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A. **Summary of Proposed Actions**

As outlined in the Notice of Preparation distributed on December 7, 2000, the City of Arroyo Grande intends to adopt a 2001 General Plan Update, including Land Use, Circulation, Agriculture, Open Space, Conservation, Housing, Noise, Safety, Economic Development and Park and Recreation Elements.

The Update focuses on future development of the urban land use area generally within the City of Arroyo Grande and accommodates an increase in community population from the existing 16,000 to approximately 20,000 residents during the next 20 years, assumed to be “General Plan Build-Out.” Some changes extend beyond City limits and propose revisions to the City’s Sphere of Influence as adopted by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), the County of San Luis Obispo’s San Luis Bay Planning Area-Inland, Land Use Element (County LUE) and possible refinement to South County Sanitation District’s potential Sphere of Influence areas.

The City of Arroyo Grande’s 2001 General Plan Update program is located in a larger Planning Area identified as its “Area of Environmental Concern”, as shown on Map EIR-1. When adopted, the 2001 Update will amend the current adopted 1990 General Plan which is summarized on Map EIR-2. This prior plan is generally the “no project” alternative. The draft Urban Land Use Element map best summarizes the proposed 2001 General Plan Update development pattern as shown on map EIR-3. Comparison of the prior 1990 General Plan Land Use map and the proposed 2001 General Plan Update Urban Land Use Element map reveal twelve (12) change or clarification Land Use Study Areas that will be the focus of this Draft EIR, shown on Map EIR-4. These maps will be referenced in this program EIR.

With the exception of the 12 Land Use Study Areas shown on Map EIR-4, the 2001 General Plan Update generally reflects existing uses, present zoning and prior 1990 adopted General Plan classifications, thus not involving potential impacts associated with changes. There are, however, some minor alterations proposed to land use classifications and related refinements proposed to the names, uses and property development standards of various zoning designations defined in the Development Code and zoning map, both of which will require amendment for consistency with the 2001 Update. These regulatory alterations, amendments and refinements are considered a part of this 2001 General Plan Update and Program EIR, although subject to subsequent Planning Commission and City Council public hearings, recommendations and decisions not yet initiated.

In addition to the Land Use Element map, the 2001 General Plan Update includes Circulation, Housing, Noise, Safety, Parks and Recreation, Economic Development, Agriculture, Conservation and Open Space Elements which also involve refinements or clarifications to policies and proposals contained in the 1990 General Plan. Most of these other elements/changes are graphically included on the Urban Land Use Element map, but some changes involve other maps contained in the 2001 General Plan Update. These will be briefly identified and referred to in the sections of this Program EIR noted below:

- **Circulation Element**: See VI, Transportation/Circulation Section;
- **Housing Element**: See II, Population and Housing and also Land Use Element;
- **Noise Element**: See X, Noise Section;
- **Safety Element**: See III, Geophysical, and IX Hazards Section(s)
- **Parks and Recreation Element**: See XV, Recreation Section;
- **Economic Development**: Included in Land Use Element; and,
- **Agriculture, Conservation and Open Space Element**: See IV Water, VII Biological Resources, VIII Energy and Mineral Resources, XIII Aesthetics, XIV Cultural Resources and also included in Land Use Element Section.
Issues To Be Resolved: Areas of Controversy

The City of Arroyo Grande’s Notice of Preparation explained the anticipated significant effects that 2001 General Plan Update involves, both directly and indirectly. Alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce significant effects will be discussed in more detail with each of the 12 Land Use Study Areas as shown on Map EIR-4. These Initial Study Explanations covering 15 topics are the issues to be resolved and/or areas of controversy to be addressed in the EIR:

I. Land Use and Planning

Most of the developed areas of the City will remain unchanged when comparing existing conditions, the 1990 adopted General Plan or the proposed 2001 General Plan Update. There are some differences, such as expansion of the Village Core and conversion of general commercial areas along East Grand Avenue to a proposed Mixed-Use designation, which will cause different impacts. These are generally shown on Map EIR-4 as 12 Land Use Study Areas, discussed later in this EIR. Because these anticipated changes require zoning reclassifications and amendments that differ from the adopted General Plan and zoning map and may require some disruption of the established community, it is apparent that these changes could involve potentially significant impacts unless mitigated.

The 2001 General Plan Update attempts to protect and preserve agricultural resources and operations to the maximum extent legally, economically, and environmentally feasible, including prevention of incompatible land uses on involved and adjoining properties. This proposed policy precludes certain urban use alternatives and impacts and causes development to occur in a different pattern, resulting in different impacts than otherwise probable.

The 2001 General Plan Update and EIR will consider the potentially significant impacts and appropriate mitigation policies, where it can be identified that the Update differs substantially from either the existing land use pattern or the adopted 1990 General Plan.

II. Population and Housing

As noted in the summary, the 2001 General Plan Update is assumed to provide approximately the same population and housing capacity as the adopted 1990 General Plan, although redistributed to include new Mixed Use and Village Commercial expansion. Because the population estimated for the Update is essentially the same as for the adopted General Plan, it is apparent that they do not exceed regional projections, nor require major displacement of existing housing. However, some sub-area increases may require infrastructure changes or involve different traffic impacts. The 2001 General Plan Update and EIR will evaluate the population and housing impacts associated with Mixed Use and Village Commercial expansion as well as other changes in density proposed for new residential developments accommodated by the Update.

III. Geophysical

The adopted General Plan includes the Safety Element addressing most geophysical issues, such as faults, ground shaking, subsidence, expansive soils, and unique geologic features. The Update will integrate this element and the mitigation measures, but the potential for increased landside exposure and erosion are inherent in potential additional hillside development. The 2001 General Plan Update and EIR will identify where these potentially significant impacts are most probable and suggest further mitigation measures and/or hillside development policies to require site specific soils and geologic studies prior to development.
IV. Water Resources

The impacts of additional growth and development beyond the available water resources was identified as potentially significant unless mitigated by the 1990 General Plan EIR and will continue as an issue in the 2001 Update. The pattern of urban development proposed is similar in most respects and thus "less than significant impacts" are associated with the Update compared to the prior adopted General Plan. However, the change in quantity of groundwater withdrawals and the amount of water otherwise available for public supplies associated with increased population growth and agricultural preservation make these impacts potentially significant unless mitigated. It is anticipated that the storm drainage and sanitary sewer treatment and reuse proposals of the adopted General Plan will be continued and reinforced as part of the 2001 Update. The EIR will identify types of projects and general locations where changes in drainage, exposure to flooding, degradation of surface water quality, or other project related impacts are most probable.

V. Air Quality

It is recognized that Arroyo Grande is a small component of regional growth and development in a region already experiencing air quality problems and non-compliance with certain state and federal clean air standards. It will be necessary to adopt overriding considerations to continue growth and development despite this potentially significant impact, which is beyond local agency ability to mitigate to less than significant.

Land use and circulation patterns are major contributors to the regional air quality problems and these are planning issues that the City can address. The 2001 Update and EIR will qualitatively consider policy alternatives such as Mixed Use that may help mitigate excessive travel patterns. Additionally, estimates based on a traffic model, will allow the EIR to identify where increased traffic may result in congestion, contributing to increased exposure of sensitive receptors to air pollution.

VI. Transportation/Circulation

The 2001 General Plan Update and EIR will evaluate the probable increases in vehicle trips and possible traffic congestion associated with additional regional and local growth and development. To the extent feasible, by qualitative analysis, it will also discuss areas of insufficient parking, inadequate access, or apparent barriers to pedestrian, bike and transit alternatives. The Update will utilize a traffic model to determine where intersection capacity problems and road deficiencies are most apparent.

The City has recently established a policy to require all proposed development projects with 20 or more peak hour trips to mitigate traffic impacts not to exceed Level Of Service C considering the existing circulation system. This may preclude implementation of some General Plan land use proposals, regardless of Update, and potentially significant impacts may be experienced due to regional growth, despite the City’s intent to mitigate traffic impacts to less than significant. The 2001 General Plan Update EIR and traffic model will identify where circulation deficiencies appear to preclude proposed land use changes.

VII. Biological Resources

The proposed 2001 Update will involve similar impacts on biological resources as the adopted 1990 General Plan. Increased impacts on creek and wetland habitats and resources will be mitigated primarily by requiring project specific mitigation and where possible by avoiding encroachment into sensitive areas. Nonetheless, these impacts on biological resources are
potentially significant unless mitigated. No new field surveys are part of this 2001 General Plan Update and EIR, but the Update will identify known sensitive areas where such resource studies would be required prior to any consideration for development projects.

VIII. Energy and Mineral Resources

The Update does not differ from the adopted General Plan regarding impacts on these resources and the EIR will not repeat 1990 EIR discussion.

IX. Hazards

The Update will note areas of high fire hazard where development is allowed by both the adopted 1990 General Plan and proposed 2001 Update. Although it may not be feasible to avoid exposure to these risks and safety hazards, it may be appropriate to increase required mitigation measures. No other substantial differences are apparent between the Update and adopted General Plan related to hazards.

X. Noise

The 2001 General Plan Update and EIR will identify areas of substantial traffic increases that will contribute to increased noise levels, where these differ from the adopted 1990 General Plan Noise Element, if any. None of these changes are expected to involve exposure of people to severe noise levels.

XI. Public Services

The 2001 General Plan Update, by accommodating continued growth and development, to approximately 20,000 population capacity, a 10% increase during the next twenty years, will impact the demand for additional public services and facilities. Fire and police services are expected to require additional personnel and equipment, and schools will require additional facilities and personnel. The EIR will generally identify and quantify the 12 Land Use Study Areas and sub-areas where growth will occur and estimate the approximate number of personnel and size and/or type of facilities required to serve this growth. For road and general government operations and maintenance, the EIR will estimate the needed additional public services by proportional increase, compared to existing staff and facilities. The 2001 Update will propose continued use of development impact fees and policies to mitigate additional service needs to “less than significant.”

XII. Utilities and Service Systems

The 2001 General Plan Update will require additional electrical power, natural gas, telephone and cable television and other energy and communications systems and facilities to serve additional growth and development, but it is anticipated that these will be increased in capacity with less than significant impacts. Water, sewer, storm drainage and garbage services are more complicated and may involve potentially significant impacts unless mitigated. The 2001 General Plan Update will outline appropriate mitigation measures and estimate where and what type of facilities or service needs will be associated with the 12 Land Use Study Area’s planned growth and development to reduce impacts to “less than significant.”

XIII. Aesthetics

Although growth and development will cumulatively contribute to increased urbanization, degrading the scenic, open or natural character of Arroyo Grande’s vicinity, design and property
development standards are intended to mitigate these aesthetic impacts to “less than significant.” The change from rural to urban uses, for example, generally involves potentially significant light and glare unless mitigated by design review and other controls, most already established.

XIV. Cultural Resources

Continued growth and development as provided by the 2001 General Plan and Update, can be considered “potentially significant unless mitigated,” particularly impacts on historical resources if not preserved. These impacts will require project specific identification and mitigation, but the 2001 General Plan Update will provide generalized, program level mitigation. (Archeological and historical resources should be avoided where feasible to assure less than significant impacts, but where avoidance is not possible, site specific identification, evaluation and mitigation will be required.)

XV. Recreation

The additional population and development provided for by the 2001 General Plan Update will increase the demand for neighborhood, community and regional parks and other local recreational facilities. This impact is considered “potentially significant unless mitigated”, but the Parks and Recreation element contains programs that are intended to reduce this impact to “less than significant.”

