportation Study indicate road traffic volumes may double in some areas of the City by 1990. This translates into a 3 dB increase in noise levels. Since it is always possible that the necessary noise control technology will not be applied in the coming years, it is necessary to review this Element periodically to assess the validity of the noise projections.



FIGURE 8

Figure 8. Average maximum passby noise levels of automobiles (at 50 feet) for current and forecast years (Source: Wyle Laboratories, 1973)



FIGURE 9

igure 9. Average maximum passby noise levels of heavy trucks (at 50 feet) for current and forecast years (Source: Wyle Laboratories, 1973).

Rail Traffic For the general planning purposes of the Noise Element, the noise levels associated with current rail traffic are assumed to describe noise levels for the forecast year. The rationale for this assumption is twofold. Either the railroad will continue to carry freight and few passengers at current volumes, or the railroad will be restored as a major transportation mode. If the second alternative is realized, it is most likely that major track rights-of-way alignments will be affected, and new, high-speed trains will be produced. Some data describing the expected noise effects of this alternative are available from studies of the BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) system in the San Francisco area and from Department of Transportation studies on experimental trains. Generally, these studies forecast quieter trains which are capable of higher speeds than existing trains. It is not possible to adequately predict the effects of any of this new technology on the City of Santa Barbara. Enough information is not available at this time.

Continuation of existing levels of rail traffic noise is, therefore, the most realistic projection for at least the intermediate future. As the price of gasoline continues to increase, the relatively energy-efficient train may assume a greater share of the freight traffic in California. Measuring this possible effect and its effect on noise is difficult, and beyond the scope of this Element.

Air Traffic Existing federal legislation will reduce future noise emissions from individual aircraft. Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR), Part 36, regulates the amount of noise that legally can be produced by newly developed aircraft. As a result of this regulation, recent aircraft types such as the Lockheed L-1011, Douglas DC-10 and Boeing 747 are quieter and less annoying than their predecessors. The exhaust nozzles and fan stages are still the primary noise producing components of the newer high bypass ratio turbofan engines, but the intensity of the noise generated by these components has been significantly reduced. However, none of these large, new aircraft types currently service Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.

FAR Part 36 also sets standards for sound modification of older, noisier turbojet or low-bypass turbofan aircraft. Fifty percent of an airline's fleet of two or three engine aircraft must be retrofit with Sound Absorbing Material (SAM) nacelle treatment by January 1, 1981. The remaining fifty percent of the fleet must be retrofit by January 1, 1983 (Mr. Altman, Hughes Airwest). Assuming that these standards are met, the noise generated by individual turbofan jets servicing Santa Barbara's Airport will be reduced by 1983. However, this improvement will be partially offset by potential increases in the number of flights.

The County's Draft Noise Element states that previous projections of future commercial air travel and general aviation activity were based on population projections for the County which are no longer considered appropriate. Therefore, in the absence of accepted forecasts of air traffic for the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, the County prepared Table 2 to illustrate a range of future airport noise exposure possibilities. Changes in Community Noise Equivalent Level exposure near the Airport can be determined by comparing the percent increase in aircraft operations with the decibel reductions in "average" aircraft noise levels. The example presented in the County's Draft Noise Element (p. 36) which accompanied the table was the following:

"...if at some point in the future aircraft are on average 4 dB quieter than those operating today, and if at the same time total aircraft operations have increased 30%, noise exposure in CNEL will have been reduced by about 2.9 dB."

TABLE 2 Change in Airport Noise Exposure Expressed in CNEL*

	0	2	4	6	8	10	
1	0	- 2.0	-4.0	-6.0	-8.0	-10.0	
10	+0.4	- 1.6	-3.6	-5.6	-7.6	-9.6	
20	+8.0	- 1.2	-3.2	-5.2	-7.2	-9.2	
30	+1.1	- 0.9	-2.9	-4.9	-6.9	-8.9	
50	+1.8	- 0.2	-2.2	-4.2	-6.2	-8.2	
100	+3.0	+1.0	-1.0	-3.0	-5.0	-7.0	
150	+4.0	+2.0	0	-2.0	-4.0	-6.0	

Reduction in Average Aircraft Noise Level (dB)

* Table Assumes:

1. Operations of all aircraft types increase proportionately.

2. No change in distribution of operations between daytime and nighttime.

3. No change in aircraft operational procedure.

Source: Santa Barbara County Draft Noise Element.

Increase in Aircraft Operations %

Ouantitative estimates of existing and future noise exposure in the City are provided in two forms in this report. Appendix C contains this data in tabular form, and the Noise Contours Maps show the data in graphic form. The noise contours are lines connecting points of equal sound intensity. They form bands 5 dBA in width along the roads, railroad, and around the Airport. Some attempt was made in this analysis to account for the attenuative effects of the more significant sideline features along the freeway and rail line. These are primarily the areas in which the route is depressed relative to the surrounding topography or is immediately adjacent to a large elevation. The effect of these sideline features is to attenuate the propagation of higher sound levels into the community. This is represented by the contour lines being closer together. Analysis of attenuation and reverberation due to small sideline features, such as buildings, is beyond the scope of this analysis and would not be appropriate to noise evaluation at a city-wide level for general planning purposes. It should be remembered, then, that the noise contours are general indicators of noise exposure and not precise levels. It should also be noted that the noise contours only represent noise generated by road, air and rail traffic. These contours will not account for interior noise or outdoor noise generated by construction work, individual persons, miscellaneous noises such as window air conditioning units, or other stationary sources.

The preparation of the noise contour maps involved a certain amount of estimating and smoothing. For example, the contour lines at intersections of roads were rounded away from the intersections indicating an increase in noise levels. Intersections are generally noisier than line sources because traffic volumes increase there. Additionally, many vehicles (e.g., trucks) create more noise under stop-and-go conditions than at steady speeds. The rounding of the contour lines represents this condition, but is not an exact estimate of the magnitude. Precise estimates should be made through site analysis.

The procedure used in contour mapping for this Noise Element is in compliance with Government Code Section 65302(g) as amended. Contours are shown in increments of 5 dB and continue down to 60 dB. Noise exposure levels for parks, schools, hospitals and rest homes were determined by direct measurement (see Appendices D, E, and F).

NOISE ENVIRONMENT

Noise-Sensitive Land Uses

Noise

Contouring

The Noise Contours Maps show the location of existing and proposed parks, schools, nursing homes and hospitals as examples of noise sensitive land uses. Appendix F contains a list of the Health Care Facilities included on the maps and Guest/Rest Homes which may be considered as noise sensitive uses, but were not mapped. The omission of other land uses from the maps is not intended to imply that these are the only noise sensitive uses. Rather, these are the examples required by the Government Code.

All land uses may be considered to be sensitive to noise, but to different levels. Land use sensitivities may be thought of as a continuum with some uses able to tolerate a high level and others unable to tolerate any but the quietest level. The level of tolerable or "acceptable" noise is a function of the subjective desires of the community and the average exposure times of people in different areas. This latter concept is related to the premise underlying the Sound Equivalent Level. That is, it is acceptable to be exposed to high noise levels for part of the day as long as this exposure is compensated by being in a quiet environment later on. For example, the acceptable noise level for industrial land use is 75 dBA (L_{dn}). A person working in that environment, however, should be

compensated by spending a certain amount of time in an interior residential area where the acceptable noise level is 45 dBA (L_{dn}).

The land use noise standards recommended in the Policy Report serve, in effect, to define the sensitivity of each land use. The maximum acceptable noise level for a land use is the level dividing the "Normally Acceptable" and "Normally Unacceptable" noise levels. A summary of these noise level standards is presented in Table 3. These standards may be used in identifying potential noise conflict areas as described in the next section.

Noise Potential noise conflict areas are those sections of an existing or proposed land use exposed to noise levels which are incompatible with that use of the land. They are termed "potential" noise conflict areas because both the land use and noise exposure representations are generalized. A site analysis might show that the particular area in conflict is not as sensitive as the general land use. For example, the conflict area of McKinley School occurs within 50 feet of the roadway. It could be that this area is used for parking rather than classrooms. It would also be that structures or other noise barriers exist at the site which reduce the noise to acceptable levels. The intent of identifying noise conflict areas, then, is to point out those places which deserve site analysis in a noise control program.

The actual identification of a noise conflict area is a simple, graphical problem given the noise sensitivities of various land uses and a noise contours map. By overlaying a land use map with a noise contours map, identification of conflicts can be made directly. Once these conflict areas have been identified, it is recommended that a site analysis be conducted to determine the precise nature of the noise problem, if any is confirmed to exist.

Table 4 contains a list of potential noise conflict areas in the City of Santa Barbara based on the noise sensitive land uses listed in the "Guidelines for the Preparation and Content of Noise Elements of the General Plan." It should be noted that this relatively short list of potential noise conflict areas does not consider land uses other than parks, schools and hospitals. Incompatible outdoor noise levels may well impact residential or commercial uses which were not included in this analysis. Appendix F contains a list of rest homes and noise levels at each location.

Noise exposure is defined as the total acoustical stimulation reaching a person's ear over a specified period of time. How much noise exposure is acceptable for what land uses and times of day are questions that are addressed in the Policy Report. The recommended land use noise compatibility guidelines in the Policy Report are intended to provide some answers. Using these guidelines (summarized in Table 3) as criteria for analysis, Table 5 lists the major noise sources in the various areas of the City. The guiding criteria in judging whether a transportation noise source is a "major" source is whether it emits an L_{dn} of 65 dBA or more. Noise exposures from these sources are likely to be incompatible with the more sensitive land uses such as parks, schools, hospitals and residences. These sources, then, may be considered as the potential noise problems in the City. In most cases, these sources are generating significant noise during the current year but are projected to generate lower levels in the forecast year, 1990. In other cases, however, the source may continue to be a major problem in 1990.

TABLE 3 SUMMARY LAND USE COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS

Land Use Category	Normally Acceptable Exterior Noise Exposure, L _{dn} dBA ¹
Residential-Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes, Multiple Family, Dormitories, etc.	60
Transient Lodging	70
School Classrooms, Libraries, Churches	65
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	65
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Music Shells	60
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports	65
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	65
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	70
Office Buildings, Personal, Business, and Professional	75
Commercial-Retail, Movie Theaters, Restaurants	75
Commercial-Wholesale, Some Retail Industry, Manufacturing, Utilities	80
Manufacturing-Communications (Noise sensitive)	70
Livestock Farming, Animal Breeding	75
Agriculture (except Livestock), Mining, Fishing	95
Public Right-of-Way	85
Extensive Natural Recreation Areas	75

¹ These noise exposure levels represent the upper limit of the range of "normally acceptable" noise levels. "Normally acceptable" is defined as being an exposure that is great enough to be of some concern, but common building constructions will make the indoor environment acceptable, even for sleeping quarters. Above these levels, unusual and costly building constructions are necessary to ensure adequate performance of activities.

TABLE 4 POTENTIAL NOISE CONFLICT AREAS

Heavily Impacted Areas¹

Oak Park Convalescent Hospital Santa Barbara Convalescent Hospital Wilson School Bohnett Park A Child's Estate Andree Clark Bird Refuge Dwight Murphy Field Moreton Fig Tree Municipal Tennis Courts Palm Park

Slightly Impacted Areas¹

Oak Park Las Positas Park Adams School McKinley School Monroe School Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara Jr. High West Beach East Beach Ambassador Park Vera Cruz Park Municipal Golf Course

Additional Potential <u>Conflict Areas²</u>

Lincoln School Santa Barbara High School Plaza del Mar

Local Noise Source(s)

Highway 101 Highway 101 Highway 101 Kailroad Highway 101 & Railroad Highway 101 & Railroad Highway 101 & Railroad Highway 101 & Railroad Highway 101 Cabrillo Blvd. & Railroad

Local Noise Source(s)

Highway 101 & Railroad Las Positas Road Las Positas Road Cliff Drive Cliff Drive Cliff Drive Milpas Street Cabrillo & Railroad Cabrillo Cabrillo Haley Street Highway 101

Local Noise Source(s)

Anacapa Anapamu Castillo & Cabrillo

¹ Based on estimated contours for 1978.

² Based on noise monitoring.

TABLE 5MAJOR NOISE SOURCES

	Existing (1977/19	<u>978)</u>	Future (1990)			
	<u>70 dB(A) and above</u> Highway 101					
	Highway 101 State Street Las Positas Road Cabrillo Bouleya	rd	Highway 101			
		65-70 dB(A)				
	Carrillo Street Meigs Road Cliff Drive Milpas Street Mission Street Anacapa Street Santa Barbara Str De la Vina Street Chapala Street Haley Street San Andres Stree Foothill Road La Cumbre Road	eet C	Carrillo Street Meigs Road Cliff Drive Milpas Street State Street Las Positas Road Cabrillo Boulevard			
CONCLUSIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	The fol findings integral	the following conclusions and assumptions are a summary of the major technical addings of this analysis of environmental noise in the City of Santa Barbara, and are segral to the objectives of the Policy Report.				
Conclusions	1.	In general, the City of Santa Barbara magenvironment. Ten potential major noise collist of 98 possible problem areas within the minor conflict areas were also identified, be noise contours. Monitoring conducted at revealed three more potential minor conflhundred road segments evaluated for traffic roadways were associated with L _{dn} noise le not to say that the City is without noise pources are few in number and of limited important.	by be considered a relatively quiet onflict areas were identified from a the City. An additional 12 potential based on the estimated locations of t locations of noise sensitive uses lict areas. Of the more than one c noise, segments on four principal evels of 70 dBA of higher. This is problems. Rather, the major noise npact.			
	2.	The most significant source of noise in the 0 and air traffic. Of the roads evaluated for 1 found to be associated with L_{dn} noise level State Street, Cabrillo Boulevard, and Las with L_{dn} noise levels of 65 dBA or higher.	City is road traffic, followed by rail noise exposure, the following were ls of 70 dBA or higher: U.S. 101, Positas Road. Table 5 lists roads			
	3.	Rail traffic on the Southern Pacific line is in events such that the total sound energy ass equivalent to that of U.S. 101. Noise sens railroad noise include Wilson School, Bo Estate, Andree Clark Bird Refuge, Dwight I Fig Tree.	nfrequent, but creates intense noise sociated with the railroad is nearly sitive areas potentially impacted by ohnett Park, Palm Park, A Child's Murphy Field and the Moreton Bay			

- 4. The Municipal Airport is a source of local noise. California Airport Noise Standards require that, by January 1, 1986, no residential dwellings (except acoustically treated units) exist within the Airport's 65 dB CNEL contour. The Draft Noise Element for the County of Santa Barbara estimated that approximately 280 housing units are located within the 65 dB CNEL contour established by Bolt, Beranek & Newman in 1972. If the schedule for reduced aircraft noise set forth in Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 36, is met, and if the number of flights does not significantly increase, the area within the 65 dB CNEL contour could be reduced by 1983. Additional measurements should be made at that time to delineate the new contour line and the number of dwelling units remaining within the 65 dB contour, and if further noise reductions are not anticipated by 1986, these remaining units will have to be The Federal Aviation Administration should be acoustically treated. encouraged to modify aircraft operational procedures in order to reduce noise over sensitive areas. Any further residential use in areas under the City's jurisdiction immediately adjacent to the airport should be prohibited. The County should ensure that additional noise sensitive land uses are avoided within the existing 65 dB contour and preferably within the 60 dB contour as well.
- 5. Potential major noise conflict areas have been identified at the following sites: Wilson School, Oak Park Convalescent Hospital, Santa Barbara Convalescent Hospital, Palm Park, Bohnett Park, A Child's Estate, Andree Clark Bird Refuge, Dwight Murphy Field, Municipal Tennis Courts, and the Moreton Bay Fig Tree. An additional 12 potential minor conflict areas were also identified, based on the estimated locations of noise contours. Three more potential minor conflict areas were revealed during monitoring of noise sensitive locations (see Table 4). Appendix F contains a list of Rest Homes and approximate noise levels at each location. Further site acoustic studies should be conducted to aid in defining the precise nature of the noise problems, should any be confirmed to exist.
- 1. Future noise levels due to road traffic are expected to be a function of increased traffic volumes and the applications of noise control technology. The analysis of this report assumes that noise control technology will be applied (as required in the California Vehicle Code, Section 27160), and that this will counteract the expected increase in road traffic in most, but not all cases. Thus, road traffic noise is forecast to remain the same or decrease somewhat by 1990.
 - 2. Current noise levels generated by the Southern Pacific Railroad are assumed to persist for at least the intermediate future, based on the assumption that existing levels of railroad traffic remain constant. If rail traffic increases, noise levels will correspondingly increase.
 - 3. The improvement in aircraft noise exposure resulting from compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 36, may be partially offset by increased airport activity. No dramatic reductions in aircraft engine noise are anticipated in the next 10 years unless there is a major technological breakthrough. In the absence of accepted projections of air traffic growth for the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, the noise contours projected by Bolt, Beranek & Newman are considered as adequately describing the 1990 noise exposure.

Assumptions

3. The improvement in aircraft noise exposure resulting from compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 36, may be partially offset by increased airport activity. No dramatic reductions in aircraft engine noise are anticipated in the next 10 years unless there is a major technological breakthrough. In the absence of accepted projections of air traffic growth for the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, the noise contours projected by Bolt, Beranek & Newman are considered as adequately describing the 1990 noise exposure.

REFERENCES

- Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc. <u>Highway Noise A Design Guide for Highway Engineers</u>. NCHRP Report No. 117, prepared for Highway Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. 1971.
- DuPree, Russell B. <u>Evaluation of Outdoor to Indoor Noise Reduction of Building Facades and Outdoor Noise</u> <u>Barriers</u>. Office of Noise Control, State of California Department of Health. July, 1975.

Envicom Corporation. Noise Element, City of San Luis Obispo. 1975.

Envicom Corporation. Noise Element, San Luis Obispo County. 1976.

- Los Angeles Department of City Planning. <u>EIR Manual for Private Projects</u>. August, 1975. (Noise Procedures updated July, 1976).
- Office of Noise Control. <u>Guidelines for the Preparation and Content of Noise Elements of the General Plan</u>. Prepared in coordination with the Office of Planning and Research. February, 1976.
- Olson Laboratories Inc. Los Angeles International Airport Draft Environmental Impact Report, Aviation Forecasts and Noise. Volume 2. 1975.
- Santa Barbara County Planning Department. Draft Noise Element. 1978.
- Swing, J.W. <u>Development of Ground Transportation Systems Noise Contours for the San Diego Region</u>. Wyle Laboratories. 1973.
- Swing, J.W. Estimation of Community Noise Exposure in Terms of Day-Night Average Level Noise Contours. Office of Noise Control, State of California Department of Health. Draft Revised May, 1975.
- Swing, J.W. and Pies, D.B. <u>Assessment of Noise Environment Around Railroad Operations</u>. Wyle Laboratories. 1973.
- Wyle Laboratories. <u>Wyle Research Report</u>. WCR 74-3, Supporting Documentation for the Development of Transportation Noise Contours for the City of Los Angeles. June, 1974.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS

- Mr. Altman Hughes Airwest, Operations, San Mateo, CA
- Mr. Brannon United Airlines
- Mr. John Card Santa Barbara County Transportation Study (SCOTS)
- Mr. Dick Coykendall United Airlines
- Mr. Harlan Damron formerly of Santa Barbara County, Planning Department
- Mr. Bob Derosiers Santa Barbara City, Transportation Department
- Mr. Dave Gorbet Santa Barbara City, Transportation Department
- Mr. Tom Hart Santa Barbara County, Planning Department
- Mr. Jim Howerton Tower Chief, Santa Barbara Municipal Airport
- Mr. Ed Ilkcagle McDonnel Douglas
- Mr. Edgar Monroy Santa Barbara City, Transportation Department
- Mr. William Robertson California Department of Transportation, San Luis Obispo
- Mr. Cliff Smith Boeing Company
- Mr. Trail CALTRANS, Los Angeles

Flood Plain Map





Circulation

CONTENT OF THESE GOALS, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

The comprehensive goal and vision of the existing Circulation Element is

"While sustaining or increasing economic vitality and quality of life, Santa Barbara should be a city in which alternative forms of transportation and mobility are so available and attractive that use of an automobile is a choice, not a necessity. To meet this challenge, the City is rethinking its transportation goals and land use policies, and focusing its resources on developing balanced mobility solutions..." (Circulation Element)

The following proposed goals, policies, and implementation actions are intended to further integrate circulation policies with the sustainability focus of new or revised policies in other elements, by emphasizing alternative modes of transportation, maintaining traffic flow for all, and reassessing parking requirements to complement a people-oriented community. Future treatment of scenic highways, state designated or not, will address questions of multi-modal use, appropriate vehicle speeds, signage, and view points.

The following goals, policies and implementation actions were either developed during the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan update process, carried over from the existing Circulation Element or Scenic Highways Elements in effect in 2011, or were EIR mitigation measures. These new goals, policies and implementation actions are operational with the adoption of the General Plan; however, until the existing Circulation and Scenic Highways Elements are comprehensively updated they also remain in effect and combined with the following.

Although the inclusion of the following goals, policies, and implementation actions do not qualify as a substantial update to the Circulation Element, they do comply with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008.



Goals, Policies and Implementation

GOALS

- *Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System.* Create a more integrated multimodal transportation system to connect people, places, goods, and services. Provide a choice of transportation modes and decrease vehicle traffic congestion.
- *Street Network.* Provide a comprehensive street network that safely serves all transportation modes.

Circulation Policies

C1. **Transportation Infrastructure Enhancement and Preservation.** Assess the current and potential demand for alternative transportation and where warranted increase the availability and attractiveness of alternative transportation by improving related infrastructure and facilities without reducing vehicle access.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- C1.1 <u>Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure.</u> Emphasize high quality public right-of-way infrastructure to include enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
 - Provide high quality pedestrian crossings as described in the Pedestrian Master Plan that result in a high rate of vehicle yielding at uncontrolled intersections.
 - Consider establishing bicyclist priority within some additional City right-of-way areas along major bicycle routes, as part of Bicycle Master Plan update including creating more bike lane connections Downtown by regulating curbside parking during peak travel periods working closely with Downtown stakeholders. Consider increased funding for bike-lane maintenance to encourage their use and maximize safety.
 - Continue implementing of the City's Sidewalk Infill Program.
 - Install pedestrian amenities (e.g., pedestrian-scaled street lighting, benches, trees and other landscaping) along high volume pedestrian corridors, at other key pedestrian destinations (parks, schools, etc.) and, in coordination with MTD, around transit stops and stations (e.g. shade and rain structures, and space for newspaper dispensers).
 - Continue with the installation of corner curb ramps in compliance with federal and state universal access requirements for public rights-of-way.
 - Consider adoption of tiered development impact fees (with discounts for community benefit uses) as needed to fund improvements.
 - Improvements to bicycle travel-ways and parking are a priority use of rights-of-way throughout the City, therefore, carry out implementation of all of the recommended improvements within the City's Bicycle Master Plan.

- Improve coordination between City, County, UCSB, SBCAG, and other South Coast cities and entities to improve and expand regional bike paths and routes that cross jurisdictional boundaries.
- C1.2 <u>Personal Transportation.</u> In partnership with private interests, promote and provide incentives including the provision of funding, for shared-cost personal transportation options such as car-sharing and bike-sharing to increase personal mobility, reduce air pollution and green house gas emissions, reduce parking demand, and decrease cost of transportation to individuals.
- C1.3 <u>Intermodal Connections.</u> Improve intermodal connections for public transit, car pools, carshare or bikeshare programs, bicycle, and pedestrian routes. Provide intermodal connectivity at transit accessible centers, including the train depot, to support sustainable commute options such as feeder shuttles, bicycle storage facilities, bike-sharing, and carsharing.
- C1.4 <u>Optimize Capacity.</u> Utilize Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies (such as signal timing) to optimize the capacity, flow and improved safety for motor vehicles, bicycles, transit, and pedestrians.
- C1.5 <u>Mid Block Traffic Flow Improvement Techniques</u>. As part of transportation planning for capital improvements and private development improvements, consider techniques for improving mid-block traffic flow along corridor segments with conditions that tend to impede the flow (such as closely-spaced intersections and driveways, and higher volumes of pedestrians and buses). Such techniques may include shared driveway access and parking, effective access design and driveway spacing, median treatment, traffic control refinement, and design of improvements for buses, pedestrians and bicycles.
- C2. **Regional Transportation and Commuter Transit.** Coordinate regionally with agencies and the private sector to establish viable rail, bus and carpooling options for commuters, and create an energy efficient regional transportation network.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- C2.1 <u>Regional Transportation Networks.</u> Actively pursue regional transportation solutions through the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments to address regional transportation needs, in conjunction with regional housing and development patterns that are responsive to the requirements of AB 32 and SB375.
- C2.2 <u>Commuter Transit.</u> Work with other local governments the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, and MTD to address the transportation needs of commuters from Ventura and San Luis Obispo counties including multi-modal and rail-commuting systems.
- C2.3 <u>Improved Transit Frequency.</u> Work with MTD and other regional partners to increase frequency of service during peak commute periods and expand non peak services, including to reduce peak period headways from 10 to 5 minutes on primary transit corridors, reduce non-peak headways along primary transit corridors, increase frequency of MTD regional express lines, and substantially improve funding of regional bus services (e.g., Clean Air Express).

- C3. Vehicle Speeds. Advocate for new state legislation that promotes vehicle speed limits that are designated and enforced with consideration of street design, neighborhood characteristics, adjacent land use, and mix of transportation mode usage.
- C4. **Bus Pull-Out Right-of-Way.** To facilitate buses in turn-out pockets merging back into traffic, monitor changes in State regulations to require motorists to yield to a merging bus.
- C5. **Transit Funding.** To provide the level of transit service needed, all funding mechanisms, new and old, will be studied.
- C6. **Circulation Improvements.** Where existing or anticipated congestion occurs, improve traffic flow in conjunction with providing improved access for pedestrians, bicycles and public and private transit through measures that might include physical roadway improvements, Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategies and others.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- C6.1 <u>Impacted Intersections.</u> Install Traffic Signals or Roundabouts at Impacted Intersections which are currently controlled by Stop Signs. This includes the following intersections:
 - Mission Street and Modoc Road
 - Las Positas Road and Cliff Drive(in design)
 - Olive Mill Road and Coast Village Road
- C6.2 <u>Intersection Master Plan.</u> Develop a program that identifies current and future deficiencies at City intersections and identify feasible improvements and funding sources to improve problem intersections. Intersections to potentially include:
 - Milpas Street and Quinientos Street
 - U.S. Highway 101 Southbound Ramps and Garden Street
 - U.S. Highway 101 Northbound Ramps and Garden Street
 - Gutierrez Street and Garden Street
 - Haley Street and Castillo Street
 - Carrillo Street and U.S. Highway 101 Northbound Ramps
 - Carrillo Street and and U.S. Highway 101 Southbound Ramps
 - Carrillo Street and San Andres Street
 - Mission Street and U.S. Highway 101 Southbound Ramps
 - Mission Street and U.S. Highway 101 Northbound Ramps
 - Las Positas Road and Modoc Road
 - Las Positas Road and U.S. Highway 101 Southbound Ramps
 - U.S. Highwy 101 Northbound Ramps and Calle Real
 - Las Positas Road and State Street
 - Hitchcock Way and State Street
 - La Cumbre Road and State Street

- Hope Avenue and U.S. Highway 101 Northbound Ramp/Calle Real
- C6.3 <u>Transit Pass Program.</u>
 - a. Encourage employer paid transit passes to be provided as part of the conditions of approval for entitlements for all employees of:
 - New development within Downtown.
 - New development within higher density land use areas
 - New development within a ¹/₄ mile of high-volume transit corridors.
 - b. Encourage employer transit passes to be provided to the employees of:
 - All new employers citywide as part of the conditions of approval for entitlements;
 - All existing employers citywide who propose physical expansions and increases to workforce as part of the conditions of approval for entitlements.
 - c. Work with regional partners:
 - To ensure that employer transit pass programs encompass all existing and future regional bus and/or rail transit services (in addition to MTD services).
 - To ensure that the fare media used by the employer transit pass program is compatible for use on all services to increase user convenience and reduce barriers to entry for new participants.
- C6.4 <u>Cash-Out Parking</u>. Develop a city-wide employee cash-out parking program similar to the existing state law that would reduce the employer size participation down to 20 employees. Require compliance for new employers and promote voluntary phased compliance for existing employers.
- C6.5 <u>Downtown Public Parking Pricing.</u> Work with stakeholders to develop a public on-street parking program that will reduce commuter use of the customer parking supply and increase the economic vitality of Downtown. Any parking pricing program shall not include the installation of individual parking meters.
- C6.6 <u>Safe Routes to School Projects/Program.</u> Promote and fund Safe Routes to School Projects and Programs that effectively increase walking and bicycling to our local schools.
- C6.7 <u>Carpooling and Telecommuting.</u> Work with regional partners such as SBCAG and other public and private interests to promote opportunities for increased carpooling and telecommuting.
- C6.8 <u>Car-Sharing</u>. Work with public and private interests to establish various types of car-sharing.

Parking Policies

C7. **Parking Management.** Manage parking Downtown to reduce congestion, increase economic vitality, and preserve Santa Barbara's quality of life.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

- C7.1 <u>Appropriate Parking</u>. Establish requirements for on and off-street parking in the Central Business District (CBD) appropriate to the parking users as follow:
 - a. Maximize availability of customer parking in the CBD;
 - b. Limit/discourage employee use of public parking in the CBD, and maximize employee commuting options to the CBD;
 - c. Manage and price public parking in the CBD so as not to put businesses in the CBD at a competitive disadvantage with other south coast shopping options; and
 - d. Change residential parking requirements and permitting programs in the CBD to maintain and/or increase the availability of on- and off-street customer parking.
- C7.2 <u>Downtown Parking Requirements.</u> Update the boundary of the delineated area of the Central Business District to include more of the commercial area.
- C7.3 <u>Parking Districts.</u> Assess existing and future parking districts to accommodate parking supply in districts such as Upper State Street, and the Funk Zone.
- C7.4 <u>Residential Parking Program.</u> Revise the Residential Parking Program to exclude residential on-street parking in the commercial zones. The program currently offers parking permits for on-street parking to residents in selected residential neighborhoods adjacent to commercial zones but permits residents to park on streets all day in commercial zones within the program area.
- C7.5 <u>Residential Parking Requirements.</u> Allow residential land development projects to "unbundle" parking (i.e., selling or renting residential units separate from parking stalls) within the commercial and high density residential land use designations to address affordability and development size, bulk, and scale.
- C7.6 <u>Residential Off-site Parking</u>. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow residential required parking off-site in commercial zones.
- C7.7 <u>Bicycle Parking and Other Needs.</u> Require all multi-family and commercial projects to be designed to meet the needs of bicyclists (e.g., secure parking, storage, lockers, showers, etc.)

Development Policies

- C8. **Emergency Routes.** It shall be a high priority to keep all emergency evacuation, response and truck routes free of physical restrictions that may reduce evacuation/response times.
- C9. Accessibility. Make universal accessibility for persons with disabilities, seniors, and other special needs populations a priority in the construction of all new development for both public and private projects.



CIRCULATION ELEMENT ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following people participated in the development of the Circulation Element. The City thanks them and values their support and input:

Circulation Element Update Consensus Group:

- Jo Black, Independent Living Resource Center
- Laura Bridley, South Coast Employers Transportation Network
- Daryl Chapman, Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce, Northside Business Association
- Dallas Clark, Beachside Merchants Association
- Ozwald Da Ros, Eastside Merchants Association
- Jack Easterbrook, Santa Barbara Industrial Association
- Sue Ehrlich, Sustainability Project
- Ralph Fertig, Bicycle Coalition
- Christopher Haskell, Eucalyptus Hill Association
- Grant House, Eastside Study Group
- Norm Johnson, Mesa Shoreline Park Association

City Council

- Harriet Miller, Mayor
- Helene Beaver
- Marty Blum
- Gil Garcia

Planning Commission

- Carol Echt, Chair
- Irma Unzueta, Vice-Chair
- Barbara Chen Lowenthal
- Brian Barnwell

- Estelle Karp, The Downtown Organization
- Beebe Longstreet, Westside Advisory Council
- Jon Martin, Santa Barbara Board of Realtors
- Don McDermott, Samarkand District Improvement Assn.
- Lee Moldaver, Citizens Planning Association
- June Pujo, Grass Roots 101
- Jose Ramirez, El Concilio del Pueblo
- Eric Sonquist, La Colina/Cienguitas Area Neighborhood Association
- Susan Trescher, La Mesa Neighborhood Association
- Dorothy Walker, League of Women Voters
- Tom Williams, Old Town Merchants Association
- Gregg Hart
- Elinor Langer
- Tom Roberts
- Dan Secord
- Harwood A. White
- Grant House
- Former Commissioner Dennis Turner

City Staff

- Sandra Tripp-Jones, City Administrator
- Peter Wilson, Deputy City Administrator
- David Davis, Community Development Director
- David Johnson, Public Works Director
- Don Olson, Assistant Community Development Director/City Planner
- Terilynn Langsev-Burt, Principal Planner

Consultants

- John Jostes, Interface Dudek
- Ron Briggs, Interface Dudek

Technical Support from Other Agencies and Participants

- Jim Damkowitch, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
- Bob Faris, Associated Transportation Engineers
- Elihu Gevirtz, County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department
- Gary Gleason, Metropolitan Transit District
- Maeve Kennedy Grimes, Traffic Solutions
- Chuck McQuary, Metropolitan Transit District
- Steve Orocz, Penfield and Smith
- Mike Powers, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
- Tim Rochte, Caltrans
- Scott Schell, Associated Transportation Engineers
- Ron Tan, Air Pollution Control District

- George Gerth, Transportation and Parking Manager
- Liz Casey Limón, Senior Planner
- Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner
- Laurie Owens, Project Planner
- Brian James, Associate Planner
- Rachel Adcox, Assistant Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUBJEC</u>	<u>CT</u>	PAGE
Acknow	ledgements	
Table of	Contents	i-1
Compre	hensive Goal and Vision Statement	ii-1
Introduc	etion	ii-2
Format	of the Circulation Element	ii-4
Goal 1	Provide a Transportation System that Supports Economic Vitality	1-1
	Economic Vitality Implementation of the Circulation Element	1-2 1-2
Goal 2	Strive to Achieve Equality of Choice Among Modes	2-1
	Equality of Convenience and Choice Monitoring Environmental Quality	2-3 2-4 2-5
Goal 3	Increase the Availability and Use of Transit	3-1
	Transit Service Transit Stops, Shelters and Information Services Regional Transit Service Intermodal Connections Education/Outreach	3-3 3-6 3-7 3-8 3-8
Goal 4	Increase Bicycling as a Transportation Mode	4-1
	Bicycle Master Plan Bikeway System Bicycle Coordinator Parking Requirements and Standards Education/Outreach	4-3 4-3 4-4 4-5 4-5

Goal 5	Increase Walking and Other Paths of Travel	5-1
	Increase Access and Walking Opportunities	5-3
	Linking Pedestrian Paths to Alternative Transportation	5-4
	Update and Expand the Paseo System	5-4
	Design Standards	5-5
	Physical Improvements and Amenities	5-6
	Street Crossings	5-8
	Land Use and Zoning	5-8
	Education/Outreach/Community Involvement	5-9
Goal 6	Reduce the Use of the Automobile for Drive-Alone Trips	6-1
	Local and Regional Transportation Demand Management Programs	6-3
	City as a Model Employer	6-3
	Regional Coordination	6-3
	Education/Outreach/Community Involvement	6-4
Goal 7	Increase Access by Optimizing Parking Citywide	7-1
	Parking Master Plan	7-2
	Parking Supply	7-2
	Residential Permit Parking Program	7-3
	Parking Requirements and Standards	7-3
Goal 8	Increase Parking Availability and Access for	
	Downtown Customers	8-1
	Downtown Parking and Economic Vitality	8-5
	Managing Downtown Public Parking	8-5
	Increased Public Parking Supply	8-7
	Signage and Aesthetics	8-8
	Downtown Housing	8-8
Develop Special Policies Related to Transportation and Parking in the Coastal Zone	9-1	
---	--	
Use of Alternative Transportation Manage Parking in Coastal Zone Link to Alternative Transportation Signage and Aesthetics	9-4 9-6 9-7 9-7	
Develop a Mobility System that will Carry all Modes of Transportation, from Automobiles to Pedestrians	10-1	
Classification System Implementation	10-4 10-6	
Review Traffic Impact Standards at City Intersections	11-1	
Traffic Standards and Impact Thresholds Mobility System	11-3 11-4	
Establish a Process to Include Neighborhoods in the Discussion of the Effects of Traffic on Residential Streets	12-1	
Establish a Process to Include Business and Non-Residential Property Owners in the Discussion of the Effects of Traffic Along Business Corridors	12-1	
Traffic Management Program Neighborhood Area Mobility Plan Business Area Mobility Plan	12-4 12-6 12-6	
Apply Land Use and Planning Tools and Strategies that Support the City's Mobility Goals	13-1	
General Plan Consistency Compact Development Incentives for Mixed Use Design Standards Neighborhood Serving Uses Location of Educational Facilities Home-Based Businesses	13-4 13-4 13-5 13-5 13-7 13-7 13-7	
	Develop Special Policies Related to Transportation and Parking in the Coastal ZoneUse of Alternative Transportation Manage Parking in Coastal Zone Link to Alternative Transportation Signage and Aesthetics Cabrillo BoulevardDevelop a Mobility System that will Carry all Modes of Transportation, from Automobiles to PedestriansClassification System ImplementationReview Traffic Impact Standards at City IntersectionsTraffic Standards and Impact Thresholds Mobility SystemEstablish a Process to Include Neighborhoods in the Discussion of the Effects of Traffic on Residential StreetsEstablish a Process to Include Business and Non-Residential Property Owners in the Discussion of the Effects of Traffic Along Business CorridorsTraffic Management Program Neighborhood Area Mobility Plan Business Area Mobility PlanApply Land Use and Planning Tools and Strategies that Support the City's Mobility GoalsGeneral Plan Consistency Compact Development Incentives for Mixed Use Design Standards Neighborhood Serving Uses Location of Educational Facilities Home-Based Businesses	

Goal 14	Coordinate with Regional Systems and Goals	14-1
	Regional Plans	14-2
	Regional Coordination	14-2
	Airport	14-4
	Education/Outreach	14-5
	Regional Cooperation and Coordination	14-5
Goal 15	Other Transportation Facilities	15-1
	Truck Traffic and Hazardous Materials Routes	15-5
	Other Transportation Facilities	15-5
Goal 16	Public Utilities	16-1
	Electric and Gas Facilities	16-5
	City Utilities	16-5
	Communication Facilities	16-7
	Maintenance of Transportation and Utility Facilities	16-7
Glossary		17-1
Appendices		18-1
Index A		19-1
Index B		20-1

List of Figures

Figure 1, Existing Street System	ii-6
Figure 2, Existing Bicycle System	4-7
Figure 3, Traffic Calming Devices	10-7
Figure 4, Traffic Calming Devices	10-8

COMPREHENSIVE GOAL AND VISION STATEMENT

"While sustaining or increasing economic vitality and quality of life, Santa Barbara should be a city in which alternative forms of transportation and mobility are so available and so attractive that use of an automobile is a choice, not a necessity. To meet this challenge, the City is rethinking its transportation goals and land use policies, and focusing its resources on developing balanced mobility solutions. The language presented here, when taken together, will move the City in the direction of achieving the Vision."

Circulation Element Update Consensus Group Consensus Report, May 31, 1995

This Comprehensive Goal and Vision Statement is the statement from which all the Goals, Policies, and Implementation Strategies of this Circulation Element are derived. It was drafted by a 22-member Consensus Group, which was comprised of a wide range of neighborhood and business representatives. The Consensus Group was charged with the task of drafting a Vision Statement aimed at solving the community transportation problems facing Santa Barbara. The statement above represents the unanimous consensus of the group.

INTRODUCTION

The Circulation Element is a required element of the City's General Plan. Government Code Section 65302(b) states that a circulation element shall consist of:

... the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use element of the plan.

The Circulation Element was created during a two-phased effort by members of the community. This was purely a "grass roots" effort to create circulation policies that address the concerns of the community. The first phase began January 17, 1995, when a 22 member Consensus Group was formed from a diverse cross section of the community representing neighborhood, business, environmental, transit, and bicycle interests. With the help of a professional facilitator, the Consensus Group created and wrote the Consensus Group Report, which was adopted on May 31, 1995. The Consensus Group Report contains the overall vision for the City's circulation system and broad goals to attain that vision. The second phase began August 9, 1995, when the Consensus Group began to distill the overall vision and broad goals into implementable policies and implementation strategies. During this effort, the goals and vision were retained in their exact form. The Consensus Group made their final recommendations on April 23, 1997, and the Consensus Group Draft Circulation Element was finalized.

The Consensus Group Draft Circulation Element was then reviewed by the Planning Commission on a chapter-by-chapter basis during a series of six public meetings. During these meetings, the Planning Commission received input from members of the Consensus Group and public to help strengthen and clarify the document. The Planning Commission made final changes and a final recommendation to the City Council on September 11, 1997. The Draft Circulation Element, which included changes made by the Planning Commission, was released for public review in October, 1997. The City Council reviewed the Draft Circulation Element during a public hearing on November 11, 1997, and adopted the Circulation Element on November 25, 1997.

The purpose of the Circulation Element is twofold. First, the Circulation Element addresses the requirements of State Law, which are to evaluate the transportation needs of the community and to present a comprehensive plan to meet those needs. Second, and most importantly, it contains measures for the implementation of the Comprehensive Goal and Vision Statement. This purpose must be taken in the context of sustaining Santa Barbara's high aesthetic values. Implementation of specific goals must be accomplished through a three-phased process of 1) establishing defined benchmarks or objectives, 2) monitoring and measuring policy impacts and results, and 3) developing City-initiated response strategies should those policy outcomes not be consistent with the Comprehensive Goal and Vision Statement.