Conclusion

Although the 1990 General Plan included a Final EIR and the 2001 General Plan Update involves essentially the same or similar impacts, it is apparent that either project increases potential growth and development compared to existing conditions. Some of these impacts are potentially significant unless mitigated, and others appear individually limited to less than significant but in combination with other jurisdictions’ growth, are “cumulatively considerable.” In at least three topics, water resources, air quality, and transportation/circulation, the impact appears potentially significant and may require overriding considerations for 2001 General Plan Update program approval. The program level EIR is integrated into the 2001 General Plan Update.

Issues Raised by Agencies

Responses to the Notice of Preparation were received from:

- Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)
- San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG);
- Department of Fish and Game (DFG), State of California;
- City of Grover Beach;
- Lucia Mar Unified School District;
- San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building; and,
- Air Pollution Control District (APCD).

The Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) letter of 12/13/2000 indicated that the General Plan Update is assigned project number 200100371-LM in the event permits are required from ACE. The letter outlines examples of the type of projects requiring permits which relate to grading and drainage modifications, and proposed land use changes discussed in sections I, land use and IV, water.
Issues and alternatives raised in SLOCOG letter of 12/30/00 relate primarily to the Circulation Element, including bike and transit planning and pedestrian oriented facilities, as well as current Highway 101 Project Study Reports. These will be addressed in the section regarding Circulation.

Department of Fish and Game's letter of 2/20/01 requests consideration of specific impacts to sensitive plant species (Pismo Clarkia and Well's Manzanita) found in the Arroyo Grande planning area, as well as creek and wetland habitat impacts. These will be discussed in Section I regarding Land Use changes and Section VII Biological Resources.

City of Grover Beach response letter of 1/18/01 expresses particular environmental concern regarding drainage and siltation from further development of Meadow Creek (Oak Park Boulevard) drainage area. This issue will be discussed in Section I regarding Land Use changes and Section IV water.

Lucia Mar Unified School District letter of 1/8/01 issues or concerns focus on both Land Use changes and Circulation system improvements. Additional coordination with the City for special events, sports and recreation programs were also included as concerns. These issues are discussed in the respective Land Use, Circulation and Parks and Recreation sections of the EIR, I, VI and XV.

The County Planning Department response of 1/10/01 indicates particular concern with conservation of prime agricultural land in and adjoining the City, and also suggests a storm water management program as a part of Utilities and Service Systems analysis. These issues will be discussed in Section I re Land Use, Sections XI and XII re Community Facilities, Utilities and Service System of the EIR.

The APCD letter of 1/8/01 requests a complete air quality analysis in the DEIR to adequately evaluate the overall air quality impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan Update. APCD recognized that a detailed quantitative emissions analysis is not relevant at this time, but requested a qualitative analysis including attainment status to State Air Quality Standards resulting from development. These issues will be addressed in Section V regarding Air Quality.

**Intended Uses of EIR**

1) As noted in the summary, the primary purpose of this program EIR is adoption of the 2001 General Plan Update, including Land Use, Circulation, Agriculture, Conservation, Open Space, Housing, Noise, Safety, Economic Development and Park and Recreation Elements. The EIR will be considered by the City Planning Commission and City Council prior to recommendations and action on the 2001 General Plan Update.

2) The County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will also be requested by the City of Arroyo Grande to consider certain County General Plan Land Use Element amendments within the Arroyo Grande Fringe Area of the San Luis Bay Planning Area – Inland document. This EIR can be used to enact the increased Planning Area Standards for the Residential Suburban classification in the Arroyo Grande Fringe, proposed as a mitigation measure in Land Use Study Area 5, which is County Jurisdiction.

3) The Local Agency Formation Commission and South County Sanitation District will also be requested by the City of Arroyo Grande to consider amendments to the adopted Spheres of Influence. SCSD's Sphere of Influence also includes Land Use Study Area 5, a portion of the County's Residential Suburban Arroyo Grande Fringe north and northwest of the City. If excluded from the City's SOI, it would be appropriate to also exclude this area from SCSD's Sphere, both
requiring amendments approved by LAFCO. Additionally, Land Use Study Areas 8 and 9 discussed in this EIR, also propose changes to the City's Sphere of Influence that may also require consideration by SCSD, the County and LAFCO.

This EIR can be used by these other agencies when considering these respective changes to the Spheres of Influence or subsequent annexations.

4) The City of Arroyo Grande will consider amendments to its Development Code and zoning map to achieve consistency with the 2001 General Plan Update, once adopted. These changes are directly related to the implementation of the 2001 General Plan Update and are part of the actions anticipated by this Program EIR.

5) The City of Arroyo Grande will also consider technical and infrastructure studies and plans such as Drainage, Water and Sewer Master Plans. These will also be reviewed and updated subsequent to 2001 General Plan Update and may be amended using this Program EIR as the relevant environmental document. These infrastructure plans are sometimes considered by other agencies such as County, State, South County Sanitation District, Regional Water Quality Control Board or others involved in funding capital improvements.

6) The County of San Luis Obispo and San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) are involved in transportation planning and improvement projects that may implement the 2001 General Plan Update Circulation Element. This Program EIR can be used as a reference document for consideration of project environmental determinations and initial studies related to transportation improvements.

**Summary of Impacts**

This integrated Program EIR has been prepared to evaluate the potentially significant impacts to the environment that are reasonably expected to result from implementation of the 2001 General Plan Update. For detailed discussion of potential impacts refer to Sections C and D of this EIR. In accordance with CEQA, a summary of the program impacts are outlined in Table EIR-1. This table lists proposed mitigation measures recommended in response to subarea and project impacts identified in the EIR and a determination of the level of significance of the impact after mitigation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact Topic = Area Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Area of Potential Significance – Project Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>G.P. Policy Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. LAND USE AND PLANNING</td>
<td>Developed areas of the City will remain unchanged form 1990 GP and existing use, except within 12 Land Use Study subareas identified. Change areas are mitigated by proposed alternative, GP policy, or requirement for project EIR. Less than significant (LTS) impacts determined for following study areas: 1) Oak Park Acres at James Way-Church and school classified CF 2) Rancho Grande-Noyes Road 53 ac.@SFR-LD-PD &amp; C/OS = 35du max. 3) Rancho Grande-LaCanada 27ac.@C/OS-S-PD-5du max. (Require EIR if GPA for more than 5du PD). 4) Royal Oaks estates 37 ac@SFR-LD-PD&amp;C/OS=20du max. 5) Northern SOI 60ac.@SFR-LD-PD = 60du max. 6) Camino Mercado (Regional Commercial uses may require project EIRs). 7E) Myrtle &amp; Cherry 21ac. @ SFR-MD=95du max. Require EIR and PD if GPA for more than SFR-MD-PD. 8) Frederick/ALC &amp; Williams SOI classified SP&amp;SP Reserve. Require EIR prior to development or annexation. 10) Farrell Ave. 10 ac.@SFR-MD-PD or MFR-PD if GPA for more than 45 du may require project EIR. 11) E. Grand Ave. Mixed Use area projects may require project EIRs. 12) El Camino Real commercial or industrial use projects may require project EIRs, depending on new uses.</td>
<td>1) LU9 2) LU2-2 &amp; LU10 3) LU2-2 &amp; LU10 4) LU2-2 &amp; LU9 5) LU Fringe 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 &amp; 1.6 6) LU5 &amp; LU10 7W&amp;E) LU2-4 7W&amp;S) LU-5 7E) LU2-3 8) LU10=LU11 8&amp;LU11-6.10 9) Ag1, Ag3, Ag4,Ag5,Ag6 10)LU2-3 LU10 LU11 11) LU5 12) LU5 All LU 12</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. POPULATION AND HOUSING</td>
<td>2001 General Plan Update Build-out same as 1990. Population under 20,000 does not exceed resources or regional projections.</td>
<td>No significant displacement of existing housing. Require studies for projects more than 20 dwellings. Require project EIR for more than 40du or sensitive sites.</td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. GEOPHYSICAL</td>
<td>2001 General Plan Update integrates Safety Element policies. Increased landslide and erosion exposure in certain hillside development areas. Seismic hazards mitigated by construction standards.</td>
<td>2) Rancho Grande-Noyes Rd. 3) Rancho Grande-LaCanada – 4) Royal Oak Estates – Require Project EIRs or geo study 5) Northern SOI-Hwy 227 8) Fredericks/ALC &amp; Williams – Require Specific Plans &amp; EIRs</td>
<td>Safety Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. WATER</td>
<td>Arroyo Grande groundwater basin allocations &amp; safe yield unresolved. Regional uses appear to exceed resources: potentially significant. Initiate regional groundwater study &amp; resource allocations now to enable mitigation/resource management before permanent damage. Land use study areas with drainage concerns include: 1) Rancho Grande–Noyes Rd. 2) Rancho Grande–La Canada 3) Royal Oak Estates 4) Fredericks/ALC &amp; Williams 5) E. Grand Ave Mixed Use 6) El Camino Real Mixed Use</td>
<td>Conservation Element</td>
<td>Potentially significant -- Requires Statement of Overriding Considerations for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. AIR QUALITY</td>
<td>Arroyo Grande growth beyond 18,676 population in 2010 requires CAP amendment, but current plan allows more sprawl than proposed by 2001 Update. Transportation management strategies to encourage increased alternative circulation modes uncertain.</td>
<td>Land Use Element</td>
<td>Potentially significant due to current non-attainment future CAP amendment, &amp; uncertain Transportation Management Strategies on regional basis: requires Statement of Overriding Considerations for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</td>
<td>Correction of circulation deficiencies to LOS 'C' in question with all alternative due to regional land use pattern. Major projects with cumulative traffic impacts include: 5) Northern SOI unless mitigation fees established &amp; density reduced. 7) Village Core – parking &amp; E. Branch congestion unresolved. 8) Fredericks/ALC &amp; Williams – Specific Plan &amp; EIR required. 11 &amp; 12) E. Grand Ave &amp; El Camino Real Mixed Use parking &amp; regional congestion unresolved.</td>
<td>Land Use Element and Circulation Element</td>
<td>Potentially significant: Require Statement of Overriding Considerations for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 2001 GPU redistributes additional planned development to least sensitive sites &amp; maximizes Mixed Use to conserve remaining resource areas. Riparian corridor &amp; wetland restoration programs weak, however. County development in Fringe Area much greater impact potential but beyond City Jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Project EIRs required for sensitive sites in City (See above). Propose reduction of impact by alternatives. City should initiate riparian corridor acquisition, wetland restoration, and storm water pollution prevention programs after GPU.</td>
<td>Open Space and Conservation Element LU Fringe Policies of Land Use Element</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES 2001 GPU does not differ from 1990 GP. No identified mineral resources in area. No local programs for new energy conservation measures proposed nor new facility provided.</td>
<td>These statewide and national issues are not addressed in the scope of this program EIR.</td>
<td>State and Federal Programs required to address issues</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. HAZARDS Fire safety concern in Northern SOI addressed by reduced density and/or need for new County CDF Station. Increased development in Mixed Use Corridors &amp; Village Core may require flood, fire &amp; project mitigations.</td>
<td>Density reduction essential in Land Use Study Area 5. for Northern SOI: Projects may still need fire safety mitigation due to 15 minute response time. Major mixed use projects in Village Core may need special fire and flood mitigation.</td>
<td>Safety Element</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. NOISE Mixed Use areas include residential use &amp; potential land use compatibility concerns. Major expansion area adjoining Freeway 101 also exposed to traffic noise sources.</td>
<td>Mixed Use projects and major expansion in Land Use Study area 8, Frederick/ALC &amp; Williams will require project study &amp; mitigation due to traffic noise exposure.</td>
<td>Land Use Element Park &amp; Recreation Element</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. PUBLIC SERVICES Cumulative impacts of urban population growth &amp; additional development may exceed current police &amp; fire service capabilities without assured mitigation measures. Other Planned Developments will generally provide for project mitigation but cumulative growth anywhere in Lucia Mar School District will impact overcrowded schools.</td>
<td>Large scale projects such as Land Use Study Area 8, Frederick/ALC &amp; Williams require project Specific Plans and EIRs. Other cumulative developments warrant consideration of new impact fees, particularly in County Fringe Area. Planned Developments will provide project mitigation measures.</td>
<td>Land Use Element Park &amp; Recreation Element State needs to increase school development priority not resolved in General Plan.</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Topic – Area Less Than Significant</td>
<td>Areas of Potential Significance – Project Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>G.P. Policy Mitigation</td>
<td>Impact After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Cumulative impacts other than Northern SOI &amp; southeast expansion. Land Use Study Areas 5 &amp; 8, appear capable of development with relatively minor mitigation measures for water, sewer, drainage &amp; other utility infrastructure impacts.</td>
<td>Potentially significant unless Northern SOI excluded &amp; density reduced. Specific Plans &amp; EIRs required for southeastern expansion to determine mitigation measures.</td>
<td>Land Use Element C/OS 6.</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. AESTHETICS Cumulative development eroding rural &amp; small town character. Community design guidelines &amp; project design review partially mitigates aesthetic impacts.</td>
<td>Large scale &amp; mixed use projects require design review. Planned Developments &amp; Specific Plans also include architectural landscape &amp; signage design standards.</td>
<td>Land Use/Agricultural, Open Space &amp; Conservation Elements. New development standards for Mixed Use areas needed.</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES Property specific surveys needed to mitigate historical &amp; archeological impacts. Most significant concentration of historic resources is in Land Use Study Area 7, Village Core &amp; environs.</td>
<td>Village Core mixed use projects, in particular, need to provide site-specific resource survey &amp; project design proposals to mitigate loss of historic or archeological resources.</td>
<td>Conservation Element Parks &amp; Recreation Element</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. RECREATION Cumulative developments contribute to increased regional need for park facilities &amp; recreation programs offset in City by in-lieu fees or dedication of added land. Need implementation programs for recreational trails &amp; increased regional funding responsibility.</td>
<td>Potential for 20,000 City population implies need for at least 20 acres of additional parks, local and regional funding &amp; implementation programs needed to mitigate.</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Element</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Project Description