Specifically, this Circulation Element will motivate change in the following ways:

- Provide a transportation system the supports the economic vitality of the City,
- Strive to achieve equality of convenience and choice among all modes of transportation,
- Increase the availability and use of transit,
- Increase bicycling as a transportation mode,
- Increase walking and other paths of travel,
- Reduce the use of the automobile for drive-alone trips,
- Increase access by optimizing parking citywide,
- Increase parking availability and access for Downtown customers,
- Develop special policies related to transportation and parking in the Coastal Zone,
- Develop a mobility classification system that will carry all modes of transportation from pedestrian to automobiles,
- Review traffic impact standards used at City intersections for consistency with the goals of the Circulation Element and the General Plan,
- Establish a process to include neighborhoods in discussions of the effects of traffic on residential streets,
- Establish a process to include business and non-residential property owners in discussions of the effects of traffic along business corridors,
- Apply land use planning strategies that support the City's mobility goals,
- Coordinate with regional systems and goals,
- Support the movement of people, goods, and services by other transportation facilities, such as air, rail, and water, and
- Provide and maintain public utilities.

FORMAT OF THE CIRCULATION ELEMENT

This Circulation Element is based upon the Vision Statement and specific goal statements identified above. The goals are shown at the beginning of each Chapter as bolded, italicized text. Each of the 16 goal statements appears at the beginning of a Chapter with specific policies and methods to achieve the desired goal. Within each Chapter, the policies are shown as bolded text and numbered with two digits (e.g. **1.1**, **5.4**) and the Implementation Strategies are shown as normal text and numbered with three digits (e.g. **1.1**, **5.4**.1). Each Chapter is arranged in the following manner:

Circulation Element Goal

The general direction and desired outcome of each chapter of the Circulation Element. The State of California General Plan Guidelines define a goal as, "a direction setter. It is an ideal future end, condition, or state related to the public health, safety or general welfare toward which planning and planning implementation measures are directed. A goal is a general expression of community values and, therefore, is abstract in nature. Consequently, a goal is generally not quantifiable, time-dependent or suggestive of specific actions for its achievement." The Circulation Element Goals were developed by a community consensus group and adopted May 31, 1995.

Example: Develop a comprehensive system of pedestrian routes which is integrated with other modes of transportation and which provide safe and efficient paths of travel.

Introduction Section	A description of the circulation conditions existing at a particular moment in time. The Introduction Section contains the following three segments:
Background	A brief description of the circulation setting and issues in the City.
Constraints	A brief description of potential restrictions in the circulation system and community that must be addressed in order to achieve the Vision of the Circulation Element.

Opportunities	A description of the potential issues and conditions that can be capitalized upon to achieve the Vision of the Circulation Element.
Policies and Implementation Strategies Section	A description of the methods to achieve the goal statement of each chapter. The Policies and Implementation Strategies Section contains the following two segments:
Policies	The State of California General Plan Guidelines defines a Policy as, " <i>a specific statement that guides</i> <i>decision making. It indicates a clear commitment of</i> <i>the local legislative body.</i> " Policies, in conjunction with the Implementation Strategies (described below), create clear directions to achieve the Vision Statement.
	Example: 5.2 The City shall link pedestrian paths with other alternative modes of transportation.
Implementation Strategies	Specific methods to achieve the Vision of the Circulation Element and provide examples of programs and actions that the City may take to achieve the goal and policy. An Implementation Strategy is "a rule of measure establishing a level of quantity that must be complied with or satisfied. Implementation Strategies further define the abstract terms of goals and policies."
	Example: 5.2.2 Continue to provide information on popular bike and walking routes to the transit providers so that their services can be linked with these routes.
Glossary	Contains a list of words and their definitions. This list can be referenced by the reader to determine the meaning or context for a number of terms in the Circulation Element.





CHAPTER 1 – ECONOMIC VITALITY

Goal 1 PROVIDE A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THAT SUPPORTS THE ECONOMIC VITALITY OF THE CITY

Establish and maintain a transportation system that supports the economic vitality of local businesses.

BACKGROUND

This goal represents a recognition that, in addition to maintaining the quality of life, the economic vitality of the City is a priority. The transportation system plays an important role in supporting the continued growth and economic vitality of local business. Therefore, the transportation system must enhance the business environment and quality of life of the City.

The transportation system of the City provides invaluable services to the business community by allowing customers access to commercial areas and allowing businesses to deliver and receive goods. When rethinking the design of a streetscape, delivery trucks must be accommodated or alternate forms of transporting goods and services must be developed. While the transportation of goods and services has traditionally been a guiding factor in developing roadways, tomorrow's solutions will rely on non-traditional approaches that support all of the transportation needs of businesses and users.

CONSTRAINTS

With the decision to rethink transportation priorities and solutions, some policies of the past will need adjustment. For example, current traffic standards sometimes prohibit commercial growth that is permitted by the land development provisions of the General Plan. Such standards can be changed to allow greater flexibility for commercial areas to better support the economic vitality of the City.

Another constraint is that the facilitation of delivery and receipt of goods may be at odds with the facilitation of access improvements for customers. For example, the addition of a delivery turnout may necessitate the narrowing of sidewalks or the loss of a traffic lane. Creative solutions will need to be found in order to accommodate all uses of the roadway.

OPPORTUNITIES

Space to store vehicles is costly, sometimes visually adverse, and limited. By increasing the use of alternative modes of transportation and reducing reliance on the automobile for-commuting to work, business areas will be able to improve access and availability of parking for customers, thereby enhancing economic vitality. This direction clearly shows how one aspect of transportation can be closely related to, or affect, another. A key to economic vitality is maintaining and enhancing the connection between the businesses and their customers. Further development of the transportation system should increase access and the mobility of people throughout the community and strengthen this relationship.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

ECONOMIC VITALITY

- 1.1 The City shall establish, maintain, and expand a mobility system that supports the economic vitality of local businesses.
- 1.1.1 Optimize access and parking for customers in business areas by implementing policies of the Circulation Element aimed at reducing dependence upon the automobile, and improving and increasing pedestrian, bicycle use, and transit use.
- 1.1.2 Review traffic impact standards used at City intersections for consistency with the goals of the Circulation Element and General Plan through public worksessions with the Planning Commission and the City Council.
- 1.1.3 Enhance alternative transportation services and infrastructure access between residential, recreational, educational, institutional and commercial areas.
- 1.1.4 Provide adequate infrastructure and info-structure to support the delivery of goods and services to and from area businesses.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CIRCULATION ELEMENT

- 1.2 The City shall place a high priority on funding and providing support for the implementation of the Goals, Policies, and Implementation Strategies of this Circulation Element.
- 1.2.1 Designate a task force and coordinator to recommend priorities for funding to the City Council to support the Goals, Policies, and Implementation Strategies of this Circulation Element.

CHAPTER 2 – EQUALITY OF CONVENIENCE

Goal 2 STRIVE TO ACHIEVE EQUALITY OF CONVENIENCE AND CHOICE AMONG ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION

Emphasize alternative modes in order to provide real options and opportunities for people to choose among different forms of transportation rather than relying exclusively on the automobile.

BACKGROUND

Currently, the automobile holds a position of prominence among mobility choices. This is based on the historical pattern of development since the advent of the automobile, and the perpetuation of its use through street, highway and other infrastructure improvements and funding. While strides have been made to make other modes of transportation attractive, equality of convenience among all modes of transportation does not exist today.

Too often, transportation facilities are designed to serve a singular purpose. For instance, many roads are designed to accommodate mainly automobile traffic, paths are designed solely for walking, and bike lanes are solely for bicycles. This system may have been feasible and appropriate in the past, but as the population of Santa Barbara increases and the circulation needs of the community change, our circulation system will need to respond in ways it has never been asked to before. We are being challenged to develop an integrated, intermodal circulation system which will serve the future needs of the community with limited financial resources and a limited ability or willingness to expand the physical system as it exists today. Planning for this future will not only involve recognizing the transportation needs of residents and businesses, but also prioritizing mobility goals.

CONSTRAINTS

The two biggest constraints to achieving equality among different modes of transportation are: 1) limited funding and resources available without shifting funds away from existing programs and street maintenance funds, and 2) the perception that the automobile will always be the most convenient mode of transportation.

People are reluctant to try shifting travel modes when other convenient choices, such as shuttles, vanpools, transit, bike lanes, and walking paths, are not readily available to them. Until alternative forms of travel become as convenient and easy to use as the automobile, most people will not take advantage of the opportunities to use alternate modes of transportation. In addition, if people are limited in their transportation choices, they tend to be more protective of the limited transportation opportunities that exist. For example, people are more resistant to paying for parking at work or shopping areas when other areas in the region offer unlimited free parking.

Finally, as Santa Barbara nears buildout, with much of the City's land use pattern fully established, alternative strategies and creative solutions must be explored in order to expand the availability of alternative transportation facilities and services. These strategies and solutions may include expansion of the existing transit systems and creation of new alternatives. As with most significant policy paradigm shifts, this may require the City to assess the value of compromises and trade-offs between existing mobility systems and alternative strategies.

OPPORTUNITIES

Santa Barbara can build upon its existing development patterns and travel systems to create an environment where all modes of travel can be conveniently used. For example, bicycle lanes already exist on many City streets, landscaped sidewalks exist along most of our streets to help make a pleasing pedestrian environment, and various forms of transit are presently available for travel within the City. Additionally, the existing grid system of roadways which is present downtown and in the older residential neighborhoods disperses traffic and provides a number of routes to any given destination.

Santa Barbara is also fortunate to have a climate which is conducive to outdoor activities, including walking and cycling. As a result, Santa Barbarans are already more accustomed to using different modes of transportation than residents of many other communities. Emphasis should be placed on further exposure of residents and visitors to the non-motorized transportation opportunities that are currently available to them.

In addition, some of the existing barriers to using alternative modes of transportation can be eliminated. For example, providing bus benches and shelters with posted schedules may reduce inconvenience and confusion surrounding the use of transit. Posting visible signs to alert drivers to the presence of pedestrian paths or completing gaps in existing sidewalks may eliminate barriers to walking. However, in order to remove these obstacles, careful analysis, community discussion and the development of creative solutions will be required. While recognizing that automobiles will remain an important mode of transportation, changes can be made to the existing circulation system to make it more inviting to those who may choose travel by other means.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

EQUALITY OF CONVENIENCE AND CHOICE

2.1 Work to achieve equality of convenience and choice among all modes of transportation. 2.1.1 Work with transit providers to enhance and expand transit services throughout the City of Santa Barbara and the surrounding region. 2.1.2 Expand and enhance the infrastructure for and promote the use of the bicycle as an alternative form of travel to the automobile. 213 Create an integrated pedestrian system that promotes safe and convenient pedestrian travel throughout the City. 2.1.4Work with outside agencies, employees, and employers to optimize the use of alternative travel modes to reduce the use of the automobile, especially during peak periods of congestion. 2.1.5 Manage the supply of parking on a City-wide basis and suggest methods to better utilize existing parking or to provide additional parking. 2.1.6 Manage the parking supply and work to increase the use of alternative forms of travel to increase the availability of parking and access to the Downtown area. 217 Address transportation issues and the provision of parking in the portion of the Coastal Zone that is within Santa Barbara city limits. 2.1.8 Develop a new classification and service system that focuses on all forms of travel and considers the needs of the land uses served by the system. 2.1.9 Explore ways to continue the concentration of development Downtown and along transit corridors to facilitate the use of transit and alternative modes of transportation. 2 1 10 Develop urban design standards that will facilitate the use of alternative means of travel and reduce dependency upon the automobile. The standards shall address linkages throughout the City, such as walkways, bikepaths, and transit. 2.1.11 Participate in an active and leadership role in regional transportation planning efforts through cooperation and communication with regional agencies.

- 2.1.12 Continue to provide and maintain adequate storm drainage, water supply and distribution, and wastewater collection systems to meet existing and projected demands. In addition, continue to work with electric, gas, and communications suppliers to maintain and provide service.
- 2.1.13 Continue to support the movement of people, goods, and services by transportation modes such as air, rail, and water. Continue to regulate the movement of trucks and hazardous materials to ensure safety.
- 2.1.14 Create a program to coordinate the execution and review of Implementation Strategies addressing signage (see Index B for a comprehensive list). The program should be reviewed by the Sign Committee, Historic Landmarks Commission, and Architectural Board of Review.

MONITORING

- 2.2 To assure that the community is moving towards the Vision articulated in this Circulation Element, the City shall monitor changes in traffic volumes, travel patterns and mobility choices through a program which:
 - establishes a baseline of traffic volumes and travel patterns,
 - establishes performance benchmarks related to the policy statements and implementation strategies within each chapter of the Circulation Element,
 - assesses the impacts of policy implementation and progress against these benchmarks, and
 - includes City response strategies if the outcomes of policy and project specific decisions are not consistent with the Vision articulated within this Circulation Element.
- 2.2.1 The City Administrator shall direct staff to develop and implement a monitoring program and submit reports every two years to the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the effectiveness of achieving the Goals and Policies of the Circulation Element. These reports shall include, but not be limited to, information on the following topics:
 - the effectiveness of land use policies in meeting the City's mobility goals,
 - the effectiveness of the policies of the Circulation Element towards increasing the use and effectiveness of transit programs,

- the attainment of regional air quality standards, and
- ridership patterns and use of alternative forms of transportation. Continue to obtain this information from responsible agencies, such as MTD. In areas where no information is available, conduct surveys.
- 2.2.2 Prior to each annual adoption of the Capital Improvement Program, public work sessions shall be held with the Planning Commission and the City Council to develop project priorities for funding.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

- 2.3 The development and maintenance of mobility and utility systems should include consideration of the impacts and enhancements to Santa Barbara's environmental quality.
- 2.3.1 Continue to review proposed mobility and utility projects for compliance with relevant documents such as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Santa Barbara General Plan, Santa Barbara Municipal Code, Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment, and Local Coastal Plan. The review should include, but not be limited to, an examination of the potential negative impacts of water runoff from streets and parking lots.
- 2.3.2 Continue to review proposed mobility and utility projects for compliance with the Santa Barbara County Clean Air Plan and Air Quality Plan.

CHAPTER 3 – TRANSIT

Goal 3 INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY AND USE OF TRANSIT

Support the increased use and availability of transit. This will be accomplished by augmenting resources, planning, and funding to promote the development, expansion and use of transit, such as buses, shuttles, rail, and vanpools (see Glossary).

BACKGROUND

This chapter focuses upon the enhancement and expansion of transit services in the City of Santa Barbara and the surrounding region. The purpose of the Policies and Implementation Strategies in this chapter is to increase the choices available for travel.

Improvements to the transit system could increase the number of riders, reduce reliance on the auto, decrease the need for street capacity improvements, make more efficient use of the existing street system, reduce the demand for parking, provide greater independence for youth and others who cannot or choose not to use cars, improve air quality, increase interaction among people, create local jobs, and enhance the quality of life in Santa Barbara.

The following transit systems currently exist and provide service to the City:

- Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) the public bus system for the South Coast, including both conventional buses, electric buses and shuttles,
- Clean Air Express subscription commuter services to Santa Barbara and Goleta from northern Santa Barbara County and Ventura,
- Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle (MTD) a City subsidized MTD service which provides short distance connections in and around the Downtown and Waterfront on short headways,
- Easy Lift Transportation pre-scheduled door-to-door service for the elderly and disabled individuals,
- Greyhound regional and nationwide bus service,
- Amtrak regional and nationwide rail service,
- Private bus and taxi operators, and
- School bus systems.

CONSTRAINTS

The City does not directly operate and has limited control over any of the transit operations in the City. This means that the City's ability to affect change is limited. However, through funding, coordination, and participation, the City can help to influence transit operations.

The policies of this Circulation Element are designed to offer incentives to use alternative forms of transportation whenever possible. This means that efforts to increase ridership on transit are focused on incentive based options.

The most successful method to increase transit ridership is to increase service. However, the operating costs involved with increased service and the competition for subsidies is the major constraint to expanded and improved public transit.

OPPORTUNITIES

To be attractive and successful, public transit in Santa Barbara must be frequent, reliable, comfortable, and affordable. With adequate funding, targeted improvements to existing transit services could considerably increase ridership in the City. These improvements include increasing the number of smaller, quieter, cleaner, more frequent electric buses, vans and shuttles. Improving the aesthetics, safety and comfort of transit stops could also result in increased ridership. Focus should also be placed on increasing the service frequency on major corridors, including linking neighborhoods and major commercial and activity centers. An optimal situation would be that during morning peak hours, noontime and afternoon peak hours, riders would expect a shuttle/bus to pass by every 7 minutes on major corridors. This would dramatically increase the convenience of public transit throughout the City. By making transit more convenient and attractive, the opportunity exists to help reduce the amount of single-occupant vehicle trips and traffic congestion. In turn, this may reduce automobile emissions and help improve air quality.

Identification and analysis of travel characteristics will help identify changes with the highest benefit/cost ratio. It has been shown in many communities that simply putting more buses on the street will not mean an increase in ridership.

The City has control over land development and associated infrastructure. The type and design of land development directly influences transit attractiveness and efficiency. Circulation system features such as bus shelters and priority bus access/movement can also influence function and ridership.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Please note: for purposes of this chapter, "support" refers to funding, coordination, and participation.

TRANSIT SERVICE

- 3.1 The City shall promote the development, improvement, expansion, and increased ridership of transit within the City, including the development of new forms of transit as they become available.
- 3.1.1 Encourage and support transit providers, in increasing the number of vehicles and reducing waiting times on selected popular routes. Explore the possibility of adding additional transit vehicles or creating new routes where it is suspected that use is low due to extended time periods between buses.
- 3.1.2 Help transit providers explore the use of "on demand" service, either by providing additional buses for expanded service or by other means such as jitneys, paratransit, shuttles, taxis and Dial-A-Ride operations.
- 3.1.3 Work with transit providers to serve new types of routes such as one that would connect grammar schools with major employers. This would provide parents the ability to take their child to school and then continue on to their place of employment.
- 3.1.4 Encourage and support MTD in expanding shuttle service to other routes within the City which have the potential to have a sustainable ridership.

- 3.1.5 Help identify and fund fare subsidies or transit pass programs. Consider the following options:
 - fare subsidies that could increase ridership on newly introduced routes,
 - a system whereby employers can choose to pay an annual fee to be dedicated to a secured transportation fund to increase transit in lieu of providing employee parking spaces,
 - a transit pass program for employers and employees,
 - a transit pass program for schools or other groups,
 - a Downtown employee subsidized bus pass program,
 - senior and youth discount passes, and
 - youth ridership programs for expanded weekend and nighttime ridership.
- 3.1.6 Identify and implement opportunities to give the movements of transit vehicles, such as buses, a priority over other vehicles through methods such as:
 - allowing transit vehicles to make turning movements that are prohibited to other vehicles,
 - allowing transit vehicle traffic signal pre-emption, and
 - providing transit vehicle only lanes that may occur during selected times and would not prohibit vehicular traffic flow.

Improvements for transit only movements will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council when service levels increase and the need is determined to be appropriate.

- 3.1.7 Work with transit providers to evaluate the impact of a centralized transfer system (spider web) against a potential for dispersed route interchange points (grid).
- 3.1.8 Encourage transit providers to establish programs for corporate sponsorship of vehicles.

- 3.1.9 Assist transit providers in the development of a strategic plan for service, including:
 - links to State Street along Mission and/or Micheltorena,
 - shuttle service between the Westside to the Eastside, Downtown, and Waterfront areas,
 - shuttle service connecting the Lower with the Upper Westside,
 - improved two-way or loop shuttle service for the Mesa, Northside, Westside, and Downtown,
 - visitor destinations,
 - Downtown grid,
 - Downtown Northside and La Cumbre Plaza,
 - Downtown Waterfront, and
 - improved service between the Airport and other areas of the South Coast.
- 3.1.10 Support the continuation of frequent, inexpensive transit service in areas with high numbers of transit dependent persons.
- 3.1.11 Implement policies in the Land Use chapter of the Circulation Element and the General Plan Land Use Element that encourage the use of transit.
- 3.1.12 Coordinate and participate in transit master planning in order to achieve a comfortable, convenient, efficient, and affordable transit system that accommodates all users, including residents, commuters, shoppers, students, visitors, youth, seniors, and the transit dependent.
- 3.1.13 Support the expansion of the hours of operation for transit providers along routes or areas where there is a need.
- 3.1.14 Support transit providers in the provision of shuttle/bus services to and from special events in areas such as the Waterfront, Downtown, Mission/Museum, County Bowl, Oak Park, and City College.
- 3.1.15 Regulate taxi operations in order to ensure fair pricing, safe and qualified drivers, efficient service, and service to heavily traveled areas such as tourist destinations or the Airport.

- 3.1.16 Provide for appropriately sited taxi loading zones where needed.
- 3.1.17 The City shall support transit through funding, coordination, and participation, including but not limited to:
 - including transit improvements in the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP),
 - using discretionary funds to support transit operations and maintenance,
 - sponsoring a monthly roundtable of agencies representing various modes of travel to coordinate planning and implementation, and
 - maintaining strong policies that encourage citywide transit system improvements.

TRANSIT STOPS, SHELTERS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

3.2 The City shall improve and develop safe, convenient, and protected transit stops that are compatible in design, color, and material with the surrounding area.

- 3.2.1 Give bus stops a priority over on-street parking when there is a demonstrated conflict or need.
- 3.2.2 Encourage transit providers to provide or continue to provide clear and easy to understand route information and maps or other computerized transit information systems at transit stops.
- 3.2.3 Provide and regularly maintain amenities such as benches, shelters, lighting, newsracks, and decorative trashcans at transit stops.
- 3.2.4 Expand the Bicycle Locker Program at transit stops and other strategic locations.
- 3.2.5 Employ a portable transit shelter that can help in the evaluation of new demonstration routes in residential neighborhoods.
- 3.2.6 Develop a program that, at the request of the property owner, would allow the City to install and maintain additional landscaping adjacent to transit stops to address neighborhood concerns.

- 3.2.7 Work with transit providers to improve and expand the transit route and signage program by showing connections between major attractions such as schools, museums, places of worship, institutions, shopping and recreation areas.
- 3.2.8 Work with transit providers and property owners to provide transit stops within parking lots of large shopping centers and other major visitor destinations.
- 3.2.9 Work with transit providers to develop and maintain the transit infrastructure, such as transit stops, in a clean, safe and cost effective manner.

REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE

- **3.3** The City shall support increases in regional transit services.
- 3.3.1 Mandate the coordination of local transit services with regional transit providers and regional transit master plans.
- 3.3.2 Coordinate and encourage public participation in discussions with transit providers, Santa Barbara County, local cities, and transit users in the creation of a Regional Transit Master Plan that addresses regional transit needs (see Implementation Strategy 3.1.9 for related policies).
- 3.3.3 Study and identify the means of providing improved transit service to the Milpas area, including, but not limited to, converting the Milpas Street post office building to a transit center which includes transportation services such as buses, vanpools, carpools, shuttles, and park and ride options, as well as post office boxes.
- 3.3.4 Encourage the continuation and expansion of commuter subscription bus service, such as the Air Pollution Control District's (APCD) Clean Air Express.
- 3.3.5 Explore the creation of designated areas for tour bus parking, drop-off and pickup, as well as routes.
- 3.3.6 Encourage the creation of light rail and metrorail connections between Santa Barbara, Oxnard, San Luis Obispo, and points in-between.

INTERMODAL CONNECTIONS

3.4 The City shall work to improve and expand intermodal connections.

- 3.4.1 Support programs and policies that maintain or expand the level of passenger rail and bus service. Bus service shall be considered in any development in the vicinity of the Union Pacific Railway Depot.
- 3.4.2 Assist transit providers in the placement of bike racks on all buses and secure storage at selected stops.
- 3.4.3 Promote and expand the employee shuttle bus service to and from the parking lots at the intersections of Carrillo St. and Castillo St. and Santa Barbara St. and Cota St.
- 3.4.4 Participate in and coordinate with efforts of the Technical Transportation Advisory Committee (TTAC) and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) to develop vital links between their different services. In addition, the City shall provide information on popular bike and walking routes to the transit providers so their services can be linked with these routes (see 14.2.3 and 3.1.17).
- 3.4.5 Provide improved service and hours of operation of transit and door-to-door transit service to and from the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.
- 3.4.6 Continue to support transit connections to other airports, such as but not limited to, Los Angeles International Airport.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH

- **3.5** The City shall work to increase public awareness of and cooperation with the City's transit planning goals.
- 3.5.1 Work with local businesses and transit providers to develop transit incentive programs.
- 3.5.2 Train City appointed MTD Board Members, Council Members, City Staff, and MTD Staff on the functions and working of transit services to ensure the consideration of City transit issues, and conduct joint work sessions with the City Council and directors of transit providers.

- 3.5.3 Encourage area schools to expand education programs about the benefits and advantages of the use of transit.
- 3.5.4 Develop and work with transit providers, regional rideshare programs, and others to expand existing transit marketing programs.
- 3.5.5 Market the City's transit system, through organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Convention and Visitors Bureau.

CHAPTER 4 – BICYCLING

Goal 4 INCREASE BICYCLING AS A TRANSPORTATION MODE

Develop a comprehensive system of bicycle routes which are integrated with other modes of transportation and which provide safe and efficient bikeways.

BACKGROUND

Although bicycling has been historically popular for both recreation and transportation, Santa Barbara's heightened awareness of the bicycle as an environmentally sensitive alternative mode of travel resulted from increased traffic congestion and higher gas prices. One goal of the City's Bikeway Master Plan, adopted in 1974, was "to make bicycling a means of transportation which may be used safely and enjoyably on any street in the City." Today, the more than 30 miles of bicycle paths and street lanes are steadily utilized and bicycle use in Santa Barbara is one of the highest in the nation (see Figure 2).

CONSTRAINTS

Despite significant improvement in the bikeway network, gaps in the system require infill and new routes need to be created to address concerns about safety. For example, traffic congestion at freeway interchanges can be an intimidating barrier to bicyclists, especially children. As Citywide vehicular traffic has steadily increased, so have requests for more bicycle lanes and paths.

The broad range of rider types and skill levels (e.g. commuters, recreational riders, children, mountain bicyclists, and racers) is a constraint because each has different bicycling needs. To maximize the community benefit, rider differences should be considered in plan development and implementation.

Another key constraint is the lack of adequate, safe, and secure bicycle storage lockers adjacent to destination points within the City. Where these have been provided, there is ample anecdotal evidence of high levels of use. Lastly, integration with other modes of transportation has been somewhat limited. Recent additions of bike racks to the front of MTD buses are a first step in addressing this issue.

OPPORTUNITIES

Increased bicycle use is directly linked to a number of goals articulated within this Circulation Element. Increased bicycle ridership will result in decreased demand for parking, reduced auto traffic congestion and lower levels of air pollution. To achieve increased ridership, the City must expand and improve the existing regional bikeway system. This includes expansion of on-street bike lanes, improved lighting and path quality on existing bicycle paths and the addition of bicycle paths in targeted areas with the potential for high levels of use. This can only be accomplished in coordination with the City of Carpinteria and the County of Santa Barbara.

Improving the convenience for commuters requires the City to improve bicycle storage safety at work locations and to expand the opportunities for multi-modal travel (i.e. bikes used in conjunction with buses, trains, carpools and vanpools). This can be done in a cost effective manner with the addition of storage lockers, funding of additional bikeracks on buses and shuttles, and the same type of employee incentive programs utilized for carpool programs. Secure bicycle storage can be located in a manner that provides benefits to specific business and properties. As a result, it is one program that may be tailored to the public-private partnership concept in order to expand the level of funding. Where secure bicycle lockers are provided, the City (and any partners) will need to address both short-term and long-term parking bicycle needs. The relatively low cost of these improvements, and the direct impact of reducing automobile trips creates an opportunity for the City to move forward on these improvements within a short time period and have significant positive impacts on mobility.

Related Benefits

It is also important to understand how increased bicycling helps to meet the goals set forth in the Vision Statement. Increasing bicycle travel will help achieve the following goals:

- support the economic vitality of the City by enhancing livability and improving community space,
- move the City closer to equality of convenience and choice among all modes of transportation,
- increase the availability of parking and access for Downtown customers, both in cars and on bikes,
- develop a mobility system that carries all modes of transportation from pedestrians to automobiles,
- review traffic impact standards used at intersections for consistency with Circulation Element and General Plan,
- coordinate the regional bikeway system,
- reduce the need for automobile parking in the Coastal Zone,
- provide air quality benefits, and
- possibly reduce wear on City streets.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

BICYCLE MASTER PLAN

4.1	The City shall update and implement the City's Bicycle Master Plan.
4.1.1	Work with neighborhoods, interest groups, employers, the County, UCSB, and SBCAG to identify current and future needs for bikeways in the Bicycle Master Plan.
4.1.2	Outline criteria for installing bike lanes on City streets in the Bicycle Master Plan.
4.1.3	Review bikeway routes and the Bicycle Master Plan periodically to address changing conditions and the needs of bicycle riders of various types and skill levels.
4.1.4	Incorporate Bicycle Master Plan projects into the City's Capital Improvements Program.
4.1.5	Monitor the use and effectiveness of bicycle parking facilities required by the Santa Barbara Municipal Code.

BIKEWAY SYSTEM

4.2 The City shall work to expand, enhance, and maintain the system of bikeways to serve current community needs and to develop increased ridership for bicycle transportation and recreation.

- 4.2.1 Create bikeways that conveniently serve major areas of attraction, such as shopping centers, public buildings, parks, places of employment, schools, and the Waterfront.
- 4.2.2 Keep public bike facilities and rights-of-way in good condition, well lit, and well maintained.

- 4.2.3 Encourage facilities for bicycle travel and parking in any future development, construction, or reconstruction projects during the review of new development and infrastructure improvements. Bicycle facilities can be achieved through methods such as:
 - purchase, dedication, and other means of property acquisition,
 - conditions of approval,
 - expanding the scope of maintenance projects, and
 - enforcement of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code, Parking Section.
- 4.2.4 Create opportunities for bicycle travel to interface with bus and train travel by working with transit providers to ensure that transit facilities are equipped with adequate bicycle carrying capacity and that the equipment is consistently deployed.
- 4.2.5 Adopt and implement the Regional Bikeway Signage Program.
- 4.2.6 Increase attractive, convenient, and secure bike parking and storage facilities on public property and encourage the provision of the same on private property. Continue to consider fully enclosed individual lockers and/or bicycle racks.
- 4.2.7 Identify possible changes at freeway interchanges and over/under passes that will facilitate the movement of bicycles through the interchange. Gather input from neighborhood groups, business groups, bicycle support groups and other interested organizations.
- 4.2.8 Install bicycle sensitive traffic signals at main bikeway intersections.

BICYCLE COORDINATOR

4.3 The City shall designate a Bicycle Coordinator.

- 4.3.1 The Bicycle Coordinator shall coordinate implementation of the goals, policies, and strategies of the Circulation Element and the Bicycle Master Plan with those of the County.
- 4.3.2 The Bicycle Coordinator shall represent bicyclist's interests in any significant discussions of transportation developments within the City.

- 4.3.3 Implement a system to report maintenance needs to the Bicycle Coordinator.
- 4.3.4 The Bicycle Coordinator shall promote the use of bicycles.
- 4.3.5 The Bicycle Coordinator shall encourage City Staff to use bicycles for short trips or deliveries.
- 4.3.6 The Bicycle Coordinator shall encourage the use of programs intended to teach safe bicycle riding techniques.
- 4.3.7 Work with local and regional bicycle groups and coalitions to promote bicycling both within and outside of the City.
- 4.3.8 Encourage bicycle retailers to sponsor bicycle "Fun Rides" or races to promote bicycle riding.
- 4.3.9 Recognize the role of bicycle related businesses as important to supporting bicycle commuting and riding.
- 4.3.10 The Bicycle Coordinator shall explore the feasibility of creating a "green bike program" designed to provide communal bicycles for local trips.

PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS

- 4.4 The City shall continue to use parking restrictions to create peak commute hour capacity for bicycle traffic. Public hearings shall be held prior to the creation of new parking restrictions.
- 4.4.1 Consider prohibiting peak commute period parking on major streets to create additional bicycle travel lanes, as appropriate, and upon consultation with adjacent property owners and a properly noticed public hearing.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH

4.5 The City shall actively promote the safe use of bicycles as an efficient and affordable mode of transportation.

4.5.1 Work with the Convention and Visitor's Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce to promote a bicycle friendly image of the City to residents and tourists.

- 4.5.2 Work with schools to provide information to children, adults, bicyclists, and motorists about the safe use of the bicycle on City streets including, but not limited to, the following:
 - safety awareness programs at area elementary, middle, and high schools,
 - providing maps outlining bikeways, streets with designated bicycle lanes, and streets with lesser traffic volumes that are safer for bicycle travel,
 - increased signage to alert motorists to the presence of bicycles,
 - work with bicycle retailers to provide patrons with information regarding the safe use of the bicycle,
 - promote ride-to-school days, and
 - promote/sponsor a Bike-to-Work Day.
- 4.5.3 Encourage local business to use bicycle couriers for deliveries.
- 4.5.4 Educate people about and enforce laws relating to safe bicycle use, such as:
 - using lights and reflectors at night,
 - stopping at signalized or signed intersections and crosswalks,
 - riding on the right side of the road,
 - keeping off of the sidewalk, and
 - properly using helmets, especially youth.


CHAPTER 5 – WALKING

Goal 5 INCREASE WALKING AND OTHER PATHS OF TRAVEL

Develop a comprehensive system of pedestrian routes which are integrated with other modes of transportation and which provide safe and efficient paths of travel.

BACKGROUND

This Chapter discusses methods to identify and build on the City's existing positive pedestrian environment in order to enhance and increase opportunities for pedestrian travel. The term "paths of travel" describes the City's walking environment, with its network of sidewalks and pathways, and conveys a recognition of the diverse abilities, needs, and interests of its businesses, residents, and visitors.

CONSTRAINTS

Some developed areas of the City and the foothills are not pedestrian-friendly because of the topography, lack of pedestrian amenities, and difficulty in accessing needed but distant services. Attempts to retrofit these areas to accommodate walking may be inhibited by these challenges.

It is also difficult to create a pedestrian-friendly environment in areas with high traffic volumes or high speeds, such as freeway interchanges, wide traffic corridors (e.g. Cabrillo Boulevard), and streets with frequent or wide curb cuts and wide or skewed intersections. Pedestrian safety is often in conflict with vehicles exiting from both large and small parking lots because of inadequate visibility and warning signs.

Highway 101 limits interaction between neighborhoods and poses a significant automobiledominated barrier to pedestrians, except at the State Street underpass, where transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians are simultaneously served successfully. Conversely, many of the Highway 101 crossings (e.g. Ortega, Anapamu, and Butterfly Lane) are under-utilized because of a sense of isolation created by poor visibility and a lack of lighting, identification signage, and aesthetic treatments.

Conflicts between uses can occur in paseos (see Glossary) located to the rear of commercial properties due to safety hazards (e.g. delivery trucks) and nuisances (e.g. noise and trash odors).

OPPORTUNITIES

The City of Santa Barbara's historical compact development grid pattern created the Downtown area with its narrow streets and wide sidewalks and a successfully integrated pedestrian circulation system that allows easy access to businesses and services. By expanding the existing positive pedestrian environment, the City could encourage housing within the Downtown area to enable employees to live near where they work.

Santa Barbara is also unique in that the paseo system is well established. Paseos are a series of connecting private and public walkways joined to streets, parking facilities, open plazas, courtyards, cafes and shops through the central portions of city blocks. Please note that alleys are different from paseos in that they are primarily automobile oriented. Paseos generally promote pedestrian use and buildings that are oriented in size, entrances, amenities, and signage to the pedestrian. Paseos provide a pleasant experience for the user and open up an increased number of facades of commercial buildings. This promotes increased pedestrian access to Downtown, which in turn supports the economic vitality of the area.

The pedestrian environment could be enhanced, where appropriate, by better lighting and security, shade trees, street furniture, and landscaped parkways to separate pedestrians and traffic. The continuation and expansion of the existing American with Disabilities Act (ADA) upgrade program, which requires physical improvements to facilitate the access by persons with disabilities, is also important.

A sign program would also help identify walking routes to various attractions around the City for those who are unfamiliar with the City. Directional signs would also improve the connections between different areas of the City by creating well-traveled routes. Designated walking routes and directional signs could encourage higher pedestrian use, a greater perception of safety, and improved connections between different areas of the City.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

INCREASE ACCESS AND WALKING OPPORTUNITIES

- 5.1 The City shall create an integrated pedestrian system within and between City neighborhoods, schools, recreational areas, commercial areas and places of interest.
- 5.1.1 Establish an annual sidewalk expansion and improvement program with a designated source of funding and update the Sidewalk Inventory Study to develop a process for funding priorities for improvements. Incorporate the expansion and improvement program into the Capital Improvements Program.
- 5.1.2 Identify and link major activity centers and destinations with walkways. This will consist of the following:
 - surveying existing connections between neighborhoods and identifying opportunities and constraints for new pedestrian connections,
 - identifying existing barriers to walking to school and where feasible eliminating those barriers,
 - providing improved access for pedestrians (for example, between such areas as the Eastside, Westside, Mesa, Lower State, Upper State and Waterfront areas, major attractions, recreation, cultural, and commercial areas),
 - working with neighborhood markets and grocery stores to identify ways to encourage walking trips to the market from surrounding neighborhood areas,
 - improving pedestrian access in and around the Mission by providing safe and attractive walking connections between the Mission, Rose Garden, Rocky Nook Park, Natural History Museum and Alameda Padre Serra, and
 - creating an integrated pedestrian system linking the Franklin Center, Franklin School, the Eastside Library and the community gardens.
- 5.1.3 Work with local merchants to create a package delivery system.

- 5.1.4 Work with Caltrans to improve and maintain Highway 101 pedestrian over/undercrossings to promote increased pedestrian use. This may include adding amenities such as lighting, landscaping, and identification signage.
- 5.1.5 Encourage newly proposed developments to include pedestrian connections to surrounding areas, adjacent transit facilities, or other travel facilities during development review.

LINKING PEDESTRIAN PATHS TO ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION

5.2 The City shall link pedestrian paths with other alternative modes of transportation.

- 5.2.1 Work with all transit providers to develop links between different transit services. This may include providing route information along pedestrian routes, improved transit stops, and providing pedestrian connections to alternative forms of travel.
- 5.2.2 Continue to provide information on popular bike and walking routes to the transit providers so that their services can be linked with these routes.

UPDATE AND EXPAND THE PASEO SYSTEM

- **5.3** *Protect and expand existing paseos and acquire new paseos in the Downtown.*
- 5.3.1 Develop conceptual designs and guidelines for new paseos.
- 5.3.2 Establish protective mechanisms such as land acquisitions, historic designations, use of easements, private development cooperation, and development controls for the paseo system.
- 5.3.3 Encourage private development to incorporate public paseos by offering increased density and other incentives for providing or improving paseos and paseo connections.

- 5.3.4 Consider closing streets to create pedestrian plazas if, upon consultation with a broad segment of the community and general agreement of the affected business owners and property owners, it can be demonstrated that it would improve pedestrian access and enhance the Downtown business environment.
- 5.3.5 Encourage business owners to keep paseos in the rear of commercial buildings free of trash and limit deliveries to hours when the paseos are not heavily traveled.
- 5.3.6 Provide mid-block crossings to connect existing paseos, if appropriate and feasible.

DESIGN STANDARDS

- 5.4 The City shall revise and enhance design guidelines and standards for the City's pedestrian system.
- 5.4.1 Work with the Architectural Board of Review and Historic Landmarks Commission to revise and enhance City design standards for all sidewalks and paths of travel. Standards should address width of paths, safety, lighting, landscaping, location, street furniture, the availability of alternate pedestrian access-ways, and the provision of kiosks or other methods to exchange public information.
- 5.4.2 Provide parkways or tree wells and develop other innovative methods where appropriate to separate and/or protect pedestrians from traffic.
- 5.4.3 Revise Outer State Street Design Guidelines and Haley Milpas Design Guidelines to emphasize pedestrian friendly design.
- 5.4.4 Update and revise the Public Works Street Design Standards to include the following standards:
 - sidewalks should be wide and shaded by trees,
 - trees should be placed at the curb-side of the sidewalk to provide a psychological and physical separation between pedestrians and auto traffic. Adequate room for growth should be given to avoid sidewalk damage by tree roots, and
 - the width and number of curb cuts (driveways) on City streets should be kept to a minimum or designed in a manner that protects the safety of pedestrians.

- 5.4.5 Improve design for disabled access by providing more ramps, providing more repair to cracked and heaved sidewalks, filling in gaps in existing sidewalks, identifying and relocating obstructions (fire hydrants, telephone poles, light poles) in narrow sidewalks or providing paths around obstructions, and using paving materials which are conducive to wheelchairs and those who have difficulty walking.
- 5.4.6 Require striping/signage, crossing guards, stop signs, and other devices to improve safety near schools and parks.
- 5.4.7 Notify and work with affected property owners, user groups, and tenants prior to the adoption of any design standards for pedestrian oriented improvements.
- 5.4.8 During the development review process, identify all sidewalk obstructions (e.g. fire hydrants, telephone poles, utilities, etc.) on development plans and, if feasible, locate or relocate them in such a way so as to remove the obstruction and to enhance visual aesthetics.

PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS AND AMENITIES

5.5 The City shall create and foster a pedestrian friendly environment through physical and cultural improvements and amenities.

- 5.5.1 Provide street furniture, especially benches for resting and shade trees along streets, where appropriate. Look for opportunities for new resting spots, plazas, placitas, small squares, and landscaped areas in all areas of the City which should include focal point(s), opportunities for people watching, and/or attractive natural surroundings. These areas will encourage gathering, public and social interaction and could be used for cultural events and activities. An example could be the placement of benches and street furniture in Chase Palm Park.
- 5.5.2 Identify areas where additional street and paseo lighting is appropriate and implement methods to provide that lighting.
- 5.5.3 Improve sidewalk conditions to increase ease of use for all pedestrians including those with strollers, wheelchairs, carts, walkers, and other walking assistance devices.

5.5.4	Encourage plazas, courtyards, cafes, shops, and restaurants along walkways in commercial areas to encourage a mix of private business and public uses. Adequate width should remain for pedestrian travel.
5.5.5	Consider public plazas, restrooms, resting spots, or gathering places in all commercial areas of the City, especially in the following areas:
	Milpas Street from Cabrillo Boulevard to Anapamu Street, and
	• the Eastside near Milpas Street starting temporarily by blocking off parts of streets such as Montecito Street, Calle Puerto Vallarta, Alphonse or Jennings for special events.
5.5.6	Look for opportunities to connect placitas to public, private and institutional uses. Include signage, as appropriate.
5.5.7	Develop procedures that improve the City's infrastructure by incorporating the new sidewalk design standards into street maintenance projects.
5.5.8	Prior to creating any plaza areas conduct a noticed public hearing.
5.5.9	Improve the beachway to increase safety for all users.
5.5.10	Adequately fund programs for regular maintenance of heavily used pedestrian amenities, including sidewalks, under/overpasses, and footbridges. Programs should include litter removal, graffiti removal, steam cleaning, and landscape maintenance.
5.5.11	Create incentives and opportunities for private property owners to make incremental improvements to enhance the pedestrian environment surrounding their properties, such as widening sidewalks and planting street trees. Any improvements should comply with relevant design guidelines and standards.
5.5.12	Consider the creation of mercados, or markets, in appropriate commercial areas of the City.
5.5.13	Install small segments of sidewalks in selected areas, especially on blind curves or in hilly areas with narrow streets, to help improve the safety of pedestrians.

STREET CROSSINGS

5.6 The City shall make street crossings easier and more accessible to pedestrians.

- 5.6.1 Where necessary, allow all-way crossings or adjust signal timing to allow more time for pedestrians to cross the street. Priority should be given to areas with high pedestrian activity as identified in the Sidewalk Inventory Study. Possible areas include Cabrillo Boulevard/State Street, Carrillo Street/Chapala Street and along Milpas Street near Santa Barbara Junior High School, Santa Barbara High School, and Montecito Street.
- 5.6.2 Widen sidewalks and add medians and other means at intersections to reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians, where appropriate.
- 5.6.3 Reduce the speed limit in targeted pedestrian areas (e.g. near parks, schools, and hospitals) to 25 miles per hour.

LAND USE AND ZONING

5.7 The City shall amend the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that land use planning and zoning encourage pedestrian uses.

- 5.7.1 Include sidewalks, landscaping, and other facilities in new public and private construction to promote pedestrian activity where appropriate and consistent with the policies contained in this element.
- 5.7.2 Review, and revise where appropriate, the Zoning Ordinance to allow more small/compact residential neighborhood services (e.g. corner markets, medical and professional offices) within walking distance of existing residential neighborhoods (see Implementation Strategies 13.5.1 and 13.5.2).
- 5.7.3 Continue to implement zoning practices that encourage mixed use developments in order to improve opportunities for pedestrian access and decrease dependency on the automobile.
- 5.7.4 Amend the Zoning Ordinance to encourage property owners to avoid situating parking lots between the street edge/sidewalk area and storefronts.
- 5.7.5 Continue to ensure that private and public developments, as well as capital improvements, are designed to accommodate the elderly, the handicapped, the disabled, and the blind.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

5.8 The City shall encourage community involvement in effectively promoting the benefits of walking and identify opportunities for improving the pedestrian system. 5.8.1 Establish a signage program for pedestrian routes throughout the City that link various neighborhoods and attractions. 582 Enhance existing or develop new partnerships with civic organizations to promote walking tours of Santa Barbara and provide brochures and signage to advertise these tours 5.8.3 Encourage public and private schools, from pre-school through high school, to promote walking through methods such as walking field trips. 5.8.4 Work with public and private schools to identify and expand safe routes to school 585 Consider establishing a hotline to report pedestrian trouble spots. Continue a Traffic Safety Committee comprised of residents, the Assistant 5.8.6 Traffic Engineer and business representatives for the purpose of studying matters of traffic and pedestrian safety, traffic calming, and making recommendations to the City Council regarding measures to promote and improve traffic and pedestrian safety. Coordinate a "Walker's Appreciation Day" with Downtown retailers. Co-5.8.7 sponsor a "Walk to Work", "Take a Walk", or "Walk to School" day. 5.8.8 Work with community groups to encourage neighborhood walk-about activities. 5.8.9 Work with the Police Department to improve pedestrian safety at night (in areas including paseos and placitas) through such methods as increased bicycle patrols. 5.8.10 Encourage public and private schools to implement pedestrian safety education programs for all ages. 5.8.11 Encourage community groups, business groups, and individuals to assist in the cleaning and maintenance of sidewalks, sidewalk furniture, landscaping, and pedestrian overpasses, including graffiti removal and litter pickup.

CHAPTER 6 – REDUCE THE USE OF THE AUTOMOBILE

Goal 6 REDUCE THE USE OF THE AUTOMOBILE FOR DRIVE-ALONE TRIPS

Efficiently and effectively use the existing street system through incentives, the provision of attractive alternatives and a transportation demand management program. Recognizing that automobiles will still be on the road, the City will support programs that encourage increased vehicle occupancies and trip reduction in order to enjoy the quality of life that currently exists. The City recognizes that reducing drive-alone trips from current levels may create roadway capacity for new development consistent with the General Plan.

BACKGROUND

This chapter focuses on making alternative transportation modes more attractive and convenient in order to reduce the use of the automobile for drive-alone trips. Social scientists have studied the history of the automobile and agree that its proliferation has dramatically changed life in America. The automobile continues to provide a freedom of movement not previously known while simultaneously negatively impacting development patterns, community life, and the environment. It is important to note that many people cannot afford to use, or choose not to use, the automobile. In addition, some segments of society do not recognize that the automobile is neither cost nor energy efficient. Yet, there is limited community support for additional street widening and infrastructure investments. The City must continue to plan for the use of the automobile until more choices are available and the community begins to change the way it perceives the single occupancy vehicle.

CONSTRAINTS

The following constraints exist in the City:

- few travel choices can match the ease and convenience of the automobile,
- streets operate at acceptable levels except during peak commute hours and special events,
 - parking is generally inexpensive and easily available,
 - Federal and State programs focus more on the expansion of the infrastructure than on the efficient use of highway system, and
 - housing in the Downtown core is less available, and therefore, more expensive than similar housing outside the City.

OPPORTUNITIES

The City's physical setting and development patterns are conducive to the expanded use of transportation alternatives. Its residential areas are part of a compact urban form and its climate is excellent for outdoor activities. There is demand for increased housing in the Downtown area that strengthens the compact urban form that allows people to live close to employment opportunities and residential support services.

Ride sharing can reduce peak hour single occupancy vehicle trips for commuters with similar schedules, origins, and destinations, because home/work, home/school, and school/work trips may be easily coordinated. Drive alone trips may also be reduced with employee incentives such as: preferential parking; guaranteed mid-work transit services; ride home transportation; and cash-out rebates. Expansion of transit services such as air, rail, water, bus, electric shuttles, taxis, and jitneys can remove additional trips from the roadway. Other opportunities to reduce the number of drive alone-trips may include:

- employee telecommuting,
- commercial telecommuting centers or satellite offices,
- local merchant tele-shopping services, and
- local merchant coordinated package delivery services.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

LOCAL AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

- 6.1 The City shall continue to support efforts to expand Transportation Demand Management Programs.
- 6.1.1 Work with local and regional transportation demand management services, such as Traffic Solutions, to actively promote the advantages and cost savings of alternative forms of transportation.
- 6.1.2 Work with local and regional transportation demand management services, such as Traffic Solutions, to explore opportunities for employer vanpool sponsorship.
- 6.1.3 Increase funding for local/regional Transportation Demand Management programs, such as Traffic Solutions.
- 6.1.4 Work with employers to provide transportation demand management programs that encourage employees to rideshare and use alternative modes of transportation. Such voluntary programs may include telecommuting, transportation allowances in lieu of free or inexpensive parking, free or low cost bus passes, and van-pools.

CITY AS A MODEL EMPLOYER

6.2 The City shall set an example as a model employer to reduce the use of the single occupancy vehicle.

6.2.1 The City, as a model employer, shall continue to promote its transportation demand management program and encourage employees to live close to the workplace. The City may discuss issues with employees' union representatives as necessary in order to meet the program's objectives.

REGIONAL COORDINATION

- 6.3 The City shall support and promote regional programs that reduce the use of the single occupancy vehicle.
- 6.3.1 Create incentives to increase use of peripheral lots.

- 6.3.2 Consider establishing van/carpool parking on street and in public parking lots.
- 6.3.3 Develop and implement land use policies and Circulation Element Implementation Strategies such as those listed under the Regional Coordination section of Chapter 14 that promote the:
 - expansion of regional park and ride facilities,
 - development of regional rail service between Carpinteria and Goleta/Isla Vista, and
 - the provision of shuttle and or express service between Ventura and Goleta/Isla Vista.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- 6.4 The City shall work to raise awareness about the effects of automobile use and the value of alternatives to driving alone.
- 6.4.1 Continue to work with agencies, such as the School District and Traffic Solutions, and fund programs that are designed to expand the education, outreach, and marketing components of transportation demand management services.
- 6.4.2 Work with groups such as the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and Traffic Solutions to educate the public about auto-related air pollution emissions.
- 6.4.3 Work with groups such as the Community Environmental Council (CEC), to incorporate information about opportunities to decrease energy consumption, reduce air pollution, and improve resource conservation through decreased use of the automobile.
- 6.4.4 Encourage local and regional transportation demand management services, such as Traffic Solutions, the Air Pollution Control District (APCD), and the Community Environmental Council (CEC) to develop a local access television program aimed at raising awareness and discouraging drive alone trips.
- 6.4.5 Participate in the Clean Cities Program (see Glossary).

- 6.4.6 Continue to participate in and share information with the Environmental Protection Agency/Local Government Commission's Transportation Partners Program.
- 6.4.7 Encourage the use of bicycling and other forms of alternative transportation through the sponsorship of events such as a Bike-to-Work Day.
- 6.4.8 Work with groups such as the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce to promote the use of public forms of transportation, alternative forms of travel and ridesharing to and within the City in all out of town advertising and promotion efforts.

The three chapters that follow (Parking Citywide, Downtown, and Coastal Zone) address parking and access issues in the City. The chapters together represent a larger, overarching goal: to increase access and to manage parking to increase parking availability. However, the chapters remain separate because they each address issues specific to the area of coverage. The Parking Citywide chapter addresses broad parking issues that are applicable throughout the City. This chapter is presented first to provide a broad community perspective on approaches to improve access and manage parking. The Downtown and Coastal Parking chapters are presented next and contain policies and implementation strategies that apply specifically to those areas.

CHAPTER 7 – PARKING CITYWIDE

Goal 7 INCREASE ACCESS BY OPTIMIZING PARKING CITYWIDE

Develop and implement innovative parking management strategies and a master parking plan that is consistent with the scale of surrounding neighborhood land uses, supports the land uses of the General Plan, and furthers the goals of the Circulation Element's Vision Statement.

BACKGROUND

This chapter of the Circulation Element focuses on the supply, master planning, and management strategies for parking throughout the City of Santa Barbara. American cities continue to devote much of their land space to the movement and storage of the automobile. As a result, zoning and design standards favor the automobile. Cities like Santa Barbara have struggled with finding ways to successfully maintain a pedestrian oriented environment while accommodating the space needs of the automobile.

Peak period vehicular parking shortages occur Citywide because of the combined demands of tourists, shoppers, residents, commuters, and other concurrent users. Santa Barbara's Downtown and Waterfront areas have the greatest parking demand. Parking is also impacted in the Milpas Street and Outer State Street corridors. Milpas Street is an example of an area with old buildings, no public parking structures, and little opportunity for private parking. Parking impacts also occur during special events at Oak Park, the County Bowl, and on Farmer's Market days.

CONSTRAINTS

Many older buildings, constructed with little or no parking, cannot expand or intensify their use because it is often difficult or impossible to comply with new parking regulations. In many areas of the City, there is little or no land available for consolidation of parking facilities.

OPPORTUNITIES

In many areas of the City, there are numerous opportunities to promote shared parking for uses that operate at different time periods, such as a dinner restaurant and offices. Other examples include the use of school, church, and peripheral parking lots for special events, in combinations such as:

- County Bowl/Santa Barbara High School,
- Mormon Church/Fielding Institute, and
- Cota Lot/Farmer's Market.

The "park once" concept, which allows access to a variety of uses without having to drive from one activity to the next, can be expanded.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

PARKING MASTER PLAN

7.1 Develop and implement a Parking Master Plan to coordinate and manage parking in the City.

7.1.1 Create a Parking Master Plan that outlines strategies and implementation measures for addressing the City's parking supply, residential parking permit program, and parking requirements and design standards.

PARKING SUPPLY

- **7.2** The City shall improve ways to utilize existing parking and create new parking opportunities through partnerships and cooperation.
- 7.2.1 Research the availability and develop the mechanism that allows the general public to use private and governmental agency parking lots.
- 7.2.2 Work with other agencies to develop peripheral parking lots linked by a shuttle system to employment centers.
- 7.2.3 Explore new opportunities to expand designated on-street carpool spaces in parking impacted business areas.
- 7.2.4 Explore the feasibility of developing jointly coordinated business/package delivery services.
- 7.2.5 Explore the feasibility of developing parking facilities for multipurpose use by both public and private entities. For instance, a parking area can be used jointly by Santa Barbara Junior High School, the County Bowl, and Milpas area merchants and customers.
- 7.2.6 Create incentives to:
 - improve underutilized parking areas (for example, the rear of Milpas Street properties), and
 - create secondary access in the rear of buildings to provide opportunities for paseos, increased landscaping, and additional parking for motor vehicles and bicycles.

- 7.2.7 Develop methods to optimize the use of on street parking. These methods may include the following:
 - the reduction of red painted curbs and other street parking prohibitions where safe and feasible,
 - considering using on-street parking, where available, to satisfy private parking demands,
 - allowing design flexibility and building siting that enhances the use of alternative means of travel, and
 - increasing the availability and use of alternative means of travel to reduce the demand for parking spaces.
- 7.2.8 Encourage uses with different peak parking hours to share facilities and, therefore, reduce the total number of required parking spaces.

RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM

- 7.3 The City shall continue to operate a Residential Parking Permit Program.
- 7.3.1 As requested, expand the Residential Parking Permit Program to help ensure onstreet parking for residents in impacted areas such as Downtown or the Waterfront.

PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS

- 7.4 The City shall update its Parking Requirements and Design Standards to optimize its parking resources and to encourage increased use of alternative transportation.
- 7.4.1 Incorporate innovative design standards, such as tandem parking, stacked parking, and valet parking.
- 7.4.2 Consider allowing on-site parking requirements to be reduced if amenities are provided that support the use of alternative transportation.
- 7.4.3 Survey land uses, public parking supplies, and available alternative modes of transportation prior to considering changes in parking requirements.

- 7.4.4 Consider amending the parking standards of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code to allow reduced parking standards for uses such as delivery services, courier services, and phone and mail order services that help reduce automobile trips.
- 7.4.5 Consider using the pricing of public parking lots as a way to discourage drive alone trips. As an example, the fee structure could be set so that rideshare vehicles pay a reduced fee or receive reserved spaces. This program should be considered with input from shoppers, businesses, and citizens.
- 7.4.6 Consider the efficacy of and appropriate location of visitor recreational vehicle parking.

CHAPTER 8 – DOWNTOWN

Goal 8 INCREASE PARKING AVAILABILITY AND ACCESS FOR DOWNTOWN CUSTOMERS

Increase parking availability and access for Downtown customers and reduce the need for downtown employee parking by making alternative modes of transportation convenient for Downtown employees and the public through methods such as:

- improving pedestrian and transit access,
- *increasing bicycle parking,*
- providing incentives for employees to use alternative transportation and park in peripheral lots,
- discouraging the employee shuffle, and
- managing parking resources and/or adding new parking spaces, where necessary.

BACKGROUND

This chapter focuses upon methods to increase the availability of parking and access to the Downtown area. The Downtown area is bounded by Sola Street on the north, Garden Street on the east, U.S. 101 on the south, and De La Vina Street on the west. The Downtown is Santa Barbara's primary governmental, commercial and business center. Its parking needs are unique because of its urban density and compact pattern of development.

In 1964, the Citywide commercial parking requirement was one space per five hundred square feet of building area. The first reference to discussion of downtown parking and traffic issues was in the 1964 General Plan, which introduced a more pedestrian-oriented vision for downtown State Street. It called for the removal of on-street parking and the creation of public off-street parking lots and a people mover system. Much of impetus for these changes came from Downtown area merchants who were concerned that business would be lost to La Cumbre Plaza (with promises of ample free parking) which was then under construction near the western City limits.

The first public parking lots were constructed to replace the on-street parking removed from the Downtown core and to increase the parking supply. To pay for construction and maintenance, two Parking Assessment Districts were formed in the Downtown area. The lots were paid for by property owners through an assessment based on Zones of Benefit (see Glossary). Sidewalks were also widened, landscaping added, and vehicle lanes reduced in order to create a more pedestrian friendly environment.

The Santa Barbara Goals Report, issued in early 1970, and the 1974 Impacts of Growth Study continued to focus on reduction of auto uses in the Downtown. These studies recommended that employee access to on-street parking be discouraged by eliminating long term on-street parking except through a Residential Parking Permit Program. Ninety minute free parking was established in the public parking lots and on Downtown streets so that short term spaces would be available to shoppers. The Shopper Hopper and People Mover systems were short-lived attempts to encourage the "park once" concept for the shopper while minimizing employee use of parking spaces.

In the early 1980s, parking requirements were revised to one parking space for every 250 square feet of development. In the Downtown area, however, one space per 500 square feet was retained because of space availability in the public parking lots. The City initiated a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) program to give parking priority to residents of a neighborhood impacted by commuter or shopper parking. Two peripheral commuter lots were built and two-level garages replaced two surface lots. Subsequently, two additional surface lots were built in the lower Downtown (Oldtown) area.

Existing Parking

The Downtown area public parking lots supply 2705 spaces in eight surface lots and four multilevel garages. The Comprehensive Parking Analysis of the Downtown area prepared by Rich and Associates, Inc. (1991), concluded that there was an existing parking deficit of 1,613 spaces north of Carrillo Street. The analysis also identified a possible future deficit in that area of as many as 2,293 spaces.

CONSTRAINTS

Most Downtown area public lots and on-street parking areas are at or near capacity during periods of peak demand. Few, if any, resources exist to construct more parking structures. Limited area is available for new surface lots. A 1994 attempt to create a new assessment district failed by a large margin, despite the cumulative benefit to the Downtown area of sharing and pooling its parking supply. A lot is considered impacted, from an environmental review perspective, when regular occupancy exceeds 85% (although the Zone of Benefit still applies) and mitigation is required for new projects. Because of the foregoing conditions, development possibilities are constrained. Downtown area parking supplies continue to be constrained by employees who use short-term spaces for long-term parking.

OPPORTUNITIES

If adequate, reliable, alternative transportation choices exist, employees will have less need for parking. Reduced demand for employee parking will leave more of the existing parking spaces available for use by downtown customers.

If the overall need for employee parking is reduced (e.g. decreasing employee and public parking demand) it may be possible to reduce the parking requirements for new development. Reduced parking requirements could lessen development costs and make more land available for other priority uses, such as housing, commercial development, open space, and landscaping. Reducing the need for parking can be accomplished through both short and long term strategies.

Short Term Opportunity

Because of the high cost of building new parking lots and structures, a reduction of employee parking demand will be required in order to meet a rising customer parking demand. If Downtown employers will support and promote employee transportation alternatives, such as shuttles, transit, and bicycles, customers will continue to be able to find convenient and inexpensive parking in the Downtown. In addition, the expansion of transit service between residential areas and places of employment could help reduce the demand for Downtown parking.

The opportunity exists to change employee commute choices by providing incentives and disincentives to change and reinforce behavior. An entrepreneurial and innovative approach must be taken to design incentives that will have a lasting effect on employee choices.

One disincentive, or deterrent, to employee shuffling is to reduce the free parking period from 90 to 60 minutes. This idea is controversial because businesses and property owners believe that shoppers will not come Downtown if the 90 minute free parking program is reduced. However, reducing the parking time could make more parking available to shoppers because employees are less likely to be able to leave work every 55 minutes to move their cars and would be required to make different arrangements.

The City can use underutilized parking lots, such as the employee parking lot at the intersection of Carrillo and Castillo, through marketing and other incentives to help alleviate parking congestion in the Downtown core.

In addition, the opportunity may exist to construct a new parking structure on the site of surface Lot #3 (at the corner of Chapala and Carrillo), which would help to alleviate the current parking deficit north of Carrillo Street.

Long Term Opportunity

At the beginning of the 20th century, the mix of land uses in Downtown Santa Barbara included many homes and second floor living areas over store fronts. Many people who worked in the State Street area also lived Downtown. As the Downtown core has expanded over time, residential neighborhoods have been slowly pushed back. Office spaces have replaced second floor living areas. Today, people who work Downtown vastly out number those who live Downtown. Consequently, the number of people driving to work has also increased, requiring more parking during the day.

One long term opportunity to help alleviate Downtown parking demand is the enhancement and provision of accessible and convenient transportation facilities for transit, biking, and walking. Increased public education regarding alternative transportation opportunities can also help alleviate parking demand. In addition, an opportunity exists through the continued management of existing parking to optimize its supply. Finally, land use patterns can have a profound effect on Downtown parking demand. The provision of housing in the Downtown area can provide the opportunity for people to either live and work in the Downtown or commute from the Downtown area to outlying areas. At the very least, additional housing in the Downtown area would allow Downtown residents the opportunity to access commercial, social, and recreational opportunities in the immediate proximity without necessitating the use of the automobile. The provision of housing units. This is known as a jobs-housing imbalance. For a detailed discussion on the jobshousing balance and a list of policies to help address this issue, please refer to the Housing Element of the General Plan.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

DOWNTOWN PARKING AND ECONOMIC VITALITY

- 8.1 The City shall continue to manage the Downtown public parking supply to support the economic vitality of the Downtown business district while sustaining or enhancing its historical and livable qualities.
- 8.1.1 Operate and manage the Downtown public parking program in partnership with the Downtown community to reduce the need for employee parking and to increase available parking for customers and clients.
- 8.1.2 Establish consistent parking demand standards in the Downtown based on the Zone of Benefit principles and through methods such as:
 - creating standards that allow capacity to be determined by the peak hour parking demands of various uses, and
 - extending the duration utilized when determining capacity. For instance, average the amount of use of parking over an entire day rather than during the peak periods.
- 8.1.3 Consider reducing or eliminating the parking requirements for small businesses and small additions (as defined in the Santa Barbara Municipal Code), when adequate alternatives are operational.
- 8.1.4 Operate and manage the Downtown public parking program in partnership with the Downtown community to meet existing public parking needs.

MANAGING DOWNTOWN PUBLIC PARKING

- 8.2 The City shall manage the Downtown parking supply to reduce the need for employee parking while increasing the availability of customer parking and working with the County of Santa Barbara to address parking needs.
- 8.2.1 Develop a subsidized bus pass program for Downtown employees. Consider other incentives for employees who bike, walk, or car/van pool to work.
- 8.2.2 Increase the awareness of employers and employees about impacts of employee parking and commuting habits through marketing and education.

- 8.2.3 Explore free or inexpensive preferential car and van pool spaces in the Downtown parking lots. Monitor any adopted program to ensure proper use and minimal customer displacement.
- 8.2.4 Sell daily parking permits in the commuter parking lots.
- 8.2.5 Support increased ridership on the electric Downtown Shuttle as an effective parking management tool which also reduces congestion.
- 8.2.6 Explore methods to discourage employee shuffling and, if possible, to increase revenue to fund alternative transportation programs while not impacting customer convenience.
- 8.2.7 Assess the impact of employee shuffling on Downtown parking.
- 8.2.8 In conjunction with any plans for new parking Downtown, assess the effectiveness of alternative transportation programs in reducing employee parking needs.
- 8.2.9 Consider reducing parking requirements for the downtown core if implementation strategies are successful in reducing employee parking.
- 8.2.10 Implement the strategies contained in the Circulation Element, Land Use chapter, and the Land Use and Housing Elements pertaining to increasing housing in the downtown core and along major transit routes.
- 8.2.11 Parking structures shall be designed to be compatible with the surrounding area in terms of scale, materials, design, and color. The incorporation of commercial uses along the street level frontage should be encouraged.
- 8.2.12 The interior and exterior of parking structures shall be designed to facilitate the movement of pedestrians to and from their vehicles in a comfortable and safe manner. This may include reducing driveway entrances, improving pedestrian pathways, providing signalized mid-block pedestrian crossings, and allowing commercial or service uses on the bottom level (see Chapter 5, Walking).
- 8.2.13 Increase the use of underutilized public parking lots through marketing, improved signage, and other incentives.

- 8.2.14 Consider methods to encourage auto entry to and exit from public parking lots during off-peak commute periods. Methods may include the following:
 - reducing or waiving the parking fee for vehicles entering or leaving public parking lots after the peak PM commute period, and
 - eliminating the free parking period for vehicles exiting public parking lots during peak commute periods.
- 8.2.15 Explore coordinated management of the Downtown and Waterfront public parking lots in order to efficiently utilize the existing parking inventory. Improve connections between the two areas with frequent electric shuttle service throughout the day.

INCREASED PUBLIC PARKING SUPPLY

8.3 The City shall increase the public parking available Downtown to address existing needs.

- 8.3.1 Identify possible areas for expanding Downtown parking that will decrease the existing parking deficit north of Carrillo Street.
- 8.3.2 Maintain the current supply and explore new opportunities for on-street parking Downtown.
- 8.3.3 Identify possible areas for expanding parking that enhance the park once concept.
- 8.3.4 Expand the use and supply of commuter and peripheral parking.
- 8.3.5 Increase the use of underutilized public parking lots through marketing, improved signage, and other incentives.

SIGNAGE AND AESTHETICS

- 8.4 The City shall promote excellent signage and aesthetics in the Downtown area.
- 8.4.1 Utilize the El Pueblo Viejo Design Guidelines to improve signage, aesthetics, and knowledge of transportation linkages to help resolve conflicts among various modes of transportation.
- 8.4.2 Develop a program for the Downtown area to improve parking lot aesthetics and provide signage regarding location and transportation linkages between parking lots and points of interest.
- 8.4.3 Work with CalTrans to improve freeway signage to and from the Downtown area.

DOWNTOWN HOUSING

- 8.5 The City shall promote/facilitate the development of housing to decrease the need for parking through an increased walking/biking population that lives, works, and shops in the Downtown (See Chapter 13).
- 8.5.1 Educate property and business owners, developers, and the community about the benefits of increased housing Downtown.
- 8.5.2 Allow residential parking in public parking lots for mixed use development after ensuring that there is adequate capacity to serve existing uses.
- 8.5.3 Develop public/private partnership criteria for the use of air space over Downtown public parking lots as an incentive for housing development.

CHAPTER 9 – COASTAL ZONE

Goal 9 DEVELOP SPECIAL POLICIES RELATED TO TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING IN THE COASTAL ZONE

Create a more consolidated parking system in the waterfront area and explore new and/or expanded opportunities for use of alternative transportation. In order to open up new areas for recreational use and to allow for better views from Cabrillo Boulevard, no further development of parking should occur on the ocean side of Cabrillo Boulevard, except in the developed harbor areas if consistent with the Harbor Master Plan.

BACKGROUND

This chapter addresses transportation and parking issues in the Coastal Zone of the City of Santa Barbara.

Approximately 4.17 square miles of the City (including 1.5 square miles at the Airport) are located within the Coastal Zone and are subject to regulations contained in the California Coastal Act. The Coastal Zone stretches from the easterly to westerly boundaries of the City and roughly includes the Coast Village Road area, the Waterfront area, the area west of Cliff Drive, and the Airport area (see Glossary for precise boundaries). The Coastal Act contains policies to guide new development in the Coastal Zone in a manner that is protective of coastal resources. Of these policies, two in particular are relevant to transportation and circulation in the City's Coastal Zone:

Coastal Act Section 30252: "The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing non-automobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high rise office buildings and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of on site recreational facilities to serve the new development."

Coastal Act Section 30253: "New development shall. . .minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled."

Consistent with the Coastal Act, the City has a Local Coastal Program (LCP) which was originally adopted by the City Council and certified by the California Coastal Commission in 1981. The LCP contains policies and actions which are consistent with the Coastal Act and specific to conditions in the City's Coastal Zone. Chapter III of the City's LCP contains a number of policies and actions pertaining to transportation and parking. The relationship of these policies to the Circulation Element is discussed in more detail below.

In 1982, the City Council adopted a Local Coastal Plan for the Airport and Goleta Slough. This area consists of the Municipal Airport and supporting aviation facilities, the Goleta Slough, and the area north of Hollister Avenue devoted to non-aviation commercial and industrial uses. The City is currently developing an Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan for the industrial area straddling Hollister Avenue, as well as an Aviation Facilities Plan for the Airport operations area. These documents will address circulation improvements in these two areas (see Chapter 15, Other Transportation Facilities, for more detail).

In 1996, the California Coastal Commission certified the City's Harbor Master Plan that provides specific policy guidance regarding development within the Harbor. The Harbor Master Plan recommends specific parking and access improvements within the Harbor to meet the needs of existing and future development.

In general, the Waterfront remains underdeveloped when compared to other areas of the City. However, several significant City projects are scheduled to be completed by the year 2000, including the extension of Salsipuedes and Garden Streets to Cabrillo Boulevard, the renovation of the Railroad Depot, and the expansion of Chase Palm Park and implementation of the improvements called for in the Harbor Master Plan. New development will dramatically change the City's Waterfront and its transportation, circulation and parking patterns.

CONSTRAINTS

The Waterfront and Coast Village areas of the City contain high concentrations of businesses that cater to both tourists and local residents. However, there is limited public parking in the Waterfront and on Coast Village Road. During busy times (e.g. summer weekends), parking problems often exist in the West Beach area, along Lower State Street and along Coast Village Road. One of the problems associated with increasing the effective use of existing parking in these areas is that most businesses are required to provide their own parking and few private lots are shared by more than one business.

Further, there is limited transit and other access to the Waterfront and Coast Village Road from the Eastside, Westside, and Downtown areas of the City. Highway 101 physically separates the Waterfront from the rest of the City, leaving only a few access points. As a result, these access routes are becoming increasingly congested. It is important to ensure that coastal access is maintained in the most efficient manner possible.

Studies related to the Harbor Master Plan (1996) indicate that an adequate number of parking spaces exist to serve the uses in the Harbor, but the location and distribution of these spaces does not always meet the needs of the potential users. Further, Harbor users are often unaware of parking that is available nearby. Implementation of the Harbor Master Plan includes installation of signs directing people to the various Harbor activity areas, including available parking areas.

LCP policy 11.5 requires that, with the exception of Stearn's Wharf, all new developments in the Coastal Zone must meet their parking demand either on-site or in other privately owned parking lots. This can be a constraint to the redevelopment of existing buildings because of limited available space for on site parking. Further, because few public parking lots exist, the Zoning Ordinance parking requirements in the Coastal Zone are greater than in the Downtown area.

Any changes to the transportation or parking system in the Coastal Zone must take into consideration the policy framework embodied by the California Coastal Act and the City's LCP. The Coastal Act policies emphasize provision of public access to coastal areas, including provision of adequate parking facilities. Any proposal(s) to change transportation or parking provisions and requirements in the Coastal Zone must demonstrate that coastal access will not be adversely affected.

OPPORTUNITIES

The Coastal Act policies listed above encourage increased public access through alternative modes of transportation and reductions in energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled. As a result, these policies are generally consistent with the Circulation Element Goals and Policies. Further, the City's Local Coastal Plan (LCP) encourages development of new multi-use parking facilities by both the City and private developers, the use of time limits and fees to generate revenue and divert drivers to peripheral lots, and the use of alternative modes of transportation.

The Waterfront is in a portion of the Redevelopment Plan Area which is less built out than other areas of the City. As a result, opportunities exist to create consolidated parking facilities. New opportunities also exist for the use of alternative transportation and connections to existing parking facilities.

The "park once" concept, which encourages people to access a variety of services and stores without having to move their cars, has been successfully implemented in the Downtown area. This concept should be incorporated into the Coastal Zone. This could be accomplished by moving away from requiring that parking demand be met on site and moving towards consolidated parking lots that are shared by a variety of users.

In 1996, Cabrillo Boulevard was deleted from the State Highway system and jurisdiction was transferred to the City of Santa Barbara. As a result, the City has the opportunity to study Cabrillo Boulevard and make changes as necessary to enhance its operation and appearance in a manner that is consistent with the City's vision for the Waterfront area and the Circulation Element Vision Statement.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

USE OF ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION

- 9.1 The City shall encourage use of alternative modes of transportation, especially non-motorized options, in and around the Coastal Zone.
- 9.1.1 Improve pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access throughout the Coastal Zone. Improve access from the Wharf and Harbor areas to the La Playa (City College) lots, Waterfront, and State Street areas through such methods as:
 - providing additional bicycle and pedestrian paths,
 - working with transit providers to increase transit service,
 - improving the existing beachway to increase safety for pedestrians, cyclists, skaters, and other forms of non-motorized travel,
 - providing additional bicycle racks and/or lockers in public areas, including public parking lots,
 - improving lighting along pedestrian routes to encourage pedestrian activity especially between Lower State Street, Stearns Wharf, the Harbor and the overnight tourist accommodations, and
 - providing additional seating and resting spots in public areas for pedestrians.
- 9.1.2 Increase pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access from the Westside, Eastside, and Downtown through such methods as:
 - creating bicycle lanes between Rancheria Street and the Harbor area,
 - widening and improving Castillo Street sidewalks from Downtown to the Waterfront,
 - developing a walkway and improving existing bicycle lanes to connect Shoreline Park to Leadbetter Beach along Shoreline Drive,
 - completing the Calle Caesar Chavez (Salsipuedes) and Garden Street extension projects,
 - working with transit providers to increase transit service,
 - creating access to the Waterfront from both a Cacique Street under-crossing

at Highway 101 and a Voluntario Street pedestrian overcrossing at Highway 101,

- providing additional bicycle racks and/or lockers in public areas along State Street and throughout the Downtown area, and
- increasing the frequency of shuttle service along the State Street route.
- 9.1.3 Develop a paseo plan for the interior portions of the HRC-2 zone, especially along Helena and Anacapa Streets between Cabrillo Boulevard, and Yanonali and State Streets to improve pedestrian circulation in the Waterfront area and attract visitors to the interior areas. See Chapter 5 for a description of paseos. Utilize dedication and develop paseos with landscaping and pedestrian amenities.
- 9.1.4 Work with the Conference and Visitors Bureau and Chamber of Commerce to market the transportation system and promote travel to Santa Barbara through methods such as:
 - marketing improvements to the transportation system to make the City more attractive to tourists and companies seeking to locate in Santa Barbara,
 - promoting and marketing the use of alternative transportation by visitors, especially between the Railroad Depot, Airport, and Waterfront hotels/motels, and
 - encouraging visitors to use alternative forms of travel such as the train.
- 9.1.5 Connect the Cabrillo Boulevard Bikeway to the Douglas Family Preserve, Arroyo Burro County Beach, and Las Positas Park with a link to the UCSB/Santa Barbara bikeway running parallel to Modoc Road.
- 9.1.6 Study the adequacy of the Harbor as a destination and departure point for interregional water transit methods such as hydrofoil, hovercraft, and high-speed catamaran, as well as ocean-dependent and ocean related activities that attract large numbers of people to the Channel Islands National Park.
- 9.1.7 Encourage the use of the Harbor as a gateway to the Channel Islands National Park.
- 9.1.8 Encourage continued and improved water taxi service in the Wharf and Harbor areas.

MANAGE PARKING IN COASTAL ZONE

- **9.2** The City shall maintain, improve, consolidate, and promote the efficient use of parking supplies in the Coastal Zone.
- 9.2.1 Study and where feasible, implement methods to extend the "park once" concept in the Waterfront through such methods as:
 - working with property owners to form a parking/transit assessment district in the Lower State Street area to consolidate existing parking resources while protecting low intensity/low density shoreline-oriented uses (see General Plan Land Use Element, page 29, Section III),
 - considering Zoning Ordinance amendments that would encourage development of private parking lots to supplement the existing parking supply in the Coastal Zone, and
 - considering Zoning Ordinance amendments that would reduce parking requirements for non-residential uses that share parking facilities.
- 9.2.2 Consider revising Local Coastal Plan Policy 11.5 to modify requirements that parking demand be met on site in the Coastal Zone. Amend the policy to allow property owners to propose alternative approaches to meeting parking demand in a manner consistent with other areas of the City, providing such modification does not reduce the number of public parking spaces available to the general public for the purposes of accessing the shoreline and beach in the waterfront area.
- 9.2.3 Prepare a long range Waterfront parking master plan, utilizing the Harbor Master Plan and traffic/transit studies as appropriate.
- 9.2.4 Preserve existing on street parking where safe, appropriate, and feasible.
- 9.2.5 Continue to work with the Santa Barbara City College to reduce the amount of drive-alone trips and the demand for parking through programs such as:
 - transit passes for students,
 - educational information about the benefits of alternative modes of travel,
 - bicycle facilities such as bike lanes and bike storage systems, and
 - pedestrian facilities such as paths, transit stops, landscaping, and benches.
LINK TO ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION

9.3 The City shall coordinate parking lot access and alternative modes of transportation.

- 9.3.1 Develop a Coastal Zone linkage plan for bicycles and pedestrians among parking lots and points of interest through dedication, acquisition, easements, the purchase of property, and other applicable methods.
- 9.3.2 Use the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) to consolidate parking facilities and create new opportunities for use of alternative transportation to connect existing parking facilities for Coastal Zone areas in and within the RDA.
- 9.3.3 Assist transit providers in providing low cost shuttle service between public parking lots and other destinations.
- 9.3.4 Work with transit providers to provide attractive, shaded shelters at shuttle stops.
- 9.3.5 Improve alternative transportation connections from the Coastal Zone to existing parking facilities outside the Coastal Zone.

SIGNAGE AND AESTHETICS

9.4 The City shall promote excellent signage and aesthetics.

- 9.4.1 Implement Harbor Master Plan policies and programs that will:
 - improve signage and aesthetics within the plan area,
 - provide information about the various forms of transportation available,
 - improve linkages between forms of transportation, and
 - resolve conflicts between various modes of transportation that occur within the plan area.
- 9.4.2 Develop a program for the entire Coastal Zone to improve parking lot aesthetics and provide signage regarding location and transportation linkages between parking lots and points of interest.
- 9.4.3 Work with Cal-Trans to improve freeway signage to and from the Downtown and Coastal Zone areas.

CABRILLO BOULEVARD

- 9.5 The City shall develop a Master Plan for the entire length of Cabrillo Boulevard and interchanges that identifies potential operational and aesthetic improvements.
- 9.5.1 Create a Master Plan for Cabrillo Boulevard that explores the implementation of the following:
 - reducing traffic lanes on Cabrillo Boulevard to provide additional recreational areas, bike lanes, parking or landscaping,
 - providing an all-way crosswalk at Cabrillo Boulevard and State Street to facilitate the movement of non-auto traffic. All-way crosswalks involve stopping vehicular traffic in all directions for a period of time to allow non-motorized travelers to cross intersections diagonally in addition to traditional street crossing,
 - improving pedestrian access and crossing of Cabrillo Boulevard as new parking is developed on the inland side of Cabrillo Boulevard,
 - maintaining on-street parking along Cabrillo Boulevard. No further development of off-street parking should occur on the ocean side of Cabrillo Boulevard, and
 - relocating tour bus parking to an area designated and signed for that purpose and enforcing tour bus parking regulations.

CHAPTER 10 – MOBILITY

Goal 10 DEVELOP A MOBILITY SYSTEM THAT WILL CARRY ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION, FROM PEDESTRIANS TO AUTOMOBILES.

Develop a classification and service system that designates streets, walkways and bikeways in a manner that meets the overall objectives of the Vision. To do this, the City will develop and implement a classification system that integrates all modes of transportation, creates intermodal connections, and results in a City in which automobile use is a choice, not a necessity.

BACKGROUND

This chapter discusses the way in which mobility corridors are used to provide access, move people, and move goods. This chapter also proposes a new classification system that is based on access and mobility rather than on street size and volume of automobile traffic. The purpose of this new classification and service system is to ensure a consideration of all forms of travel when designing or improving transportation infrastructure.

The City's 1988 Interim Circulation Element relied upon the standard street classification system adopted by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. This system utilized five categories of streets: freeway; primary arterial; minor arterial; collector street; and local street. These classifications were based on traffic volumes in vehicles per day, right-of-way width, and design features such as the number of travel lanes, presence of driveway access and on-street parking. Historically, the volume of vehicular traffic was the primary basis by which a City qualified for funding from the Federal or State governments.

As required by California State Government Code Section 65089, the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's Congestion Management Plan (CMP) contains a designated roadway system which identifies State Highways and principal arterials within the City of Santa Barbara. The City of Santa Barbara is required to maintain a certain level of service, or congestion level, on streets designated in the CMP in order to receive Federal and State funding (Government Code Section 65089.2). In addition, the CMP provides its own classification system used when determining eligibility for funding rather than the classification system contained within the City's Circulation Element. However, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), passed in 1991, established new policies that fund a variety of modes of transportation, including cars, trucks, buses, trains, bicycles, and walking. ISTEA requires the comprehensive planning of appropriate modes of transportation for natural and built environments and air quality standards. State highways and principal arterials within the City of Santa Barbara which are identified in the CMP are as follows:

State Highways:

Highway 101 (within City limits) State Route 144 (portions of Milpas St., Mason St., Salinas St., and Sycamore Cyn. Rd.) State Route 192 (portions of Sycamore Cyn. Rd., Stanwood Dr., Mission Ridge Rd., Mountain Dr., and Foothill Rd.) State Route 225 (portions of Las Positas Rd., Cliff Dr., and Castillo St.)