Location and Boundaries: The Arroyo Grande Planning Area called the Area of Environmental Concern (AEC) is shown on Map EIR-1. The Urban Land Use Element, Map EIR-2, is the focus of the 2001 General Plan Update and composes the center of the Planning Area (AEC). These area boundaries can be determined in greater detail by use of larger maps on file with the Community Development Department of the City of Arroyo Grande.

The Land Use Study Areas, Map EIR-4, indicates twelve areas of potential classification changes inherent in the 2001 General Plan Update, Map EIR-2 when compared to the adopted 1990 General Plan, Map EIR-3. Several of these areas are fully developed and do not involve potential impacts, despite proposed clarification to land use classification changes from 1990 to the 2001 General Plan Update. But, most of these Land Use Study Areas contain undeveloped properties and/or sensitive environmental resources which may be affected by proposed development alternatives. The EIR will therefore focus on these 12 Land Use Study areas and identify significant effects, mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce these effects associated with each of the potential changes.

Statement of Objectives of the Proposed Program:

As explained in the Introduction section, the General Plan is the foundation policy document of the City regarding growth and development. It is required by State law and must contain seven elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise and Safety. Arroyo Grande has added three optional elements: Agriculture, Economic Development and Parks and Recreation.

The fundamental purpose of the 2001 General Plan Update is to comply with State law and maintain a comprehensive, consistent set of objectives, policies and implementation proposals that reflect current conditions and evolving community vision of the future. Changes since 1990 include population growth, housing characteristics and needs, traffic conditions, economic development and commercial trends and increased concerns regarding conservation of small town character and preservation of prime agricultural lands.

A summary of objectives outlined in the component Elements include:

Agriculture, Open Space and Conservation Element

Ag 1. No net loss of prime farmland soils and conservation of non-prime Agriculture use and natural resource lands.
Ag 2. Allocate and conserve water resources for agricultural use and minimize potential Fringe Area and urban development that would divert such resources from agriculture.
Ag 3. Current acreage of agricultural uses within the Arroyo Grande’s Area of Environmental Concern (AEC) shall be maintained
Ag 4. Support continued economic viability of agriculture as a specialized site-specific industry
Ag 5. Promote compatible coexistence of agricultural and urban land uses (e.g. Ag buffers)
Ag 6. Agriculture classification shall include minimum development standards (20ac. prime, 40ac. non-prime, 1du/10ac.)

C/OS 1. Protect visually accessible scenic resources
C/OS 2. Safeguard important environmental and sensitive biological resources contributing to healthy, functioning eco-system
C/OS 3. Plan for a well-maintained system of footpaths and non-vehicular trails that provide access to areas of non-urban environments
C/OS 4. Preserve historic and cultural resources of public interest that reflect the legacy of earlier human settlement
C/OS 5. Conservation/Open Space classification shall include minimum development standards: (5ac., 10ac. or 20ac. minimum parcels and 1du/1parcel)
C/OS 6. The City of Arroyo Grande shall manage land use and limit its urban development to that which can be sustained by the available water resources and serviced by the circulation system and other infrastructure.

Land Use Element

LU 1. The City requests that the County amend its Land Use Element to reduce Residential Rural and Residential Suburban land uses and density within Arroyo Grande's Fringe Area and Area of Environmental Concern (AEC)/Planning Area.
LU 2. Accommodate a diversity of single-family residential types and densities within the City.
LU 3. Accommodate a diversity of multiple family residential and special needs housing types and densities within the City.
LU 4. Provide for a diversity of medical facilities and professional office uses to complement the character and serve the population of Arroyo Grande by designation as Office appropriately located areas of the City.
LU 5. Community commercial, office and other compatible land uses shall be located in Mixed Use areas and corridors both north and south of the freeway in proximity to major arterial streets.
LU 6. The historic Village Core area shall be sustained, enhanced and expanded as the symbolic, functional and unique business center of the City, with diverse mixed uses emphasizing pedestrian-oriented activities and providing for the needs of residents and tourists.
LU 7. Regional Commercial and Business Park uses shall be located along the freeway corridor.
LU 8. Automobile related uses, including dealerships, service/repair uses, and light industrial uses may be conditionally permitted in Mixed Use and Regional Commercial areas to assure that their design and operations are compatible with adjacent uses.
LU 9. Provide for an adequate supply of Community Facilities at locations to accommodate existing and planned public and institutional uses.
LU10. Utilize Conservation/Open Space, Planned Development and/or Specific Plan districts or combining designations for areas of special site development concerns.
LU11. Promote a pattern of land use that protects the integrity of existing land uses, area resources and infrastructure and involves logical jurisdictional boundaries with adjacent communities and the County.
LU12. Components of “rural setting” and “small town character” shall be protected.

Circulation Element

C 1. Plan and develop a coordinated and efficient functional classification system of local streets and highways throughout the community: Maintain Level of Service ‘C’.
C 2. Maintain and improve existing infrastructure including roads, streets, transit facilities and operations, bikeways and pedestrian facilities, to optimize the use of existing facilities as an alternative to new construction.
C 3. Develop and support multi-modal approaches, including safety enforcement and educational programs to improve travel safety.
C 4. Develop and support multi-modal transportation including transit, bike lanes and pedestrian facilities.
C 5. Develop land use and circulation patterns that facilitate efficient use of the existing transportation system and are compatible with existing development.
C 6. Coordinate local transportation planning efforts with County, regional, State and federal agencies.

Housing Element

H 1. Encourage continuing supply of affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and future Arroyo Grande residents in all income levels.
H 2. Require all approved General Plan amendments and/or zoning applications that increase allowed residential density on a property to allocate at least 25% of the increase be developed for low and moderate-income households by payment of an in-lieu fee, or dedicating land to be used for development of affordable housing.
H 3. New housing subdivisions or developments of 50 or more units shall provide at least 10% of the total units as affordable to low income households, subject to approval of a density bonus of at least 10%.
H 4. Adopt guidelines for the operation of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and consider other funding sources to increase low and moderate income housing development.
H 5. Housing for low and moderate-income households shall not be concentrated into a single building or identifiable portion of a development but dispersed throughout and integrated into the design.
H 6. Require abatement of unsafe or unsanitary structures including buildings or rooms inappropriately used for housing contrary to adopted health and safety codes.
H 7. The City shall encourage the conservation of existing mobile home parks, but where redevelopment is deemed appropriate, the City shall seek replacement-housing opportunities and provide relocation assistance to eligible residents.

Safety Element

S 1. Attain a high level of emergency preparedness.
S 2. Reduce damage to structures and danger to life caused by flooding, dam failure inundation and other water hazards.
S 3. Reduce the threat to life, structures and the environment caused by fire.
S 4. Minimize the potential for loss of life and property resulting from geologic and seismic hazards.
S 5. Reduce the potential for harm to individuals and damage to the environment from radiation hazards, hazardous materials, electromagnetic fields, radon and hazardous trees and buildings.

Noise Element

N 1. To protect the citizens of Arroyo Grande from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise.
N 2. To protect the economic base of Arroyo Grande by preventing incompatible land uses from encroaching upon existing or planned noise producing uses.
N 3. To preserve the tranquility of residential areas by preventing the encroachment of noise producing uses.
N 4. To educate the residents of Arroyo Grande concerning the effects of exposure to excessive noise and the methods available for minimizing such exposure.
N 5. To avoid or reduce noise impacts through site planning and project design, giving second preference to the use of noise barriers and/or structural modifications to buildings containing noise-sensitive land uses.
Parks and Recreation Element

PR 1. Neighborhood and community park facilities, including the sports complex, should be provided at a ratio of four acres per 1000 persons (City residents).
PR 2. The City should supplement existing park, recreation and cultural facilities when needed and financially feasible.
PR 3. Establish a network of recreational trails, bicycle lanes and bikeways for use by local residents and visitors to Arroyo Grande.
PR 4. The City will consider all available financing and acquisition techniques in the development of parks and recreation facilities.
PR 5. City parks and recreation facilities should be maintained in an attractive and functional condition.

Economic Development Element

ED 1. Create an economic development-marketing program to promote the City’s balanced image and implement the Redevelopment Plan Implementation Strategy.
ED 2. Enhance business retention and expansion consistent with the General Plan Land Use Policies.
ED 3. Encourage and support the retention and expansion of Agriculture business activities.
ED 4. Protect and promote the overall commercial service and retail business sectors of the local economy.
ED 5. Become an active participant in the SLO Countywide tourism programs.
ED 6. Promote development of affordable housing in accordance with the General Plan Housing Element.
C. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT TOPICS: Technical, Economic and Environmental Characteristics and Supporting Public Service Facilities

I. Land Use and Planning. The 1990 General Plan Final EIR, Table 1, Land Use Summary estimated that the 2885 acres of residential districts within the City had the potential to accommodate 7575 dwelling units, and an approximate population capacity of 19,500. Approximately 600 acres of commercial, industrial and public facility land use categories were estimated to provide approximately 5.1 million square feet of potential non-residential building area.

The City boundaries have changed very little in the 11-year period since 1990 with only a 50-acre low-density residential annexation added northeast of James Way near Rodeo Drive. Internal developments, particularly in the northwest quadrant of the City have utilized most of the 1112 acres classified as “vacant” from 1987 land use inventory. Three large Planned Developments – Oak Park Acres, Rancho Grande and Royal Oak Estates – have dramatically changed the former undeveloped hills into numerous, low density single family residential subdivisions separated by several large open space areas composed of steeper canyons. The commercial north side of Freeway 101 along West Branch Street from Brisco to Oak Park Boulevard developed with the large “Five Cities Shopping Center” as part of this quadrant of Planned Development. Other portions of the City experienced smaller scale developments, infilling scattered vacant properties within the predominantly built up areas. In the southwest quadrant of the City, a specific plan for a neo-traditional residential subdivision known as Berry Gardens was approved, enabling homes in former agricultural field north of Soto Sports Complex. To the southeast of Arroyo Grande High School, Vista del Mar converted former undeveloped hillside within the City into a low density residential custom home subdivision, while outside the City Falcon Ridge Estates replaced former hillside grazing. To the east, near Cherry Avenue and Branch Mill Road former agricultural field was subdivided for single family homes.

From 1990 to 2000, the City of Arroyo Grande issued building permits for approximately 850 dwelling units, almost all of which are entirely single family residential. Concurrently, 54 permits for new commercial building were issued, the majority for offices. The early 1990’s, during national recession, was a period of relatively slow growth with an average of 40 new homes per year and annual permit valuation of approximately $10 million. The 1995 to 2000 period in comparison, was almost triple this annual activity with an average of 125 homes and permit valuation of almost $26 million. The population growth from 14,215 in 1990 to 15,851 in 2000 reflects an average of under 1% annually.

The 2001 General Plan Update reflects the fact that the City of Arroyo Grande is reaching "build-out", with relatively limited remaining vacant, undeveloped land available for continued single family residential subdivision. Once rural areas of South County, particularly the unincorporated community of Nipomo and adjoining Mesa area are growing at rates more than double that of Arroyo Grande, absorbing much of the regional residential development pressure.

The developed land use pattern in and around the City of Arroyo Grande will constrain population growth in the future and require that much of the new housing be higher density multiple family rather than low density single family. The 2001 General Plan Update proposes mostly Mixed Use and Village Core development opportunities. Of the 12 Land Use study areas involving change from the 1990 General Plan, four containing approximately 125 acres enable a total potential of 85 single family residential dwellings, while four other Mixed Use areas containing approximately 80 acres are estimated to provide more than 320 multiple-family dwelling unit potential.
It is uncertain whether the future land use change, involving different housing type and density, will be accepted in the regional market or population growth will instead seek alternative low density single family development areas. If given the choice, based on historic trends, however, it is probable that low density residential development in the Nipomo Mesa area will accelerate rather than shift to multiple family, mixed use housing projected in the City of Arroyo Grande. It is apparent that the City has few available expansion areas to continue providing low-density single family residential developments, unless it enables conversion of prime Agriculture lands to the northeast and south or commits the eastern Arroyo Linda Crossroads Specific Plan to more hillside residential use than commercial and business park uses currently planned. While these alternatives would respond to short term housing market preferences, they would substantially erode long term Agriculture productivity and eliminate the only significant opportunity for future urban expansion within the City along the Freeway 101 corridor, Arroyo Linda Crossroads. In a regional perspective, approximately 500 acres composing the Frederick/ALC and Williams properties east of the urban developed City of Arroyo Grande might be an alternative low-density hillside residential expansion area with 250 or more homesites replacing grazing. This pattern could continue around Picacho Hill on both sides of Freeway 101 displacing vineyards and other agricultural uses eventually merging with Nipomo and Mesa developments in a sprawling South County extension of “Five Cities”. Clearly, this land use and planning alternative is not the future pattern preferred by Arroyo Grande citizens. But, unless the County curtails rapid urban suburban and rural residential development in the unincorporated community of Nipomo and across the Mesa, it is the apparent potential. Recognizing that Arroyo Grande and other parts of the "Five Cities" area are now filling up should cause the County to evaluate regional land use and planning impacts before Nipomo and the Mesa become the sixth and seventh cities.

The City of Arroyo Grande 2001 General Plan Update, by restricting land use and population growth to reflect apparent resource and infrastructure constraints to urban expansion may inadvertently contribute to acceleration of unincorporated South County suburban sprawl. This is an avoidable impact alternative outside the jurisdiction and control of the City, requiring planning and growth management mitigation by the County of San Luis Obispo.

II. Population and Housing. As noted above, the 2001 General Plan Update redistributes projected population from continued low density single family residential development to new Mixed Use and Village Core multiple family housing potential. The 1990 General Plan build-out population of 19,500 remains as the 2001 General Plan Update estimated capacity. The rate of population growth and housing development within the City is projected to continue at approximately 1% average annual increase, but this assumes a shift in housing type and density that has not historically been a substantial part of the market. From 1990 to 2000 very few multiple family dwellings have been constructed in Arroyo Grande and this type and density of housing may not conform to the rural, small town character preferred by current residents. Nonetheless, the opportunities for continued low density single family residential development in Arroyo Grande are few, unless prime Agriculture land is converted or the proposed eastern expansion area is committed to hillside residential rather than Specific Planned commercial and Business Park urban development.

The lack of continued large scale Planned Development for low density single family subdivisions in the City of Arroyo Grande, combined with similar build-out within Grover Beach and Pismo Beach will probably accelerate suburban sprawl in Nipomo and Mesa areas of the South County. Another apparent unintended alternative, also involving unincorporated area, is increased development pressure in the large Arroyo Grande Fringe Area north of the City. While already fragmented and generally lacking adequate roads and other infrastructure, this Fringe Area contains approximately 2865 acres classified as Residential Suburban and 3585 acres classified as Residential Rural. At currently allowed densities of 1 acre and 5 acres homesites, this Arroyo...
Grande Fringe Area implies a potential for more than 2700 rural and suburban homesites and a population in excess of 8000 residents in a 10 square mile area.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes to avoid or reduce this apparent Fringe Area potential by excluding 700 acres of northern Sphere of Influence area from the City’s urban reserve and requesting the County to increase the minimum lot size to 1du/2.5 acres in the RS classified area. The population and housing impacts of the 2001 General Plan Update imply a shift from low-density single family residential to higher density multiple family and Mixed Use housing which are not probable unless the County precludes continued suburban and rural low density sprawl in alternative growth areas. Although beyond the control of the City of Arroyo Grande, the proposed 2001 General Plan Update will contribute to accelerated suburban sprawl of low density housing and population growth in Nipomo, the Mesa and Arroyo Grande Fringe Area unless prevented by County planning and growth management. Conversely, it is improbable that Mixed Use and multiple family housing alternatives proposed by the 2001 Update will occur unless unincorporated area sprawl alternatives are precluded.

III. Geophysical  The proposed 2001 General Plan Update provides for approximately 500 acres of urban expansion to the east including Frederick/ALC and Williams properties, while proposing to exclude approximately 700 acres from the adopted Sphere of Influence to the north along Printz, Noyes and Oak Park Roads. From geophysical impact comparison, the topography, drainage, soils and hazards associated with eastern rather than northern expansion involve substantially fewer problems although both are hillside terrain. The few remaining internal areas proposed for further low density residential development by the 2001 General Plan Update also involve difficult grading and erosion impacts and increased landside or seismic hazards with potential additional hillside development.

Most of these geophysical impacts can be avoided or reduced by hillside development policies and site-specific design and mitigation measures, to less than significant cumulative impact. Of the 12 internal land use study areas proposed by the 2001 General Plan Update, approximately 130 acres of hillside terrain compose five subareas within the northwest quadrant of the City, while more than 700 acres of County Fringe Area to the north is proposed to be excluded from urban expansion. The proposed addition of 500 acres of urban expansion to the east will be separately evaluated by pending Specific Plan and EIR for Arroyo Linda Crossroads and similar future studies of Williams property potential.

The 2001 General Plan Update incorporates Safety Element policies intended to mitigate hillside development hazards. Additional site-specific geologic studies prior to development will be required to resolve appropriate Specific Plan and Planned Development design and mitigation measures for cumulative geophysical impacts.

IV. Water Resources.  The 1990 General Plan Final EIR identified that the City of Arroyo Grande has an estimated total of 1200 acre feet of groundwater supply from the Arroyo Grande Sub-basin, about 100 acre feet groundwater supply from the Pismo formation and 2290 acre feet entitlement from Lopez Lake. The groundwater resources are part of voluntary agreements for unallocated 9500 acre feet estimated safe annual yield of the larger basin capacity utilized by agriculture and other jurisdictions.

The Urban Water Master Plan prepared in 1985 estimated that water resources available to Arroyo Grande could support a population of 19,388 based on average daily water consumption of 167 gallons per capita. According to the Water System Master Plan, adopted in July 1999, from 1987 to 1997 water production records indicate that per capita consumption varied from 151 to 197 gallons per person per day.
Based on per capita consumption of 190 gallons per person per day, the maximum average considered appropriate at that time, the 1990 City population of 14,057 was consuming 2990 acre feet per year. If the same rate of consumption were continued to the projected 19,500 City population at General Plan build-out, it was estimated that approximately 4148 acre feet per year of water resources would be required, 556 acre feet more than currently available. This significant adverse impact of inadequate water resources for maximum build-out under the proposed land use plan was discounted by noting that development generally reaches approximately 75 to 80% of maximum build-out based on potential land use at maximum density. The 1990 plan assumed 80% of maximum build-out or approximately 16,000 population and estimated that existing water resources could serve the planned build-out at or below 17,000 residents. The 1990 FEIR identified the water deficiency as a “significant but mitigable” impact that would require either an additional water supply or limitations on development so as not to exceed existing supply.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes that average per capita consumption be reduced by conservation measures to a maximum of 160 gallons per person per day. More detailed mitigation measures will be outlined in subsequent Water Management Master Plan studies to achieve this reduced per capita average consumption. Increased residential density, more efficient landscape irrigation and other water conservation including more efficient Agriculture irrigation may contribute to better utilization of available water resources. Use of storm water retention and possible re-use of treated wastewater for park and/or agriculture irrigation are among the mitigation measures to reduce per capita consumption. But until more accurate estimates of safe annual yield of groundwater and formal allocation of resources are accomplished, the potential exists for over-drafting the estimated basin capacity. Lopez Lake entitlements are also subject to alteration based on reduction due to siltation, seismic safety or environmental mitigation measures.

Groundwater quantity as well as quality can also be substantially impacted by County Residential Rural and Residential Suburban Fringe Area developments not currently calculated as part of regional water resource consumption potential.

For these reasons, and because supplemental sources such as Lake Nacimiento Project or State Coastal Aqueduct Project water resources are unresolved, the 2001 General Plan Update EIR considers water resource deficiency a significant impact without apparent mitigation. It should be recognized that the 1990 General Plan discounted prior general plan capacity estimates and that the 2001 General Plan Update only re-distributes the current adopted build-out potential of about 19,500. Nonetheless, the current population of almost 16,000 within the City may be approaching the safe annual yield and City entitlements of existing water resources if the City does not achieve reduced per capita consumption.

Although the “no project” alternative of the 1990 General Plan is equally adverse, the City must confront this water resource deficiency as a cumulative significant adverse impact of continued regional population growth. Mitigation to “less than significant” is beyond the control of the City and reliance must be on cooperative County and regional agency planning and growth management. A Statement of Overriding Considerations per CEQA Section 15093 and/or one of the findings of CEQA Section 15091 is considered necessary for this potential significant impact.

Regarding water storage and distribution, the City’s five water storage tanks in three separate pressure zones, in combination with well production, delivered water for both peak daily water use and emergency purposes. The Water System Master Plan recommends that the City upgrade its storage and distribution systems to correct apparent deficiencies. The Main zone will require an additional 1 million gallon additional storage or recommended replacement of Reservoir No. 1 with a new 2.0 million gallon reservoir for a total main zone storage of 5.0 million gallons. The
Oro pressure zone will need an additional 0.75 million gallon storage tank at Reservoir No. 3 site
and some improved transmission mains and booster station to connect with the Rancho Grande
zone. Numerous distribution system improvement projects are identified in the Water Master
Plan to correct existing deficiencies and enable future buildout. These include large mains in East
Grand Avenue from Halcyon to Oak Park; Arroyo Grande Creek crossing at Fair Oaks; cast iron
pipe replacement along Fair Oaks, Halcyon and Cornwall Streets; larger mains in the Harloe
School area; and mains along Myrtle Street, West El Camino Real, Farroll Avenue, Cherry Avenue
and other local areas (See Water Master Plan).