Principal Arterials:

Street	Segment
State Street	De La Vina St. to Hollister Ave.
Las Positas Road	Highway 101 to State St.
Chapala Street	Gutierrez St. to Mission St.
De La Vina Street	Mission St. to State St.
Mission Street	Highway 101 to Anacapa St.
Anacapa Street	Mission St. to Highway 101
Carrillo St./Meigs Rd.	Cliff Drive to Anacapa St.
Haley Street	Highway 101 to Milpas St.
Gutierrez Street	Bath St. to Milpas St.
Milpas Street	Cabrillo Blvd. to Haley St.
Garden St.	Haley St. to Cabrillo Blvd. (upon extension)
Hollister Ave.	San Pedro Creek to Los Carneros Rd.
Fairview Ave.	Placencia St. to Olney St.

CONSTRAINTS

The limitation of most classification systems is that they focus exclusively on the movement of automobiles. The systems have not included nor measured transit or the movement of pedestrians or bicycles. Further, the design standards which have been used tended to focus on automobile capacity (number of travel lanes, lane width, presence of turn pockets, distance between intersections) and less on other modes (sidewalk and bicycle lane widths, distance between transit stops, design and location of bus stops, etc.). Classification systems also tended to place limitations on roadway design. Another constraint is the fact that all paths of travel cannot accommodate all forms of travel.

OPPORTUNITIES

The CMP provides a classification system for obtaining State and Federal funding. However, any classification and service system developed to implement the Circulation Element could be designed to serve additional objectives. For example, the classification and service system could be identified by function (e.g. residential, commercial, multiple/mixed purpose) rather than by design characteristics (e.g. number of vehicle lanes, access). This could result in a fully integrated system that includes automobiles, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit, and considers the specific land use and neighborhood characteristics while emphasizing multimodal access that supports the economic vitality of the local businesses.

A classification and service system is a mobility infrastructure planning tool that provides information about potential infrastructure needs, recognizing that residential neighborhoods have less intensive uses than commercial and industrial neighborhoods. Classification and service systems complement other long range planning strategies to facilitate movement of people and goods through the community now and in the future.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

10.1 The City shall develop and use a mobility classification and service system that will designate mobility corridors throughout the City based on their purpose and function. The purpose of this classification and service system is to ensure consideration of all forms of travel in the design, development, improvement, and maintenance of all mobility corridors.

Residential Corridors:

Residential corridors include public alleys, transit routes, streets, bicycle routes, sidewalks, and footpaths which are located in residential neighborhoods and which exclusively serve the local transportation needs of the surrounding residential neighborhood. While land uses along residential corridors are predominately residential, these corridors may also contain other residential serving land uses such as neighborhood markets, offices, child care facilities, churches, and public services facilities (fire stations, schools, etc.).

Residential corridors shall be designed and maintained in a manner that preserves and enhances neighborhood aesthetics. These corridors may be designed with lower automobile traffic speeds and provide comfortable paths of travel for children, pedestrians, bicyclists, and others. Consideration for the safety of children shall be particularly emphasized.

The following design features, as appropriate, may be incorporated into residential corridors (See Figures 3 and 4):

- lighting
- sidewalks
- widened sidewalks
- street trees
- bicycle racks/lockers
- parkways
- stop lights
- curb bulbs
- chokers
- speed humps
- reduced speed limits
- utility poles and equipment
- neighborhood traffic circles
- other traffic calming measures
- safe sight distances for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians

- landscaping
- seating
- raised intersection
- transit stops
- bicycle lanes
- newsracks
- one way streets
- directional signage
- signal pre-emption
- fire hydrants
- permit parking

Commercial Corridors:

Commercial corridors include streets, public alleys, transit routes, bicycle routes, footpaths, sidewalks, and paseos that principally serve commercial and industrial areas of the City. These corridors shall be designed and maintained to support and serve commercial and industrial activities emphasizing multimodal access to preserve and sustain the economic vitality of local businesses. These corridors shall be designed and maintained in a manner that preserves and enhances aesthetic quality. The streets included in the Congestion Management Plan (listed on Page 10-2) would typically be covered in the Commercial and Multiple/Mixed Purpose categories. The following design features, as appropriate may be incorporated into commercial corridors:

- adequate delivery loading/unloading areas
- safe sight distances for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians
- wide sidewalks
- landscaping which does not distract from nor conceal storefronts
- transit stops
- pedestrian scale amenities
- signal preemption
- paving materials
- traffic calming devices

Multiple/Mixed Purpose Corridor:

Multiple/Mixed purpose corridors include, public alleys, transit routes, streets, bicycle routes, footpaths, sidewalks, and paseos that serve multiple areas and functions (residential, commercial, scenic, through traffic between neighborhoods, etc.). Each multiple/mixed purpose corridor in the City is different as determined by location, principal transportation modes, and purpose of users. Therefore, each corridor requires individual design. The streets included in the Congestion Management Plan (listed on Page 10-2) would typically be covered in the Commercial and Multiple/Mixed Purpose categories.

The design features for both Residential and the Commercial Corridors, as appropriate, may be used in the multiple/mixed purpose corridors. However, caution must be taken to ensure that the corridor will continue to serve the needs of its residents, businesses, and other users.

Gateway Corridors:

Gateway corridors, such as Route 154 at State Street, Cabrillo Boulevard at the Bird Refuge, Carrillo Street at Route 101, and Garden Street at Highway 101, serve as major entry points into the City and should be distinctive. Design criteria for these gateway corridors may include but are not limited to:

- interesting landscaping or entry structures which become the signature of the City
- traffic control mechanisms
- 10.1.1 Create a Mobility Classification and Service System Map that identifies paths of travel as Residential, Commercial, Multiple/Mixed Purpose, or Gateway. The draft map shall be reviewed at public workshops before being considered for approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.
- 10.1.2 Include in the development of the Mobility Classification and Service System Map, input from citizens groups, business groups, and neighborhood groups, the general public, local and regional transportation agencies, and transit providers.
- 10.1.3 Corridor specific design features shall be drawn from the list of possibilities contained in each corridor described in Policy 10.1; other features may be added through the review process.

IMPLEMENTATION

- **10.2** The City shall implement its Mobility Classification and Service System.
- 10.2.1 Review all transportation improvement projects for consistency with the City's Mobility Classification and Service System.

Traffic Calming Devices



Source: Making Streets that Work, Neighborhood Planning Tool, City of Seattle, May 1996 Figure 3

Traffic Calming Devices



Source: Making Streets that Work, Neighborhood Planning Tool, City of Seattle, May 1996 Figure 4

CHAPTER 11 – TRAFFIC STANDARDS

Goal 11 REVIEW TRAFFIC IMPACT STANDARDS USED AT CITY INTERSECTIONS FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE GOALS OF THE CIRCULATION ELEMENT AND GENERAL PLAN.

Explore ways to continue the concentration of development Downtown and along transit corridors to facilitate the use of transit and alternative modes of transportation.

BACKGROUND

Land use patterns directly affect the transportation choices that people make. A compact, pedestrian oriented development pattern will provide a greater variety of transportation choices by facilitating modes of transportation other than the automobile. This happens because people can live and work in close proximity to transportation centers and facilities. Conversely, a low-density, sprawling development pattern that segregates residential and non-residential uses limits transportation options and increases dependence on the automobile for mobility. This land use pattern, commonly known as Urban Sprawl, can be seen in many post World War II communities such as Los Angeles and San Jose.

Currently, the amount and density of development that can occur in the City is governed by different sets of regulations. Passed by the voters in 1989, Measure E was incorporated into the City Charter as Charter Section 1508. This Charter Section not only places a ceiling on the total amount of non-residential square footage developed in the City until the year 2010, it also states that new non-residential construction can only occur where it will not cause a significant and unmitigated adverse impact on the City's water resources and *traffic* within the City, or the supply of affordable housing on the South Coast. However, because Measure E has not been incorporated into the City's Local Coastal Program it cannot be used for the purpose of making findings regarding the consistency of any project with the certified Local Coastal Program until such time as the provisions of Measure E are certified through the Coastal Commission through an amendment to the City's Local Coastal Program.

Traffic impacts are currently determined in two different ways. The first way that traffic impacts are determined is by adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards for signalized City intersections. Currently, signalized intersections are considered impacted if they exceed the City's LOS goal of C, which carries a Volume to Capacity Ratio of .80. However, for the purposes of environmental assessment in the City of Santa Barbara under the California Environmental Quality Act, a signalized intersection is considered impacted if a project causes the Volume to Capacity Ratio to exceed .77. By state law, in any case where a project results in a significant traffic impact, an environmental impact report must be prepared.

CONSTRAINTS

The current method for determining traffic impacts acts as a constraint to development in areas where intersections are at or near the maximum allowable capacity. Impacted intersections are typically located near freeway on/off-ramps, Downtown, or near commercial centers. Ironically, it is these compact and higher density areas that will most easily facilitate transit and alternate modes of transportation. In addition, the inability of small businesses to expand in locations at or near impacted intersections may result in the relocation of those businesses to lower density or outlying areas that may not be as suitable for alternative modes of transportation. This will, in turn, increase the reliance on the automobile in these areas and possibly contribute to a sprawling development pattern. In addition, the charter section requirement that new development occur only where it does not cause a significant and unmitigated adverse impact on traffic also acts as a constraint. Traditionally, the methods to mitigate traffic impacts involved improvements to streets, such as street widening, turn lanes, or striping. In a city such as Santa Barbara that is mostly developed, many of these mitigation methods may no longer be feasible or desirable.

OPPORTUNITIES

Santa Barbara currently has several areas with a compact development pattern that can support a transportation system comprised to a large degree of alternative modes of travel (i.e. Downtown and areas adjacent to commercial corridors). By allowing the pattern of compact development to continue in these areas, the use of alternative modes of transportation can be facilitated. In addition, the City can explore ways to allow Small Additions to existing businesses to occur in the Downtown area and along transit corridors near impacted intersections and expand the list of available methods to mitigate traffic impacts. This can include methods such as funding for transit operating costs or partial contributions to larger improvement projects supporting alternative transportation.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

TRAFFIC STANDARDS AND IMPACT THRESHOLDS

- 11.1 The City shall facilitate the use of transit and alternative modes of transportation by emphasizing compact, pedestrian oriented development and connections among all forms of travel during the development and environmental review process. Within the Coastal Zone portion of the City, the provisions of Measure E shall not be used for the purpose of making findings regarding the consistency of any project with the certified Local Coastal Program until such time as the provisions of Measure E are certified by the Coastal Commission through an amendment to the City's Local Coastal Program.
- 11.1.1 Continue to use existing traffic standards and impact thresholds as described in the City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA), until new standards and thresholds consistent with the 1997 Circulation Element are developed and incorporated into the City's Environmental Goals and Guidelines.
- 11.1.2 In addition to the Implementation Strategies discussed in Chapter 13, Land Use, the City shall facilitate the use of transit and alternative modes by exploring methods such as, but not limited to:
 - considering ways to allow Small Additions to existing businesses to occur in the Downtown area and along transit corridors near impacted intersections,
 - considering expanding the list of available methods to mitigate traffic impacts. This can include methods such as funding for transit operating costs or partial contributions to larger improvement projects supporting alternative transportation,
 - reviewing traffic impact standards used at City intersections to see whether they should be raised or lowered for consistency with the goals of the Circulation Element, other elements of the General Plan, and with the City Charter through public worksessions with the Planning Commission and City Council, and
 - considering adoption of the County Congestion Management Plan Level of Service Standards for freeway interchanges. This standard would allow higher volumes of traffic and increased congestion at freeway interchanges.

MOBILITY SYSTEM

- 11.2 The City shall create an adequately funded mobility system consistent with the vision of this Circulation Element that will increase the access to and convenience of alternative forms of travel.
- 11.2.1 Increase funding for alternative transportation systems to solve community transportation issues and problems not resulting from new development.
- 11.2.2 Implement the Goals and Policies of Chapter 12, Public Involvement, to involve the community in methods to create a flexible system of mobility.

CHAPTER 12 – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Goal 12 ESTABLISH A PROCESS TO INCLUDE NEIGHBORHOODS IN THE DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECTS OF TRAFFIC ON RESIDENTIAL STREETS

Develop a mechanism for monitoring changes to all neighborhoods and for addressing those changes if appropriate. The mechanism should take the form of a methodology or procedure for assessing and responding to neighborhood traffic impacts both during periodic reviews and upon neighborhood request. Any review and discussion of neighborhood through traffic should be addressed on an area-wide basis so that all segments of the community, including persons representing commercial and industrial areas, can participate in creating solutions to a given traffic problem.

ESTABLISH A PROCESS TO INCLUDE BUSINESS AND NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY OWNERS IN THE DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECTS OF TRAFFIC ALONG BUSINESS CORRIDORS

Establish a process to include businesses and non-residential property owners in the discussion of the effects of traffic along business corridors. Opportunity to comment on the effects of traffic on business would provide assurance that future transportation policies support economic vitality. Any review and discussion of traffic in and around business areas should be addressed on an area-wide basis so that all segments of the community including persons representing surrounding residential areas, can participate in creating solutions to a given traffic problem.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this chapter is to give residents, business owners, property owners, and commercial and residential tenants the opportunity to provide input and help find solutions to address traffic problems and mobility issues. This chapter suggests that a cooperative approach between people in an affected area is the best approach to finding a workable solution to these issues. In this way, people who share common paths of travel and have different needs, such as residents, business owners, industrial users, or service providers, can be considered as one planning area.

Over the years, some of Santa Barbara's residential neighborhoods have experienced a steady increase in traffic volumes which have affected the livability of many neighborhoods. Consequently, the use of the residential street as an interactive community space has declined. For example, as traffic volumes increase, the ability of children and adults to use the street for recreational activities diminishes. Many City residents have already expressed concern regarding high levels of noise pollution along freeway and major transportation corridors. In response, people may open front windows less and may not use front rooms to sleep. In addition, the speed of passing cars affects the livability of streets and affects access to and from

the area, as well as in and out of driveways. Automobile traffic also creates a barrier to visiting neighbors on the other side of the street. Studies have shown that on high volume streets, fewer neighbors know each other and there is general perception of unfriendliness.

Traffic issues also continue to arise in commercial areas. The widening of streets and the increased speed of passing cars are detrimental to the free movement of people and goods in commercial areas. Ease of access to business corridors and free mobility between them are highly important to the economic vitality of an area. Congested streets and high speeds make access to commercial areas difficult, and the associated air and noise pollution makes them less attractive to patrons.

Due in part to these increasing traffic volumes, the number of requests to respond to traffic problems in residential, commercial, and mixed/multiple use areas has also increased. The negative effects of traffic on the quality of life and the economic vitality of an area are clear, and the City must provide leadership and be proactive in addressing related concerns and issues. However, a cooperative effort between all property owners and tenants in a given area is imperative to reach an equitable and workable solution for all.

CONSTRAINTS

The desire to use the automobile for transportation directly conflicts with a desire to reduce traffic volumes on City streets. The City of Santa Barbara is largely made up of a grid roadway system with few cul-de-sac streets. The benefit of this type of layout is the ability to effectively limit the number of arterial streets necessary to carry City traffic. However, as traffic volumes increase and arterials become congested, drivers in commercial areas become frustrated resulting in traffic spreading to neighborhood streets or drivers avoiding congested areas. Although closing such streets to through traffic would certainly enhance the livability of neighborhoods, the corresponding traffic congestion on arterial streets (e.g. streets in predominantly commercial areas) causes problems for business owners and patrons. In addition, there are many areas of the City where streets were not developed in the grid pattern (e.g. the Foothill, Las Positas, and Samarkand areas), which aggravates existing traffic flow problems because of a lack of alternative routes.

The City's inability to handle more automobile traffic is a growing concern. Increases in traffic are caused by commercial and residential growth both inside and outside of the City. Although much of the City's increased traffic has been attributed to commercial growth, neighborhood growth is also a factor. With each additional household, approximately 10 new trips are added to the street. Streets "down stream" from new residential developments are also affected. While the traffic generated by one new home is seldom noticed, the development of numerous residential units over time can dramatically change the character of a neighborhood.

This Chapter looks at ways that community members can work together to find solutions to traffic problems generated by increased automobile use. These solutions to address traffic issues in an area will be called a Neighborhood or Business Area Mobility Plan. As initiated by the public, the City will assist area groups in developing Neighborhood or Business Area Mobility Plans. These plans are described below.

OPPORTUNITIES

A major goal of this element is to create transportation options that effectively reduce dependency on the automobile. It is envisioned that the increased utilization of transit and alternate forms of transportation throughout the City will go a long way toward relieving increasing levels of automobile traffic and traffic congestion. However, vehicular traffic may continue to increase and the car's presence may continue to create livability problems. The City has an opportunity to design a community process to address the negative effects of the car without dramatically reducing mobility and accessibility. This community process shall be known as the Traffic Management Program.

The Traffic Management Program will be designed to guide neighborhoods, businesses, and mixed use areas in the development of specific plans addressing mobility and traffic issues. The Traffic Management Program will present a range of options to help address specific mobility and traffic issues, present the methodology for implementing the desired actions, explain the potential costs and benefits of the desired actions, and explain the public process required to implement desired actions. In essence, this program will present a method to address community mobility and traffic issues with an emphasis on community participation, education, and ownership.

Property owners and tenants will use the Traffic Management Program as a guide to create either a Neighborhood or Business Area Mobility Plan. These plans, developed with the assistance of City Staff, will detail the desired methods and implementation measures to address a particular mobility or traffic issue. Community members representing both residential and business interests in a given area will convene to address traffic problems and find mutually agreeable solutions. A short video describing the process of developing a Neighborhood or Business Area Mobility Plan will be provided. Developing a traffic plan can be a unifying process that will introduce residents and business owners to one another and create a spirit of community. A successful process will also give residents and business owners a sense of responsibility for implementation and monitoring.

For many years, traffic solutions have focused on accommodating the car, sometimes at the expense of other forms of travel or the surrounding area. When addressing traffic problems it should be recognized that streets have more functions than simply moving cars. Streets are an integral part of the surrounding area and should be treated as such. The residential street right-of-way should be treated as an extension of the home and outdoor living space for the neighborhood. Streets serving commercial areas should be treated as an extension of the adjacent businesses to help attract shoppers. Therefore, policies designed to reduce the automobile's negative effects should not be dictated solely by a traditional traffic engineering approach. Solutions need to include land use planning and encompass a wide range of innovative strategies with an emphasis on community participation, safety, and mobility.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

- 12.1 Improve livability and economic vitality by creating a program that describes a process for residents, tenants, property owners, business owners, and other interested parties in an area or corridor, to address mobility issues and mitigate impacts of vehicular traffic.
- 12.1.1 Create a Traffic Management Program which will:
 - detail a process to develop and implement Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans that address the traffic and mobility concerns of an impacted area, including the concerns of any residential, commercial, mixed use, industrial, recreational, and service uses in the area. The types of issues that this plan is intended to address include: transit issues; mobility issues; maintenance issues; pedestrian and bicycle connections; through traffic volumes; visual impacts; traffic speeds; noise; safety for children and pedestrians; and collisions,
 - detail the process required for education on traffic issues, implementation, potential costs and benefits of various alternatives addressing mobility and traffic issues, conflict resolution strategies, the public hearing and design review process, and future enforcement and monitoring,
 - describe various options available to address traffic issues such as:
 - encourage the use of alternate modes of transportation to reduce vehicle traffic,
 - speed humps,
 - chokers,
 - street closures,
 - partial street closures,
 - raised intersections,
 - roundabouts,
 - neighborhood traffic circles,
 - street trees,
 - curb bulbs,
 - loading/unloading areas,
 - distances for vehicles leaving commercial facilities to reduce conflicts with bicycles and pedestrians,
 - providing wide sidewalks for pedestrian travel and outdoor display/activity areas, where appropriate,
 - access ramps,

- 12.1.1 landscaping to enhance storefront displays and not distract from or conceal those displays, and
 - providing transit facilities,
 - encourage community members to identify innovative solutions to address traffic problems,
 - include the location of information sources related to traffic, including but not limited to the following:
 - status of current projects or improvements,
 - other applicable area plans, and
 - neighborhood traffic statistics such as traffic counts, speeds, local vs. cut-through traffic, truck traffic,
 - describe a process by which concerned community members can effectively organize to address traffic related issues, and
 - include video instruction detailing the process for developing Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans.
- 12.1.2 The City shall fund a pilot Traffic Management Program to assess the efficiency/impact of such programs and to quantify the staff and resources needed to implement this program. The City shall dedicate the necessary staff and resources to implement the program.
- 12.1.3 Schedule a regular review and monitoring cycle of Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans to address changing conditions. Prepare the Plans in advance of the Public Works' street maintenance cycle to ensure community input.

NEIGHBORHOOD AREA MOBILITY PLAN

- 12.2 Improve livability and economic vitality by working with residents, tenants, property owners, business owners, and other interested parties of an impacted area or corridor to mitigate the impacts of vehicular traffic. The City shall consult with residents, property owners, and commercial tenants located in close proximity to any corridor or street before implementing improvements that could result in changes to the existing characteristics of that corridor or street, its traffic patterns or infrastructure. Improvements shall be consistent with Neighborhood Area Mobility Plans.
- 12.2.1 Work with residents, tenants, adjacent business owners, property owners, and other interested parties to create Neighborhood Area Mobility Plans that:
 - address community traffic concerns, including decreased access due to congestion, visual impacts, maintenance issues, traffic speeds, and high volumes that contribute to noise and collisions, and discourage pedestrian activity,
 - prevent the diversion of traffic problems from one area to another, and
 - facilitate the communication and interaction between the various areas to help coordinate efforts and strengthen the connections and interrelationships.

BUSINESS AREA MOBILITY PLAN

12.3 Sustain or improve economic vitality and quality of life in business areas or corridors by working with property owners, business owners, residents, tenants, and other interested parties to mitigate the impacts of vehicular traffic in business areas. The City shall consult with commercial tenants, property owners, and residents located in close proximity to any corridor or street before implementing improvements that could result in changes to the existing characteristics of that corridor or street, its traffic patterns or infrastructure. Improvements shall be consistent with Business Area Mobility Plans.

- 12.3.1 Work with residents, tenants, adjacent businesses owners, property owners, and other interested parties to create Business Area Mobility Plans that:
 - address community traffic concerns, including decreased access due to congestion, visual impacts, maintenance issues, traffic speeds, and high volumes that contribute to noise and collisions, and discourage pedestrian activity,
 - prevent the diversion of traffic problems from one area to another, and
 - facilitate the communication and interaction between the various areas to help coordinate efforts and strengthen the connections and interrelationships.

CHAPTER 13 – LAND USE

Goal 13 APPLY LAND USE PLANNING TOOLS AND STRATEGIES THAT SUPPORT THE CITY'S MOBILITY GOALS.

Enhance the historic pattern of compact development. The City can facilitate this development pattern in a number of ways, including:

- Allowing more compact development along major transit corridors (without increasing the City-wide development potential as provided for in the existing Zoning Ordinance and General Plan);
- Providing incentives for mixed use development;
- Establishing provisions that allow for creative site development and urban design standards;
- Studying neighborhoods to determine their service needs and creating mechanisms to address those needs;
- Encouraging development of schools, preschools and day care centers in ways which reduce travel demand;
- Encouraging and supporting neighborhood services and commercial uses in residential areas;
- Establishing social/neighborhood centers (in conjunction with neighborhood schools if possible);
- *Reducing/eliminating parking requirements (residential and nonresidential)* where it can be demonstrated as appropriate; and
- Evaluating proposed annexations to ensure that services/commercial needs and transportation linkages are adequately addressed.

BACKGROUND

This Chapter addresses ways in which the physical development patterns can affect transportation modes. Land use patterns directly affect the transportation choices people make. The dominant land use pattern which has emerged in many U.S. cities since World War II tends to separate residential uses from commercial and industrial uses. This development pattern favors the automobile because of the greater distances between homes, schools, businesses, services and other activities. As a result, most people frequently rely on the automobile for daily activities. Reliance on the automobile negatively impacts the environment and quality of life. The amount of congestion, air pollution, and paving increases in direct proportion to the use of the automobile. As an example, the Land Use Element of the General Plan states that approximately 20% of the land in Santa Barbara is devoted to the automobile. Exclusively automobile oriented land use patterns create difficulties for those who cannot drive, or do not drive. A land use pattern which tends to favor one mode of transportation will limit the transportation choices available to all.

The City's relatively small size and historic pattern of compact development has resulted in less automobile orientation than in other communities. For example, high density residential uses are located in close proximity to Downtown and neighborhood services. Many neighborhood markets are located in residential neighborhoods even though some do not conform to zoning regulations. Because of consolidated parking areas and clustered businesses, the Downtown area has remained compact. The Zoning Ordinance encourages mixed use developments in commercial areas. The downtown grid system with relatively narrow streets reduces vehicle speeds, making people feel more comfortable.

CONSTRAINTS

Some places in the City are difficult to access by modes other than the automobile by virtue of their design. Limited opportunities exist for large-scale changes in areas where access is difficult because the City is approaching buildout. Compact development which encourages pedestrian use may result in conflicts between land uses. For example, a grocery store may result in increased noise, odors, lighting, and traffic for nearby residential uses. Alternatively, some land uses by their vary nature require large expanses of open areas to accommodate the automobile, impeding compact development.

OPPORTUNITIES

The General Plan Land Use Element contains policies that govern the physical development of the City. The Land Use Element encourages growth in established commercial centers, thus efficiently and effectively using existing resources. This type of growth could also facilitate the use of alternative transportation and could reduce the need for the automobile.

The City has a responsibility to create, continue, or enhance compact development patterns that allow alternative transportation modes in the Downtown and other commercial areas. New strategies could include incentives encouraging the transfer of development rights from outlying areas, such as hillside and environmentally sensitive areas, to existing centralized residential and commercial centers nearer to transit corridors (See Transfer of Existing Development Rights in Glossary). While new development occurs, opportunities for improvements should be identified. Where infill development occurs, opportunities for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle linkages should be identified.

In order facilitate a compact development pattern, Santa Barbara must actively encourage housing development within the Downtown core. One possible incentive for the development of residential units is to offer the use of space above parking lots (air rights) for housing. On a broader level, other City policies (e.g. Zoning Overlays, Ordinances) should be changed to encourage Downtown housing. The City may need to sponsor a project to demonstrate the success of Downtown housing to business and financial institutions.

New housing should be designed for a broad range of household income levels. Housing that would most benefit the parking system would be located between De La Vina and Garden Streets from Cabrillo Boulevard to Sola Street. By increasing the resident population of the Downtown and moving toward a jobs/housing balance, parking demand will be reduced.

An added benefit of this strategy will be an increase in customer base and an increase in the range of businesses operating Downtown. For example, new businesses and services that cater to household needs will develop, such as groceries, laundries, and house cleaning services. The Downtown business day will also expand to include the morning and late evening hours. People living Downtown will not require additional public parking, as residential on site or remote parking will be required. These benefits will help meet the Downtown Parking Program's goal to increase the economic vitality of the business district.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

- **13.1** The City shall integrate the goals of this Circulation Element with land use decisions.
- 13.1.1 Encourage the development of projects that combine and locate residential uses near areas of employment and services.
- 13.1.2 Continue to require the review of proposed projects for consistency with the Goals and Policies of the General Plan.

COMPACT DEVELOPMENT

- 13.2 Without increasing the City wide development potential as provided for in the existing Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, the City shall allow more compact, pedestrian oriented development along major transit corridors (see Traffic Standards Chapter, Implementation Strategy 11.1.1).
- 13.2.1 Coordinate with transit providers and the public to identify those streets and routes that could be designated as major transit corridors.
- 13.2.2 Consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to:
 - allow increased residential densities and more compact, pedestrian oriented, non-residential development along streets identified as major transit corridors, and
 - reduce parking requirements for properties near major transit corridors if it can be demonstrated that a negative impact will not occur. In conjunction with this reduction, the City shall evaluate and aggressively monitor the results to ensure continued use of alternative means of travel and to justify reduced parking demands.
- 13.2.3 Identify commercial areas along transit corridors where opportunities exist for creating pedestrian access, such as paseos and paths.

INCENTIVES FOR MIXED USE

- **13.3** Provide incentives for mixed use development (see Glossary).
- 13.3.1 Evaluate the effectiveness of the post 1992 Zoning Ordinance Amendments that were intended to encourage mixed use development.
- 13.3.2 Continue to identify and pursue new strategies to encourage the development of mixed use projects.
- 13.3.3 Continue to assist in the development of mixed use projects through such methods as, but not limited to:
 - land use policies,
 - modified development standards, and
 - public private partnerships and/or financial support, where a City Council finding of General Plan consistency has been made.

DESIGN STANDARDS

13.4 Establish provisions to allow for creative site development and urban design standards that support the City's mobility goals.

- 13.4.1 Revise the Public Works street design standards, as appropriate, to:
 - minimize the use of cul-de-sacs in new developments,
 - include properly maintained landscaping and street trees in public rights of way,
 - ensure access between cul-de-sacs and streets, and
 - allow narrower streets and intersections, wider sidewalks, and parkways where safe.
- 13.4.2 Ensure that all City design guidelines orient buildings toward pedestrian activities through such methods as:
 - Commercial Areas:
 - creating attractive, interesting, and pleasing building facades that are oriented toward paseos, streets and sidewalks,
 - reducing or eliminating setbacks for non-residential or mixed use buildings,

- placing parking lots behind buildings or underground, if feasible,
- encouraging shared parking facilities,
- incorporating paths and paseos between adjacent properties as new development, redevelopment and infill development occurs,
- screening equipment and materials storage from public view,
- incorporating lighting, seating, landscaping, newsracks, shade structures, etc., and
- creating landscaped open spaces.
- Residential Areas:
 - encouraging front porches,
 - encouraging garages to be placed behind residences to the rear of lots,
 - encouraging minimal use of new cul-de-sacs. Cul-de-sacs may be allowed where justified based on geologic or other significant features. Where allowed, provide access between cul-de-sacs and streets,
 - incorporating pedestrian and bicycle paths and connections between adjacent properties,
 - minimizing fences, walls, and private entry gates to separate large scale residential developments from the street (or use of private entry gates),
 - minimizing fences, walls, hedges and private entry gates along frontages of single family residential lots, and
 - allowing flexibility in design standards for residential development adjacent to transit corridors to ensure adequate buffering of noise and traffic.
- 13.4.3 Continue to prohibit new drive-through facilities.
- 13.4.4 Review the Transfer of Existing Development Rights (TEDR) Ordinance for consistency with the Circulation Element.
- 13.4.5 Explore the feasibility of the transfer of residential development rights from hillside and environmentally sensitive areas to transit corridors and commercial areas while preserving the residential development rights.

NEIGHBORHOOD SERVING USES

- 13.5 Determine the need for residential neighborhood services and commercial uses that support the City's mobility goals. Provide opportunities to address those needs, while preserving and protecting the neighborhood character.
- 13.5.1 Allow small scale neighborhood serving commercial uses in residential areas if supported by affected property owners. Ensure that the character of the surrounding neighborhood is protected.
- 13.5.2 Consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to:
 - reduce or eliminate automobile parking requirements for small scale neighborhood serving commercial uses,
 - encourage the establishment of new social/neighborhood centers, and
 - grandfather existing non-conforming uses.

LOCATION OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

- 13.6 Identify specific suitable areas and encourage the development of schools, pre-schools, or day care centers that are compatible with surrounding land uses and that minimize travel demand.
- 13.6.1 Work with school districts, private schools, major employers, and appropriate agencies to:
 - locate child care facilities near existing schools and major employment centers,
 - encourage parents and students to share trips, and
 - create employer incentives for sponsoring on-site child care facilities.

HOME-BASED BUSINESSES

- **13.7** Encourage and support appropriate home-based businesses in residential areas.
- 13.7.1 Revise the Zoning Ordinance to:
 - allow home based business activities, and
 - allow telecommuting centers (see Glossary) in appropriate areas.

ANNEXATION

- 13.8 Ensure that sustainable transportation linkages, public services, infrastructure, and commercial needs support the City's mobility goals and are evaluated in proposed annexations.
- 13.8.1 Complete the City's 1995 Annexation Policy Update that promotes sustainable development practices including development near existing services and use of alternative transportation and discourages urban sprawl and land use patterns which further the region's dependence on the automobile.

CHAPTER 14 – REGIONAL COORDINATION

Goal 14 COORDINATE WITH REGIONAL SYSTEMS AND GOALS.

Increase the City's participation in regional transportation planning activities and continue to influence the development of regional plans.

BACKGROUND

This chapter focuses on increasing City participation in regional transportation planning efforts through cooperation and communication. The City recognizes that it is an integral part of a regional and statewide transportation system. The City's facilities connect to areas outside the City's boundaries. These connections need to be coordinated with facilities in other jurisdictions.

Effective South Coast participation decisions result from membership on and participation in the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) and the Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) Board of Directors. Close coordination with the County of Santa Barbara and the City of Carpinteria is critical to the success of these efforts. Other important agencies with overlapping jurisdictions are the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

CONSTRAINTS

Although the City has twenty-five percent of the County's population, it has but one of twelve votes on SBCAG. Therefore the City has limited influence over regional planning and funding efforts.

OPPORTUNITIES

Active participation in the development of regional plans and programs may result in greater cooperation between jurisdictions and greater consideration of the City's transportation goals and objectives.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

REGIONAL PLANS

- 14.1 The City shall encourage regional transportation plans and programs (such as those under the jurisdiction of the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments) that support the Circulation Element.
- 14.1.1 Proactively participate in the development and review of regional plans. Allocate resources to ensure input from City Council, Planning Commission, the Planning and Public Works Departments, the offices of the City Attorney and the City Administrator's Office.
- 14.1.2 The City's representation on the SBCAG Board shall reflect the strength of the Circulation Element's community consensus.
- 14.1.3 The City's representative to the SBCAG Board shall inform the Planning Commission and the City Council if regional plans or impending decisions are discussed or decisions are made that are inconsistent with this Circulation Element.
- 14.1.4 Prior to each annual adoption of the Capital Improvements Program, public work sessions shall be held with the Planning Commission and the City Council to develop project priorities for funding.

REGIONAL COORDINATION

- **14.2** The City shall encourage coordination with the County of Santa Barbara and other agencies and jurisdictions through joint work sessions in order to pursue regional transportation goals.
- 14.2.1 Hold regular annual sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council on regional transportation issues. Invite the First, Second, and Third District Supervisors as well as the City of Carpinteria to the meeting.
- 14.2.2 Explore funding to expand a coordinated regional traffic model to include City streets (not just Congestion Management Plan routes).

- 14.2.3 Establish a South Coast Land Use and Transportation Work Group that includes representatives from:
 - City of Santa Barbara Planning Department,
 - City of Santa Barbara Public Works Department,
 - City of Santa Barbara Airport Department,
 - City of Santa Barbara Waterfront Department,
 - County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department,
 - County of Santa Barbara Public Works Department,
 - County of Santa Barbara Affordable Housing Program,
 - City of Carpinteria Planning Department,
 - City of Carpinteria Public Works Department,
 - Santa Barbara County Association of Governments,
 - Air Pollution Control District,
 - Metropolitan Transit District,
 - Caltrans,
 - school districts,
 - Traffic Solutions and/or other regional transportation demand management programs,
 - private sector transportation planners,
 - private sector transportation engineers, and
 - where appropriate, the Cities of Ventura, Lompoc, and Santa Maria.

The work group shall focus on:

- regional and local coordinated planning efforts,
- developing a comprehensive list of funding sources, and
- developing a prioritized list of potential projects for funding.

The public shall be notified and permitted to observe all meetings of the South Coast Land Use and Transportation Work Group.

14.2.4 The City shall review and comment on significant development projects located outside of, but with potential impacts upon, the City of Santa Barbara. Each proposal's consistency with the Circulation Element should be addressed and the comments forwarded to appropriate agencies.

AIRPORT

14.3 The City shall coordinate with the County and other agencies and jurisdictions to improve transportation to and from the City's Airport.

- 14.3.1 Work with the County on high priority projects such as:
 - the South Kellogg extension,
 - Highway 217 off-ramp,
 - the Hollister/Los Carneros intersection,
 - electric shuttles,
 - bicycle/pedestrian paths parallel to Hollister and the Railroad,
 - the extension of the South Fairview bike path,
 - bicycle/pedestrian bridge over the freeway either at La Patera or west of Fairview, and
 - developing a direct connection between the Goleta Rail Depot and the Airport.
- 14.3.2 Encourage the development of transit services to, into, and from the Airport Terminal, such as:
 - increased and enhanced taxi service,
 - increased/regular bus service, and
 - increased on-demand services such as airport shuttles.
- 14.3.3 Explore the development of bicycle paths/amenities to encourage bicycling to and from the Airport.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH

14.4 The City shall develop an education/outreach program about the City's Circulation Element.

- 14.4.1 Distribute the adopted Circulation Element to SBCAG, other jurisdictions, transportation related agencies, and affected groups.
- 14.4.2 Encourage regional marketing of transportation services to educate the public about the availability and benefit of alternative modes of transportation.
- 14.4.3 Review proposed State and Federal legislation for effects on the Circulation Element and comment as appropriate.

REGIONAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION

- 14.5 The City shall cooperate with regional efforts that promote the use of alternative transportation.
- 14.5.1 Work with regional agencies to explore the feasibility of a regional commuter shuttle system linking City employment centers with distant residential areas.
- 14.5.2 Encourage development of new or expanded regional park and ride facilities.
- 14.5.3 Encourage the development of regional rail service between Carpinteria and Goleta/Isla Vista.
- 14.5.4 Encourage station improvements and the development of intermodal connections between the Union Pacific Railway Depots and employment centers.
- 14.5.5 Encourage regional transit providers (e.g. APCD's Clean Air Express) to provide express service from Ventura, Santa Barbara, and Goleta/Isla Vista.
- 14.5.6 Encourage the development of and provide incentives for telecommuting and a regional teleconferencing system to reduce interregional trips.
- 14.5.7 Work with other agencies to implement the adopted Regional Bikeway Plan.
- 14.5.8 Encourage and support the possibility of the expansion of Metrolink service to Santa Barbara.
CHAPTER 15 – OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Goal 15 OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Continue to support the movement of people, goods, and services by transportation modes such as air, rail, and water. The movement of trucks and hazardous materials shall continue to be regulated to ensure safety.

BACKGROUND

State Planning Law requires that Circulation Elements address the movement of people and goods. State Planning Law also requires Circulation Elements to discuss issues related to other forms of transportation, communication and public utilities. This chapter discusses other transportation facilities in the City that have not been addressed in the preceding chapters.

TRUCK AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ROUTES

Truck Routes

The City does not have a network of designated truck routes. The City relies on weight limit regulations to restrict truck traffic in inappropriate areas, such as residential neighborhoods.

Hazardous Materials Routes

The State of California Vehicle Code, beginning with Section 31300, governs transport of hazardous materials, including waste. The California Highway Patrol enforces these regulations on state highways and local police and fire departments oversee compliance elsewhere. The majority of tank trucks transporting hazardous materials travel via U.S. Highway 101. Until prohibited in the late 1980's, State Highway 154 was used as an alternate route.

Hazardous materials are also transported through the City via the Union Pacific Railroad. However, in 1995, the City Council adopted a resolution opposing the transportation of spent nuclear fuel through the City.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Air Transportation

The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is located in the South Coast region of Santa Barbara County. The City of Santa Barbara has owned and managed the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport since 1941. It is the largest commercial service airport on the California coast between San Jose and Los Angeles.

The Airport includes three runways. Runway 7/25 is the east-west runway. It is 6,052 feet long and is the only runway at the Airport set up for instrument landing. It is also the runway for commercial jets and other large aircraft. Runways 15/33L and 15/33R are parallel north-south runways that are 4,183 feet and 3,952 feet long respectively. The Airport is presently served by ten airlines, including United, United Express, Shuttle by United, American Eagle, USAir, Northwest, Alaska Airlines, Sky West/Continental Connection, Sky West/Delta Connection, and America West Express. Nonstop destinations include Los Angeles, San Francisco, Sacramento, Denver, Las Vegas, and Phoenix.

Currently, there are over 100 commercial flights daily with domestic and international destinations. The Airport generated 530,650 passengers in 1995 with the total number of passengers projected to be 936,000 by 2010. The number of Airport operations (take-offs and landings) is also expected to increase from 194,000 in 1995 to 218,000 in 2010. The rate of increase for passengers is greater than that for operations because it is expected that smaller commuter planes will be replaced with larger planes, reducing the number of flights necessary to carry the same number of passengers. While air carrier operations are the most visible of operations, the majority of air traffic at the Airport is generated by general aviation which includes small private planes, corporate jets, and helicopters. The Airport also provides an important base for U.S. Forest Service fire fighting planes during the fire season.

In 1990, the City Council established goals that are the basis of the development of the Airport Specific Plan, Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan, and the Aviation Facilities Plan. The Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan (ASP) is focused on the commercial/industrial area on the north side of the Airport, straddling Hollister Avenue. The Administrative Final Specific Plan was released for public review in August, 1997, and will be the subject of public hearings through the end of 1997. The Aviation Facilities Plan (AFP) is focused on Airport operations. This Plan calls for:

- construction of a 1,000 foot long by 500 foot wide Runway Safety area at each end of Runway 7/25,
- extension of Runway 7/25 to accommodate the loss of usable runway due to the construction of Runway Safety Areas at each end of the runway,
- construction of a 1,000 foot long by 500 foot wide Runway Safety area at each end of Runway 7/25,
- addition of 40,000 to 50,000 square feet to the Airline Terminal,
- addition of parking for 1,300 automobiles,
- addition of a new Taxiway M west of and parallel to Runway 15/33L, and
- addition of up to 75 T-hangars (covered parking for aircraft).

These changes are proposed in order to meet existing needs, projected future needs, and to increase Airport safety. A draft Aviation Facilities Plan was completed in 1990 and is presently being rewritten to include updated passenger projections, noise contours, and project descriptions.

Because the intersections affected by traffic generated from both the Airport Specific Plan and the Aviation Facilities Plan are in the unincorporated County area, the City is working with County Planning and Development and Public Works Departments to develop traffic mitigation measures.

Rail Transportation

Union Pacific Railroad arrived in Santa Barbara in 1886 and completed the Coast Line in 1901, making it possible for passengers to travel between San Francisco and Los Angeles. The present Railroad Depot at State and Yanonali Streets was completed in 1905 and is a designated City Landmark. Union Pacific Railroad operates freight trains through Santa Barbara. On average, seven freight trains travel through Santa Barbara daily on weekdays, and four freight trains travel through Santa Barbara daily on weekends. Passenger trains are operated by Amtrak. Amtrak has increased the number of passenger trains substantially over the last decade. The Coast Starlight train travels between Los Angeles and Seattle and stops once daily in Santa Barbara northbound and southbound. The San Diegan operates between Santa Barbara and San Diego with three daily round trips to Santa Barbara. In fall 1995, a new San Diegan was added that travels north to San Luis Obispo. The last San Diegan each evening lays over at a spur between Santa Barbara and Salsipuedes Street in the Waterfront area of Santa Barbara. This late evening northbound San Diegan then becomes the first southbound passenger train in the morning.

CalTrans, in cooperation with Amtrak, has plans to provide additional passenger stations between Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo with the intent of promoting commuter traffic between the new stations. An unstaffed station at Carpinteria was recently opened. Proposed stations include Goleta, Guadalupe, and Surf. All of these stations would be unstaffed. In addition to the proposed Goleta Station, a new overnight layover spur would likely be provided in the Goleta area to replace the one in Santa Barbara's Waterfront.

Water Transportation

The Santa Barbara Harbor serves both the commercial fishing industry, recreational boaters, and others who enjoy the Harbor atmosphere. Facilities for commercial fishing, storage areas, and retail and recreational activities are located in the Harbor area. The demand for Harbor slips far exceeds the supply and there is a waiting list consisting primarily of recreational boaters.

The Local Coastal Plan, adopted in 1981, required the preparation of a plan for the Harbor and Stearn's Wharf that will maintain the existing "working harbor" nature of the area. The Harbor Master Plan and associated changes to the LCP received final certification from the California Coastal Commission in June 1996. The goals of the Harbor Master Plan are to provide for primary ocean dependent uses, such as fishing and recreational boating, and for secondary uses, such as ocean related and visitor serving uses. In order to improve access to the Harbor area, the Harbor Master Plan (HMP) includes several policies related to circulation issues (see Chapter 9, Coastal, for more detail).

The City should also consider working with cruise ship lines to determine what facilities would be needed to make Santa Barbara a regular stop on Pacific Coast trips. Cruise ships bring in tourists without automobiles or the need for overnight accommodations. Such tourists can walk or use shuttles to explore the Santa Barbara Waterfront or will visit historic locations via tour bus. Cruise ship passengers can have a healthy impact on the City's economy without substantially impacting the circulation system.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

TRUCK TRAFFIC AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ROUTES

- 15.1 Regulate the movement of truck traffic and hazardous materials throughout the City.
- 15.1.1 Enforce weight limits as a means to safely regulate truck traffic in noise sensitive areas, such as residential neighborhoods and near schools and hospitals.
- 15.1.2 Ensure that signage indicating weight limits is clearly posted throughout the City.
- 15.1.3 Coordinate with agencies, such as the California Highway Patrol, the County Office of Emergency Services, and Union Pacific Railroad, to regulate the transportation and storage of hazardous materials in and through the City.
- 15.1.4 Continue to coordinate with the County to implement the Hazardous Waste Management Plan of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code.
- 15.1.5 Support the development and implementation of a quick-response emergency services program for the 101 Freeway and railroad corridors and continue to support the City's Hazardous Materials Team.
- 15.1.6 Continue to oppose the transportation of spent nuclear fuel through the City.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

- 15.2 Manage and operate the Airport in an efficient, cost effective, and safe manner.
- 15.2.1 Operate the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport in a safe and cost effective manner.
- 15.2.2 Accommodate a variety of users, such as commercial and general aviation users, at the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.

- 15.2.3 Implement the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan to address circulation issues associated with the industrial area on the north side of the Airport, including policies designed to:
 - improve vehicle circulation within the Plan area, including improved access to Hollister Avenue,
 - improve usability of the street system for pedestrians, including making the system more inviting and providing a pedestrian walkway along Hollister Avenue,
 - accommodate and support alternative modes of transportation, including working with Metropolitan Transit District and other agencies to provide transit and shuttle service within the area and to surrounding areas,
 - coordinate bicycle and pedestrian facilities with those planned by the County and design the new street system within the planning area to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians, and
 - develop a direct link between the Airport and the Goleta Rail Depot.
- 15.2.4 Implement the Aviation Facilities Plan to address existing and projected future safety and operational needs of the Airport.
- 15.2.5 Work with agencies, such as the FAA, the County Planning and Development and Public Works Departments, and U.C.S.B. to address circulation and Airport related issues, such as noise and the use of alternative modes of transportation.
- 15.2.6 Support the creation of excellent transit access to and from the Airport terminal.
- 15.3 Work with transit providers to ensure safe and reliable rail transportation.
- 15.3.1 Coordinate with rail transportation operators, such as Union Pacific Railroad and Amtrak, to ensure safe and reliable rail transportation in the City.
- 15.3.2 Work with rail transportation operators, such as Amtrak and Metrolink, to increase regional and commuter passenger rail service and connections to help reduce dependency on the automobile.

- 15.3.3 Consider the development of a light rail system that serves the City and the South Coast.
- 15.3.4 Develop the train depot as a major gateway of the City. Provide traveler amenities and connections to other modes of transportation.
- 15.4 Operate and manage the City's harbors and waterways in a safe, efficient and cost effective manner.
- 15.4.1 Provide water transportation facilities to serve a variety of users such as recreational, tourist, commercial users, and Channel Islands National Park visitors.
- 15.4.2 Implement the Harbor Master Plan.
- 15.4.3 Encourage the development of scheduled water transit between local coastal communities.
- 15.4.4 Dredge the harbor, inlet, and recreational boating area to allow safe commercial and pleasure boating.

CHAPTER 16 – PUBLIC UTILITIES

Goal 16 PUBLIC UTILITIES

To meet existing and projected needs, continue to provide and maintain adequate storm drainage, water supply and distribution, and wastewater collection systems. In addition, the City shall continue to work with electric, gas, and communications suppliers to maintain and provide service.

BACKGROUND

State Planning Law requires that Circulation Elements address the movement of people and goods. State Planning Law also requires Circulation Elements to discuss issues related to other forms of transportation, communication and public utilities. This chapter discusses public utilities in the City that have not been addressed in the preceding Chapters.

PUBLIC AND QUASI-PUBLIC UTILITIES

POWER FACILITIES

Electricity

Edison Company provides electrical power to the City. The City is served by an electrical distribution system operating at two voltage levels, 4 Kilovolts (Kv) and 16 Kv. The 4 Kv system serves the Downtown. The 16 Kv system primarily serves the remainder of the City. However, as new uses are added Downtown the higher voltage system is used in order to avoid overloading the existing system. Electricity is moved from sources to substations over the City's transmission system. At present the transmission system operates at 60 Kilovolts and is approximately 30% underground. Future facilities will all be underground. As commercial, industrial or residential neighborhoods have funds available or agree to an assessment against their property taxes, transmission lines in other areas of the City will also be placed underground.

Present facilities are adequate to serve both current and projected electrical needs of the City. Minor upgrades and monitoring of existing substations will continue to occur over time.

Natural Gas

Southern California Gas Company (SCG) provides natural gas to the City. In 1995, annual consumption in the City was 2,049,847,600 cubic feet. Approximately 97% of the City uses natural gas for water heating, 94% for space heating, 78% for cooking and 72% for clothes dryers. Natural gas is provided via pipelines. SCG has indicated that it can meet future demands for natural gas in the City. More deregulation and competition are the biggest changes foreseen in the future. However, this will primarily affect manufacturing use of natural gas.

CITY UTILITIES

Storm Drain System

The storm drain system is designed to safely convey water runoff to the ocean. Storm drain facilities used to collect and transport this water include natural watercourses, channels, ditches, gutters, catch basins, inlet structures, pumps, tide gates, and pipes. The Laguna Pump Station is fully automated and assists in pumping runoff from the north side of the freeway to the south side of the freeway. Catch basins, pipes, and inlet structures are cleaned annually to prevent the lines from clogging and to reduce flooding potential. During storm conditions, crews mobilize to respond to clogged drains, damaged facilities, blocked roads, and to protect property. After storms pass, storm debris, mud, and sand are cleaned up and removed from the public right-of-way. There is an annual budget appropriation for repair of and improvements to the system. In addition, the City has recently established a public education program to reduce illegal dumping of hazardous wastes into storm drains. This program includes public education, stenciled signs at drop inlets, and other locations and increased enforcement of violations.

Water Supply and Distribution System

The City of Santa Barbara operates the principal water supply and distribution system that serves City residents and some unincorporated portions of Santa Barbara County, primarily in the Mission Canyon area. A small percentage of City residents are served by other water agencies through special agreements. The City's distribution system is maintained on a 100-year replacement cycle, with a portion of the system replaced each year. Current demand is approximately 13,000 AFY. In the short term, as post-drought usage continues to recover, demand is projected to reach 14,000 AFY by 1999. For the long term (through the year 2015), demand is projected to be between 15,200 AFY and 16,900 AFY depending on the long term effects of demand reduction efforts instituted during the drought. The Long Term Water Supply Program, which includes a safety margin for unanticipated demand increases or supply deficiencies, was adopted by the City Council on July 5, 1994, and includes supplies sufficient to meet a demand of up 18,200 AFY, given a maximum acceptable shortage of 10%.

Source of Supply	Average Annual Delivery (AF)
Cachuma Project	8,203
Gibraltar Reservoir	4,310
Mission Tunnel	1,109
Juncal Transfer	300
Groundwater	1,018
State Water Project	2,200
Desalination	141
Reclaimed Water	900
TOTAL	18,181

On an average long term basis, deliveries are expected to be approximately as shown below:

Wastewater Collection and Treatment System

The City provides wastewater treatment services to City residents through the operation of El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant (EEWTP) and a City-wide wastewater collection system. The collection system is maintained on a 100-year replacement cycle, with a portion of the system replaced each year. Wastewater is also received from the Mission Canyon area pursuant to an agreement with Santa Barbara County. Current inflow at EEWTP ranges between 7 and 8 million gallons per day, except during extreme precipitation events of short duration. Future inflows are projected to be approximately 9 million gallons per day. The capacity of El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day and is sufficient for all anticipated City needs. The plant operates under a discharge permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. It has the capacity to reclaim up to 1,200 AFY of wastewater for distribution through the reclaimed water distribution system to major irrigation accounts.

COMMUNICATION UTILITIES

Telephone

Local telephone service in the City is provided by General Telephone (GTE). GTE is in the process of system upgrades involving the use of fiber optics which can carry many more lines than can copper wiring. In addition, all of Santa Barbara County is equipped with digital switching capability. This capability will facilitate transmission of all telecommunications services including voice, video, and data. GTE has indicated that there are no foreseeable problems with the provision of telephone and other telecommunications services to growth areas in the City.

Because of the rapid increase in facsimile machines, cellular phones, pagers, and computer modems across the state, the number of telephone lines has increased at an astounding rate during the last few years. In the Santa Barbara area alone, growth was 8,000 lines in 1995, a substantial increase over the past several years and more than could be directly accounted for by population and employment growth. In addition, new competition in the local market will result in certain blocks of prefixes in each area code being assigned to different telephone companies, further depleting the availability of phone lines. In addition, as of June 1, 1996, GTE is now able to enter the long distance market. This will facilitate GTE's ability to provide Internet access and cable television programming to its customers in the future. The 805 area code that serves the Santa Barbara area is planned to be divided in the future.

Cable

While cable television services are not technically considered public utilities and are not regulated by the Public Utilities Commission, such services are an important part of the community and have the potential to assist in reducing traffic in Santa Barbara. Cox Communications provides cable television service to the City of Santa Barbara. Cable service is available to all City residents and is used by 30,700 customers in the City and approximately 65,000 in the South Coast. Cox is continuing its South Coast infrastructure investment program which has totaled more than \$20 million over the past five years. Cox has also completed a state-of-the-art electronics and signal facility in Goleta. This upgrade has increased the company's channel capacity and increased service reliability and picture quality. Through Cox, the City and County are able to provide live television coverage of City Council, Board of Supervisors, and Planning Commission meetings, as well as special events that occur in the community. Cox is exploring the possibility of conducting tests later in 1995 for interactive data services such as video-conferencing, electronic mail, interactive participation in community forums, and other computer related services.

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

ELECTRIC AND GAS FACILITIES

16.1	Ensure that adequate electrical systems are provided to meet the needs of Santa Barbara residents, industrial uses, and businesses.
16.1.1	Work with the Edison Company to maintain and improve current levels of service and meet future demands, assuring the development of three phase power throughout the M-1 zones.
16.1.2	Prior to approval of new or expanded structures that have the potential for significant energy use, contact the Edison Company to identify the adequacy of supplies.
16.1.3	As appropriate and feasible and based upon demand, work with the Edison Company to plan for and provide recharging stations for electric vehicles.
16.1.4	Where possible, place gas lines, electrical lines, and equipment underground.
16.2	Ensure that an adequate gas supply is provided to meet the needs of Santa Barbara residents and businesses.
16.2.1	Continue to work with Southern California Gas Company and other providers to maintain and improve current levels of service and meet future demands.
16.2.2	Prior to approval of new or expanded structures that have the potential for significant energy use, contact Southern California Gas Company or other providers to identify the adequacy of supplies.

CITY UTILITIES

- 16.3 Provide a storm drainage system that is able to support the permitted land uses while preserving the public safety.
- 16.3.1 Maintain and improve, as necessary, the existing public storm drains and flood control facilities.

16.3.2	Coordinate with County and Regional agencies in the maintenance and improvement of storm drain facilities in order to protect the City's residents, property, and structures from flood hazard (e.g. Highway 101 or railroad crossings and Laguna Creek).
16.3.3	Ensure that adequate storm drain facilities are in place to serve new or expanded uses.
16.3.4	Encourage the use of methods, such as the use of pervious surfaces and percolation ponds, that help to reduce the amount of runoff.
16.3.5	Require structures located in designated flood hazard areas to comply with local, State, and Federal building and safety standards.
16.3.6	Explore methods to educate and inform the public of the potential impacts of dumping dangerous/hazardous materials into the storm drains.
16.4	Provide an adequate water supply system to meet the needs of existing and future residents and businesses.
16.4.1	Manage and enhance the City's water supply facilities to accommodate existing and projected population levels as identified in the Long Term Water Supply Program.
16.4.2	Require the incorporation of water conservation techniques in the design of new work projects in order to reduce the demand on available water resources.
16.4.3	Ensure that there is sufficient water capacity and supply prior to approving new development projects or expansions to existing projects.
16.5	Provide a safe, efficient, and cost effective wastewater collection and treatment system that is able to meet the needs of permitted land uses.
16.5.1	Collect and treat wastewater to meet local, Regional, State, and Federal Standards.
16.5.2	Monitor existing and projected demands on the wastewater system and ensure that adequate capacity exists.
16.5.3	Prior to allowing the development of new structures, ensure that adequate capacity exists. If capacity does not exist, identify means and costs involved in meeting the increased demand.

16.5.4 Improve and upgrade the wastewater treatment and collection system to mitigate existing deficiencies and meet the needs of projected growth.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

- 16.6 Ensure adequate telecommunication and cable services are provided to meet the needs of Santa Barbara residents and businesses.
- 16.6.1 Work with communication service providers to maintain current levels of service and meet future demands.
- 16.6.2 Promote the development of telecommuting and teleconferencing info/infra structure and facilities to help reduce the number of automobile trips.
- 16.6.3 Promote implementation of new communication technologies (e.g. fiber-optic lines with higher speed and wider band-width utilization).

MAINTENANCE OF TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITY FACILITIES

- **16.7** *Ensure that utility and transportation facilities are well maintained and located, so as not to impede pedestrians or traffic, and are aesthetically pleasing.*
- 16.7.1 Encourage and work with utility providers and transportation providers to maintain their facilities in a clean and safe manner.
- 16.7.2 Continue the graffiti removal and enforcement program working closely with transportation and utility providers to ensure graffiti removal from their facilities.
- 16.7.3 Expand public and private street and parking lot cleaning, maintenance, and improvement programs.

Circulation Element

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Affordable housing

A residential unit that is generally affordable to households with low and moderated incomes. The residents generally should not be required to pay more than 30% of their gross monthly income on rent or house payments.

Air Pollution Control District (APCD)

An independent special district whose mission is to "protect the people and the environment of Santa Barbara County from the effects of air pollution." The APCD regulates local sources of air pollution, except motor vehicles. APCD monitors pollution in the county; adopts rules, issues permits, and inspects businesses to ensure compliance; prepares clean air plans to achieve clean air standards; responds to complaints about air pollution; and educates the public on their role in cleaning up the air. The APCD is governed by a board consisting of each of the five county supervisors and one representative (a mayor or Councilmember) from each of the seven cities in the county. *(Source: Provided by the APCD)*

Air rights

The rights to the space above a property. Common law grants the owner a piece of real estate ownership of a vertical space extending an unlimited distance above the ground.

Alternative transportation

In the context of this Circulation Element, a form of travel that does not utilize the single occupant motor vehicle. May include transit, vanpools, carpools, bicycling, and walking.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

Federal law that is intended to ensure accessibility to physical structures for all people. The ADA sets minimum standards to accommodate the physically challenged.

Arterial streets

A functional description of a road segment that provides for through traffic movement between areas and across the city, and direct access to abutting property.

Assessment districts

A specified area that is charged a fee or tax for the provision of services, the installation of infrastructure improvements, and/or maintenance.

Automobile oriented uses

Functional activities that are auto-related and/or those which by their design attract primarily customers and employees using the automobile.

Beachway

A path adjacent to the beach that is used by pedestrians and all forms of non-motorized vehicles.

Benefit/Cost Ratio

The relationship between the benefits and costs of a project. When the ratio is less than 1, the costs outweigh the benefits. When the ratio is more than 1, the benefits outweigh the costs.

Bicycle Coalition

The Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition is a countywide advocacy and resource organization that promotes bicycling for safe transportation and recreation.

Bicycle Coordinator

A employee who has as part or all of their job description the responsibility for coordination, study, evaluation, or development of bicycle and bike use programs or facilities for the employer. Local government agency coordinators may also be responsible for identifying and securing funding for bike projects.

Bicycle facilities

Any bicycle-related structure, such as a bike rack or bike lane, designed to improve or encourage bicycle use.

Bicycle lane

Also referred to as Class II lanes, these are semi-exclusive lanes for bicycles. Bike lanes should include striping, pavement stencils, directional arrows and signs. Existing examples include Coast Village Road, Canon Perdido and State Street in the downtown area.

Bicycle Parking

A facility or piece of equipment designed to hold and lock a bicycle. Can be in the form of a rack or fully enclosed locker.

Bicycle Path

Also referred to as Class I bike paths, these are segregated paths separated from the roadway facilities. Existing examples include the bike path along Cabrillo Boulevard.

Bicycle Routes

Also referred to as Class III bike routes, these are routes distinguished only by signage. Typically, these are roadways where the cyclists are integrated with motor vehicles.

Bikeway network or system

Linked bike-riding facilities.

Bikeways Master Plan

A long range plan for bicycle facilities, such as bike lanes and bike racks, in the City. First adopted in 1974. An updated plan is being developed in coordination with the CEU.

Bus pockets or turnouts

A bus stop which allows the bus to stop out of the moving traffic (and bike) lane. May be at the curb if parking is permitted on the street or the curb may be recessed into the sidewalk area if no parking is allowed.

Bus shelters

A weather shelter that protects waiting bus riders from the elements such as wind, rain, and shade from the sun.

California Coastal Commission (CCC)

Empowered by California Coastal Act to protect the coastal areas of California, ensure access to the coastline, and to regulate coastal development.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

A State agency that is responsible for the development and maintenance of State roadways. Equivalent to the Board of Directors for Caltrans. They approve the disbursement of all State and Federal transportation related funds for transportation related projects in the State.

Canopy

A covering or roof-like structure created by things such as tree branches, cloth structures, and/or solid materials.

Capital improvements

Improvements that are called out by the capital budget and land use controls (e.g. roads, public facilities and utilities).

Carpool

A group of two or more people who ride together in one vehicle.

Catch basins

A storm water structure designed to collect rainwater and direct it into a pipe.

Central Business District (CBD)

The area roughly bounded by Arrellaga Street to the north, Garden Street to the east, U.S. 101 to the south, and De La Vina to the west. *(Source: Santa Barbara Municipal Code Section 28.90.100)*

Central City Redevelopment Plan (CCRP)

A plan which governs the conduct of redevelopment activities in the Central City Redevelopment Project Area, which includes significant portions of the downtown business district and the Waterfront. It also defines significant redevelopment goals, projects and powers, and expires in 2007.

Centralized transfer system

A system by which many modes of transportation meet at central locations to simplify transferring between modes.

Chamber of Commerce

Local association of businesses.

Circulation Element

Mandated as a part of the General Plan, it serves as the City's guide in making decisions for public and private improvements of the transportation system. The Circulation element also establishes policies that reflect the desires of the community and responds to the uniqueness of Santa Barbara and its resources.

Circulation System

A network of roads, sidewalks, bikeways, and paths used for travel.

City Council

Santa Barbara City Council

City Redevelopment Agency

Created under the authority of the State Community Redevelopment Act, it is a local agency that can exercise general and specific governmental powers to effect the elimination of economic or physical blight within the Central City Redevelopment Project Area. Powers include the ability to buy private property for resale to private parties, the ability to exercise eminent domain to acquire property, and the power to collect incremental property taxes to service debt. The Agency Board is comprised of members of the City Council.

Clean Air Express

A subscription commuter bus (club bus) funded by the Air Pollution Control District. The busses utilize a dual fuel technology to reduce emissions.

Clean Cities Program

A locally based government/industry partnership coordinated by the U.S. Department of Energy, to expand the use of alternatives to gasoline and diesel fuel.

Cluster development

Grouping development in order to maximize the open space between buildings, preserve environmentally sensitive areas, or create a certain development pattern.

Coastal Act

A 1976 legislative mandate requiring all jurisdictions lying wholly, or in part, within the State's Coastal Zone to prepare a coastal plan. The coastal plan determines the future development that can occur on the coast and consist of land use plans, zoning ordinances, Zoning maps, and implementation programs.

Coastal Zone

The area of the City that is within the area designated by the California Coastal Act. This area is bounded by the westerly and easterly City limits. From the westerly City limits to Las Positas Road, the zone extends inland approximately 1000 yards paralleling the mean high tide of the sea. At Las Positas Rd. the inland boundary shifts seaward to Cliff Drive, and from that point easterly along Cliff Drive to Rancheria Street. From Rancheria to Chapala Street, Montecito Street forms the land boundary. Easterly from Chapala Street to Salinas Street, the eastern City limit, the zone widens again to 100 yards parallel to the mean high tide line. Another portion of the City, four miles west of the City proper, is the Municipal Airport, an enclave of approximately 950 acres, which is almost wholly within the Coastal Zone.

Coast Village area

An area of the City characterized by a mix of restaurant, commercial, retail, and residential uses. In general, this area is bounded on the north by the rear property lines of lots on the north side of Coast Village Road, on the south by Highway 101, on the East by Olive Mill Road, and on the west by Hot Springs Road.

Commercial/Activity Centers

A cluster of uses that collectively generate many trips (e.g., schools, parks, neighborhood commercial district etc.).

Community Development Block Grant

An annual entitlement (approximately \$1.5 million) received by the City from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to be used for activities that benefit low and moderate income persons. Moneys are predominantly used for capital projects located in low-income neighborhoods. The grants also fund activities of social service agencies.

Community Environmental Council (CEC)

A community action group concerned with sustainable communities, recycling, waste management, environmental business assistance, organic gardening, and environmental education.

Compact Development

A development pattern characterized by structures located in close proximity to each other. This term is also used to describe a pattern of development with commercial, residential, recreational, and service uses located in a close proximity to each other to facilitate walking, bicycle, and transit use.

Congestion Management Plan (CMP)

A Countywide program, required by Proposition 111, that is designed to reduce auto-related congestion on major streets (as designated in the plan) through the provision of roadway improvements, travel demand management, and coordinated land use planning among all local jurisdictions.

Consensus Group

Circulation Element Update Consensus Group. The 22-member group appointed by the City Council to review and develop consensus on the City's Circulation Element Update.

Constraint

Something that restricts, limits, or regulates. For the purposes of the CEU, this term is used to describe situations that block or prevent realization of potential opportunities.

County Bowl

Santa Barbara County Bowl; an outdoor entertainment amphitheater located near Milpas and Anapamu Streets.

Cul-de-sac

A dead-end street with a turn around bulb at the end.

Curb cuts

Also known as wheelchair ramps, a warping of the sidewalk at an intersection so that the street and sidewalk grades match.

Customers

The clients of a particular use or sector of uses.

Dedication

The transfer of property from private to public ownership.

Demolition/rebuilding projects

Projects that involve the demolition of a building and reconstruction of a new building on the same site

Density

The average number of housing units per unit of land, typically an acre.

Depot

The Santa Barbara Railroad Depot on Lower State Street.

Development controls

Land use controls that acquire their legal force through adoption by a legislative body or through powers granted by the State (i.e. the police power). Examples include the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations.

Development potential

The maximum nonresidential square footage or number of residential units that can be developed on a particular site as determined by the zoning designation.

Dial-A-Ride

On Demand transportation service.

Disincentives

Strategies designed to discourage certain behaviors or actions.

Downtown

An area of approximately 169 acres roughly bounded by Sola Street on the north, Garden Street on the east, U.S. 101 on the south, and De La Vina Street on the west.

Downtown Organization

A business organization comprised of Downtown businesses and those with business licenses in the Downtown area.

Downtown Parking Program

The City Division that operates and maintains downtown parking lots and parking and Transportation Demand Management programs in the Central Business District. It is a self supporting enterprise fund in the City Budget.

Downtown/Waterfront Shuttle

Shuttle bus service along State Street and Cabrillo Blvd. funded by the City and the Redevelopment Agency, and operated by MTD.

Downtown/Waterfront Vision Study Area

An area bounded roughly by a line extending easterly from the intersection of Bath St. and Micheltorena St. to Garden Street, southerly to Haley St., easterly to the intersection of Quarantina St. and Montecito St., easterly to the intersection of Highway 101 and Los Patos Way, southerly along Los Patos Way to Cabrillo Blvd., westerly along Cabrillo Boulevard (including the Harbor and Wharf areas) to Loma Alta, northerly following Loma Alta to Haley Street, easterly to Bath St., and northerly to Micheltorena St.

Easements

A right, such as a right-of-way, afforded to a person or entity to make use of another person's real property.

Eastside

<u>General Plan Definition</u>: A 445 acre area bounded by Canon Perdido Street, Highway 101, the base of the Riviera, and the rear of the commercial strip on the east side of Milpas Street. <u>Eastside Study Group Definition</u>: The area bounded by Anapamu Street, Salinas Street, Santa Barbara Street, and the ocean.

Easy Lift Transportation

A private, non-profit paratransit service provider on the South coast. Since 1979, Easy Lift has provided frail elderly and temporarily or permanently disabled individuals with wheelchair-accessible transportation. Service area includes all of south Santa Barbara County.

Electric Shuttle

The electric powered 26-passenger vehicle currently in use in the Downtown and Waterfront areas.

El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant (EEWTP)

City wastewater treatment facility

Employee Shuffle

A term to describe the movement of vehicles, which are parked on public streets or in public lots, to comply with the 90 minute parking restrictions.

Environmental impacts

A substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the environment.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Federal agency empowered to protect the environment.

Facade

The exterior surface of a wall of a building.

Fare Subsidies

A method of reducing the cost of transit service to the user.

Fixed route service

Transit service with a pre-established route.

Foothill area

An area bounded on the north, east and west by the City limits and on the south by Foothill Road and Laurel Canyon Road to the City limits line above Marilyn Way.

Future Bikeway Map

A map which depicts the City's vision for the City's bikeway system.

General Plan

As required by State law, the City has a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the City. The plan includes seven required elements: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The City's first General Plan was adopted by City Council in 1964.

General Plan Update (GPU)

A systematic or comprehensive update of a General Plan. For the purposes of the CEU, this term is used to refer to the public involvement process and long term growth decisions that were made in 1989 culminating in the November 1989 ballot "Measure E."

General Telephone (GTE)

Provider of telephone service in the area.

Goal

The State of California, General Plan Guidelines define a goal as "an ideal future end, condition or state related to the public health, safety or general welfare toward which planning and planning implementation measure are directed. A goal is a general expression of community values and, therefore, is abstract in nature. Consequently, a goal is generally not quantifiable, time-dependent or suggestive of specific actions for its achievement."

Grid system

A system of city streets which result in four sided "city blocks" in a "checkerboard" pattern.

Harbor

An area of approximately 252 acres in the vicinity of Stearn's Wharf and the Breakwater. 2/3 of the area is under water, and 1/3 is dry land.

Harbor Master Plan

Adopted in June 1996, the goals of the Harbor Master Plan are to provide for primary ocean dependent uses, such as commercial fishing and recreation boating, and for secondary uses such as ocean related and visitor serving uses. It covers the ten-year period from 1995 to 2004.

Headways

The elapsed time between transit vehicles on the same route.

Impacted parking

Situation where there is not enough parking spaces to meet demand. Occurs in both residential and nonresidential areas.

Implementation strategy

The State General Plan Guidelines define as "an action, procedure, program or technique that carries out general plan policy. Each policy must have at least one corresponding implementation measure.

Incentive based policies and programs

Policies or programs that are designed to encourage certain actions.

Inductive coupling

The transfer of alternating electrical energy between separated electrical coils.

Infill development

Development in areas that are already largely developed. May include development of vacant properties or redevelopment of underdeveloped properties.

Info-structure

Technological devises that help reduce the need for automobile travel. This includes such devises as electronic mail, faxes, teleconferencing, etc.

Infrastructure

Improvements or structures, such as streets, water pipes, or storm drains, bicycle lanes, alternative transportation facilities, or other public right-of-way improvements, typically intended to serve the public.

Inlet structures

Points where water overflow can enter storm drain facilities and creeks.

Integrated pedestrian system

Connected pedestrian paths of travel.

Interface

A point at which independent systems or diverse groups interact.

Intermodal circulation system

A coordinated, comprehensive transportation system which connects different types or modes of transportation.

Intermodal connections

Locations where people can move from one type of transportation to another.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)

Federal Legislation passed in 1991 that established new policies that fund a variety of modes of transportation, including cars, trucks, buses, trains, bicycles, and walking. ISTEA requires state and regional authorities to think and plan comprehensively about appropriate modes of transportation for natural and built environments and relate the selected modes to air quality in metropolitan areas and the quality of life in communities in general.

Jitney

A door to door transportation service.

Jobs/housing balance

Relationship between the location of current and future jobs and housing. The relationship is important in that it affects future transportation/circulation needs. Imbalance leads to impacts on air quality, energy consumption, congestion and housing affordability.

Joint parking

Parking lots that serve more than one property or use.

Level of Service (LOS)

A method of describing the operating efficiency of a roadway or intersection. Typically described on a scale from A to E, with E being the most congested and A representing free-flow conditions.

Linkage

A path of travel that connects two points.

Living within resources

Used to refer to an early 1980's ballot Measure K that amended the City Charter to include "…land development shall not exceed its public services and physical and natural resources… All land use policies shall provide for a level and balance of residential and commercial development which will effectively utilize, but will not exhaust, the City's resources in the foreseeable future." Measure K was approved by the voters and incorporated into the City Charter as Section 1507.

Local Coastal Program (LCP)

A local government's land use plans, zoning ordinances, zoning district maps and implementing actions which, taken together, meet the requirements for an implement the provisions of the Coastal Act at the local level.

Local Government Commission's Transportation Partners Program

A program coordinated by the Local Government Commission in which cities exchange information and encourage innovative transportation solutions that promote decreased reliance on the automobile.

Long term parking

Vehicles that remain parked for extended periods of time when compared to other vehicles. In the downtown, it is usually employee parking as compared to shopper parking.

Lower State Street

State Street between Cabrillo Boulevard and Highway 101.

Lower Westside

The area generally bounded by Carrillo Street, Montecito Street, Highway 101, Loma Alta and the base of Mesa Hills.

Measure D

A 1/2 percent sales tax referendum approved by voters in 1989 to fund transportation facility maintenance and improvements in Santa Barbara County over the next 20 years.

Measure E

Charter Section 1508, which limits future non-residential growth in the City and mandates that implementation of the growth cap be completed through General Plan Amendments, zoning ordinance revisions, and other measures.

Mercado

A market; can be an open-air market.

Mesa

The area generally bounded on the east by Oceano Avenue, on the south by the Pacific Ocean, on the west by the City limits, and on the north at the top of the steep hillside.

Metropolitan Transit District (MTD)

The designated authority for transit services in the South Coast, and the agency authorized to receive transit funding from state and federal sources. In many Implementation Strategies, MTD is referenced. For the purposes of the Circulation Element, MTD is intended to include all transit providers.

Minor Addition

Defined by the S.B.M.C. Section 28.87.300 as a non-residential addition, conversion of residential floor area to non-residential floor area, or new non-residential construction of less than or equal to 1,000 square feet.

Mission

The Santa Barbara Mission.

Mission Canyon area

The unincorporated area between the Riviera and Foothill areas as shown on the General Plan Map.

Mitigation measures

Measures taken to lessen the intensity or severity of environmental impacts associated with a project.

Mixed Use

The combination of residential units with other land uses, typically commercial office or retail uses in the same building or on the same site.

Mobility classification system

Classification of streets intended to ensure that all forms of travel are considered in the City's street system.

Mobility corridor

A path of travel intended to accommodate various forms of travel.

Multi-modal transportation systems

Transportation systems intended to allow connections between and use of various forms of travel, such as a bike racks on transit.

Multiple/Mixed Purpose

The combination of different types of uses (e.g. residential/commercial/office or office/commercial/light industrial) within a common neighborhood or district.

Neighborhood

Property owners and tenants located in close proximity to each other and sometimes sharing physical similarities or distinctive characteristics.

Neighborhood Commercial Uses

Commercial uses intended for patronage by people who live within walking distance of them. These uses are typified by markets, laundromats, video stores, and cleaners.

Neighborhood Serving Uses

Uses that are designed to provide a desired need for people in the surrounding area. These can be typified by uses described above in neighborhood commercial uses, medical offices, recreational facilities, educational facilities, and public service facilities.

Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans

In conjunction with the Traffic Management Program, the Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans detail the desired methods and implementation measures to address a particular traffic issue.

Neotraditional town planning/New Urbanism

Term used to describe a development pattern typical of cities that developed prior to use of the automobile. This type of development pattern is characterized by the location of commercial, residential, educational, service, and recreational uses in a close proximity to one another. This allows access by means other than the automobile.

Noise contours

Lines connecting points of equal sound intensity.

Non-residential growth limits

Regulations that restrict the amount of non-residential development potential.

Old Town

The area of Downtown generally located in and around State Street between the freeway and Cota Street.

"On-demand" service

Used to describe transportation, such as a taxi, that is available when needed.

Ordinance

A regulation or law governing an aspect of a project.

Outer State Street area

An area bounded on the north by the northern boundary of commercial properties on the north side of Sate Street and Via Lucerno, on the south by Highway 101 and the southern boundary of the commercial property on State Street and De La Vina, on the east by Mission Creek, and on the west by San Marcos Pass Road.

Paratransit

A door-to-door transportation service for the physically challenged.

Park and ride facilities

A facility where people can leave their vehicles while they commute to work in a car\vanpool. Facilities include reserved parking spaces or parking lots intended to accommodate long-term parking.

"Park once" concept

An idea where a person can access desired commercial and service needs without having to drive to each individual use. This is associated with Neotraditional town planning. The Downtown area is generally referred to as a successful "park once" environment where a person can park a car in a public lot and walk or take a shuttle to a variety of retail, entertainment, cultural and other type uses without having to use a car.

Parkway

A strip of planted area between the street and the sidewalk.

Participatory planning process

A process which gives the community many opportunities to review and discuss important planning goals and issues and to express opinions regarding future goals, policies, and strategies. The emphasis is on early and frequent involvement and the exchange of information.

Paseos

A series of connecting private and public walkways joined to streets, open plazas, courtyards, cafes and shops through the central portions of City blocks.

Peak commute congestion periods

Periods when most people are commuting to work. These typically occur between 7:00 and 9:00 AM and 4:00 and 6:00 PM.

Peak hour capacity

The amount of traffic that a street can accommodate during the peak congestion periods (see above).

Pedestrian amenities

Features designed to encourage and facilitate travel by foot. These can be such things as benches, trees, information kiosks, newspaper racks, sidewalks, drinking fountains, or transit stops.

Pedestrian friendly design

Development which is designed with an emphasis primarily on the street sidewalk and on pedestrian access to the site and building, rather than on auto access and parking areas. The building is generally placed close to the street and the main entrance is oriented to the sidewalk.

Pedestrian Oriented Development

Pedestrian oriented developments provide clear, comfortable pedestrian access to a commercial and residential areas and transit stops.

People mover

System designed to move people through selected areas.

Peripheral lots

Parking lots located on the outskirts of the downtown area. These include the parking lots on the intersections of Castillo - Carrillo and Cota - Santa Barbara.

Placita

A small plaza.

Planning Commission

The City of Santa Barbara Planning Commission. Commissioners are appointed by the City Council to review matters related to planning and development.

Plaza

A public square or open area.

Policy

The State General Plan Guidelines describe a policy as: "a specific statement that guides decision making."

Policy framework

A set of policies that denote a collective course of action.

Public improvements

Features intended to serve and help the public. These can be streets, sidewalks, public landscaping, and public utilities.

Redevelopment

The elimination of economic or physical blight in a redevelopment project area through a redevelopment agency that is endowed with the powers to acquire and dispose of private property, to acquire property through the exercise of eminent domain, and to collect incremental property taxes in order to service debt.

Redevelopment Project Area

An area designated by the City Council as containing economic or physical blight that hampers orderly and effective development to the degree that private market forces cannot correct the blight. The Redevelopment Agency is empowered to exercise its powers in the project area to correct the blight. The Central City Redevelopment Project Area roughly encompasses the Downtown from Highway 101 on the west to Santa Barbara Street on the east and extends from Victoria Street on the north to the Waterfront on the south.

Region

Commonly refers to the "South Coast" which extends from Gaviota to Oxnard. However, the practical boundaries of the region may be limited or expanded depending on the chosen mode of transportation. For example, the effective region of a bicyclist would be smaller than that of a vehicular commuter, whose region may extend as far north as Santa Maria or as far south as Los Angeles.

Replacement cycle

The length of time between installation and replacement of infrastructure.

Residential Parking Permit Program (RPP)

A system intended to preserve on-street parking for residents in a designated area. The system allows residents with a RPP pass to remain parked in areas restricted with time limits.

Rezone

To change the zoning of a parcel or area.

Ridership

Use of transit or participation in ridesharing programs.

Right-of-way

Denotes the area used or intended to be used for public travel. This includes the street, sidewalks, and any public landscaping area.

Riviera

An area bounded by the top of Mission Ridge, Alameda Padre Serra, Sycamore Canyon Road, and Mountain Drive.

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG)

A voluntary council of governments formed under a joint powers agreement executed by each of the general-purpose local governments. In Santa Barbara County, SBCAG is the designated regional planning agency and the metropolitan planning organization.

Scale

The relative dimensions or size of a project

Setback

The required distance between the edge of a building and the street, sidewalk, or lot line as established by the zoning of the area.

Short term parking

Parking that is restricted to a specified time limit, such as 90 minutes.

Signal phase

An assignment of right-of-way using red and green traffic lights at a signalized intersection.

Small Addition

Defined by the S.B.M.C Section 28.87.300 as a non-residential addition, conversion of residential floor area to non-residential floor area, or new non-residential construction of greater than 1,000 and less than or equal to 3,000 square feet.

Southern California Edison (SCE)

Provider of electricity in the area.

Southern California Gas Company (SCG)

Provider of gas in the area.

Stacking Parking

A parking pattern where the first vehicle is blocked in by a second vehicle which parks behind the first. Also known as tandem parking.

Street frontage

The portion of a lot that forms an edge with the street.

Surface parking lots

Parking lots located on the street level.

Sustainable

The quality of being maintainable and existing in perpetuity.

Tandem parking

See Stacking Parking

Telecommute

Working without physically traveling by using a computer and contacting an employer by modem, phone etc. to reduce work-related automobile trips.

Teleshop

Shopping at home using a computer modem and/or phone and catalog to reduce consumer-related automobile trips.

Tide gates

Gates used to keep tidewaters in or out of an area.

Traffic Calming

Devices intended to reduce the speeds of vehicles. These include, but are not limited to, curb bulbs, speed bumps, and landscaping.

Traffic corridors

Paths of travel intended to accommodate vehicular travel.

Traffic impact standards

Standards which determine the acceptable level of congestion at signalized intersections and details at what point a traffic impact will occur with the addition of a given amount of traffic.

Traffic Management Program

A Citywide program to create Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans. The Neighborhood Traffic Management Program present a range of options to help address specific traffic issues, present the methodology for implementing the desired actions, explain the potential costs and benefits of the desired actions, and explain the public process required to implement the actions.

Traffic Solutions

A Countywide program aimed at reducing the amount of drive-alone vehicle trips.

Transfer of Existing Development Rights (TEDR)

A mechanism that allows the transfer of existing non-residential development rights from certain properties to certain other properties within the City.

Transit

Travel by alternative forms of group transportation on facilities such as buses, shuttles, rail, water, jitney, vanpools, and carpools.

Transit center

A facility designed to accommodate boarding and disembarking of transit vehicles. This term is also used to describe the Greyhound and MTD stations on Chapala and Carrillo.

Transit corridors

A path of travel designed to provide transit either exclusively or in conjunction with other forms of travel.

Transit Pass Programs

Programs through which free bus passes are distributed to encourage people to use transit rather than the automobile.

Transit turnouts

See Bus Turnouts

Transit vehicle traffic signal pre-emption

A system at signalized intersections which that detects a bus in traffic and assigns sufficient green time for the bus to clear the intersection.

Transportation Demand Management Program

Actions that are designed to change travel behavior in order to reduce single-occupancy vehicles, improve performance of transportation facilities, and reduce the need for additional road capacity.