Generally, these deficiency correction capital improvement projects will also enable water storage
and delivery to the projected 2001 General Plan Update build-out or alternative 'no project' 1990
General Plan land use pattern. These water system improvements would be required mitigation
measures if additional development is proposed in deficient areas prior to planned and
recommended improvement projects. With refinement of these mitigation measures the water
storage and distribution systems are considered adequate for 2001 General Plan Update
purposes. It should be noted that easterly expansion known as Arroyo Linda Crossroads will be
the subject of a separate Specific Plan and EIR to address this potential development.

As a separate water related issue, a Storm Drainage Master Plan prepared in 1999 defines the
major drainage systems serving the City. The City is essentially composed of three drainage
zones containing 5 retention basins and 9 detention basins (6 of which are private). More than
$1.3 million of "high priority" improvement projects and $0.6 million of "medium priority"
improvement projects are identified in the Drainage Master Plan, generally to correct existing
deficiencies. However, several additional deficiencies affecting East Grand Avenue, Soto Sports
Complex and Tally Ho Road north of the Village are not included but would be needed to correct
existing deficiencies and accommodate planned development. These drainage improvements do
not necessarily address project related impacts associated with the 12 land use study areas
outlined as potential change areas when comparing 1990 and 2001 General Plan Update.
Several of these, particularly in Meadow Creek watershed, require site specific retardation basin
mitigation measures.

The city should formulate a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Program to reduce urban
contaminants from direct discharge into the creek system, including inlet filters, settlement ponds
an other methods.

Additionally, East Grand Avenue and El Camino Real Mixed Use development areas within the 670
acre Drainage Zone A relying on infiltration (recharge) basins will require additional ponding
basin expansion. The large Drainage Zone B containing more than 2100 acres drains to Arroyo
Grande Creek, composing the eastern two thirds of the City. Project specific impact studies will
be required to evaluate the water quality and capacity constraints affecting the Village Core and
other eastern urban expansion potential such as Arroyo Linda Crossroads and Williams
properties. Generally, however, these project related drainage issues are considered capable of
mitigation to less than significant.

V Air Quality. The Existing Setting and Community Issues Report of the 1990 General Plan
included a chapter devoted to description of climate, air quality standards and air pollution trends
and corrective strategies. In simple terms, the 1990 General Plan was described as a project
involving approximately 20,000 population and almost 400 acres of commercial development, but
recognizing that the bulk of development and population is already built. The Final EIR for 1990
General Plan adoption estimated that "development will increase the production of air pollutants
to 9.5 tons per day", described as a significant but mitigable impact. These estimates were
based on build-out with a total of 205,500 vehicle trips generated by 7575 dwelling units and
approximately 400 acres of non-residential uses: Carbon monoxide represents 76% of the total
pollution, oxides of nitrogen 15%, and total organic gases 9% of the total based on air quality model of the 1990 plan.

The 1998 Clean Air Plan (CAP) notes that state air quality standards adopted to protect public health, vegetation and visibility are currently exceeded for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM10) in San Luis Obispo County. The State Air Resources Board has designated the County as a non-attainment area for these pollutants and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District is the agency responsible for developing and updating the attainment plan for the County. Implementation of the 1998 CAP is expected to bring the County into attainment of State ozone standards within five years, including reactive organic gases and oxides of nitrogen.

The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) requires the 1998 CAP include the following components:

- Application of Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and District permitting designed to allow no net increase in emissions from stationary sources of a certain size;
- Application of BACT and reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for all other existing emission sources;
- Implementation of RACT for transportation control measures sufficient to substantially reduce the growth rate of motor vehicle trips and miles traveled; and,
- Development of control programs for area sources and indirect sources of emissions.

Emission control measures already implemented in the CAP include:

- Vapor recovery from industrial and commercial operations;
- Solvent content reduction;
- Improved transfer efficiency;
- Retrofitting gasoline and diesel engines to burn cleaner fuel or replace with electric motors;
- Catalytic or chemical reduction;
- Reduced vehicle use (carpool, transit, telecommute, bike and other trip reduction); and,
- New source review and indirect source review.

According to the CAP, reductions achieved by prior measures have exceeded the 20% minimum targets for both ROG and NOx emission sources, but attainment of State ozone standard has not yet been accomplished. This is due in part to pollutant transport from areas outside the County. But the ARB anticipates continued projections of ROG and NOx emission reduction due to cleaner cars expected in the vehicle fleet. The ARB has primary responsibility for controlling emissions from motor vehicle, fuels and consumer products at the state level, while the APCD is the regional agency responsible for implementation of the CAP and enforcing emissions controls for stationary and indirect sources. At the local level, city and county government and regional transportation agencies such as SLOCOG play an important role in transportation control measures and land use planning strategies. City and County planning agencies are required by law to determine that new development is consistent with the CAP prior to granting project approval.

Arroyo Grande is part of the Coastal Plateau region of San Luis Obispo County, containing about 75% of the county population and employment facilities.

Arroyo Grande is part of the San Luis Bay Planning Area projected to increase from about 43881 population in 1990 to 57222 by 2010. Arroyo Grande composed 14215 population in 1990 and is projected to 18676 by 2010, but provides no increase after 2010 in anticipation of General Plan buildout.
Communities within the San Luis Bay Planning Area are projected to continue population growth at rates ranging from Pismo Beach at 44% to Avila Beach at 16% with Arroyo Grande projected at 31% increase from 1990 to 2010.

In comparison, Nipomo and its rural environs composing South County Planning Area are projected to increase from 14,845 in 1990 to 25,199 in 2010. This reflects a 45% increase in rural area and a 99% growth rate between 1990 and 2010 in the community of Nipomo.

It is evident that the Clean Air Plan anticipates population growth to continue in Arroyo Grande at about the same rate as San Luis Obispo County as a whole, but at a rate substantially slower than South County and Nipomo.

The 2001 General Plan Update is consistent with the 1998 Clean Air Plan which projects Arroyo Grande population not to exceed 18,676 by 2010. And the 2001 City General Plan Update proposes many of the land use planning and transportation control measures recommended by the 1996 Guide for Communities of San Luis Obispo County: "Creating Transportation Choices through Development Design and Zoning". The intent of the Update proposals to create Mixed Use corridors and Village Core enhancement, for example are strategies to reduce vehicle trips and miles traveled compared to suburban regional growth alternatives.

Chapter 6 of the 1998 CAP describes the relationship between transportation and land use management strategies with Transportation Control Measures intended to reduce vehicle use and facilitate alternative transportation options. Slow speeds and congestion tend to increase emissions of most vehicle pollutants and short trips create disproportionately large ROG emissions. NOx emissions tend to increase in proportion to trip length and vehicle speed, making miles traveled for longer trips an important factor. Currently, average vehicle occupancy surveys indicate 90% of commute trips have only one occupant except along the 101 corridor where average vehicle occupancy during peak commute was estimated at 1.3 to 1.4 between South County and the City of San Luis Obispo.

The CAP identifies three mechanisms available for influencing regional travel behavior:

- Market based programs such as parking fees, vehicle emissions fee or fees for vehicle miles traveled;
- Command and control measures such as school based or employer based trip reduction programs; and
- Local agencies can also adopt transit programs or develop facilities such as park and ride lots, transit stops and bike lanes to encourage alternative transportation.

Other long term planning strategies with air quality and other benefits are improved jobs/housing balance, planning compact communities and providing more Mixed Use development to reduce trips and vehicle mile traveled.

While the 2001 General Plan Update proposes a major emphasis on new Mixed Use developments and provides for higher density multiple family housing in close proximity to major traffic generators, the overall regional land use pattern is clearly one of dispersed low density suburban and rural character. The Circulation Element will promote alternative transportation such as transit, biking, walking and carpooling. However, improved traffic flow by maintaining Level of Service 'C' can also encourage more vehicle use even if accompanied by better alternative transportation modes.

Finally, the 2001 General Plan Update proposes a reduction in Residential Rural and Suburban Arroyo Grande Fringe Area development to promote more compact City Mixed Use and Village
Core development pattern. Although beyond the scope of this General Plan Update, reduced Residential Rural and Suburban growth in the Nipomo area of South County are additional planning strategies proposed for LAFCO, County, SLOCOG and APCD consideration. Prior to 2010, the Clean Air Plan should be re-evaluated based on these revised land use and growth strategies to enable 2001 General Plan Update build-out projections in excess of 18,676.

Until compliance with State air quality standards is attained, however, this EIR considers cumulative low density residential growth and dispersed employment and shopping patterns conducive to excessive vehicle trips and miles to traveled criteria. The predominant pattern of development in Arroyo Grande including many proposed projects to infill the segregated, low density, suburban residential portions of the City continue to rely on motor vehicle use. Because this pattern is characteristic of all of Five Cities and sprawl continues with regional development in Arroyo Grande Fringe and Nipomo Mesa, the potential air quality impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable unless the County alters regional land use and transportation planning strategies.

The City will consider a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Section 15093 and/or one of the findings of CEQA Section 15091 for adoption of the 2001 General Plan Update. It will integrate land use and circulation mitigation measures proposed by the Update to reduce potential regional air quality impacts, but not to level of less than significant.

VI Transportation/Circulation

The 1990 General Plan Existing Setting and Community Issues Report included a chapter regarding Transportation infrastructure. The street system includes Freeway 101, State Highway 227 and numerous arterial and collector routes traversing the local access street network. The major street system lacks adequate connection with the Freeway and the freeway bisects the City with inadequate cross-town routes. The circulation system also includes many dead-end or unconnected local access streets which makes circulation and cross-town travel especially difficult for persons not familiar with the local street pattern. Most major streets traverse developed urban areas and are further constrained by topographic barriers such as creeks, hills and canyons. These circulation deficiencies contribute to congestion of the major and collector street network with few feasible alternatives for improvement.

The 1990 General Plan Final EIR identified traffic as a potential "significant but mitigable impact". It projected that additional development will increase traffic in the City from 131,000 to 214,000 vehicle trips per day (1.2 million vehicle miles). Needed improvements were identified in the Circulation Element but funding mechanisms for mitigation were not established. Many areas of the City are low-density residential developments lacking sidewalk or bicycle facilities and not feasibly serviced by efficient convenient public transportation.

Arterial and collector traffic congestion, as measured by Level of Service criteria, has substantially worsened since 1990 despite project mitigation measures and collection of traffic impact fees in the City. Although the County collects similar development impact road fees in the South County Nipomo area, it does not mitigate traffic increases in the Arroyo Grande Fringe nor unincorporated Oceano urban area, both of which generally traverse the City of Arroyo Grande along Elm, Grand and Oak Park Roads to access Freeway 101. Additionally, traffic from Nipomo Mesa rural developments often traverse Arroyo Grande along Valley, Halcyon, Brisco Roads and Fair Oaks Avenue to reach Freeway 101. Southbound area traffic from Nipomo and Oceano, also use Los Berros and El Campo Roads to access Freeway 101.

These regional circulation problems, most deficient within the city, will be further aggravated by Rural and Suburban growth regardless of the development pattern enabled by 1990 City General
Plan or 2001 General Plan Update. The Circulation Element Update Map EIR-5 will be evaluated by use of a traffic model to identify existing and projected deficient segments and intersections but correction of these deficiencies to LOS 'C' criteria desired by the City will be extremely difficult if not infeasible considering regional development patterns and existing deficiencies. Improvement to Freeway 101 interchange configurations at El Campo, Traffic Way, Fair Oaks, Grand, Halcyon, Brisco, and Oak Park Roads, for example, are unresolved regional circulation problems directly affecting development potential in the City of Arroyo Grande.