Transportation linkages

Facilities intended to connect various forms of travel. These can be such things as streets, transit stops, bicycle lanes, and bicycle racks.

Transportation modes

Various forms of travel such as bicycle, automobile, walking, transit, rail, air, or water.

Travel lanes

Paths intended to accommodate travel such as streets, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks.

Turn pockets

Designated lanes designed to facilitate the movement of automobile traffic. These are typically right or left-hand turn lanes.

Urban design

The large scale organization of a city, dealing with the massing and organization of buildings and the spaces between them, but not with the design of the individual buildings.

Urban Sprawl

The decentralization of development, resulting in low density construction away from traditional urban centers.

Vanpool

A ridesharing strategy whereby several people use a van to commute to work instead of using their individual vehicles.

Watercourses

Waterways; the beds or channels of waterways.

Waterfront Area

An area of approximately three square miles along the Pacific Ocean from the Bird Refuge to the Mesa Bluffs, south of Highway 101.
Waterfront Area Traffic Study

A traffic study required by the Harbor Master Plan to be completed for the Waterfront area following the completion of the Salsipuedes and Garden Street extensions.

West Beach area

An area bounded on the southeast by Cabrillo Boulevard and Shoreline Drive, on the Southwest by the western property line of Santa Barbara City College, on the northwest by Montecito Street, Castillo Street, and Highway 101, and on the northeast by Yanonali Street, Chapala Street, and Kimberly Avenue.

Wharf (prop. n.)

Stearn's Wharf, the oldest working wooden wharf in CA, built in 1867 to facilitate the transfer of cargo and people from ships to shore.

Zones of Benefit

A designated area that does not have to provide the entire amount of parking required by the Santa Barbara Municipal Code, Parking Section. These areas are located near a public parking lot that provides the required parking for the uses.

Zoning Ordinance

Chapters 23-28 of the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code and defined in the Municipal Code as established to "serve the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare and to provide the economic and social advantages resulting from an orderly planned use of land resources, and to encourage, guide and provide a definite plan for the future growth and development" of the City.

Zoning overlays

A method of increasing particular zoning standards in an area where the standards in the basic zone are not sufficiently restrictive to assure appropriate development or protect the residents against inappropriate land uses or activities otherwise permitted in the basic zone category.

Zoning regulations

Establish development standards and regulate land uses throughout the City.

Appendices

List of Alternatives from Public Workshop on Highway 101 Widening Alternative Analysis, February 17, 1994

Beyond Sprawl, New Patterns of Growth to Fit the New California, Bank of America

Paved Paradise and 15 Ways to Fix the Suburbs, Newsweek

Common Questions Regarding Small and Minor Non-Residential Additions, City of Santa Barbara

List of Alternatives from the Public Scoping Workshop on Highway 101 Widening Alternatives Analysis

February 17, 1994

LIST OF ALTERNATIVES (GROUP 1)

- 1. Light rail
- 2. On/off ramp improvements (increase efficiency)
- 3. Subscription van service for commuters similar to EasyLift
- 4. Improve bus/transit (expand lines, increase users
- 5. Ferry cars by boat (LA SB)
- 6. Better transit to railroad and airport to decrease car rental by tourists
- 7. Incentives for tourist to leave car at home (discount on transit tickets)
- 8. Multi-use ticket for rail, bus, shuttle option of choices
- 9. Integrate transportation modes
- 10. Employer stimulation/incentive employee carpool
- 11. Electric car rental
- 12. Company-owned commuter vehicles for vanpooling
- 13. Tax incentives for telecommuting
- 14. Improve retail delivery service to decrease shopping trips
- 15. Magnetic trains
- 16. Long-term inter-city high speed rail
- 17. Need multi-modal alternatives (take bikes on train or bus)
- 18. Depots must be attractive & safe to be used
- 19. Solutions geared toward private enterprise or combination of public/private
- 20. Parking pricing policy to decrease car use (vehicle emissions)
- 21. Employers pay for carpoolers gas (similar JPL program)
- 22. Disincentives for SOV
- 23. Need more Class I bike trails (look at Ojai)
- 24. Summerland bus stops need improvements (benches, covers)
- 25. Ortega Hill needs better, safer bike path

LIST OF ALTERNATIVES (GROUP 2)

- 1. On-demand transport service
- 2. Reduce residential traffic
- 3. Enhance and expand mass transit in Santa Barbara corridor from Ventura to San Luis Obispo
- 4. No Alternatives
- 5. Businesses offer employees "monetary" incentives for carpooling
- 6. Fast train route Do-able on coastline...
- 7. Bicycle corridor along railroad from Carpintería to Goleta. Feeder routes. Facilities for secure parking and facilities for lockers, showers
- 8. Improve point-to-point service
 - City subsidized (low cost)
 - Frequent
- 9. Earthquake safety
- 10. Bike and Ride
- 11. Multi-modal export
- 12. Live and work zoning
- 13. Close some Montecito and Summerland exits on Highway 101
- 14. Incentives for tourists to use alternative transportation (partner with local business)
- 15. Better transit information in phone book
- 16. More and better access from transit pick-up points to residential areas
- 17. Increase telecommuting

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES (GROUP 2)

- 1. On-demand transit services (subsidized) to supplement mass transit
- 2. Close selected on/off ramps in Montecito and Summerland
- 3. Inter-modal connectivity
- 4. Major bicycle corridor along railroad
- 5. Live and work zoning
- 6. Increase telecommuting work
- 7. Incentives for business and tourists to use alternative modes

- 4. Improve bicycling facilities
- 5. Commuter traffic diverted to other systems
- 6. Creative funding for above
- 7. Alternate route

LIST OF ALTERNATIVES (GROUP 4)

- 1. Require certain level of participation (carpool, alternative modes) or you won"t get it (mandates)
- 2. Look to large employers (e.g., UCSB) for enforcement or encouragement practices
- 3. Remove truck traffic to Interstate 5
- 4. Transit, who? large percent of transit dependents
- 5. Jitney Service may be incompatible in public transit corridors
- 6. Have bikeway lead to popular destinations/provide bike lockers at work/provide showers at work
- 7. Bike lane needs to be continuous from Santa Barbara to County line (Ventura) to get people off 101
- 8. Safe bikeways have to be provided
- 9. How can transit compete with 15-20 minute private commute? High cost parking in downtown could create one disincentive
- 10. How long does it take to develop clientele for a new transit service?
 - Need good headway

Need logical routes

May take 1-2 years to establish

- 11. Consider one/two trip frequency for a large capacity bus into Santa Barbara from Ventura/San Luis Obispo for tourist transport
- 12. Surplus rail capacity exists to accommodate commuter/local runs
- 13. Express transit inter-county/intra-county
- 14. Transit should address segments of the market
- 15. Park and Ride (carpool or rail)
- 16. Improve surface streets to reduce local use of 101
- 17. Commuter bus links between/within County
- 18. Connections between modes
- 19. Parking disincentives

LIST OF ALTERNATIVES (GROUP 5)

- 1. Take more programmatic approach; one lane addition won"t solve it
- 2. Look at alternatives that would change tourist traffic patterns
- 3. Ramp Metering
- 4. Long-term land use planning
- 5. Telecomm.
- 6. Flex work schedule
- 7. Comprehensive approach to reduce traffic
- 8. Access transit system for tourists as well as residents
- 9. Use tolls in town and use a carpool lane (no cost for carpooling)
- 10. Add lanes as well as other alternatives
- 11. Should be feasible to not own a car
- 12. Expand downtown shuttle
- 13. Parking pricing
- 14. Light rail service SB
- 15. Can"t do all alternatives on list
- 16. Consultant should study alternative modes primarily
- 17. Increase walking by better planning
- 18. Don"t react to statistics plan for alternatives
- 19. Look for a solution that"s environmentally sensitive and best economic impact on SB
- 20. Cities should be planned to make it viable not to have a car (general statement)
- 21. Multiple solutions are needed not just one/two
- 22. Need more communication between public agencies (re: Caltrans, County)

LIST OF ALTERNATIVES (GROUP 5)

- 1. Address the need to provide for regional travel (statewide)
- 2. Find best transit solution for SB and develop a way to evaluate solution successfully (i.e., transit miles/year)
- 3. Rigorous analysis of fundability of solutions (examples of previous funding)

Beyond Sprawl: New Patterns of Growth to Fit the New California

Sponsor's Note:

This report suggests new ideas about how California can continue to grow while still fostering the economic vitality and quality of life that makes it such a vibrant place to live and work. It is sponsored by a diverse coalition-the California Resources Agency, a government conservation agency; Bank of America, California's largest bank; Greenbelt Alliance, the Bay Area's citizen conservation and planning organization; and the Low Income Housing Fund, a nonprofit organization dedicated to low-income housing.

The fact that such a diverse group has reached consensus on the ideas in this report reflects how important the issue of growth is to all Californians. We hope this report will make a meaningful contribution to the public dialogue about the quality and direction of California's growth in the 21st century.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California is at a unique and unprecedented point in its history-a point at which we face profound questions about our future growth that will determine the state's economic vitality and quality of life for the next generation and beyond.

One of the most fundamental questions we face is whether California can afford to support the pattern of urban and suburban development, often referred to as "sprawl," that has characterized its growth since World War II.

There is no question that this pattern of growth has helped fuel California's unparalleled economic and population boom, and that it has enabled millions of Californians to realize the enduring dream of home ownership. But as we approach the 21st century, it is clear that sprawl has created enormous costs that California can no longer afford. Ironically, unchecked sprawl has shifted from an engine of California's growth to a force that now threatens to inhibit growth and degrade the quality of our life.

This report, sponsored by a diverse coalition of organizations, is meant to serve as a call for California to move beyond sprawl and rethink the way we will grow in the future. This is not a new idea, but it is one that has never been more critical or urgent.

Despite dramatic changes in California over the last decade, traditional development patterns have accelerated. Urban job centers have decentralized to the suburbs. New housing tracts have moved even deeper into agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas. Private auto use continues to rise.

This acceleration of sprawl has surfaced enormous social, environmental and economic costs, which until now have been hidden, ignored, or quietly borne by society. The burden of these costs is becoming very clear. Businesses suffer from higher costs, a loss in worker productivity, and underutilized investments in older communities.

California's business climate becomes less attractive than surrounding states. Suburban residents pay a heavy price in taxation and automobile expenses, while residents of older cities and suburbs lose access to jobs, social stability, and political power. Agriculture and ecosystems also suffer.

There is a fundamental dynamic to growth, whether it be the growth of a community or a corporation, that evolves from expansion to maturity. The early stages of growth are often exuberant and unchecked-that has certainly been the case in post-World War II California. But unchecked growth cannot be sustained forever. At some point this initial surge must mature into more managed, strategic growth. This is the point where we now stand in California.

We can no longer afford the luxury of sprawl. Our demographics are shifting in dramatic ways. Our economy is restructuring. Our environment is under increasing stress. We cannot shape California's future successfully unless we move beyond sprawl.

This is not a call for limiting growth, but a call for California to be smarter about how it grows-to invent ways we can create compact and efficient growth patterns that are responsive to the needs of people at all income levels, and also help maintain California's quality of life and economic competitiveness.

It is a tall order-one that calls for us to rise above our occasional isolation as individuals and interest groups, and address these profound challenges as a community. All of us-government agencies, businesses, community organizations and citizens-play a role. Our actions should be guided by the following goals:

- To provide more certainty in determining where new development should and should not occur.
- To make more efficient use of land that has already been developed, including a strong focus on job creation and housing in established urban areas.
- To establish a legal and procedural framework that will create the desired certainty and send the right economic signals to investors.
- To build a broad-based constituency to combat sprawl that includes environmentalists, community organizations, businesses, farmers, government leaders and others.

Californians are already taking some of these steps. We have attempted in this report to not only point out the obstacles to sustained growth, but also to highlight the positive actions that are occurring to better manage growth. Our fundamental message is that we must build on these early successes and take more comprehensive and decisive steps over the next few years to meet this challenge. To build a strong, vibrant economy and ensure a high quality of life for the 21st century, we must move beyond sprawl in the few remaining years of the 20th century.

INTRODUCTION

California is at the crossroads of change.

Our economy is emerging from its worst downturn in 60 years-a downturn that has required nearly all of the state's major industries to retool for greater competitiveness in a global marketplace. Our demographic profile is changing dramatically. New racial and immigration patterns are rapidly producing a truly multicultural society, creating a variety of related social and economic issues. At the same time, California has emerged as one of the most urbanized states in the union, as our metropolitan areas continue to grow in population and scale.

In the face of this change, California remains shackled to costly patterns of suburban sprawl. Even as our economy and our society are being reinvented daily, we continue to abandon people and investments in older communities as development leap-frogs out to fringe areas to accommodate another generation of low-density living. And we continue to create communities that rely almost exclusively on automobiles for transportation. In short, the "new" California-with 32 million people and counting- is using land and other resources in much the same fashion as the "old" California, with only 10 million people.

We cannot afford another generation of sprawl. As the Governor's Growth Management Council stated in a recent report: "What may have been possible with 10 or even 20 million people is simply not sustainable for a population of twice that much in the same space." Continued sprawl may seem inexpensive for a new homebuyer or a growing business on the suburban fringe, but the ultimate cost-to those homeowners, to the government, and to society at large-is potentially crippling. Allowing sprawl may be politically expedient in the short run, but in the long run it will make California economically uncompetitive and create social, environmental and political problems we may not be able to solve.

At a time when economic growth is slow and social tensions are high, it is easy to dismiss an issue like suburban sprawl as superfluous. Yet it lies at the heart of the very economic, social and environmental issues that we face today. Rapid population growth and economic change are occurring in a state increasingly characterized by a limited supply of developable land, environmental stress at the metropolitan fringe, and older communities in transition. With the onset of economic recovery, the next few years will give rise to land-use decisions of fundamental importance. They will help determine whether our state can succeed in reestablishing the economic and social vitality that have made it such a successful place to live and work for more than 140 years.

Suburban Sprawl and the "Old" California

In the decades after World War II, California emerged as an economic and political powerhouse, providing jobs, housing and prosperity for most of its rapidly growing population.

Underlying this success was a development pattern that emphasized expanding metropolitan areas, conversion of farmland and natural areas to residential use, and heavy use of the automobile. In the postwar era, this way of life worked for California. With a prosperous and land-rich state, most families were able to rise to the middle class and achieve the dream of home ownership. Government agencies and private businesses were able to provide the infrastructure of growth-new homes, roads, schools, water systems, sewage treatment facilities, and extensions of gas and electric distribution.

Within the last generation, however, this postwar formula for success has become overwhelmed by its own consequences. Since the 1970s, housing has become more expensive, roads have become more congested, the supply of developable land has dwindled, and, because of increasing costs, government agencies have not been able to keep up with the demand for public services.

Since the late 1970s, several efforts have been initiated to address the question of how to manage California's growth, but all have failed-some for lack of consensus, some for lack of engaged constituency, some simply because of bad timing.

The Challenge of the "New" California

In the 1990s, California is undergoing change of such scale and significance that it will literally redefine the state. To succeed, the new California must recognize and build upon the following changes in positive ways.

Population Growth

California's population continues to grow at a remarkably fast pace. Today's total of approximately 32 million people represents a doubling of the population since the mid-1960s, when California became the nation's most populous state.

During the boom years of the 1980s, California added more than 6 million new residents, a population larger than all but a few of the 49 other states. Even during the bust years of the early 1990s, the state's population grew at a rate of almost a half-million people per year-in effect, adding another Oakland or Fresno every year-even as we have suffered a net loss in the number of jobs.

This continuing surge in population puts pressure on both existing communities and on the remaining supply of undeveloped land, making it extremely difficult for traditional suburban patterns to accommodate more people.

Changing Demographics

While growing rapidly, California's population is also changing in significant ways. The demographic changes are well documented. Latinos-whose roots extend to Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean-are growing rapidly in number and may outnumber Anglos a generation from now. Californians of Asian ancestry now make up almost 10 percent of the population. African-Americans remain an important racial group, and the state's mosaic is rounded out by Native Americans, immigrants from South Asia and the Middle East, and others who bring great diversity to the state. California is truly one of the world's most multicultural societies.

Underneath the racial diversity lies another important change in the state's population patterns that will have a profound effect on California's attitudes toward growth over the next generation. Traditionally, the popular perception has been that California's population grows because of migration from other parts of the United States. However popular, this perception is no longer true. Most new Californians now come from other countries, principally in Latin America and Asia.

The birth rate is also an increasing source of population growth. During the 1990s recession, "natural increase"-the net total of births over deaths-has accounted for almost 400,000 new people each year. Tomorrow's California will include-for the first time-a vast pool of people who are Californians from birth. They will want what Californians before them have wanted-education, jobs and housing. Most will expect the state to find a way to accommodate them. But their numbers are so huge that they probably cannot be sustained by traditional suburban development patterns.

Economic Change

During the recession, California has undergone an unprecedented economic restructuring. The state has lost 400,000 manufacturing jobs since 1990, causing businesses and workers alike to rethink old assumptions about how to ensure prosperity.

Traditional foundations of the state's economy, such as aerospace and defense, have been drastically reduced and will probably never return, at least not in their previous form. Otherssuch as entertainment, technology, the garment industry and agriculture-remain just as important as ever. But they too have undergone tremendous change, becoming leaner and more efficient in response to global competition. And small businesses remain the largest source of new job creation. In the near future, the impact of the North American Free Trade Agreement will begin to be felt.

These economic changes are also putting pressure on the state's land-use patterns. The loss of manufacturing jobs is emptying out the state's long-established industrial areas, usually located in older communities. Downsizing and technological change in other industries is also rendering older buildings obsolete and creating a demand for new buildings-often in new suburbs-that are both inexpensive and flexible. The closure of many military bases is bringing a huge amount of land to the real estate market that will either extend sprawl or encourage new development patterns, depending on how that land is used.

Spreading Urbanization

In response to both demographic and economic pressure, California has become the most urbanized state in the union. According to the 1990 Census, more than 80 percent of all Californians live in metropolitan areas of 1 million people or more, with 30 percent of the state's population living in Los Angeles County alone.

This large-scale urbanization means that California's people and businesses compete intensely with each other for space to live and work. The edges of metropolitan areas continue to grow to accommodate expansion of population and economic activity, while some neglected inner-city areas are left behind. These patterns increase the stress of daily life while, at the same time, put more pressure on land and environmental resources at the metropolitan fringe.

SPRAWL AND ITS CAUSES

All of these factors-a growing population, a changing economy, and increased urbanization-have been present in California for many years. But they have accelerated in the 1990s, while traditional suburban development patterns have continued. In a state with such powerful growth dynamics, the results are astonishing. The following trends are typical of the effects of sprawl over the last 10 to 20 years:

- Employment centers have decentralized dramatically. While jobs used to be concentrated in central cities, most are now created in the newer suburbs. For example, the complex of office centers around John Wayne Airport in Orange County-built on land that was, until a generation ago, cultivated for lima beans-recently surpassed downtown San Francisco as the second-largest employment center in the state.
- New housing tracts have pushed deeper into agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas. Job centers in suburban San Jose and the East Bay area have opened up Tracy, Manteca, Modesto, and other Central Valley towns as "bedroom suburbs," while job growth in the San Fernando Valley has stimulated housing construction 40 miles to the north in the Antelope Valley. This development has created metropolises virtually unmanageable in size.
- Dependence on the automobile has increased. According to the California Energy Commission, between 1970 and 1990 the state's population grew by 50 percent, but the total number of miles traveled by cars and trucks grew by 100 percent.
- Isolation of older communities, including central cities and "first wave" suburbs built in the 1940s and 1950s, has increased. Easy mobility for the middle class has caused them to abandon many older neighborhoods, disrupting social stability and increasing the economic disparity between older communities and newer suburbs. The decentralization of jobs has hit older neighborhoods especially hard, because new jobs are now virtually inaccessible to the poor and the working class. Also left behind are infrastructure investments, which are tremendously expensive to replicate in new suburbs.

Even though the consequences of sprawl have been understood for at least two decades, attempts to combat it have been fragmented and ineffective. The engine of sprawl is fueled by a mix of individual choices, market forces, and government policies, most of which have only become more entrenched over time. These forces include:

- A perception that new suburbs are safer and more desirable than existing communities. Many people believe that suburbs provide them with good value-safe streets, neighborhood schools, a "small-town" atmosphere, close proximity to their local governments, and new (though not necessarily better) community infrastructure.
- A perception that suburbs are cheaper than urban alternatives. Owning a starter home in a distant new suburb is still within the financial reach of a typical family, despite the increased commuting costs. The family's financial equation, however, does not take into account the larger cost to society of far-flung suburbs-a cost the family will eventually share in paying.

- A belief that suburban communities will give businesses more flexibility to grow. Businesses welcome the tax incentives and freedom from heavy regulation that are often provided in newer suburban communities trying to develop a strong business base. Businesses also view suburban locations as safer-a view reflected in the cost of insurance-and they perceive they will have access to a better-educated work force.
- Technological changes that have decentralized employment away from traditional centers. This phenomenon permits dispersal of both jobs and houses across a huge area. The emergence of the "information superhighway" may accelerate this trend.
- Highway and automobile subsidies that have traditionally fueled suburban growth remain in place today. Since the 1950s, automobile use has been encouraged by government-financed road- building programs, and for the most part the "external costs" of automobile use (i.e., air pollution) have not been the direct financial responsibility of the individual motorist.
- Local land-use policies that inadvertently cause sprawl. In many older suburban communities, "slow-growth" attitudes restrict new development, pushing employment and housing growth to the metropolitan fringe. With a lack of regional planning, each community pursues its own self-interests, regardless of costs imposed on other communities.
- Fiscal incentives that encourage local governments to "cherry- pick" land uses based on tax considerations. Under Proposition 13's property-tax limitations, there is little fiscal incentive for many communities to accept affordable housing-and when such housing is built, developers must usually pay heavy development fees. Meanwhile, because communities must raise revenues to provide mandated services, auto dealers and retailers, both big sales-tax producers, receive subsidies to locate in communities.

The result of all these factors is a severe regional imbalance. Housing, jobs, shopping, and other activities are scattered across a huge area and long auto trips are often required to connect them. Such a development pattern imposes a considerable cost on all who use it, though the costs are often hidden and those who pay them are not always aware of it.

THE COST OF SPRAWL

The cost and consequences of sprawl have been documented among academics and planning experts for more than two decades. In the early 1970s, planning consultants Lawrence Livingston and John Blayney produced a landmark study showing that in some cases, a California community would be better off financially if it used a combination of zoning and land acquisition instead of permitting development of low-density subdivisions. A few years later, the U.S. Council on Environmental Quality produced its landmark report, The Cost of Sprawl-the first comprehensive analysis of sprawl's true expense to society. As fiscal and cost-benefit analysis techniques have become more refined, the true cost of sprawl has become much more apparent.

Today, no one in California is unaffected by the cost of sprawl. Its consequences spread across all groups, regardless of geography, race, income, or political status.

Taxpayers

Sprawling suburbs may be cheaper in the short-term for individuals and families who buy houses in new communities, but their "hidden" costs may ultimately be passed on to taxpayers in a variety of ways.

- The cost of building and maintaining highways and other major infrastructure improvements to serve distant suburbs.
- The cost of dealing with social problems that fester in older neighborhoods when they are neglected or abandoned.
- The cost of solving environmental problems (wetlands, endangered species, air pollution, water pollution) caused by development of virgin land on the metropolitan fringe. Taken together, it is clear that all these costs have contributed to California s dire fiscal situation during the 1990s, which has strained state and local government budgets to the breaking point.

Businesses

Many businesses benefit from suburban locations. But all businesses, both small and large, also bear many of the following costs.

- Adverse impacts on the state's business climate. By reducing the quality of life, sprawl has made California a less desirable location for business owners and potential employees. By increasing suburban resistance to further growth, sprawl has made it difficult for businesses to relocate and expand in California. Both these trends increase the attractiveness of neighboring states such as Arizona, Nevada, and Utah. For example, a major film studio recently decided to relocate its animation facility to Arizona, principally because of lower housing prices and less traffic congestion.
- Higher direct business costs and taxes to offset the side-effects of sprawl. This can include the cost of new business infrastructure or of mitigating transportation and environmental problems. For example, in many metropolitan areas, air-quality regulators have forced businesses to take the lead in fighting air pollution by initiating carpooling programs for their employees.
- A geographical mismatch between workers and jobs, leading to higher labor costs and a loss in worker productivity. Many workers must now commute long distances to their jobs, which takes a significant toll on their personal, family and professional life. Many other workers are removed from large portions of the job market simply because they cannot get to where the new jobs are.
- Abandoned investments in older communities, which become economically uncompetitive because of sprawl and its associated subsidies. This is especially true of the state's utility companies, whose investments in gas, electric and water infrastructure are literally rooted in established communities.

Residents of New Suburbs

There is no question that new suburban residents are, in many ways, the principal beneficiaries of suburban sprawl. They often live in new and affordable neighborhoods which they perceive as safe and prosperous. Yet many suburban residents are becoming increasingly aware that they pay a high price for these benefits in the following ways.

- The cost of automobiles. The average Californian spends one dollar out of every five on buying and maintaining their cars. As a consequence they have less to invest or spend on other items.
- Time lost commuting to work and other destinations. A huge number of Californians now spend an hour or more per day in their car, and the number continues to rise. A recent survey by the Walnut Creek-based Contra Costa Times showed that the commute times for residents of 10 cities in Alameda and Contra Costa counties had increased an average of 13 percent between 1980 and 1990.
- The cost of new suburban infrastructure. Suburbs are often perceived as "low-tax" locations, when, in fact, most new suburban homebuyers in California must pay additional taxes (usually Mello-Roos taxes) to cover the massive cost of new roads, schools, and other infrastructure required in new communities. These additional taxes often have the effect of doubling a new homeowner's property tax bill.

Residents of Central Cities and Older Suburbs

Residents of central cities and older suburbs are among the biggest losers in the sprawl process. Once they were among the most fortunate of metropolitan dwellers, because their central location provided access to jobs, shopping, and other amenities. However, sprawl has penalized them by creating or accelerating the following trends:

- Loss of jobs and access to jobs. Residents of older neighborhoods no longer have convenient access to most jobs. This is especially difficult for poor and working-class citizens who must rely on public transportation, because it is difficult to commute to most suburban jobs without a car.
- Economic segregation and loss of social stability. By luring middle-class residents from older neighborhoods, sprawl creates destructive economic segregation and robs those neighborhoods of the social stability that will keep them viable. The distribution of income becomes more skewed, and it becomes increasingly difficult for low-income people to escape poverty.
- Underutilized or abandoned investments. Businesses are not the only entities whose investments can become stranded when city neighborhoods decline. Individual homeowners and small shopowners can also see a stagnation or decline in property values. And this trend is not only visible in the inner city. Huge investments in older suburban shopping centers, for example, are now threatened because these centers are perceived as uncompetitive.

• Shifts in political power and government services. By removing the middle class of all races from older communities, sprawl makes it easier for that middle class to ignore the political and social problems left behind. Thus, revenues fall and it becomes more difficult for older neighborhoods-urban or suburban-to maintain government services, and the incentive for home ownership required to provide the foundation for prosperity.

Farmers

Agriculture remains one of California's leading industries. Yet sprawl continues to take a heavy toll on California agriculture in the following ways.

- A permanent loss of agricultural land. Between 1982 and 1987, the Central Valley-California's leading agricultural region-lost almost a half-million acres of productive farmland. Some of this land can be replaced by bringing new land into agricultural production, but often at a high economic and environmental cost. Also, many of California's micro-climates support unique agricultural products that cannot be replaced by land in other areas. Highly productive coastal agricultural lands lost to sprawl cannot be replaced at any cost.
- A loss in productivity due to pollution. Sprawl-induced ozone pollution alone can reduce crop yields by as much as 30 percent. According to the Agricultural Issues Center at UC Davis, pollution-induced costs to agriculture exceed \$200 million per year.
- A decline in farm communities. As sprawl has eroded agricultural production, the effect on farm communities has been devastating. In some cases, rural communities have been transformed into bedroom suburbs, creating destructive commuting patterns while destroying agriculture infrastructure and productivity.
- Long-term uncertainty. Sprawl destabilizes agriculture by creating the temptation to "sell out." The prospect of eventual sale to a developer reduces incentives for farmers to make long-term capital investments. In many cases, farmers stay afloat financially only by borrowing against the speculative value of their farm for development- creating a self-fulfilling prophecy of sprawl. Another uncertainty for farmers arises from increased demand for water for urban uses driven by sprawl patterns.

The Environment

Traditional development patterns have taken a massive toll on all three basic elements of the natural environment: land, air, and water.

• Land: After 50 years of sprawl, California's metropolitan areas are enormous, reaching deep into natural ecosystems that were thriving even a generation ago. Some 95 percent of the state's wetlands have been destroyed over the last 200 years, and the few wetlands that remain are threatened. Also, California now has the highest number of candidate and listed endangered species of any state-partly because sprawl is affecting the state's unmatched diversity of biological systems. Sprawl makes it more difficult to resolve these land conservation issues by putting tremendous development pressure on the supply of remaining open land. Finally, sprawl compromises one of the most essential assets of California-the beauty and drama of its landscape. Far from being just a luxury, this value

of open space is an important component in the state's ability to attract and hold workers and investors.

- Air: California has the worst air quality in the nation, and air pollution experts estimate that a third of all air pollution emissions are traceable to car and truck emissions exacerbated by longer commutes and higher auto use. The South Coast Air Quality Management District, which has the strictest air-pollution regulations in the country, estimates that air pollution in the four-county Los Angeles area costs \$7.4 billion per year, or about \$600 per resident. Dramatic gains in pollution technology are likely to be offset by further sprawl. According to air pollution expert J.V. Hall, "The benefits of pollution-reduction technology can easily be overwhelmed by our choices about where to live and work, about modes of travel, and about how many miles we drive."
- Water: Sprawl takes a serious toll on California's water supply. Forty of the state's 350 groundwater basins are seriously overdrafted, and water planners predict that by 2020 the state will face a water supply deficit of between 2 million and 8 million acre-feet. Though not the sole cause, fringe development does make the water issue more expensive and complicated to manage.

BEYOND SPRAWL

In the postwar era, the continuous cycle of suburban sprawl-counter-productive as it was in many ways-actually helped to fuel California's prosperity, as consumption of new houses and new cars became one of the bases of our prosperity. It is clear, however, that the new California cannot sustain old patterns of urban development, if the state is to prosper in the future.

The sponsors of this report-Bank of America, the California Resources Agency, Greenbelt Alliance, and the Low-Income Housing Fund-firmly believe that California cannot succeed unless the state moves beyond sprawl. Strong policy direction from our political leaders on both the state and local level is essential. But government policies alone will not help California move forward. Our businesses, our community groups, and our citizens must also take the initiative. We must understand how sprawl affects each of us individually, how it impedes the state's progress, and how it could make a prosperous future more difficult to achieve.

Population growth will require some degree of development on the suburban fringe. The question is whether we will be able to use existing urban and suburban land more efficiently in order to minimize sprawl and protect valuable open spaces. The answers will lie in our ability to attract housing and businesses to older urban and suburban areas and to channel development on the fringe to achieve the desired protection and economic benefits.

California businesses cannot compete globally when they are burdened with the costs of sprawl. An attractive business climate cannot be sustained if the quality of life continues to decline and the cost of financing real estate development escalates. People in central cities and older suburbs cannot become part of the broader economy if sprawl continues to encourage disinvestment, and the state can neither afford to ignore nor fully subsidize these neglected areas.

California must find a new development model. We must create more compact and efficient development patterns that accommodate growth, yet help maintain California's environmental balance and its economic competitiveness. And we must encourage everyone in California to propose and create solutions to sprawl.

A do-nothing approach, in effect, constitutes a policy decision in favor of the status quo. This, in fact, has been the de facto direction for the last generation. While the state and the regions have created a leadership void in this area, many local governments have stepped in with their own policies, which often have served to promote sprawl rather than prevent it. Recent research has shown that individual local growth-control policies do not stop development, but merely deflect it- often to another area further out on the metropolitan fringe, where the cost of development is even greater. The question is not whether to address sprawl. The question is how to address it.

In the early 1990's, the California Legislature convened a consensus project on growth management, and in 1991 Governor Wilson formed a cabinet-level council charged with developing a plan on how the state should address the challenge. A great deal of good work was done and agreement was reached in some areas. These processes did not result in legislative action, but a good foundation of understanding has been established.

As was stated at the outset, this report is not meant to be a manual or a tactical "how-to" on changing development patterns in California. Rather, it is meant as a wake-up call to all Californians that the sprawl issue has a new urgency in the state, and that all of us can play a role in addressing the problem.

To succeed, we will have to set aside individual interests, build on the foundation that has been laid, and work for the good of the whole. We need to address sprawl through community action, public policy, private business practices, and individual behavior. It is our intent that the ideas and examples that follow will be used as a basis for further refinement and concerted action.

First, more certainty is needed in delineating where new development should and should not occur. Sprawl occurs partly because current policy constrains the real estate market by rewarding "leapfrog" development driven by cheaper and more easily developed land on the metropolitan and suburban fringe. The alternative is to be more explicit about conservation and development priorities, targeting actions and policies for better integration of the two.

Using this approach means utilizing land at the suburban fringe more efficiently and encouraging the reuse of land and other development opportunities in already developed areas. It does not mean stopping growth at the fringe, but doing it at density levels that will not promote further sprawl. To succeed, this approach needs more effective public policies encouraging such compact growth and removing barriers to it.

However, the other side of certainty for developers requires commitments to conserve ecologically important habitats and other open space. Accelerating statewide planning efforts such as Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP), which involves voluntary action at the local level and requires consensus among development, environmental, community and local government interests, will enhance our ability to provide greater environmental and economic certainty regarding new development. With its emphasis on biological assessment, ecosystem protection and compatible economic development, NCCP can provide much greater certainty to both those who want to develop their property and those who want to protect the natural environment. Broader use of mitigation banks can facilitate market-based compensation to landowners who choose to help protect ecologically valuable land.

Conservation of other habitat and open space, such as prime agricultural land, will also require us to find creative approaches like the NCCP process. The newly established California

Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES) will help this process by expanding access to data about important resources in the state.

Regardless of the methods used, much of the leadership for providing greater certainty for conservation and development must come from the state, regional agencies, and local governments working together. But private businesses also have a critical role. Especially in difficult economic times, real estate developers and their lenders know that certainty of approval and availability of infrastructure, rather than speculative leapfrogging, will reduce costs and reduce processing time. Thus, new real estate developments can be brought to market more quickly and cheaply within areas where effective consensus plans for conservation and development have been created.

Second, we should make more efficient use of land that has already been developed. Older urban and suburban neighborhoods should be reinforced as good places to live and do business, and the process should take place without displacing low-income residents. Sprawl occurs partly because of the perception that older neighborhoods are dangerous, expensive, obsolete, unpleasant, or otherwise unacceptable to those who have the option of leaving. The result is a tragic neglect of both people and capital investments.

Older neighborhoods must be maintained and improved so they are again desirable places to live and work. Old Town Pasadena, the South of Market area in San Francisco, and the train depot reconstruction in Sacramento are all prime examples of successful restoration projects. Better school systems, job training and access to capital for small businesses are prerequisites. These efforts require a combination of government policy initiatives, active business investment, and special efforts by individuals and community groups.

Attracting jobs is absolutely critical. State and local governments should adopt land-use and transportation policies that reinforce investments in older neighborhoods. Incentives must be developed for job- creating businesses, homebuyers, and others willing to invest in older neighborhoods. For example, Superfund laws can be made more sensible so existing industrial sites can be recycled into new uses. Investors can make more aggressive use of low income housing tax credits. Wider use can be made of Enterprise Zones. And tax credits or other incentives can be established for lending and equity investments that support small businesses and job growth. Development on the fringe imposes infrastructure, pollution and social costs well in excess of assessed development fees. If we rationalize development and control the costs of sprawl, it will free up capital that can be reinvested into existing cities and suburbs.

Older communities themselves need to make their neighborhoods attractive to job creating and housing investments. Individuals and community groups in those areas should redouble their efforts to improve the quality of urban life in small ways, for example, by forming community-based crime prevention groups and supporting local community development efforts that will enhance their neighborhoods.

Home ownership at all income levels needs to be encouraged. In general, those who own homes have the greatest interest in maintaining neighborhood vitality. Public policy should support methods of keeping low-income people from displacement through development of affordable housing (both home ownership and rental) and provision of supportive services. Also if developers are to provide quality housing in existing neighborhoods, they need protection from frivolous environmental and product liability suits.

The closing of military bases in California offers interesting potential for development. Bases have substantial potential as alternatives to building houses and job centers on the suburban fringe. While there are problems associated with redeveloping many bases, they also have excellent potential for showcasing how to resolve difficult urban rebuilding strategies.

Third, a legal and procedural framework should be established to create the desired certainty and send the right economic signals to investors. Four elements are needed.

(a) Where development is allowed, state and local permitting should be streamlined. This is critical to encouraging development in urban and older suburban areas. It may require changes to legislation that relates to permitting.

(b) Development at the metropolitan fringe should be required to pay the full marginal cost of development. Housing and business space on the metropolitan fringe is often inexpensive because those developments pay for local infrastructure, but do not pay the full cost of constructing roads, developing water supplies, mitigating environmental problems, and creating regional imbalances. Imposing such costs on those developments would discourage sprawl. For example, the city of Lancaster adopted an innovative program that requires new development to pay capital and operating costs of infrastructure. Development further out pays its full cost, while development that is closer to the city's center pays much less, since it is tied in to existing city services.

Again, this is a task that requires the active participation of both government and business. For example, many government agencies, such as water suppliers, subsidize development on the metropolitan fringe by spreading the cost of their infrastructure across all users, new and old. Changing such policies would discourage sprawl.

Failing to levy the full marginal cost gives leapfrog development an unfair competitive advantage over projects in existing urban areas, where transactions are made more difficult and expensive by toxic waste and other environmental liability issues. Expanding environmental audits to include wetlands, endangered species, and other issues-a practice that is already beginning-would also discourage sprawl by including the full assessment of environmental cost in private real estate transactions.

(c) California's local governments should encourage more efficient and coordinated local landuse policies. Sprawl has been encouraged by tax revenue competition among local governments for some land uses, such as retail centers, and by slow-growth policies that discourage other land uses, such as housing.

Development patterns that are now truly regional are being created almost completely by an accumulation of local decisions. But some local governments are beginning to show that it is possible to work together toward consistent land-use policies when given the incentive to do so. In planning for the reuse of closed military bases, for example, local governments are forming "joint powers authorities" in which many jurisdictions work together toward a common goal.

The vast majority of Californians choose to locate in large metropolitan areas. But most of these people live in small, politically independent suburban jurisdictions. These local governments must work together toward a consistent set of land-use policies-such as discouraging development on the metropolitan fringe and reinforcing investments in transit systems-that will enhance economic opportunity and quality of life across the entire metropolitan area. Joint

powers authorities, such as those created for military base reuse, should be viewed as one model for cooperative planning, and others are needed.

(d) Technological change should be used to combat sprawl rather than encourage it. In the past, technological advancements (such as automobiles and government-sponsored freeways) have supported sprawl, requiring expensive after-the-fact government action of questionable value (such as ridesharing requirements). Today we stand at the threshold of a new technological era that offers the opportunity to have more work done at home and in local communities. We must take advantage of the opportunities presented by the information superhighway to improve our land-use patterns rather than further destroy them.

For example, the information superhighway could end up encouraging a further decentralization of jobs to the metropolitan fringe. Freed of a daily commute to a large employment center, some individuals and small businesses will seek to locate in distant suburbs and travel back to older urban centers to do business as needed. This trend could put more pressure on land at the fringe.

However, the telecommunications revolution can also hold the potential for reviving economically troubled areas. Because of its locational flexibility, telecommunications can provide new job prospects for older urban neighborhoods and for rural towns. Both government policy and private business practice should encourage the use of telecommunications to reinforce existing communities rather than further dissipate them.

Fourth, we should forge a constituency to build sustainable communities. Past efforts to reduce sprawl have been hampered because little constituency exists beyond groups of government reformers, some local government leaders, community groups, and conservationists. But, as this report suggests, many other players in California's future will also find themselves increasingly stifled by sprawl. Political alliances must be forged between environmentalists, inner-city community advocates, business leaders, government experts, farmers, and suburbanites to improve the quality of life in all our existing communities and protect our resources.

This will not be an easy task. Most of these groups are focused on their specific agendas and often harbor animosity toward each other even though alliances make long-term strategic sense. But it is possible. For example, environmentalists concerned about development at the suburban fringe have tremendous opportunities to work with governments and community organizations seeking to increase investment in more central urban areas. Farmers seeking a long-term future in agriculture near an urban area can form very effective alliances with those working to protect resources. Community groups, government agencies, and builders can explore new marketing and funding options that support homebuilding closer to major transit lines, taking advantage of the huge demand for housing created by the state's dramatically changing demographics. Taxpayers concerned about the inefficiency of governmental expenditures can join with those working to make better use of infrastructure in existing urban areas. There are literally dozens of such alliances waiting to be created.

We must act now. The decisions we make in the next few years will determine California's future course-and its chances for success. To build a strong economy and retain a good quality of life for the 21st Century, we must move beyond sprawl to a new vision of community in the few remaining years of the 20th Century.

Acknowledgments

All of the report's conclusions may not be endorsed in their entirety by each of the four sponsors. At the same time, each of the organizations believes that the time to act is now and that this report can help advance the public dialogue about California's growth and development.

The sponsors are grateful for the assistance provided by Steven Moss and his associates at the consulting firm of M. Cubed for developing much of the basic research behind this paper. We are also indebted to William Fulton for conceptualizing and drafting the paper. His clarity of vision helped consolidate our thinking into a comprehensive whole. If you would like to comment on the paper, or obtain additional copies, please contact any of the following sponsors:

Bank of America Environmental Policies and Programs #5800 PO Box 37000 San Francisco, CA 94137 (415) 622-8154

California Resources Agency The Resources Building Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 653-5656

Greenbelt Alliance

116 New Montgomery, Suite 640 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 543-4291

The Low Income Housing Fund 605 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 777-9804

Originally published on the Bank of America's Web site. Copyright © 1996, BankAmerica Corporation.

Newsweek Magazine

Bye-Bye, Suburban Dream

May 14, 1995

Phoenix Sprawls into the desert at the rate of an acre an hour. Greater New York City stretches clear into Pennsylvania. Strip malls, traffic, fear of crime have wrecked the tranquil 'burbs of Ozzie and Harriet's time. How can we bring civility back to Suburban life?

PAVED PARADISE

The "new urbanists' are going back to the future to take the edge off edge cities. They want to bring small-town charm to blighted metropolitan landscapes.

Viewed from the air, there's no apparent reason why a city like Phoenix, Ariz. already the seventh largest in the nation, couldn't keep growing forever. Four times a year, a pilot from Landiscor, an aerial-surveying company, flies over the city at 20,000 feet, snapping pictures to be assembled into vast photographic maps. They show the white boxes of downtown, the graceful loop of the freeways as they intersect and sort themselves out by compass point, and the gleaming roofs of suburbia stretching to the horizon in nested curves of roads, streets, drives and lanes. The pictures from the end of March show .5,000 more houses than the ones taken three months earlier. Houses squeeze through the gap between two Indian reservations and follow the highways into the desert, which they are consuming at an acre an hour. Excluding federal land, the only thing standing in the way of Phoenix's swallowing the rest of the state, says Michael Fifield, director of the Joint Urban Design Program of Arizona State University, is Tucson.

Unless, that is, you subscribe to the view of former mayor Terry. Goddard, that Phoenix is approaching the marginal disutility of suburban sprawl. This is the point at which each new subdivision subtracts more from the quality Of life than the new inhabitants will contribute to the economy by buying wind chimes, mesquite logs and Nayajo-motif throw rugs. Many other places in the country are coming round to this view Most suburbs are exploding in size without even

WONDER TOWN

Some people consider such communities too cute, but cuteness is the glue that holds them together at five units an acre.

the compensation of economic growth: the Cleveland metropolitan area expanded by a third between 1970 and 1990 even as its population declined. Over roughly' the same period, California's population increased by 40 percent while the total of vehicle-miles driven doubled. Maintaining a fleet of cars to navigate among the housing tracts, commercial strips and office complexes of the American landscape now takes 18 percent of the average family budget.

As anyone who reads the fiction in The Now Yorker knows. Americans mostly live in banal places with the souls of shopping malls, affording nowhere to mingle except traffic jams, nowhere to walk except in the health club. By itself, this hasn't been a reason to stop building suburbs. But economic unsustainability may carry more weight. A conference on "Alternatives to Sprawl" at the Brookings Institution this year was electrified by a report from the Bank of America endorsing the formerly elitist view that sprawl in California has created "enormous social, environmental and economic costs, which until now have been hidden, ignored, or quietly borne by society . . . Businesses suffer from higher costs, a loss in worker productivity, and underutilized investments in older communities." "You can't keep spreading out." says Mike Burton, executive director of Port-kind. Ore.'s metropolitan government, Metro. "The cost to make roads and sewers gets to the point where it doesn't work."

The challenge is to devise an alternative to sprawl, where people can envision their children playing in the streets. It must not evoke "the city." an alien place where by definition middle-class Americans refuse to live. So a growing corps of visionaries. of which the best-known are Miami-based architects Andres Duany and his wife and partner, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, are looking to an even older model-the "village," defined as a cluster of houses around a central place that is the focus of civic life. Under the banner of "new urbanism," they have promulgated some surprisingly simple and obvious rules for building better suburbs described in detail on the following pages. They can be roughly summarized in these three principles:

Density: A typical modern suburb may have one to two dwelling units per acre, and is laid out entirely for the convenience of the automobile. The new urbanism strives for five or six units per acre, including a mix of housing types: detached houses. row houses, apartments, "granny fiats" tucked away, above the garages. In theory and the new urbanism still exists mostly in theory--the village would extend no more than a quarter-mile from the center to the edge and include a transit stop and a place to buy a quart of milk and a newspaper (actually, probably, a decaf latte and a copy of The Kenyon Review, but the point is the same).

Civic space: Suburbs--except for the streets-consist of almost exclusively private space, much of it devoted to the single most useless form of plant life in all botany, the ornamental lawn. A suburb is a place that's two-thirds grass but with nowhere for kids to play ball, except in the streets. Communities need parks and outdoor public spaces in which people can gather and interact.

NO STREET OF DREAMS

The "dvic center" of many suburbs, designed for the convenience of the car, is a strip mall along a six-lane highway. **Mandatory design codes:** Obviously, no one with a choice in the matter would want to look out his window at a 7-Eleven. New urbanist practitioners impose elaborate design and zoning controls intended to create harmonious streetscapes. The results can be intensively cute and not to the taste of people unaccustomed to seeing dormers, gables and porticoes on every building. But cuteness is the glue that holds neighborhoods together at five units per acre.

Like most visionary architectural schemes, this idea has sold more books than houses. Its principles were known to planners early in the century, when such charming communities as Scarsdale, N.Y., Mariemont, Ohio, and Lake Forest, Ill., were built. But they were forgotten in the postwar rush to build suburbs on the same principles of efficiency that had been employed in constructing army bases. Their first new application came a decade ago, when Duany and Plater-Zyberk drew up plans for a small resort town on the Florida panhandle, called Seaside. Seaside--with its cozy, narrow streets, its jumble of pastel homes with mandatory front porches -- is probably the most influential resort community since Versailles. Prince Charles noted it approvingly in his BBC special on architecture. Since then other "neotraditional" developments have been built in places as far-flung as suburban Maryland (Kentlands. also planned by Duany and Plater-Zyberk) and the outskirts of Sacramento, Calif. (Laguna West. planned by Peter Calthorpe of San Francisco). But the real test of this idea will come in about a year, when the Disney Co. opens its first planned community ever, Celebration, Fla., on a 5,000-acre swath of land near Disney World. After considering a typical subdivision built around a golf course, the company opted for a plan which vice president Wing Chad described as "traditional little-town America."

"SEASIDE' PLANNER

American city planning went to hell during World War II, says Andres Duany, the architect who, with his wife and partner, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk. designed the neotraditionalist town of Seaside, Fla. "Any townplanning text prior to 1935," he says, "has references to social Issues, to technical issues, to esthetic issues." But after the war, specialists and bean counters took over it. Was as if America had suffered a stroke. "We lost language, we lost the ability to think complexity." As a result, "the suburbs we have are cartoons of planning."

Celebration will either validate the new urbanism with the imprimatur of Disney--"safe for middleclass consumption"-- or prove the point of its critics, that it's a plot to lure unwitting citizens into living in theme parks.

You can look at Phoenix as a pretty good example of what the new urbanism is up against. It is among the five fastest-growing metropolises in the country, and few places are as relentlessly suburban in character. It has a downtown so exiguous that a pedestrian outside its biggest office building at 9 on a weekday morning is a phenomenon as singular as a cow in Times Square. Meanwhile the new subdivisions race each other toward the mountains. Del Webb Corp., a major national developer, recently won approval over heated opposition for a 5,600-acre project in New River, 80 miles north of downtown and at least 10 miles beyond the outer edge of existing development. The environment, which to developers used to just be the stuff they knocked

down to make room for houses, is now a cherished selling point. There is a catch, according to Frances Emma Barwood, a city council member who represents most of the sparsely populated northeast quadrant of Phoenix: "The people who bought houses in Phase One [of a popular development] were told they'd be surrounded by beautiful lush deserts, hut instead they're surrounded by Phases Two and Three."

Left behind in this rush to embrace nature are thousands of 1960s-era ranch houses that are too old, small and unfashionable to attract middle-class buyers, and as a result are turning into that new American phenomenon, the suburban slum. This may be the fate of an area called Maryvale, which like all west-side suburbs suffers from the competitive disadvantage that commuters must drive into the sun both ways. Interspersed among the houses are large tracts of vacant land, dreary commercial strips and a mall, once the cynosure of a thriving neighborhood, now dark and empty. "For the same money that Del Webb is spending in New River, I'll bet they could buy up most of this area and rebuild it," Goddard says. "What is the imperative that says we have to go to a beautiful rural area when we have all this land a few miles from downtown? We're destroying ourselves in shorter and shorter cycles."

The imperative, as Goddard well knows, is "the market." To build in an existing neighborhood, says Jack Gleason, a senior vice president at Del Webb, is to "run against the market, instead of with it." Banks are reluctant to lend to such "infill" projects because they have no assurance the houses will sell. A prime engine of Phoenix's growth apparently consists of middle-aged couples fleeing California. This is a market, Gleason notes, heavily driven by "security," the polite term for "fear." "Fear of crime is a great motivator for development," says Joe Verdoorn, a Phoenix planner. "Everybody wants to be on the far side of the fleeway."

So the new subdivisions go up behind ocher-colored stucco walls six feet high, with guards and gates between the public roads and the inner sanctum of residential streets. Other kinds of barriers defend something nearly as dear to suburbanites as their own skins, property values. Homeowners are isolated by design from apartments, shops, public squares or anything else that might attract people with less money or of a different race. Deed

DON'T FENCE ME IN

To run with the market is to develop virgin land farther out, not to rebuild dying communities closer to the city.

restrictions and community associations see to it that no one will ever bring down the tone of the neighborhood by turning his living room into a beauty parlor. Success for a development lies in freezing for eternity the social and economic class of the original purchasers.

No wonder they're so sterile-sterility is designed into them! Anything else is a threat to the steady appreciation of resale value homeowning Americans take as a basic economic right. You drive down the wide, curving streets of Terravita, in north Scottsdale, whose sales slogan is "The Harmony of Land and Life," and the only signs of "Life" are the saguaro cactuses, which accrue at the rate of about an inch a year. The houses themselves are magnificent monuments to family life: thoughtfully designed, carefully constructed, with master bath suites the size of the Oval Office, but the face they turn to the street is the blank brown plane of a three-car garage.

To even think of changing this culture is an enormous task. It runs counter to the dominant ideology of free-market economics, which in its reductive fashion holds that developers by definition are building what people want to buy. "There is this strange conceit among architects," says Peter Gordon, a professor of economics at the University of Southern California, "that people ought to live in what they design. If you look at how people really want to live in this country, suburbanization is not the problem, it is the solution." And for that matter, Oscar Newman, a celebrated New York-based urban planner, describes the new urbanism as "a retrogressive sentimentality." American families typically live in a neighborhood for three to five years, forming communities based not on common birthplace but on interest: young singles, families with children, "active adults." Who among us, Newman asks, really wants to re-create the social ambience of an 18th-century village? He thinks the suburbs need more exclusivity, gates and barriers where none exist already, recognizing that most of us are going to live among strangers for most of our lives.

On the other hand, people can buy only what's for sale. The housing market is notoriously conservative and conformist, if for no other reason than that most people expect to sell their houses someday. Perhaps more people would choose to live in urban villages if they were exposed to them. "if you ask people if they want "density,' they' will always say no," says Peter Katz, author of "The New Urbanism." "But if you ask if they want restaurants and schools and other things close to where they live, they say yes." But you couldn't build a village in most places in the country even if you wanted to. Suburban sprawl is built into the zoning codes of most communities and the lending policies of virtually every bank. For new villages to become a reality, they will have to get past a phalanx of planning boards and bank officers, whose first principle is, "Nobody ever lost his job for following the code."

We are, nevertheless, on the verge of a great opportunity. Americans moved to the suburbs for the best of motives--to give their children better schools, cleaner air, a place to ride their bicycles without getting their tires caught in the trolley tracks. Suburbs should teem with life, with humanity in all its diversity (or as much diversity as you can find within one standard deviation of the median family income)--with people walking, running, biking, rocking. But their design has promoted instead the ideals of privacy and exclusivity: the clapboard-sided ranch house, evocative of empty plains; the brick colonial, hinting at descent from the Virginia aristocracy. We can continue the trend of the last 40 years, which Gopal Ahluwalia, director of research for the National

Association of Homebuilders, complacently describes as bigger houses, with more amenities. situated farther from the workplace. Or we can go down a different path, which probably will begin with the kind of humble observation a visitor made at a subdivision near Phoenix recently. Like most new developments, this one aimed to conserve water for important uses-namely the golf course--by landscaping the houses with gavel and cactus rather than lawns. As the visitor paced the lot with a puzzled look, it suddenly dawned on him that the desire for an acre of land is not an unvarying constituent of human nature. "Gee." he remarked wonderingly to a saleswoman. "if it's all gravel, you don't really need that much of it, do you?"

Population Distribution

Since 1970, there have been more people in U.S. suburbs than in central cities or rural areas.

Source: Bureau of the Census

The Expanded Metropolis

Phoenix has sprawled almost tenfold since 1950.

1994 Area of city: 449.8 sq.mi. Population: 1,052,000

1970 Area of city: 247.8 sq.mi. Population: 584,000

1950 Area of city: 17.1 sq.mi Population: 107,000

Source: City of Phoenix Planning Dept.

With MAGGIE MALONE and PATRICK ROGERS in New York. NINA ARCHER BIDDLE in Memphis. SPENCER REISS in Miami. JEANNE GORDON in Los Angeles. PAUL RANDALL in San Francisco and DANIEL GLICK in Washington. Newsweek Magazine

Bye-Bye, Suburban Dream

May 14, 1995

15 Ways to Fix The Suburbs

Most of us actually know what we want in a neighborhood-we just don't know how to get it, because developers have been building the wrong thing for 50 years. Here's how to get our communities back on track.

For decades, Anton Nelesson of Rutgers University has been using the tools of science to pursue that most elusive and subjective quality, happiness. When a developer comes into a community, humbly seeking permission to re-create ancient Pompeii on the site of an old Go Karl track, the town's planners commission Nelesson to survey the populace and determine if that's what they'd actually like there. Using photographs, models and questionnaires, Nelesson has surveyed people all over the country, and these are some of the things he's found:

- "Everybody will call for a green open space in the middle-that's automatic. They will put the major community buildings around the plaza, then group the houses on relatively narrow streets. Ninety-nine percent don't want streets that are more than two lanes wide. At the edges of the village they leave open space."
- "With two working spouses, [smaller lots] make a lot more sense. You don't want to mow that big lawn."
- People have a fundamental, psychological, spiritual response to nature. If you show them recently built multi-family housing or office parks, they go negative. A small, traditional neighborhood is what people want, They don't know how to get it."

Well, of course they don't: most of them haven't even seen a "small, traditional neighborhood" in years, if ever. But they instinctively choose it anyway. The premise of the new urbanism is that people can have the kinds of neighborhoods they say they like. Architects know how to design them, developers can build them, banks can make money on them. All it takes is a measure of political will to overcome the inertia of 50 years of doing things the wrong way... and the application of a few simple rules.

Give Up Big Lawns

1 One useful way to define a suburb is "a place that grows lawns." The great postwar disillusionment began for many Americans when they left the city in search of a simpler life and discovered that watering, fertilizing, weeding and mowing the measliest yard takes more time over a year than the average New Yorker spends looking for parking. And the expanses of front lawn themselves serve no purpose but their owners' vanity except that most suburban communities require them, on the theory, that large setbacks help preserve the bucolic character of a community.

That may have been true in the 1920s, when suburbs were being settled 80 houses at a time. But when highways opened up huge areas of countryside after the war, large-lot zoning had the opposite effect: by spreading population over a larger area, it accelerated sprawl. If zoning boards weren't so fearful of "density," they could require developers to cluster houses and set aside land nearby for open space and recreation. This is also a more efficient way to build a community. Houses that are 100 feet apart, obviously, have 100 feet of unused road and utility lines between them. School buses have that much farther to travel.

And the goal of making a walkable community is defeated when houses are spread out on huge lots. Even the depth of the front yard turns out to make a crucial psychological difference. When houses are set back behind 30 feet of lawn, the streetscape becomes oppressively desolate; your perspective changes so slowly you don't feel you're reaching a destination. Probably no single change would improve the quality of suburban life as much as shrinking the size of lots--and it would actually make houses cheaper.

Bring Back the Corner Store

2 The suburban condition, says architect Peter Calthorpe, "is a landscape of absolute segregation . . . not just in terms of income, age or ethnicity. but simple functional uses." This is so obvious that most people no longer see the absurdity of making a five-mile round trip for a loaf of bread. That is, as long as they have a car; for anyone not so blessed children, the elderly or handicapped, people who can't afford a car for every member of the family- it's nuts.

Again, this is a function of good intentions undone by the explosion of suburbia. What worked in a compact neighborhood in a city-a dry- cleaner, a drugstore. a corner grocery--became grotesque when blown up a hundredfold and applied to whole counties. Shopping strips stretched for dozens of miles along the highways, while the curving streets of suburbia wormed their way ever deeper into the countryside.

Obviously, malls and supermarkets, with their vast selections and economies of scale. will never be supplanted by neighborhood shopping streets and corner groceries. But it still should be possible to provide some of the necessities of life within walking distance of many people. Then you could send your kid out for that bread -- and a newspaper while he's at it.

Make the Streets Skinny

3 Modern subdivisions are designed to be driven, not walked. Even little-used streets are 36 feet or 40 feet wide, with big sweeping curves at the corners. It's great for cars: traffic barely needs to slow down. But for those on foot, the distance is daunting. Narrow streets--as little as 26 feet wide - and tight, right-angled corners are a lot easier for walkers, and probably safer as well, because they force drivers to slow down. One objection: fire departments worry about getting trucks through. But that hasn't been a big problem in old nabes in cities like New York and Boston.



Drop the Cul-De-Sac

4 The cul-de-sac, a fancy term for "dead end." has emerged as the street plan of choice for modern suburbs. Its great advantage the elimination of through traffic is also its weakness, because it compels everyone in a given subdivision to use the same few roads, often at the same times. Anyone attempting to travel on foot or by bicycle will eventually wind up on the shoulder of a busy highway and probably give up. But streets don't have to be like that: they can follow predictable routes and interconnect. This gives motorists a choice of routes, so they don't all pile up every morning waiting to make a left turn at the same intersection.

Draw Boundaries

5 In an absolute sense, there is no real shortage of land in the United States; if the entire population lived on an acre of land per household, it would occupy less than 5 percent of the contiguous 48 states (plus all of Canada and Mexico for parking). But in the regions where Americans actually want to live. they are swarming into the countryside, covering whole counties with "edge cities" flung outward from the beltways as if by centrifugal force. New York City's suburbs reach across the whole state ot' New Jersey into eastern Pennsylvania, nearly 100 miles from Times Square. To newurbanist theoreticians, this is the disastrous result of shortsighted government policies, such as the bias in the federal mortgage-guarantee program toward detached houses on large plots of land. To flee-market economists, it represents the sum of millions of choices by informed individuals who have decided that, on balance, getting up before dawn in Bucks County beats a full night's sleep in Brooklyn.

LEADING NEW URBANIST

Nothing irks Peter Calthorpe more than "naysayers who say that Americans don't want to live in high-density cities--they want suburbs, as though there were only two choices!" According to the San Francisco architect, "The answer is to understand there are a huge number of people with different lifestyles. There are different densities in new urbanism, some low, some high. Neighborhoods that have diversity--cafes, recreation, casual social encounters--will be increasingly important. Suburbs aren't just about bedrooms anymore."

But sprawl is not a necessary component of affluence. In Europe and Japan, governments have proclaimed "urban-growth boundaries," beyond which development is more or less prohibited. Even in a democratic country such as Holland, a businessman seeking to live on a farm and drive into the city to work would have to request permission from the government-and he might not get it. Try telling that to Lee lacocca. Contrary to popular American political theory, these regulations haven't noticeably affected the prosperity of Western Europe--nor of the one major American city that has instituted its own urban-growth boundary: Portland, Ore.

In Oregon, naturally, no one would prevent the hypothetical businessman from living on a farm; he just couldn't sell it off for a subdivision when he retired to Palm Springs. More than 20 years ago, planners for the Portland metropolitan area drew a line around 325 square miles--covering 24 municipalities and parts of three counties-and designated it to receive virtually all population growth. Along the way they have reduced the average lot size for detached houses from 13,000 square feet to an average of 8.500 square feetroughly the difference between putting three and five units on an acre. The proposed future goal is an even mingier 6,600 square feet. Between now and the year 2040, Portland's planners expect the population to grow some 77 percent, but they are committed to an increase of residential land use of only 6 percent. Instead of planting more "edge cities" at the arbitrary points where freeways intersect, Portland has concentrated job growth in its downtown. The urban-growth boundary has been so successful that even a conservative property-rights group, Oregonians in Action, endorses the concept (although it argues with some details). Imagine how Los Angeles would look today if it had done this 20 years ago.

Hide the Garage

6 Most suburban houses give the appearance that they are first of all places to park, turning to the world the blank and desolate face of a garage door. Neighborhoods look more pleasant when garages are put behind the houses, accessible by side yards or by alleys.

Mix Housing Types

7 Of all the ways to improve the social and physical organization of the suburbs. none would be as subversive as breaking the monopoly of single-family detached homes: that endless alternation of "Crestwoods" and "Auroras" intended to foster the illusion of preference in buyers' choosing between four bedrooms and three bedrooms plus a den. Homogeneity is the very essence of the suburbs. Attached houses, rental units, shops or businesses-anything that might attract traffic and its attendant evil, a decline in property values--are banned.

This is a fairly new phenomenon in human history. For most of the last 9,000 years, most people inhabited villages, where by definition nothing was very far from anything else. As late as the 1940s, for that matter, Memphis,. Tenn., developer Henry, Turley grew up in the End of haphazard city neighborhood that is the despair of sensible planners: a jumble of stores, shacks, flats, walk-ups and decaying mansions. all suffused with the vivid street life neighbors made for themselves in the era before air conditioning lured them indoors. It is, course, beyond the power of zoning to bring back those days. even if we wanted them back. But it may be possible to recapture some of the energy and spirit that characterized American civic life before television clamped its monopoly on public discourse and entertainment. So in 1987 when Turley bought a 135-acre vacant plot on an island in the Mississippi five minutes from downtown Memphis. he embarked on a radically different kind of development, which began not by asking "What will the county let me builds?" or "What will the banks finance?" but "What kind of place do people want to live in?"

The result was Harbor Town, intended to be "a slice of the world--the more complete and varied the better." There are houses ranging in price from \$114,000 to \$425,000, which contrasts with a typical subdivision in Phoenix, Ariz., for example, where the seven basic models run the gamut from \$271,990 to \$316,990. There are town houses and apartments, and shops being planned. Developers had tried mixing housing types in the "planned communities" of the 1970s, but in those each use was isolated in its own thousand-acre quadrant; in Harbor Town they are all within a few blocks of each other. Turley seems to have decreed that instead of golf, the leading recreational activity would be chatting with neighbors while watching the sun set over the river, so he set the houses close together and built cozy village squares. The houses themselves are an eye-popping collection of styles, including Charlestown provincial, Cape Cod and Bauhaus modern, but they have an underlying unity based on materials (mostly clapboard or wood siding) and the ubiquitous new-urbanist amenity, porches. Turley expects to make money on the project, when it's completed in 1997, but he also has a higher aim. "Democracy assumes-demands-that we know, Understand and respect our fellow citizens," he says. "How can we appreciate them if we never see them?"

Plant Trees Curbside

8 Nothing humanizes a street more than a row of trees shading the sidewalk. But they must be broad-leafed shade trees such as sycamores or chestnuts, not the dinky globular things like flowering pears that developers favor in parking lots. And they should be planted out at the curbline, where they will grow out to form a canopy over the roadway. Why don't more places have such an obvious amenity already? Because traffic engineers worry that people might drive into them.

Put New Life Into Old Malls

9 They've got fountains, hanging ferns and ice rinks, and if you stay in one long enough you may eventually hear "Wichita Lineman" rescored for 140 violins, but most shopping malls are, essentially, just vast sheds that consumers trudge through until, with nothing left to spend, they are spit out into the parking lot. No wonder people are so quick to desert them when a bigger one opens up down the road. Ghost malls are no longer a rare sight in America. Phoenix has at least two, including one right across the street from several of its largest office buildings. But the land they occupy can, with some ingenuity and a lot of money, become the nucleus of a real neighborhood, an architectural adornment rather than a hulking blight.

The process is happening first with strip shopping centers. which are usually older than enclosed malls and less complex architecturally. The first step is to transcend the definition of a "shopping center" as a grouping of unrelated stores in the middle of a parking lot. That pretty much described the New Seabury, Shopping Center, a dreary 1960s-era strip mall on a busy highway in Cape Cod, Mass., about 70 miles from Boston. A decade ago, the owners decided to redevelop it on a radically different scheme, modeled on a New England town. New streets were hid out in what had been the parking lot: new shops were built in the neglected area behind the existing ones. A 25-year development plan was drawn up, envisioning a substantial community; offices, a library, a church and a senior-citizens' home have already been built.
Parking was redistributed along the curbs of the new internal streets. This makes for some congestion and inefficiency, but lessens the frustration of trudging down long aisles of parked ears toward a distant mall entrance. Developer Douglas Storrs says that shoppers find the strength to walk as much as half a mile down the sidewalks of what is now called Mashpee Commons, passing shop windows, benches and planters. The same people reach the threshold of exasperation when they have to park more than 400 feet from the door to an ordinary mall.

There are other examples, including Mizner Park, in Boca Raton, Fla., where a failing shopping center was replaced with a 28-acre mixed-use development organized around a new public park. To be sure, not all developers will be this ambitious with their properties. But as a first step, hiding the ugly collection of Dumpsters and loading docks on the backsides of strip malls could eliminate a lot of suburban blight.

Plans for Mass Transit **10** Is there any way to get Americans out of their cars and into buses and trains? In Los Angeles, not even an earthquake sufficed; only about 2 percent of drivers switched to mass transit after their freeways fell down last year, and most of them went right back to driving as soon as the roads were patched up.

The problem is that transit seems to need a critical mass to work, and many metropolitan areas (Los Angeles among them) are just too spread out. Many commuters seem to think that if you have to drive to the train station anyway, you might as well just keep going to the office.

Hence Calthorpe's idea for the "pedestrian pocket": a relatively dense settlement within a quarter-mile walk of a transit stop. In Portland, Ore., they're building the transit line first-putting stops literally in the middle of empty fields--in the expectation that the development will follow.

A DIFFERENT APPROACH

Mixing income levels in a neighborhood is a newurbanist credo, and nobody does that better than planner Oscar Newman. His scattered-site low-income housing for Yonkers, N.Y., is a model of its kind. But Newman is no fan of the new urbanists. "Instead of saying, "This is what's wrong [with suburbs],' they should ask, "Why do people feel it's worth it to live there?""

Link Work to Home

11 Suburbs are no longer just bedroom communities; the dispersal of employment out of the central cities has been going on for a generation. (As the writer William H. Whyte demonstrated two decades ago, big corporations leaving the city tend to relocate within a few miles of the chief executive's house.) But the result-the oxymoronic "office parks" consisting of indistinguishable glass cubes amid a token fuzz of grass and a giant parking lot-is just a higher class of sprawl than the gas stations and fried-chicken places that would have been built there instead.

If companies don't want to be downtown, they should at least attempt to integrate their offices-or factories, for that matter-into communities. Nobody wants to live next to a steel mill, naturally. But in Laguna West, outside Sacramento, people are happy to live within a quarter-mile of an Apple Computer plant, which provides 1,200 white-collar and assembly-line jobs. Apple agreed to locate there after the community was already planned: developer Phil Angelides says the company liked the idea that executives and workers could afford to live in the same community. Playa Vista, a new-urbanist community being planned for Los Angeles, has been mentioned as a possible home for the DreamWorks SKG multimedia company. It could be an updated-and very. upscale-version of the company town, which in this case will comprise 13,000 houses and apartments, shops, a park, promenades and jogging trails along the last tidal marsh in the city.

Calthorpe believes that more businesses will move to new-urbanist projects as they grow disillusioned with the traffic and isolation of their office parks. "The idea is not necessarily to live in the same development you work in," he says; "there are a lot of criteria for where you choose your house. But if people can walk to a park, to midday shopping, restaurants and day care, it's better for the people working there."

Make a Town Center

12 Every town needs a center: a plaza, square or green that is a geographical reference point and a focus of civic life--even if that just means a place to push a stroller or throw a Frisbee. Shopping malls are a poor substitute; the area they serve is too diffuse, and in any case their civic function is incidental to their real purpose making money. Developers often provide some parkland in their subdivisions, but it's usually on leftover parcels that wouldn't be built on anyway, by the edge of the highway or adjoining another subdivision.

Shrink Parking Lots

13 Parking is one of Suburbia's highest achievements. Only in the United States does the humblest copy-shop or pizzeria boast as much space for cars as the average city hall. But it is also a curse; the vast acreage given over to asphalt is useless for any other purpose, and goes unused more than half the time anyway. Most planners regard parking as a prerequisite for economic growth, like water. But downtown Portland, Ore., which strictly regulates parking, has been thriving with essentially the same space for cars as it had 20 years ago. Developers often build more parking than they actually need; a half-empty lot is presumed to reassure prospective tenants that they'll never run out of space for their cars. Yet a bank, a movie theater and a church are all full at different times. One simple improvement towns can make is to look for ways to share and pool parking space among different users.

The ideal-although expensive- solution to the parking problem is for cars to vanish underground when they get where they're going. A shopping center surrounded by acres of striped asphalt, whether it's empty or full, might as well put up a moat against pedestrians. Large parking lots should be situated behind buildings whenever possible--something most suburban zoning codes don't currently allow-and divided by streets, sidewalks or structures into smaller segments of around three acres or less. On-street parking in residential neighborhoods is controversial. Some planners favor it, because it creates a "buffer" between pedestrians and traffic, but others consider it a danger to children running out between the cars.

Turn Down the Lights

14 It is probably true that illuminating a suburban street to the level of the infield at Comiskey Park reduces accidents, especially for people who leave their regular glasses at home and have to drive in sunglasses. For everyone else, though, towering, garish sodium-vapor street lamps intrude on the peacefulness of the night with the insistence of a stuck horn. Where safety is not a big issue, why not use several smaller lamps that cast a gentler glow and let you see the stars?

Think Green

15 Out beyond the beltway, where the roads are narrow and blacktop, past the point at which the dwindling traffic is too sparse to warrant plucking by even the mingiest motor court, there's a beautiful land. There are pale green corn plants poking through the brown soft, lakes glimpsed through trees, cholla cactus among the tumbled red rocks. It's not wilderness, but countryside, the unfinished canvas of America. It tells us where we are-in Illinois, Maine or Texas--and it locates us in time: summer, fall, winter, spring. There's nothing to buy there, nowhere to park; it doesn't lure us with golden arches or free coffee mugs with a fill-up. It's just there.

And by the same token, it isn't making anyone rich, yet. There is a gradient of value that runs from the city to the country, and it keeps moving outward; pick any spot and it's just a matter of time before it makes the magical transition from "countryside" to "real estate." The process seems inevitable, but it isn't, really. It's the product of concrete decisions made in an age when roads were still viewed as the harbingers of civilization rather than discount muffler outlets. And as surely as our society made those decisions, it can change them, before lawn meets lawn and asphalt meets asphalt, covering the land in a seamless carpet of sprawl.



COMMON QUESTIONS REGARDING SMALL AND MINOR NON-RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONAL

What is Measure E?

Measure E was a ballot initiative passed by Santa Barbara voters in 1989 that limits the amount of new non-residential development within the City to 3 million square feet until the year 2010. This was done in response to resident concerns about living within the existing resources available to Santa Barbara and the preservation of the existing quality of life. The 3 million square feet was divided into categories available to different types of projects. These categories are: Approved Projects Pending Projects, Vacant Property, Small Additions, Community Priority, and Economic Development. Minor Addition square footage is also available but is not counted in the 3 million square foot limit.

Does Measure E limit residential development?

No. Measure E applies only to new non-residential development in the City. The City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance encourage residential development, specially in and around the Downtown area. Property owners faced with limited commercial development potential under Measure E are encouraged to pursue mixed-use development projects. There are many successful examples of buildings with retail/commercial space on the ground floor with residential units above. Examples of detached residential and non-residential uses that are on the same parcel also exist in the area.

Common Measure E Questions November 24, 1997 Page 2

What is a Minor Addition?

The Santa Barbara Municipal Code defines a Minor Addition as a project Involving less than or equal to 1,000 square feet of new non-residential development. This square footage can take the form of new development, an addition to an existing building, or the conversion of residential floor area to a non-residential use. Any legal lot, as permitted by zoning, is eligible to apply for up to 1,000 square feet of Minor Additions. Minor Additions are not subject to Development Plan review and approval.

What is a Small Addition?

The Santa Barbara Municipal Code defines a Small Addition as 1,001-3,000 square feet of non-residential development. This development can be in the form of an addition to an existing building, new construction, or conversion of residential floor area to a non-residential use. The Small Addition category was created to allow for the expansion and growth of existing businesses in the City while maintaining a limit on total non-residential growth.

There is a total of 600,000 square feet of Small Addition space available until the year 2010. This Measure E development category is unique in that the ballot measure stated that Small Additions shall be limited to 30,000 square feet per year. This limitation was placed on Small Additions in anticipation of the demand for Small Additions exceeding the 20 year allocation. The annual limit is intended to pace the rate of development in this category.

If the 30,000 square feet is completely allocated by some point in the same calendar year, no development in this category can take place until the following year.

What properties are eligible for a Small Addition?

Any legal lot, as permitted by zoning, is eligible to apply for up to 2,000 square feet of non-residential square footage from this category. However,

Common Measure E Questions November 24, 1997 Page 3

the 2,000 square foot limit is a cumulative total per parcel until the year 2010/ Small Additions are subject to Development Plan review and approval and must not result in any significant impacts on traffic, water, or housing.

How are Minor and Small Additions used together?

Square footage from the Small and Minor Addition categories are often combined and used together for a single development project. The 2,000 square foot limit per lot on Small Additions, combined with the 1,000 square foot limit per lot on Minor Additions, means that the total new nonresidential square footage available per lot from these categories is 3,000 square feet until the year 2010.

The first 1,000 square feet of development on a lot is considered a Minor Addition in all cases. Any cumulative development on a lot exceeding 1,000 square feet up to the 3,000 square foot limit is considered a Small Addition. For example, an addition of 1,000 square feet would be a Minor Addition, while a later addition of 2,000 on the same parcel would be considered a Small Addition. In this example, the cumulative total of 3,000 square feet per lot has been reached and no further applications could be made for Small or Minor Additions.

There are also cases where square footage for the same addition may be drawn from both categories. For example, a 1,200 square foot addition to a building with no previous additions would use 1,000 square feet of Minor Addition square footage and 200 square feet of Small Addition square footage.

When is a Minor Addition considered a Small Addition?

When the cumulative square footage total per parcel exceeds 1,000 square feet, any additional development on the parcel must come from the Small Addition category. For example, an addition of 900 square feet to a building with a previous addition of 1,000 square feet would bring the cumulative parcel total to 1,800 feet. Therefore, even through both additions

Common Measure E Questions November 24, 1997 Page 4

Were less than or equal to 1,000 square feet, the later 800 square foot addition would be processed as a Small Addition.

Can Small Addition square footage be used with square footage from other categories?

The submittal of a **complete** application for review by the Architectural Board of Review, the Historic Landmarks Commission, the Development Review Committee, or the Planning Commission will start the process for a square footage allocation. Please see the attached sheet which outlines the Small Additions square footage allocation procedure. Planning Division Staff will be able to assist you in determining the type of review that your projects require and the applicable submittal requirements. All Small Additions are subject to Development Plan review and approval findings as described in Section 28.87.300 of the Zoning Ordinance.

For further information regarding Measure E or the status of development activity under Measure E, please contact Rachel Adcox, Acting Assistant Planner, or Liz Casey, Senior Planner, at (805) 564-5470.

Small Addition Allocation Process



Boxes with shaded arrows indicate the need to apply for a square footage allocation after January 1 of the next calendar y

Index A

The following index groups Policies and Implementation Strategies by subject matter. The left hand column describes the particular subject. The right hand column lists the relevant Policies and Implementation Strategies.