Highway 227 and Lopez Drive concentrates both through traffic and truck traffic along E. Branch Street through the heart of the Village. E. Grand Avenue is the major gateway arterial street providing regional access to Grover Beach, Pismo Beach and Oceano coastal areas. Thus, the City is confronted with an inadequate circulation system and regional growth patterns which impact the City street network regardless of internal growth and development alternatives. The 2001 General Plan Update can only redistribute local traffic, seek regional trip reduction by better land use strategies, and propose regional cooperation to correct existing circulation deficiencies.

Preliminary traffic model analysis reveals significant 2020 deficiencies on Freeway 101, El Campo, Traffic Way, Fair Oaks, Halcyon, Elm, E. Grand, Oak Park, Brisco, El Camino Real, W. Branch, E. Branch, and many collector streets as well as local streets functioning as arterial or collector routes. These models and development alternatives will be the subject of traffic study report concurrent with Circulation Element Update consideration, but it is apparent that significant traffic impacts are unavoidable in the City regardless of 2001 General Plan Update or retention of the 1990 Circulation Element. Except for major growth and development project alternatives such as Specific Plan for Arroyo Linda Crossroads, accompanied by El Campo and Traffic Way circulation improvements, the regional traffic network deficiencies involve significant unavoidable impacts with 'no project' or any apparent land use alternatives.

Statement of Overriding Consideration pursuant to CEQA Section 15093 and/or one of the findings of CEQA Section 15091 will be necessary for 2001 General Plan Update adoption. The most effective long-term transportation and circulation mitigation measures are dependent on regional network improvements, Mixed-Use and higher density land use developments and future potential shift to increased use of alternative transportation. None of these mitigations is feasible at the local level without County, Caltrans, SLOCOG and other adjoining jurisdictions cooperation and increased priority for funding improvements as well as studies.

Some reduction to projected significant traffic impacts can be achieved by project alternatives and mitigation measures associated with local development, but redistribution of additional trips in a deficient network does not alleviate the basic circulation problems associated with regional growth. None of the 12 Land Use Study area alternatives nor the several Circulation Element project study alternatives provide a solution to the fundamental network deficiencies evident in Arroyo Grande.

VII Biological Resources

The proposed 2001 General Plan Update will not substantially impact biological resources identified in the 1990 General Plan if accompanied by recommended project mitigation measures. The Existing Setting and Community Issues Report of the 1990 plan identified most riparian area biotic resources along Arroyo Grande, Tally Ho and Meadow Creek branches. Coastal oak woodland, grassland and chaparral habitat areas were concentrated in the northwest and southeast areas of the City where Planned Development had not yet been implemented. The 1990 General Plan FEIR concluded that significant riparian and wetland areas as well as landmark tree groves will be preserved. In 1990 the FEIR summary concluded "no significant impact" despite development continuing in areas supporting remnant significant species and isolation of
wildlife habitat areas assuming that large areas with native vegetation outside the City to the north, east and southeast that also help preserve native vegetation and wildlife remain rural or undeveloped. Numerous mitigation measures contained in the 1990 Land Use Element and Open Space and Conservation Element policies were cited to conserve biological resources within the City and reduce biological impacts to less than significant.

Few residents would argue, however, that cumulative urban and rural developments are eroding the residual natural environment including sensitive plant and animal species. The 2001 General Plan Update EIR will more closely examine the twelve land use study areas where proposed land use changes would amend the 1990 General Plan. Each project involving a sensitive residual habitat area will be required to provide site-specific survey and environmental analysis prior to further Planned Development, particularly for vegetated hillside and canyon areas or contributing to riparian and wetland drainage degradation. Conservation and Open Space classification and combining designations are expanded by the 2001 General Plan Update and additional Agriculture, and Land Use policies are proposed to further mitigate biological resource impacts.

The intent of the 2001 General Plan is to redistribute additional Planned Development to the least sensitive portions of residual sites and maximize Mixed Use opportunities for further urban development of lands already partially committed to urban use, preserving and conserving important remaining resource areas. But, implementation programs for riparian corridor restoration, wetland area conservation and wildlife habitat preservation are at best “general”. And, storm water pollution prevention programs are totally absent and should be added.

The major proposals for Agriculture and open space preservation and resource conservation rely on development project review and private land use compatible with natural resources. These resources are much less disturbed in the large Arroyo Grande Fringe Area north of the City. Unless the County substantially improves land use and property development standards in this 10 square mile Fringe Area, the impacts of cumulative urban development impacts on residual habitat areas within the 5 square mile City limits will be relatively insignificant. Additionally, the City and County will need to cooperate regarding Agriculture and Rural Land conservation practices to better protect natural biological areas in the Area of Environmental Concern surrounding Arroyo Grande. The 2001 General Plan Update viewed in this perspective proposes less than significant refinements to the 1990 General plan. The basic City mitigation measures possible with individual development project implementation are miniscule compared to regional development alternatives controlled by the County. The impacts of the 2001 General Plan Update are considered less than significant in this program EIR context.

VIII Energy and Mineral Resources

As noted in the Notice of Preparation, the 2001 General Plan Update does not differ from the adopted 1990 General Plan regarding impacts on these resources. The 1990 EIR conclusion that there are no identified mineral resource areas was reinforced by the Existing Setting and Community Issues Report. While energy generation and conservation are currently major state and national concerns, there are no apparent General Plan impacts or mitigation measures related to these problems of inadequate generation and distribution. New energy conservation measures and more facilities may be required but these are beyond the scope of this program EIR and the 2001 General Plan Update to address.

IX. Hazards. The Safety Element of the 2001 General Plan Update is essentially intended as a series of policy mitigation measures to address urban area natural and man-made hazards. Most of the 12 Land Use Study area changes proposed by 2001 Update refinements to the 1990 General Plan involve reduction to or no substantial difference related to hazards. Particularly in Study Area 5 involving County Residential Suburban Fringe Area development north of the City of
Arroyo Grande, the proposed elimination of Sphere of Influence for urban expansion and increased parcel size for reduced development density are important alternatives in a natural high-risk fire hazard area. The County should pursue further mitigation of this serious hazard, by installation, equipping and operation of an additional County fire station in this area at least on a seasonal basis, to correct fire response time deficiencies now dependent on mutual aid response by The City of Arroyo Grande. Other proposed land use study areas as well as the County Fringe Area involve increased exposure to fire, slope stability and seismic hazards but these are generally considered capable of project specific mitigation to less than significant impacts, assuming adherence to Planned Development project design and current construction standards.

In the Village Core adjoining Arroyo Grande and Tally Ho Creeks, the General Plan Update proposes Mixed-Use development and some increased residential potential in flood hazard and dam failure inundation areas not mentioned in the 1990 General Plan EIR. Site-specific and project-specific flood and fire hazard mitigation measures such as fire suppression systems, flood proofing or special design for planned Mixed-Use developments will be determined on a case by case basis, reducing potential hazard impacts to less than significant. These hazards should, however, be avoided with new essential public facilities and possible relocation of public safety buildings and equipment such as the headquarters fire station and city administrative offices. The further consideration of civic and other public facilities expansion within the Village Core versus the South County Regional Center site on West Branch Street should carefully evaluate safety issues and alternatives. With proper hazard mitigation however, the development pattern proposed by the 2001 General Plan Update involves less than significant impact changes to the 1990 General Plan.

X Noise. The 1990 Existing Setting and Community Issues Report contained a summary of noise issues and impacts also addressed in the Noise Element of the 1990 General Plan. The 1990 General Plan Final EIR acknowledged that development will increase additional vehicles which may cause increased noise impacts to residents but concluded that proper planning and design will mitigate otherwise significant impacts to less than significant.

The 12 Land Use Study areas proposed for refinement of the 1990 General Plan by the 2001 General Plan Update involve several Mixed-Use areas that may include residential uses in close proximity to major arterial noise sources. These Mixed-Use areas will require site specific and project specific design and construction evaluations to determine necessary mitigation measures. In most instances, site planning to separate residential uses from directly adjacent traffic noise sources will prevent unacceptable noise levels. It is evident that Mixed-Use areas will differ in composition depending on location, parcel size, existing uses in the area, access, adjoining facilities and services, compatible neighboring uses and similar considerations. Not all Mixed-Use areas will enable or include substantial residential development. In any event, the Noise Element contains policies and standards to enable project-by-project evaluations and mitigation to less than significant impact.

XI Public Services. The City of Arroyo Grande police department is responsible for law enforcement, investigations and crime prevention programs within the City limits. The fire department, composed largely of volunteers, is responsible for providing fire protection. The 1990 Existing Setting and Community Issues Report included estimates of local staffing compared to national and state averages for Cities of comparable size. The City has historically had low levels of major crime or fire loss despite below average police and fire department staffing. There are no uniform standards regarding appropriate or adequate number of officers per number of residents. Each jurisdiction differs in the area serviced, population density, demographics, land use composition, traffic and safety issues. It is generally assumed, however, that increased size and additional population contribute to the need for additional police and fire department staffing to maintain service levels. Because the 1990 General Plan projected build-
out at 19,500 population within essentially the same geographic area as proposed by the 2001 General Plan Update, there are few differences in the police and fire service impacts expected. The 1990 General Plan FEIR suggested that cumulative growth would require additional police and fire department staffing but that increased City revenues would help offset additional costs. It concluded that these impacts would be "significant but mitigable". Many of the 12 Land Use Study areas proposed by the 2001 General Plan Update for change from the 1990 plan involve relatively small and internal changes that do not increase the geographic area of the City. The substantial reduction of Sphere of Influence proposed by excluding the northern Residential Suburban County Fringe (Study Area 5) is somewhat offset by potential eastern expansion of Sphere of Influence to include Frederick/ALC and Williams properties (Study Area 8). The latter areas will be subject to Specific Plans and separate EIRs while the former have not been proposed for annexation nor previously evaluated for public service impacts.

Another basic difference is that the 2001 General Plan Update proposes several existing commercial areas as appropriate for Mixed Use including the Village Core, Traffic Way, East Grand Avenue, Camino Mercado and El Camino Real. Conceptually, the benefit of increasing potential residential uses within formerly exclusively commercial areas is that such Mixed-Use areas are self-policing and thus safer due to residents providing neighborhood watch. Conversely, Mixed- Use may increase the police and fire protection service requirements due to complaints of incompatible activities and increased intensity or density of development. Unfortunately, there is inadequate comparative information available to conclude either beneficial or adverse impacts associated with Mixed-Use versus conventional commercial development.

Rather than imply any specific formula for future staffing, this Program EIR for 2001 General Plan Update proposes project level environmental determinations to establish necessary mitigation of police and fire service impacts.

Similarly, the increased need for water, sewer, garbage service, street maintenance, libraries, schools, parks and other public services, infrastructure and facilities are generally considered directly proportional to population and area served. Project level environmental evaluations reveal, however, that public service impacts are not uniform but differ widely depending on location, topography, use, character of development, project design and many other factors. The 2001 General Plan Update involves 12 land use study areas each requiring site specific consideration. But because most changes are internal refinements, the public service impacts are considered relatively minor and capable of project level mitigation.

Mitigation of cumulative development impacts, particularly in unincorporated Fringe Areas is a major political problem that lacks clearly feasible fiscal solutions. Land use planning and growth management to prevent substantial increase or intensification of such rural and suburban areas with inadequate public services is the recommended mitigation, but this is beyond the control of the City.

Ideally, the City of Arroyo Grande will continue to coordinate and cooperate with adjoining jurisdictions including County, City of Pismo Beach, City of Grover Beach and Oceano CSD to improve regional public safety and service levels as well as public service efficiency.

In general, additional impact fees may be needed to offset major geographic expansions such as being considered by Specific Plans and separate EIRs for Arroyo Linda Crossroads and Williams properties.

One public service issue only briefly addressed in the 1990 Existing Setting and Community Issues Report is public schools, generally the responsibility of Lucia Mar Unified School District to provide. The 1990 General Plan Final EIR had no discussion of school impacts resulting from
plan adoption, presumably because the plan reduced the projected population potential of the City from more than 24,000 to a maximum build-out estimate of 19,500 population. The 2001 General Plan Update proposes approximately the same build-out potential, but recognizes that this implies approximately 20% increase during the next 20 years, compared to existing population.

Lucia Mar Unified School District response to Notice of Preparation noted four environmental factors of primary concern to the District:

- Land Use and Planning;
- Transportation/Circulation
- Public Services; and,
- Recreation

Because most schools within the City are older and all are exceeding design capacity, residential land use is of particular concern. While state law requires the City to accommodate its fair share of low-income housing, the School District notes that this type of housing generates more students per unit than market rate single-family residences. Based on School District data, multiple-family and mobile homes generate fewer students per household than single-family developments, but this is offset by higher density.

Lucia Mar School District operates and maintains 10 elementary schools, 3 middle schools, 1 high school, 1 continuation school and an adult education school, with total enrollment at 11,000 in 2000. Most schools were constructed in the 1950’s and 60’s and operate over their intended design capacity. Schools in the Arroyo Grande urban area include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>YEAR BUILT</th>
<th>DESIGN CAPACITY</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2000 ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harloe Elementary</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Oceano Elementary</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulding Middle</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGHS</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passage of a recent bond measure enabled the district to start construction on a new high school in Nipomo, a new elementary school in Nipomo and a new elementary school in Arroyo Grande, all of which will be completed after 2002-3. Most of the new facilities are outside of Arroyo Grande but will enable shifts in attendance areas and provide substantial relief from overcapacity in Arroyo Grande schools when opened. These new facilities do not, however, provide for surplus space to accommodate continued growth. Thus, cumulative growth and development anywhere in the District will impact area school facilities.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes no increase in projected build-out population but increases the proportion of multiple family and mixed-use housing compared to the 1990 General Plan. Project-by-project evaluation and mitigation including impact on school facilities will be required for any major Planned Development.

Inadequate parking, congested circulation and incomplete pedestrian and bike circulation are among the reasons that Lucia Mar operates an extensive bus transportation system. However, with the exception of the Paulding Middle School, the existing schools are generally located southwest of Freeway 101 while new development in the City has been primarily occurring to the north, requiring cross-town transportation. A new elementary school located near James way and Rodeo Drive will relieve this lack of convenient neighborhood elementary schools within
walking or biking distance. Much can be done by the City to improve alternative modes of school access including proposed priority pedestrian walks and multi-purpose trails, bike lanes and improved transit. Better public transit service and improved parking management will also assist correction of apparent circulation deficiencies affecting school facilities as well as the general public.

Conversely, the City and Lucia Mar Unified School District should explore alternative location for bus storage and maintenance facilities currently at Paulding Middle and Arroyo Grande High Schools in residential neighborhoods. District bus routing and scheduling should be programmed to minimize travel during peak hour traffic congestion and avoid problem areas such as East Grand Avenue and East Branch Street where possible.

The District has expressed desire to continue cooperative programs for use of school buildings and grounds for community events and recreation programs and requests City participation in providing new gymnasium space, play fields, meeting rooms, swimming pools and additional sport court and recreation centers. Funding at both City and District levels appears inadequate to provide for such facilities unless the public approves additional bonds or other financing. However, The Parks and Recreation Element includes several opportunities for priority cooperation including possible community swimming pool and sport fields on High School property near Valley Road and Fair Oaks and new multi-purpose building and improved playgrounds at Paulding Middle School. The Circulation Element proposes pedestrian, bike, transit and other route improvements to correct school related circulation problems, but implementation programs are similarly lacking. It is apparent that the 2001 General Plan Update involves relatively minor internal land use changes to the 1990 General Plan except for Land Use study areas 5 and 8. Project related impacts are discussed below but the 2001 General Plan focus is to diversify and concentrate land use for more efficient public service provision rather than expand development into alternative Residential Rural and Suburban County Fringe Areas.

XII Utility and Service Systems. The City is currently preparing an Update to its Sewer Facilities Master Plan to coordinate with 2001 General Plan Update. Water resources, storage and distribution system and storm drainage impacts were discussed in prior sections of this Program EIR. Electric, gas, telephone and cable TV systems are operated by private companies and are beyond the scope of this report.

It is generally assumed that General Plan policies and City development standards contain sufficient measures to mitigate utility infrastructure and service system impacts. The emphasis on Mixed-Use and compact urban form proposed by the 2001 General Plan Update are refinements to the 1990 General Plan that involve relatively minor internal and mitigable impacts. Study Areas 5 and 8 are, however, contrasting examples of alternative external growth and development patterns that are not minor regarding utilities and service system impacts.

Because of inherent public service and utility system concerns (among other reasons), the 2001 General Plan Update proposes exclusion of the potential northern Sphere of Influence urban expansion into the Residential Suburban County Fringe Area. Conversely, the 2001 General Plan Update suggests Specific Plans and separate EIRs to evaluate potential SOI expansion to the east, clearly dependent on major utility and service system improvements not yet resolved. Other than these two study areas, the 12 land use study areas appear to be capable of project related mitigation measures to less than significant impacts.

XIV Aesthetics. The 1990 Existing Setting and Community Issues Report included Chapter III regarding Aesthetic and Cultural Resources. Scenic resources including most of the natural valleys, canyons, hills, mesa and creeks around Arroyo Grande area are identified as essential to the rural, small town character. Scenic corridors included: Highway 101; Highway 227; Grand
Avenue; Huasna Road; Corbett Canyon Road; Carpenter Canyon Road; Oak Park Boulevard and Noyes Road; Printz Road; James Way; Camino Mercado and Rancho Parkway; Fair Oaks; and, Branch Mill Road. Numerous scenic features mentioned within the City included the historic Village, landmark trees and groves, Arroyo Grande, Tally Ho and Meadow Creeks, and the wooded canyons and valleys located in the northwest part of the City. Agriculture lands to the south and east are one of the major scenic resources adjoining and within the City contributing to its attractive “rural quality of life”. The major issue of hillside development and cumulative reduction of “Aesthetic Resources”, open spaces and scenic views were discussed in the 1990 General Plan Final EIR as mitigated by General Plan policies and community design guidelines. While acknowledging the evolution of character from rural to more suburban, the EIR concluded the aesthetic resources, views and most open spaces would be maintained by the General Plan contributing to “No Significant Impact”.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes refinements to the 1990 General Plan that classify most undeveloped or change areas as Planned Development, Conservation/Open Space or require Specific Plan consideration. These proposals, discussed for each of the 12 Land Use Study Areas will reinforce project-by-project design and environment impacts mitigation including aesthetics.

The 2001 General Plan Urban Land Use Element policies, as well as Agricultural, Open Space and Conservation Element, are intended to manage growth and urban development to conserve natural resources and enhance aesthetic resources. In addition to prescribing community design standards, the City requires all substantial development projects to obtain design review and approval. Planned Developments and Specific Plans for major projects must also include architectural, landscape and signage design consistent with community standards and City approval prior to construction. The 2001 General Plan EIR considers aesthetic impacts “significant butmitigable” rather than “no significant impact”. In other words, cumulative degradation due to development is a potential significant impact unless carefully mitigated by planning policy, growth management and design and development standards. Development as well as natural open space and scenic resources can be aesthetically attractive. The 2001 General Plan Update proposes a balance recognizing the sensitivity of remaining undeveloped areas. Project design review is an essential mitigation measure for all proposed developments in the City for the 2001 General Plan Update impacts to be considered “less than significant”.

XIV  Cultural Resources. The 1990 Existing Setting and Community Issues Report Chapter III regarding Aesthetics also addressed “Historical and Cultural (Archaeological) Resources”. Property specific surveys are needed to identify archaeological sites, but often historical resources are more apparent. Arroyo Grande has a rich heritage of both with numerous Chumash Indian sites dating back more than 9000 years. During the last 260 years the initial Mexican ranchos were further developed as Californians settled and subdivided for farms and the historic 1862 township of Arroyo Grande. The City of Arroyo Grande, incorporated in 1911, was separated by agricultural areas from the nearby towns of Pismo Beach, Grover City (now known as Grover Beach), Halcyon and Oceano. The slow evolution of the area changed rapidly after World War II when suburban subdivisions connected the once-separate communities into “Five Cities”.

Fortunately, the historic character of the Village was recognized early as one of the essential features of Arroyo Grande and special emphasis to its preservation and enhancement remain central to the City’s General Plan. Although no sites have been officially designated as federal or state historical buildings, the Paulding Historical House, Loomis/Pacific Coast Railroad Warehouse, Santa Manuela School, Old Catholic Cemetery, Old Stone House, Odd Fellows Hall, Bridge Street Bridge and the Swinging Bridge are the eight most widely recognized local “historically significant” points of interest. The Historical Society has a more comprehensive inventory identifying 116 structures of local significance more than 75% within the Village and
nearby areas. Most of these historically significant structures are located on private property and the issue of preservation or restoration versus removal or remodeling involves questions of feasibility for adaptive reuse.

The 2001 General Plan and Village Core design guidelines will help preserve historic and cultural resources according to the 1990 General Plan Final EIR, but probably not to the extent concluded in that document, “No significant Impact”. Expansion of the Village Core classification to include adjoining areas along Bridge Street, Traffic Way and Station Way will further enhance Village design character and promote preservation of existing older buildings for compatible Mixed Uses. Additional design standards will be proposed for Village Core expansion areas such as Traffic Way and East Grand Avenue Mixed-Use Corridor gateways to the south and west. Site specific, project specific surveys and mitigation proposals will be required however, particularly for projects involving development within the Village Core area. Removal of historic structures should be avoided where feasible and mitigated if not to assure less than significant cumulative impact. In some instances structural condition, public safety or other considerations may warrant removal, subject to project level mitigation and/or statement of overriding considerations.

XV Recreation. The 2001 General Plan Update integrates the 1990 General Plan Park and Recreation Element (1988) policies and implementation programs. The 1990 Existing Setting and Community Issues Report included Recreation and Open Space as Aesthetic and Cultural Resources. The 57 acres identified as park and recreation facilities are inventoried in the 2001 Park and Recreation Element Update essentially unchanged from 1990. Needs assessments are also projected to be the same as previously outlined based on General Plan build-out approaching 20,000 City residents and a standard of 4.0 acres of parkland per 1000 population.

Neither the 1990 General Plan nor the 2001 General Plan Update attempt to locate the additional 20 acres of park and recreation facilities implied by these projected standards. The lack of community sport facilities, despite development of Soto Sports complex is also apparent and might be addressed in cooperation with Lucia Mar Unified School District on Arroyo Grande High School and/or Paulding Middle School properties. The City and School District might consider relocation of corporation and transportation maintenance facilities to enable these and/or Soto Sports Complex facility expansion. Finally, the City has recently invited discussion with Grover Beach, Oceano CSD and Pismo Beach to address park, recreation and sport facility capital improvement, operations and maintenance as regional issues.