Subject	Policies and Implementation Strategies
Air Transportation	2.1.13
Airport	3.1.9, 3.4.5, 14.3, 14.3.1, 14.3.2, 14.3.3, 15.2, 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.5,
	15.2.6
Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan	15.2.3
Aviation Facilities Plan	15.2.4
Annexation	13.8, 13.8.1
Bicycle	
Bicycle Coordinator	4.3, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10
Coastal Zone	2.1.7, 5.5.9, 9.1, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.2.5, 9.3.1, 9.3.5
Downtown	2.1.6, 8.2.1
Expansion of routes/paths	2.1.2, 4.2, 4.2.1, 4.4, 4.4.1, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.1.5, 9.2.5, 9.5.1
Green Bike Program	4.3.10
Infrastructure	1.1.3, 2.1.2, 3.4.2, 4.1.2, 4.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 9.1.1, 9.1.5
Linkages	1.1.3, 4.2.1, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.1.5, 14.3.3, 15.2.3
Parking/Storage	3.2.4, 3.4.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.3, 4.2.6, 7.2.6, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.2.5
Planning	4.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.2.5, 4.3.1, 9.5, 9.5.1, 14.5.7
Safety	4.3.6, 4.5.2, 4.5.4, 5.5.9, 5.8.6, 9.1.1
Business	
Economic Vitality	1.1, 5.3.4, 8.1
Delivery Systems	1.1.4, 4.3.5, 4.5.3, 5.1.3, 7.2.4, 7.4.4
Home-based businesses	13.7, 13.7.1
Mercados	5.5.12
Capital Improvements Plan/Program	2.2.2, 3.1.17, 4.1.4, 5.1.1, 14.1.4
Carpool/Vanpool	3.3.3, 6.1.2, 6.1.4, 6.3.2, 7.2.3, 8.2.1, 8.2.3
Compact Development	2.1.9, 13.2.2, 11.1

Design Standards	
Bicycle System	2.1.10, 4.1.2, 9.4.1
Coastal Zone	9.4.1, 9.5, 9.5.1
Commercial Areas	2.1.10, 5.4.3, 5.7.4, 7.2.7, 8.2.11, 8.2.12, 8.4, 8.4.1, 13.4.2
Parking facilities	2.1.10, 5.7.4, 7.1.1, 7.2.6, 7.4, 7.4.1, 8.2.11, 8.4.2, 9.4.2,
Pedestrian System	2.1.10, 5.3.1, 5.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 5.4.5, 5.4.6, 5.4.7, 5.4.8,
	5.5.7, 5.5.11, 9.4.1, 13.4.1
Residential Areas	2.1.10, 7.2.7, 13.4.2
Streets	2.1.10, 4.1.2, 5.4.4, 9.4.1, 10.1.3, 13.4.1
Transit Facilities	3.2, 3.2.6, 9.4.1
Drive-through facilities	13.4.3
Educational Facilities	3.1.5, 3.2.7, 4.2.1, 5.4.6, 5.6.3, 13.6, 13.6.1
Education and Outreach	See Index B
Environmental Quality	2.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.4.2, 6.4.3, 6.4.5, 6.4.6
Flood	16.3.5
Funding	1.2, 1.2.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.5, 3.1.17, 4.1.4, 5.1.1, 6.1.3, 8.2.6, 11.1.2, 11.2.1, 12.1.2, 13.3.3, 14.2.2
Hazardous Materials	2.1.12, 15.1.3, 15.1.4, 15.1.5, 15.1.6, 16.3.6
Housing	8.2.10, 8.5, 8.5.1, 8.5.3, 13.1.1, 13.2.2, 13.3, 13.3.2, 13.3.3
Incentive Programs	3.5.1, 5.3.3, 5.5.11, 6.1.4, 6.3.1, 7.2.6, 8.2.1, 8.2.13, 8.3.5, 8.5.3
Intermodal Connections	1.1.3, 3.2.4, 3.3.3, 3.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.4.6, 4.2.4, 5.1.5, 5.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 7.2.2, 9.1.1, 9.3, 9.3.1, 9.3.2, 9.3.3, 9.3.5, 10.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, 12.3.1, 14.3.2, 14.3.3, 14.5.4
Maintenance	12.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, 12.3.1
Bicycle Facilities	4.2, 4.2.2, 4.3.3
Pedestrian Facilities	5.5.10, 5.8.11
Transit Facilities	3.2.3, 3.2.6, 3.2.9
Transportation Facilities	4.2.2, 5.5.7, 9.2, 16.7, 16.7.1, 16.7.3
Utilities	16.7, 16.7.1, 16.7.2

Marketing	12.1.1
Bicycle	2.1.2, 4.3.4, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.5, 4.5.1, 6.1.1, 6.3, 6.4, 6.4.1, 6.4.7,
	6.4.8, 9.1.4
Pedestrian	5.8, 5.8.2, 5.8.3, 5.8.7, 5.8.8, 6.1.1, 6.3, 6.4, 6.4.1, 6.4.7, 6.4.8, 9.1.4
Transit	3.5.4, 3.5.5, 6.1.1, 6.3, 6.4, 6.4.1, 6.4.7, 6.4.8, 9.1.4
	8.2.2, 8.2.13, 8.3.5, 9.2
Mixed/Multiple Purpose	5.7.3, 8.5.2, 13.1.1, 13.2.2, 13.3, 13.3.1, 13.3.2, 13.3.3
Monitoring	See Index B
Neighborhood Serving Uses	5.7, 5.7.2, 13.5, 13.5.1, 13.5.2
Parking	
Consolidated/Shared	7.2.1, 7.2.5, 7.2.8, 9.2, 9.2.1, 9.3.2
Customer parking	1.1.1, 3.2.8, 6.3.2, 8.1.1, 8.2, 8.2.7
Demand Standards	8.1.2, 9.2.2
Employee Parking	3.2.8, 6.3.2, 8.1.1, 8.2, 8.2.2, 8.2.8, 8.2.9
Employee Shuffle	8.2.6, 8.2.7
Management	2.1.5, 2.1.6, 7.1.1, 7.2, 7.2.6, 7.2.7, 7.4, 8.1, 8.1.1, 8.1.4,
	8.2, 8.2.15, 9.2, 9.2.1,
New parking areas	2.1.5, 7.2, 7.2.6, 8.2.8, 8.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 8.3.4, 9.2.1, 9.5.1
On-street	3.2.1, 4.4.1, 6.3.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.7, 7.3.1, 8.3.2, 9.2.4, 9.1.5
Park and Ride	14.5.2
"Park Once" concept	8.3.3, 9.2.1
Peripheral/Commuter lots	3.4.3, 6.3.1, 7.2.2, 8.2.4, 8.3.4
Planning	3.1.17, 7.1, 7.1.1, 9.2.3, 13.4.2
Pricing	7.4.5, 8.2.3, 8.2.14
Recreational Vehicle	7.4.6
Requirements	3.1.5, 4.2.3, 5.7.4, 7.1.1, 7.2.7, 7.4, 7.4.2, 7.4.3, 7.4.4,
	8.1.3, 8.2.9, 8.5.2, 9.2.1, 9.2.2, 13.2.2, 13.5.2
Residential	7.1.1, 7.3, 7.3.1, 8.5.2
	3.3.5, 9.5.1

Pedestrian	
Accessibility (disabled, elderly)	5.4.1, 5.4.5, 5.4.8, 5.5.3, 5.6, 5.7.5
Coastal Zone	2.1.7, 5.5.9, 9.1, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.1.3, 9.3.1, 9.3.5
Downtown	2.1.6, 5.3, 5.3.4, 5.8.7, 8.2.1
Improvements/Amenities	5.1.4, 5.2.1, 5.3.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.5, 5.5.1, 5.5.2, 5.5.4,
	5.5.5, 5.5.6, 5.5.8, 5.5.11, 5.7.1, 5.7.5, 5.8, 8.2.12, 9.1.1,
	9.1.2, 9.1.3, 9.2.5, 9.5.1,
Infrastructure	1.1.3, 2.1.3, 5.1, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.4, 5.4.1, 5.4.4, 5.5.3,
	5.5.6, 5.5.7, 5.5.8, 5.5.13, 5.6.1, 5.6.2, 5.7.1, 5.7.5, 5.8,
	5.8.5, 9.1.1, 9.2.5, 9.5.1
Linkages	1.1.3, 5.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.5, 5.3.6, 5.5.6, 5.7, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 13.2.3,
	15.2.3
Paseos	5.3, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.3.5, 5.3.6, 5.5.2, 7.2.6, 9.1.3,
	13.2.3
Safety	2.1.3, 5.3.5, 5.3.6, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.4, 5.4.5, 5.4.6, 5.4.8,
	5.5.2, 5.5.9, 5.5.13, 5.6, 5.6.1, 5.6.2, 5.6.3, 5.8.4, 5.8.6,
	5.8.9, 5.8.10, 8.2.12, 9.1.1
Public Involvement	See Traffic Management Program
Public Utilities	
Communication and Telecommunications Excilities	2.1.12, 5.4.8, 6.1.4, 13.7.1, 14.5.6, 16.6, 16.6.1, 16.6.2,
Telecommunications Facilities	16.6.3
Electricity	2.1.12, 5.4.8, 16.1, 16.1.1, 16.1.2, 16.1.3, 16.1.4
Gas	2.1.12, 16.1.4, 16.2, 16.2.1, 16.2.2, 16.4.2
Storm Drainage	2.1.12, 16.3, 16.3.1, 16.3.2, 16.3.3, 16.3.4, 16.3.5, 16.3.6
Wastewater Collection	2.1.12, 16.5, 16.5.1, 16.5.2, 16.5.3, 16.5.4
Water Supply	2.1.12, 5.4.8, 16.4, 16.4.1, 16.4.2, 16.4.3
Rail Transportation	See Transit Rail Transportation
Kan Hansportation	See Transit, Run Transportation
Redevelopment Agency	9.3.2
Regional	
Planning	2.1.11, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 4.3.1, 14.1.1, 14.1.2, 14.1.3, 14 2.4, 14.5, 14.5.1,
	14.5.2, 16.1.3
Coordination with agencies	2.1.11, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.4.4, 4.3.1, 4.3.7, 6.3.3, 14.2, 14.2.1, 14.2.3, 14.3,
	14.3.1, 14.5.5, 14.5.7, 15.1.3, 15.1.4, 15.2.3, 15.2.5, 15.3, 15.3.1, 16.1, 1.6.1, 2.16, 2, 1.6, 2, 1.6, 2, 3
	10.1.1, 10.1.2, 10.2.1, 10.2.2, 10.2.3
Signage	See Index B
Street Classification System	2.1.8, 10.1, 10.1.1, 10.1.2, 10.1.3, 10.2, 10.2.1

Traffic Calming	5.8.6, 10.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, 12.3.1
Traffic Impact Standards	1.1.2, 11.1, 11.1.1, 11.1.2
Traffic Management Program	11.2.2, 12.1, 12.1.1, 12.1.2
ood Area Management Plan	12.2, 12.2.1
rea Management Plan	12.3, 12.3.1
Transfer of Existing Development Rights	13.4.4, 13.4.5
Transit	
ne	2.1.7, 3.1.5, 9.1, 9.1.1, 9.1.3, 9.3.5,
	2.1.6, 8.2.5, 9.1.2
Subscription Service	3.3.4,
/Improvement of Services	1.1.3, 2.1.1, 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.8, 3.1.10, 3.1.13, 3.1.14, 3.1.17, 3.2.5, 3.2.7, 3.3, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.5, 4.2.4, 6.3.3, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.3.3, 12.1.1, 14.5.5
ure	3.4.2, 11.1
	1.1.3, 3.1.7, 3.1.9, 3.1.14, 3.1.15, 3.2.7, 8.2.15, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.1.3, 12.1.1, 15.2.3, 15.2.6
ams	3.1.5, 6.1.4, 8.2.1, 9.2.5
	3.1.9, 3.1.11, 3.1.12, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.5, 3.5.2, 9.5, 9.5.1, 12.1.1, 13.2.1
ovement	3.1.6, 3.2.1
Rail Transportation	2.1.12, 3.3.6, 3.4.1, 6.3.3, 14.5.3, 14.5.4, 14.5.8, 15.2.3, 15.3, 15.3.1, 15.3.3, 15.3.4
	3.3, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.6, 3.4.5, 3.4.6, 6.3.3, 15.5.1, 14.5.5
	3.2.9
ops	3.2, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.4.2, 5.2.1, 9.2.5, 9.3.4
	3.1.4, 3.1.14, 3.3.3, 3.4.3, 6.3.3, 7.2.2, 8.2.5, 8.2.15, 9.1.2, 9.3.3, 12.1.1, 15.3.4
	3.1.15, 3.1.6
S	3.3.5
nter	3.3.3
Transportation Demand	6.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2.1, 6.4.1, 6.4.4, 6.4.6
Management	
Truck Traffic	2.1.13, 15.1, 15.1.1, 15.1.2
Water Transportation	271 2113 916 917 918 154 1541 1543 1544
stor Dian	15 4 2
stel Plan	9.2.2
nai fiall	1.2.2

Index **B**

The following index presents the text of Policies and Implementation Strategies that relate to Education, Monitoring, and Signage. The left hand column lists the number of each Policy and Implementation Strategy and the right hand column includes the text.

Education

Policy or I.S.	Text
3.5	The City shall work to increase public awareness of and cooperation with the City's transit planning goals.
3.5.1	Work with local businesses and transit providers to develop transit incentive programs.
3.5.2	Train City appointed MTD Board Members, Council Members, City Staff, and MTD Staff on the functions and working of transit services to ensure the consideration of City transit issues, and conduct joint work sessions with the City Council and directors of transit providers.
3.5.3	Encourage area schools to expand education programs about the benefits and advantages of the use of transit.
3.5.4	Develop and work with transit providers, regional rideshare programs, and others to expand existing transit marketing programs.
3.5.5	Market the City's transit system, through organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Convention and Visitors Bureau.
4.3.4	The Bicycle Coordinator shall promote the use of bicycles.
4.3.6	The Bicycle Coordinator shall encourage the use of programs intended to teach safe bicycle riding techniques.
4.3.7	Work with local and regional bicycle groups and coalitions to promote bicycling both within and outside of the City.
4.3.8	Encourage bicycle retailers to sponsor bicycle "Fun Rides" or races to promote bicycle riding.
4.5	The City shall actively promote the safe use of bicycles as an efficient and affordable mode of transportation.
4.5.1	Work with the Convention and Visitor's Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce to promote a bicycle friendly image of the City to residents and tourists.

Policy or I.S.	Text
4.5.2	Work with schools to provide information to children, adults, bicyclists, and motorists about the safe use of the bicycle on City streets including, but not limited to, the following:
	• safety awareness programs at area elementary, middle, and high schools,
	• providing maps outlining bikeways, streets with designated bicycle lanes, and streets with lesser traffic volumes that are safer for bicycle travel,
	• increased signage to alert motorists to the presence of bicycles,
	• work with bicycle retailers to provide patrons with information regarding the safe use of the bicycle,
	• promote ride-to-school days, and
	• promote/sponsor a Bike-to-Work Day.
4.5.3	Encourage local business to use bicycle couriers for deliveries.
4.5.4	Educate people about and enforce laws relating to safe bicycle use, such as:
	• using lights and reflectors at night,
	• stopping at signalized or signed intersections and crosswalks,
	• riding on the right side of the road,
	• keeping off of the sidewalk, and
	• properly using helmets, especially youth.
5.8	The City shall encourage community involvement in effectively promoting the benefits of walking and identify opportunities for improving the pedestrian system.
5.8.1	Establish a signage program for pedestrian routes throughout the City that links various neighborhoods and attractions.
5.8.2	Enhance existing or develop new partnerships with civic organizations to promote walking tours of Santa Barbara and provide brochures and signage to advertise these tours.
5.8.3	Encourage public and private schools, from pre-school through high school, to promote walking through methods such as walking field trips.

Policy or I.S.	Text
5.8.4	Work with public and private schools to identify and expand safe routes to school.
5.8.5	Consider establishing a hotline to report pedestrian trouble spots.
5.8.6	Continue a Traffic Safety Committee comprised of residents, the Assistant Traffic Engineer and business representatives for the purpose of studying matters of traffic and pedestrian safety, traffic calming, and making recommendations to the City Council regarding measures to promote and improve traffic and pedestrian safety.
5.8.7	Coordinate a "Walker's Appreciation Day" with Downtown retailers. Co-sponsor a "Walk to Work", "Take a Walk", or "Walk to School" day.
5.8.8	Work with community groups to encourage neighborhood walk-about activities.
5.8.9	Work with the Police Department to improve pedestrian safety at night (in areas including paseos and placitas) through such methods as increased bicycle patrols.
5.8.10	Encourage public and private schools to implement pedestrian safety education programs for all ages.
5.8.11	Encourage community groups, business groups, and individuals to assist in the cleaning and maintenance of sidewalks, sidewalk furniture, landscaping, and pedestrian overpasses, including graffiti removal and litter pickup.
6.1	The City shall continue to support efforts to expand Transportation Demand Management Programs.
6.1.1	Work with local and regional transportation demand management services, such as Traffic Solutions, to actively promote the advantages and cost savings of alternative forms of transportation.
6.4	The City shall work to raise awareness about the effects of automobile use and the value of alternatives to driving alone.
6.4.1	Continue to work with agencies, such as the School District and Traffic Solutions, and fund programs which are designed to expand the education, outreach and marketing components of transportation demand management services.
6.4.2	Work with groups such as the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and Traffic Solutions to educate the public about auto-related air pollution emissions.

Policy or I.S.	Text
6.4.3	Work with groups such as the Community Environmental Council (CEC), to incorporate information about opportunities to decrease energy consumption, reduce air pollution, and improve resource conservation through decreased use of the automobile.
6.4.4	Encourage local and regional transportation demand management services, such as Traffic Solutions, the Air Pollution Control District (APCD), and the Community Environmental Council (CEC) to develop a local access television program aimed at raising awareness and discouraging drive alone trips.
6.4.5	Participate in the Clean Cities Program (see Glossary).
6.4.6	Continue to participate in and share information with the Environmental Protection Agency/Local Government Commission's Transportation Partners Program.
6.4.7	Encourage the use of bicycling and other forms of alternative transportation through the sponsorship of events such as a Bike-to-Work Day.
6.4.8	Work with groups such as the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce to promote the use of public forms of transportation, alternative forms of travel, and ridesharing to and within the City in all out of town advertising and promotion efforts.
8.2.2	Increase the awareness of employers and employees about impacts of employee parking and commuting habits through marketing and education.
8.5.1	Educate property and business owners, developers, and the community about the benefits of increased housing Downtown.
9.1.4	Work with the Conference and Visitors Bureau and Chamber of Commerce to market the transportation system and promote travel to Santa Barbara through methods such as:
	 marketing improvements to the transportation system to make the City more attractive to tourists and companies seeking to locate in Santa Barbara,
	• promoting and marketing the use of alternative transportation by visitors, especially between the Railroad Depot, Airport, and Waterfront hotels/motels, and
	• encouraging visitors to use alternative forms of travel such as the train.

Policy or I.S.	Text
12.1.1	Create a Traffic Management Program which will:
	• detail a process to develop and implement Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans that address the traffic and mobility concerns of an impacted area, including the concerns of any residential, commercial, mixed use, industrial, recreational, and service uses in the area. The types of issues this plan is intended to address include transit issues, mobility issues, maintenance issues, pedestrian and bicycle connections, through traffic volumes, visual impacts, traffic speeds, noise, safety for children and pedestrians, and collisions,
	• detail the process required for education of traffic issues, implementation, the potential cost and benefits of various alternatives for addressing traffic issues, conflict resolution strategies, the public hearing and design review process, and future enforcement and monitoring,
	• describe various options available to address traffic issues such as:
	(See body of document for text)
	• encourage community members to identify innovative solutions to address traffic problems,
	• include the location of information sources related to traffic, including but not limited to the following:
	 status of current projects or improvements, other applicable area plans, and neighborhood traffic statistics such as traffic counts, speeds, local vs. cut-through traffic, truck traffic,
	• describe a process by which concerned community members can effectively organize to address traffic related issues, and
	• include video instruction detailing the process for developing Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans.
13.6.1	Work with school districts, private schools, major employers, and appropriate agencies to:
	• locate child care facilities near existing schools and major employment centers,
	• encourage parents to share trips, and
	• create employer incentives for sponsoring on-site child care facilities.

Policy or I.S.	Text
14.4	The City shall develop an education/outreach program about the City's Circulation Element.
14.4.1	Distribute the adopted Circulation Element to SBCAG, other jurisdictions, transportation related agencies, and affected groups.
14.4.2	Encourage regional marketing of transportation services to educate the public about the availability and benefit of alternative modes of transportation.
14.4.3	Review proposed State and Federal legislation for effects on the Circulation Element and comment as appropriate.

Monitoring

Policy or I.S.	Text
2.2	To assure that the community is moving towards the Vision articulated in this Circulation Element, the City shall monitor changes in traffic volumes, travel patterns and mobility choices through a program which:
	• establishes performance benchmarks related to the policy statements and implementation strategies within each chapter of the Circulation Element,
	• assesses the impacts of policy implementation and progress against these benchmarks, and
	• includes City response strategies if the outcomes of policy and project specific decisions are not consistent with the Vision articulated within this Circulation Element.
2.2.1	The City Administrator shall direct staff to develop and implement a monitoring program and submit reports every two years to the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the effectiveness of achieving the Goals and Policies of the Circulation Element. These reports shall include, but not be limited to, information on the following topics:
	• land use policy effectiveness in meeting the City's mobility goals,
	• the effectiveness of the policies of the Circulation Element towards increasing the use and effectiveness of transit programs,
	• the attainment of regional air quality standards, and
	• ridership patterns and use of alternative forms of transportation. Continue to obtain this information from responsible agencies, such as MTD. In areas where no information is available, conduct surveys.
2.2.2	Prior to each annual Capital Improvements Program, public work sessions shall be held with the Planning Commission and City Council to develop project priorities for funding.
8.2.7	Assess the impact of employee shuffling on Downtown parking.
12.1.3	Schedule a regular review and monitoring cycle of Neighborhood Area and Business Area Mobility Plans to address changing conditions. Prepare the Plans in advance of the Public Works' street maintenance cycle to ensure community input.

Monitoring (Cont.)

Policy or I.S.	Text
13.2.2	 Consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to: allow increased residential densities and more compact, pedestrian oriented non-residential development along streets identified as major transit corridors, and reduce parking requirements for properties near major transit corridors if it can be demonstrated that a negative impact will not occur. In conjunction with this reduction, the City shall evaluate and aggressively monitor the results to ensure continued use of alternative means of travel and to justify reduced parking demands.

Signage

Policy or I.S.	Text
2.1.14	Create a program to coordinate the execution and review of Implementation Strategies addressing signage (see Index B for a comprehensive list). The program should be reviewed by the Sign Committee, Historic Landmarks Commission, and Architectural Board of Review.
3.2.7	Work with transit providers to improve and expand the transit route and signage program by showing connections between major attractions such as schools, museums, places of worship, institutions, shopping and recreation areas.
4.2.5	Adopt and implement the Regional Bikeway Signage Program.
4.5.2	Work with schools to provide information to children, adults, bicyclists and motorists about the safe use of the bicycle on City streets including, but not limited to, the following:
	• Increased signage to alert motorists to the presence of bicycles (3 rd bullet)
5.1.4	Work with Caltrans to improve and maintain Highway 101 pedestrian over/undercrossings to promote increased pedestrian use. This may include adding amenities such as lighting, landscaping, and identification signage.
5.4.1	Work with the Architectural Board of Review and Historic Landmarks Commission to revise and enhance City design standards for all sidewalks and paths of travel. Standards should address width of paths, safety, lighting, landscaping, location, street furniture, the availability of alternate pedestrian accessways, and the provision of kiosks or other methods to exchange public information.
5.4.6	Require striping/signage, crossing guards, stop signs and other devices to improve safety near schools and parks.
5.5.6	Look for opportunities to connect placitas to institutional, public, private and institutional uses. Include signage, as appropriate.
5.8.1	Establish a signage program for pedestrian routes throughout the City which links various neighborhoods and attractions.
5.8.2	Enhance existing or develop new partnerships with civic organizations to promote walking tours of Santa Barbara and provide brochures and signage to advertise these tours.
8.2.13	Increase the use of underutilized public parking lots through marketing, improved signage, and other incentives.

Signage (Cont.)

Policy or I.S.	Text
9.4	The City shall promote excellent signage and aesthetics.
9.4.1	Implement Harbor Master Plan policies and programs that will:
	• improve signage and aesthetics within the plan area,
	• provide information about the various forms of transportation available,
	• improve linkages between forms of transportation, and
	• resolve conflicts between various modes of transportation that occur within the plan area.
9.4.2	Develop a program for the entire Coastal Zone to improve parking lot aesthetics and provide signage regarding location and transportation linkages between parking lots and points of interest.
9.4.3	Work with Cal-Trans to improve freeway signage to and from the Downtown and Coastal Zone areas.
9.5.1	Create a Master Plan for Cabrillo Boulevard that explores the implementation of the following:
	• Relocating tour bus parking to an area designated and signed for that purpose and enforcing tour bus parking regulations. $(5^{th} bullet)$
10.1	Directional signage (included in the list of possible design features for Residential Corridors)
15.1.2	Ensure that signage indicating weight limits is clearly posted throughout the City.

SCENIC HIGHWAYS ELEMENT

The Scenic Highways element of the General Plan is concerned with the development, establishment, and protection of scenic highways.

The California scenic highway program was created in 1963 by the State legislature through Senate Bill 1467. This legislation establishes the State's responsibility for the protection and enhancement of California's natural scenic beauty by identifying those portions of the State highway system which, together with the adjacent scenic corridor, require special conservation treatment.

Official scenic highways are so designated by the State Scenic Highways Advisory Committee after land use controls have been adopted by the local jurisdiction to protect the scenic appearance of the highway corridor, and after specific planning, design, and maintenance standards have been established by the State Department of Transportation to ensure the scenic appearance of the highway. Highways eligible for such designation are listed in the Scenic Highways Master Plan found in the California Government Code. In formulating the list, the Committee used the following standards in its evaluation of state highways:

- 1. The scenic corridor through which the highway passes should have consistent scenic, historic, or aesthetic value during all seasons.
- 2. Consideration should be given those highways or routes which are:
 - a. State or jurisdictional entry routes.
 - b. Predominately used for recreation or vacation travel.
 - c. Utilized for one-day sightseeing, or study trips.
 - d. Part of an integrated or semi-integrated, scenic route system that traverses varied scenic corridors for longer trips.
 - e. Typical of varied scenic factors available within the jurisdiction.
 - f. Through areas of extraordinary scenic value.
- 3. If possible, all principal landscape and topographical-type areas should be represented in the system.
- 4. Routes of historic significance which connect places of interest should be considered even though the route is of marginal scenic value.

At present, the City of Santa Barbara has two of its five State highways included in the eligible Scenic Highways Master Plan; U.S. Highway 101 and State Highway 154, known as San Marcos Pass Road. State Highway 154 is the only officially designated scenic highway, adopted November 12, 1968, by the County Board of Supervisors.

Goal

The scenic highways element is the initial step leading toward official designation. The purpose of the scenic highway designation is the protection and enhancement of the natural scenic resources of the highway corridor, and the assurance that the highway incorporates not only safety, utility and economy, but also beauty.

The standards for achieving official designation of eligible scenic highways require that local government agencies take such planning actions as may be necessary to protect and enhance the scenic appearance of the highway corridor, including, but not limited to the following controls:

- a. The regulation of lane use which may include intensity of development.
- b. Specific land and site planning.
- c. Prohibition of offsite outdoor advertising.

Additional optional measures may also be included in scenic highway planning:

- a. Citizens Advisory Committee.
- b. Setback and height regulations.
- c. Subdivision regulations.
- d. Location of overhead utilities.
- e. Management policies.
- f. Maintenance provisions.
- g. Grading ordinance.
- h. Urban and rural programs.
- i. Coordination and cooperation with adjacent jurisdictions.

Potential State Scenic Highways

Two highway routes within the City, one urban and one semi-rural, have potential for the state scenic highway program. However, because each is a secondary state highway, neither is presently listed on the Master Plan of eligible State highways. Because both routes meet the standards of the State Scenic Highways Advisory Committee for eligible State highways, eligibility can be established by requesting that the Committee consider and include both in the Master Plan. A description of these routes, with a discussion of land use controls, and planning, design, and maintenance standards follows:

CABRILLO BOULEVARD (225) FROM 101 TO CASTILLO STREET

Description

East Cabrillo Boulevard begins at the 101 Freeway near the Montecito border. The road curves past the Bird Refuge and Child's Estate on the north, and the Santa Barbara Cemetery and Clark Estate on the south. A separated bikeway parallels the boulevard, winding around the Bird Refuge. At Niños Drive, Cabrillo widens to ninety feet. On the north side are the East Beach condominium complex, the Mar Monte Hotel, and other similar hotel and motel developments. On the south, Cabrillo Boulevard borders East Beach, Palm Park, and the Santa Barbara Channel. The expansive view of the beach and water through the tall palm trees looks west toward Stearns Wharf and the harbor. This panorama is one of Santa Barbara's most treasured scenic resources.

At Punta Gorda Street, Cabrillo Boulevard passes the Southern Pacific Round House, a building of historic value which may be preserved. Beyond the Round House to Santa Barbara Street, the Boulevard offers a continuing view of the Channel to the south. Shrubbery screens an undeveloped area to the north along this portion, creating a naturally landscaped effect until the more developed portion of Cabrillo begins. At Santa Barbara Street, the Chart House Restaurant on the north initiates the urbanized area of Cabrillo. Both the Chart House and another restaurant, the España, are of special interest because they contribute to the attractive urban scene. On the south, Stearns Wharf extends out from the shoreline opposite State Street. Cabrillo Boulevard's intersection with State Street is the center of the tourist vicinity, which continues on with restaurants and motels on the northern side until Castillo Street. West Beach and the Harbor are visible to the south, providing a scene of sailboats and docks, as Cabrillo Boulevard ends.

Land Use Controls

Along with other points of interest in the City, Cabrillo Boulevard is a major tourist attraction and should be preserved for visitors and residents as an urban scenic highway.

Land use regulations consistent with the policies of the General Plan should be in effect over the entire corridor. There are two areas on Cabrillo Boulevard, however, which are not in conformance at the present time. The first is an area north of Cabrillo Boulevard from Chapala Street to approximately Santa Barbara Street, designated in the General Plan for hotel and related commerce, which is presently zoned for commercial and manufacturing uses. Under the C-2 and C-M zoning, inappropriate land uses such as auto repair or retail and wholesale service activities could occur. The second is an adjacent area, also north of Cabrillo Boulevard, from Santa Barbara to Punta Gorda Street, designated in the General Plan for hotel and residential development. It is presently zoned M-1 for manufacturing uses and should be rezoned to enable proper development to take place.

These areas are within the Central City Redevelopment Project study area and may be rezoned upon specific land use recommendations resulting from the study.

Although there are height restrictions for hotel and motel development, setback requirements are minimal. Because the second area is a prime site for some type of hotel facility, it is recommended that appropriate setback requirements be established, and that a height-setback relationship be created in such a manner that any future development does not obstruct views of scenic resources or infringe on the open quality of the corridor. In addition to setbacks, it is recommended that building separations be required to provide significant open spaces and to control the intensity of development. Excellence in landscape, architectural, and construction designs should be encouraged for this hotel site, as well as for the proposed redevelopment of Stearns Wharf. Both facilities must be considered visually important elements within the highway corridor, and should therefore be in keeping with the cityscape and skyline. Along with any other commercial development on Cabrillo Boulevard, these facilities should reflect the density, tempo, and activities of the population.

The size, height, number and type of on-premise restaurant, motel and other commercial advertising signs allowed on Cabrillo Boulevard should be the minimum necessary for identification. Both on-premise and off-site signs should be strictly controlled by the Architectural Board of Review in the scenic highway corridor. Their design and location should relate to the surrounding environment. The Architectural Board of Review's control over building colors should be expanded to cover repaintings not only within the scenic highway corridor, but throughout the entire City.

The public right-of-way should be landscaped, where appropriate. Mission Creek, passing under Cabrillo Boulevard near State Street, is presently an eyesore. The creek should be improved and landscaped.

Planning, Design, and Maintenance Standards

The essence of Cabrillo Boulevard as a scenic drive is its proximity and exposure to the shoreline. The City is considering enhancing the shoreline through the expansion of Palm Park in order to provide recreational features such as bikeways, walkways, picnic areas, and parking areas within uncrowded, generous spaces. The park is heavily used on the weekends, and additional space is necessary to reduce the density.

In order to accomplish this expansion, it has been suggested that the beach area beyond Palm Park be widened. Methods to expand oceanward, to the south, should therefore be investigated. Such an expansion could also be accomplished by widening the Park northward. This latter type of expansion requires the realignment of Cabrillo Boulevard. The designation of a scenic highway is based on that which can be seen by the traveler in relation to the corridor adjacent to the highway. Therefore, adequate standards for the planning, location, and design of the Cabrillo Boulevard realignment, if that occurs, should be applied in order to take advantage of the best scenic values within the corridor.

Toward this end, planning and design for Cabrillo Boulevard should provide for roadside parking areas and lookouts wherever scenic vistas are warranted. Parking areas on the ocean side would be designed and treated in such a way as to preserve the view of the shoreline from the highway. A good example of such design can be found in Shoreline Park, where lots are depressed and landscaped so that their impact on the scenic vista is minimized. On-street parking should be prohibited on Cabrillo Boulevard east of State Street. West of State Street to Castillo Street, on-street parking should be removed on the ocean side of Cabrillo. The varied needs of parkers in the area between State Street and the Harbor presently conflict, and need to be studied as part of an overall shoreline plan already recommended in the General Plan.

Night views from Cabrillo Boulevard are also treasured as scenic resources by residents and visitors alike, and should be protected. If Cabrillo Boulevard is realigned, the street lighting installed should be more traditional. Lighting standards in keeping with the image of the City should replace those existing, which now lend a "freeway" feeling to the drive.

Finally, Senate Bill 1467 states that the Department of Transportation shall give special attention to the highway's visual appearance. Therefore, in addition to improved planning and design standards, a scenic highway designation ensures that Cabrillo Boulevard will receive a superior maintenance program.

SYCAMORE CANYON ROAD

Sycamore Canyon Road (144) from Alameda Padre Serra to Stanwood Drive (192). Stanwood Drive to Mission Ridge Road (192) where it intersects with Mountain Drive. Mountain Drive (leaving 192 which continues on Foothill Road) to the Old Mission on Los Olivos Street.

Description

Sycamore Canyon Road begins heading north at Alameda Padre Serra, curving through a residential area that slopes up on either side of the canyon. In the far distance is a view of the Santa Ynez Mountains. Further into Sycamore Canyon, the landscape becomes more natural, revealing open grassy hillsides. Eucalyptus, evergreen, and sycamore trees border the road. Adjacent, to the west, is Sycamore Creek which is often hidden by dense shrubbery.

Turning left on Stanwood Drive, the road is bounded by dense, natural vegetation as it twists and winds slowly upward through the canyon. Rock outcroppings appear and residences can occasionally be seen. At the top of a rise, Stanwood Drive opens onto rocky fields where horses graze. Beyond is a beautiful broad span of the Santa Ynez Mountains.

On Mission Ridge Road, going west, the foothills dotted with houses are visible below the mountains. Sheffield Reservoir lies just off the road to the north. Further on Mission Ridge Road, residences can be seen closer to the roadway. Mountain Drive, with dense vegetation to one side and an old stone wall to the other, snakes down toward the Santa Barbara Mission. In the foreground, the towers of St. Anthony can be seen. Turning onto Los Olivos Street, the historic Mission appears on the right while open lawns spread before the Mission on the left.

Land Use Controls

In contrast to the potential urban scenic highway described above, the combination of Sycamore Canyon Road, Stanwood Drive, Mission Ridge Road, and Mountain Drive runs primarily through rural residential areas of extraordinary scenic value, which should be protected and enhanced for the residents of Santa Barbara as a semi-rural scenic highway. In addition, this route has historic significance because it passes by preserved remnants of an Indian water system and terminates at the Santa Barbara Mission. Existing land use regulations are consistent with the policies of the General Plan, and are now in effect over this entire corridor. A portion of this potential scenic highway is within the designated hillside open space described in the open space element of the General Plan, and most of the adjacent lands have been appropriately rezoned to the lowest residential density allowable at the present time. However, more restrictive measures are necessary to preserve the scenic qualities of this highway corridor. For example, the City presently has a subdivision ordinance, but more specific land development control is desirable. Site plan and architectural control should be established in regard to the construction of single-family dwellings and specific subdivision design standards should be developed. In addition, it is necessary to establish a method for the control of the removal of trees on public property in rural areas, particularly within the scenic highway corridors. In order to achieve such control, it is recommended that a tree preservation ordinance be adopted. At the present time, public sentiment for tree preservation bespeaks a need for an ordinance which would provide protection throughout the City. Through creation of such mechanisms, the natural beauty of the hillsides through which the scenic highway corridor passes will be protected and preserved.

Improper grading has occurred in the past within this scenic highway corridor. An example of its effects is visible from Sycamore Canyon Road, below the Conejo Road subdivision, where debris is crumbling down the steep slope of the hillside to Sycamore Creek. This situation should be remedied. A grading plan is now required as part of the subdivision ordinance, and as a result of the recent council action, must now be approved by the Architectural Board of Review as well as the Director of Public Works. The Architectural Board of Review, acting as a grading review board, and the newly adopted grading ordinance (June 25, 1974) are concerned with the development of single-family lots as well as subdivisions. Both will help prevent any type of improper residential development of these hillsides.

The setback requirements for the low-density residential zones found in these designated hillside open spaces is presently set at 35 feet. In order not to obstruct important scenic views of the hillsides and the mountains beyond, it is recommended that setback requirements be regulated through the previously mentioned site plan and review.

Finally, the most blighting influence on this potential scenic highway is the overhead wiring which abounds throughout the route. The General Plan recommends an increased tempo for underground conversions with an ultimate goal of complete underground utilities for Santa Barbara within this century. By resolution of the City Council in 1967, the entire City is subject to the undergrounding of new construction. In addition, the State requires generally that any wiring installed after December 1972, visible from a scenic highway, must be placed underground. There is no State requirement to underground utilities installed before 1972, but the State has determined that utility companies must set aside funds and formulate a program of utility conversion. The priority of areas in need of conversion is determined by each local jurisdiction in cooperation with the public utility involved. Although there are many areas of Santa Barbara in need of conversion, the removal of the overhead wires presently found in this highway corridor through a conversion program would greatly enhance this scenic route for the enjoyment of all the residents of Santa Barbara. When a scenic highway designation has been acquired for this route, the Council may decide to request that the overhead utilities be undergrounded.

Planning, Design, and Maintenance Standards

The essence of this highway as a scenic route is its exposure to quiet hillsides, mountainous terrain, natural vegetation, and beautiful views available in Santa Barbara's foothills. Through improved planning, design, and maintenance, this exposure can be protected.

Many residents enjoy these roads not only for automobile driving, but also for hiking, riding bicycles, and riding horses. The highway right-of-way is narrow at several locations along the route and ample room is not now available for all the present uses. Because the Department of Transportation is required to consider the concept of a "complete highway" in its planning and design for a scenic highway, it must incorporate plans for safety, economy, and utility, as well as beauty. Therefore, the needs of bicyclists and equestrians will be considered by the DOT and the location of bikeways and riding trails will be an important element in the design standards created for this scenic route.

The combination of Sycamore Canyon Road, Stanwood Drive, Mission Ridge Road, and Mountain Drive should not be considered an expedient route to get from one place in the City to another. The scenic quality of this drive results in part from the slow and winding terrain that the highway corridor traverses. Major changes in the present route alignment could detract from this scenic quality. The designation of this route as a scenic highway can protect the qualities of the route against inappropriate realignment, widening, or improvement.

Potential City Scenic Routes

Instead of acquiring a State scenic highway designation for a particular road, Santa Barbara can create a city scenic route designation which would protect the appearance of any selected highway corridor or street corridor through adopted land use controls. In regard to a State highway, however, it should be noted that such a city designation would have little impact on the highway within the corridor, or on the planning, design, and maintenance standards of the State Department of Transportation. At the present time, only one scenic city street should appropriately be considered for this program. In the future, it may be determined that there are other streets that might also benefit.

SHORELINE DRIVE FROM CASTILLO STREET TO THE END OF SHORELINE PARK

Shoreline Drive, when considered in combination with Cabrillo Boulevard, meets State Standards for a scenic highway designation. However, because of the fear that increased traffic might result from a State designation, it is recommended instead that Shoreline Drive be preserved and enhanced through a City scenic route designation.

Land Use Controls

Beginning at Castillo Street, Shoreline Drive curves past the harbor to the south. Two parcels of land adjacent to Shoreline Drive and west of the City Plunge are now vacant. Both need to be properly landscaped to minimize the visual impact of the expanded harbor parking now being proposed in the current Harbor Improvement Plan. In addition, existing parking areas on the north side of Shoreline Drive in the vicinity of City College should also be landscaped so that they do not detract from the view.

Passing by City College, Shoreline Drive rises onto the Mesa offering another beautiful panorama of the Santa Barbara Channel beyond the lawns of Shoreline Park. The speed limit in this area of Shoreline Drive at the present time is 30 miles per hour. Although average daily traffic counts demonstrate that 30 miles per hour is an appropriate speed, the scenic aspects of the route may require a slower speed limit in order for drivers and pedestrians to properly enjoy another of Santa Barbara's scenic resources in safety.

Relationship to Other Elements

OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

The Scenic Highways element relates directly to the Open Space Element because the proposed scenic corridors traverse significant natural and urban open space areas. The proposed Cabrillo Boulevard route borders the Santa Barbara shoreline, which is an actively used open space consisting of the harbor, harbor facilities, beaches, and adjacent park areas. The corridor of this urban route encompasses all of these open spaces. As earlier stated, the intent of the Scenic Highways element is to protect and enhance the natural scenic resources within the corridor.

The proposed Sycamore Canyon Road, Stanwood Drive, Mission Ridge Road, and Mountain Drive route traverses the largest major hillside open space, consisting of Sycamore Canyon, Mountain Drive, and Mission Canyon. The newly acquired Parma Park is part of this open space area. In addition, Sycamore Creek, lying parallel to the proposed scenic route, provides one of Santa Barbara's open space corridors through the community. It is the policy of the City to maintain these hillside areas and creek channels in their natural state. Through the regulation of land use and through specific land and site planning, the scenic highways element offers an opportunity to augment protection for Santa Barbara's natural and urban open space areas.

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

The scenic highways element relates directly to the circulation element because the scenic routes proposed are State highways and City streets, and are therefore part of the select system of arterial and collector streets which comprise the City's circulation system. Santa Barbara's circulation system should be attractive as well as functional, and those routes adopted as scenic highways will be assured of incorporating beauty as well as safety, utility, and economy.

RECREATION ELEMENT

Inasmuch as scenic highways provide major access to Santa Barbara's urban and rural space where recreation can take place, there is a relationship between the scenic highways element and the recreation element. The scenic highways corridors incorporate active forms of recreation such as hiking, biking, and riding trails, and passive forms of recreation found in the modular parks. A leisurely drive through one of Santa Barbara's scenic corridors will provide a good deal of recreation for residents and visitors alike.

Goals for Potential State Scenic Highways

CABRILLO BOULEVARD (225)

- 1. Rezone areas not in conformance with the General Plan.
- 2. Establish appropriate setback requirements for development on Cabrillo Boulevard.
- 3. Create a height-setback relationship for development.
- 4. Require building separations for development.

- 5. Consider either realigning Cabrillo Boulevard, or widening East Beach in order to allow for the expansion of Palm Park.
- 6. Prohibit on-street parking on Cabrillo Boulevard, east of State Street.
- 7. Remove on-street parking on the ocean side of Cabrillo Boulevard, west of State Street.
- 8. Landscape the public right-of-way.
- 9. Improve Mission Creek at Cabrillo Boulevard.
- 10. Control building colors on Cabrillo Boulevard.
- 11. Control on-premise and off-site outdoor advertising signs on Cabrillo Boulevard.
- 12. Utilize traditional lighting standards.

SYCAMORE CANYON ROAD (144), STANWOOD DRIVE (192), MISSION RIDGE ROAD (192), MOUNTAIN DRIVE

- 1. Establish site plan and architectural control in relation to the construction of single-family dwellings.
- 2. Develop specific subdivision design standards.
- 3. Write a tree preservation ordinance.
- 4. Remedy the grading problem caused by the Conejo Road Subdivision.
- 5. Regulate setback requirements in order that development will not obstruct important views.
- 6. Maintain an Underground Utilities Advisory Committee.
- 7. Establish biking, hiking, and horse trails where appropriate.

Goals for Potential City Scenic Routes

SHORELINE DRIVE

- 1. Landscape properly the vacant parcels of land west of the City Plunge, to minimize the visual impact of expanded harbor parking.
- 2. Landscape properly the existing parking areas on the north side of Shoreline Drive in the vicinity of City College.
- 3. Consider the scenic aspects of Shoreline Drive as well as the average daily traffic in determining the appropriate speed for the route.

Procedure to Acquire a State Scenic Highways Designation

1. Letter directed to the State Scenic Highways Advisory Committee for consideration of each highway to be placed on the State's Scenic Highway System Master Plan of eligibility.

- 2. Adoption of each potential scenic highway by the State legislature and placement on the Master Plan.
- 3. City Council initiate corridor studies (Corridor Survey and Highway Facility Study) leading to official designation. The Department of Transportation will conduct corridor studies in cooperation and coordination with the local government staff.
- 4. The City shall prepare a specific local Scenic Highway Corridor Protection Plan and Implementation Program for each highway, based on the State's Corridor Survey and Facility Study.
- 5. The corridor boundaries, the local Scenic Highway Corridor Protection Plan, and the Implementation Program shall be adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council.
- 6. Upon adoption of the boundaries, the plan, and the program, the City shall make application to the District Director of Transportation for official designation.
- 7. Designated State Scenic Highways shall be marked with the official "poppy sign", and shall be indicated on State maps and other publications.
- 8. Designated City Scenic Routes shall remain unmarked and unadvertised.
References

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc. (AMEC), Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update: Plan Santa Barbara, March 2010

California Department of Water Resources (DWR), California Water Plan Update 2005

California State Department of Finance (DOF), *Table 2: E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and State, 2001 – 2009 with 2000 Benchmark*, October 2009

Community Environmental Council, A New Energy Direction, September, 2007

Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines, 2003

Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *California Planning Guide: An Introduction to Planning in California*, December 2005

Moore, Iacofano, Goltman, Inc. (MIG), Plan Santa Barbara, Community Input Summary Report, December 2007

Santa Barbara Planning Task Force, Impacts to Growth, 1974

Santa Barbara City Charter, sections 1507, 1508

Santa Barbara Community Development Department, and Eisner-Stewart and Associates, *The City of Santa Barbara General Plan*, as amended February, 1995

Santa Barbara Community Development Department, City of Santa Barbara Housing Element, August 2004

Santa Barbara Community Development Department, Development Trends Report 1990 - 2007, March 2008

Santa Barbara Community Development Department, General Plan Update 2030: Conditions, Trends and Issues, September 2005

Santa Barbara Community Development Department, General Plan Update: Draft Policy Preferences, City Council Direction, January 2009

Strategic Economics, Economic Analysis of Growth Scenarios, November, 2009

Strategic Economics, Economic and Demographic Conditions, November, 2009

U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census Data for Santa Barbara, California, 2000, American Factfinder, http://factfinder.census.gov,April,2000

U.S. Census Bureau, *American Community Survey, 2006 – 2008 Summary Tables*, American Factfinder, http://factfinder.census,gov, Fall, 2009

U.S. Census Bureau, *American Community Survey, 2007 Estimates*, American Factfinder, http://factfinder.census.gov, Fall, 2009

U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Data for Santa Barbara, California, 2010, American Factfinder, http://factfinder.census.gov, March 2011

U.S. Census Bureau, Emergency and Transitional Shelter Population, 2000, 2001

Western Regional Climate Center (NOAA), wrcc@dri.edu, 10/6/2009