The eventual solutions to existing deficiencies can be separated from impacts caused by additional development, the latter contributing either parkland or in-lieu fees. Other project level mitigation measures such as private recreation and open space areas can be included with new Planned Developments. Correcting existing local and regional deficiencies, however, is a more difficult problem requiring cooperative efforts of the City, Lucia Mar Unified School District and adjoining agencies including the County. With the exception of Study Area 8, Arroyo Linda Crossroads and Williams properties and Study Area 10 near Farrell Road, the other Land Use Study areas are not logical candidates for major additional park and recreation facilities. These are either environmentally sensitive residual sites or already partially developed potential Mixed-Use areas. Some potential for certain types of indoor recreation facilities and passive outdoor areas may be satisfied adjoining the South County Regional Center and Women's Club if not otherwise essential to civic and other community facilities. However, this location might duplicate the nearby Rancho Grande neighborhood park and its size and terrain are not suited to needed outdoor sports facilities. The City should seek to identify and acquire the site(s) for park and recreation facility development as soon as possible.

This Program EIR considers the Park and Recreation Element policies and park in-lieu fee program as mitigation to less than significant related to 2001 General plan Update adoption.
D. Environmental Setting and Impacts by Subarea

The subareas are shown on Land Use Study Area Map EIR-4.

1.) Oak Park Acres at James Way

Existing Conditions – Prior Plans and Regulations

This area is part of Oak Park Acres PD shown as Planned Development/Specific Plan on the 1990 General Plan and zoned PD1.1. The original 1976 PD designated this 5.7-acre subarea for Neighborhood Commercial, but subsequently it was developed with a large church and related school. The 2001 General Plan Update proposes that the property be shown as CF Community Facility rather than Community Commercial as shown on the 2000 draft map. Existing churches and lodges will be distinguished by specific symbols on the LUE Update maps and proposed as conditionally permitted uses in all zones, including PF or CF.

Impacts of the Proposed General Plan

Because the site is developed with church, school and related off-street parking and further development would be controlled by conditional use permit in any alternative, the proposed Community Facility classification implies no change or significant development impacts. The existing development does not include resident population or housing. The institutional structures were constructed to current seismic design and building safety requirements and do not pose a significant public safety concern. No increase in water demand is implied by the CF classification. Controlled drainage from development areas particularly paved parking areas, contributes to cumulative urban degradation of surface water quality. If additional church and school construction occur, special mitigation measures to prevent erosion and siltation into Meadow Creek should be required: On-site ponding and siltation basin maintenance are two recommended methods for surface water quality mitigation. Potential church and school expansions, if proposed, would be reviewed by APCD, but would not be expected to exceed the criteria for project significance for air quality (10 lbs/day of emissions from related vehicle trips). Unless church and school expansion proposals exceeded 20 peak hour additional trips, the traffic impacts of such development would also be considered less than significant. (The nearest intersection, Oak Park and James Way operates at better than LOS 'C' with signalization.)

Biological resources adjoining the church and school have already been altered by development. If additional development were proposed, the most significant biological impact would be indirect cumulative contribution to erosion and siltation of Meadow Creek watershed, discussed above. Energy and Mineral resources and hazards are not apparent impact issues regarding this study area. The church and school are not subject to substantial traffic noise increases that affect areas adjacent to Freeway 101 and other major arterials. These uses are considered a sensitive receptor that could be impacted by commercial development recently approved in the City of Pismo Beach, but noise impacts could be mitigated by special construction to achieve acceptable interior noise levels if the problem is evident with additional development. The public services and utilities systems serving the area are adequate for existing development despite marginal fire response time. Special fire suppression and alarm systems should be required for institutional expansion if proposed. No aesthetic, cultural resource or recreation impacts are apparent with existing or potential additional church or school expansion on this developed property, other than those normally addressed by design review and impact fees. Conclusion: Less than significant, including additional church and school expansion proposed with traffic, drainage, fire, safety and possible noise mitigation.
Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:

a. Create a PD classification similar to the 1990 plan;

b. Create a CC classification similar to 2000 draft;

c. Utilize the CF classification reflecting existing institutional uses;

d. Consider Mixed-Use classification enabling commercial, residential and institutional
development in addition to that existing; and,

e. Consider Office or Residential classification to encourage these alternative uses.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes alternative 'c', to classify the property CF,
Community Facility.

The CF designation is being created to replace the Public Facility (PF) for facilities such as
churches, lodges, and cemeteries. Although some additional community facilities may be
developed as conditionally permitted uses in other land use classifications and zones, without
requiring General Plan amendment, the City wants to identify where these institutions exist.

The non-residential, non-commercial characteristics of institutional land uses are very different
than the neighborhoods and districts where they often locate. Traffic generation, parking,
potential conversion, hours of operation, and land use compatibility are frequent problems,
particularly in low-density residential or agricultural settings. Some community facilities such as
cemeteries interrupt prevalent land use patterns or preclude circulation improvements. Others
such as lodges and churches may fit well as a transitional use or service facility for meeting and
recreational use by neighboring residential or commercial uses.

Regarding alternatives, the General Plan Update attempts to avoid the PD classification used in
the 1990 plan since that classification did not identify the actual uses allowed by Planned
Development, revealed only by research of related zoning and Development Code regulations.
The original PD provision for neighborhood shopping at this intersection became obsolete when a
large community and convenience shopping center was developed at the southwest corner of
James Way and Oak Park Boulevard in the City of Pismo Beach, and the subject property was
developed with a large church and related school. The Mixed-Use, Office or Residential
classifications would not reflect actual use: Mixed-Use, including office and fitness center is
being developed on the southeast corner of James Way and Oak Park Boulevard. A wide variety
of residential uses at diverse densities compose other parts of Oak Park Acres PD nearby on
James Way and Oak Park Boulevard.

No additional irreversible changes or growth-inducing impacts are apparent from the proposed
reclassification of the property from PD to CF, and potential rezoning to CF.
2.) **Rancho Grande – Noyes Road**

**Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations**

This remaining undeveloped 53-acre property is part of the Rancho Grande PD shown as Planned Development/Specific Plan on the 1990 General Plan. It is zoned PD 1.2 and shown on the Rancho Grande Conceptual Master Plan as two parcels that are part of "unplanned PD areas". The EIR for the PD indicated 5 units on each parcel but the PD allows 1 unit per parcel unless rezoned. The 2000 draft map indicated Open Space and Low Density Single Family for the undeveloped area, but other single-family densities and open space configurations may be appropriate. Adjoining lots to the south in the City are generally 1-acre while County areas to the west and north are Residential Suburban also allowing 1-acre lots.

**Impacts of the Proposed General Plan**

These 53-acres contain two parcels of relatively steep slopes, mostly vegetated, traversed by several drainage ways and relatively undisturbed wetland. The sites have not been surveyed or evaluated but would be subject to a project EIR with any proposed Planned Development. The range of land use and planning considered reasonable for this property range from 1 to 53 dwelling units, all subject to Planned Development approval. Environmental impacts would be expected to be proportional to development intensity and amount of property disturbed for construction. Population and housing would range from a minimum of 6 residents if only one house were allowed on each of the two existing parcels to approximately 159 if 53 single-family dwellings were developed on the 53 acres. The proposed plan includes a maximum of 35 dwellings which would accommodate approximately 105 residents.

The relatively steep slopes composing the eastern half of the property are considered high landslide and slope stability risk while the relatively level areas traversed by drainage and wetlands are potential liquefaction and settlement risk areas. In either event, Planned Development would require site-specific geotechnical and soils evaluations and engineering to mitigate geophysical concerns prior to grading and construction. Water resources for increase of potential development is a cumulative impact issue affecting this property, currently limited to two dwellings. If development were proposed on the lower flatter portions of the property, flood control and drainage would require site engineering to mitigate these potential impacts. One potentially significant impact associated with grading and drainage would be the degradation of surface water quality due to siltation from disturbed hillsides draining into downstream Meadow Creek and extremely sensitive Pismo Lagoon. Prior developments have not adequately mitigated erosion and siltation impacts which will require better design and construction to prevent permanent degradation of these important resources: On-site ponding and siltation basin maintenance are two recommended methods for surface water quality mitigation. The potential for a project with up to 35 dwellings, would generate approximately 10 lbs per day of air quality emissions but less than 25 lbs per day, the "screening-level" criteria. Some project mitigation measures to reduce vehicle trips and travel distance would be appropriate, but low-density residential development is inherently automobile oriented, a pattern already established by adjoining existing urban and Residential Suburban uses. A 35 home project if proposed would add approximately 350 trips to the local and regional street system and require traffic study with 20 or more peak hour trips expected. Traffic mitigation measures would be determined by project EIR.

Biological resources of the undeveloped property have not been surveyed but are expected to include Coastal Oak woodland and chaparral on the hillside and Riparian woodland and wetlands on the Noyes Road valley floor. Sensitive plants such as Pismo Clarkia, and Well’s Manzanita may be found on this diverse residual area at the northwest edge of the City. Energy and Mineral
Resources are not apparent concerns regarding this property. As noted above, slope stability and landslide hazards are hillside development risks while flooding, liquefaction and settlement are hazards affecting the relatively level portions of the site. Fire hazard due to Oak Woodland and chaparral interface with existing and potential residential development is an additional hazard, particularly due to marginal fire response time from the City's fire station, approximately six minutes away. Noise is not a potential impact issue on this property at the northwest edge of the City except during short-term construction activity. Public services such as fire and police are least efficient at the edge of the City and currently overcapacity school facilities will require student transportation to all grade levels since none exist in this part of the City. The cost-benefit of residential development, particularly low density development at the edge of the City, would be expected to be adverse, including water, sewer, storm drainage and garbage service as well as schools.

Although Planned Development for low density residential would be subject to design review and special site planning, and aesthetically attractive cluster development screened from adjoining areas would be expected, the conversion of natural open space to urban use would be a degradation of existing natural scenic character. The alternate potential for conventional subdivision would be much more detrimental aesthetically, however, as roads, building sites and yards associated with large lots if evenly spread over the site would cause removal of most natural vegetation and become visually prominent from Noyes Road as well as adjoining existing residential areas.

Cultural resources of this undeveloped property have not been surveyed and impacts on possible archeological areas are thus unknown. Planned Development would require site evaluation to determine possible impacts and appropriate mitigation measures, including avoidance by cluster design. The recreation impacts of potential Planned Development would be off-set by prior dedication of a public park site, payment of park fees, provision of proposed recreational trails traversing the property and possible on-site private recreation commons. The PD would extend equestrian and multi-purpose trails to the edge of the City to eventually connect with County trails in Residential Suburban Fringe Area or along County road rights-of-way. Park and recreation facilities will be provided by the City at Rancho Grande Park, already programmed for improvement. Conclusion: Any Planned Development would require project EIR.

Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:

a. Create a PD classification similar to the 1990 plan;

b. Classify as Conservation/Open Space and enable one house on each existing parcel or allow consideration of 1 du/5 ac. or 10 ac., implying 5 to 10 houses with PD approval;

c. Classify as SFR-VLD-PD to enable consideration of a very low-density, single-family residential planned development not to exceed 1 du/2.5 acres, enabling up to 21 units;

d. Classify as SFR-LD-PD to enable consideration of a low density single family residential planned development not to exceed 1 du/1.5 acres enabling up to 35 units, or 1 du/ac. enabling up to 53 units; and,

e. Classify as SFR-LM-PD and C/OS to enable consideration of a LM Low Medium-density single-family residential planned development on the most developable portions of the site, requiring Conservation Open Space on the bulk of the slopes, drainage and vegetated areas. This might enable 53 units or more, depending on the proportion of property classified C/OS versus SFR.
The 2001 General Plan Update proposes alternative 'd' SFR-LD-PD Single Family Residential-Low Density (Hillside) Planned Development and Conservation/Open Space combining designations to retain natural slopes, drainage and vegetation over the majority of both parcels. Planned Development would allow maximum of 1 du per 1.5 acres and encourage cluster residential and open space up to 35 units.

Although the General Plan Update classification as SFR-LD-PD and C/OS combining designation implies a potential for up to 35 dwelling unit residential planned development, that would require a PD zoning amendment and prerequisite project EIR to implement. (Current PD1.2 allows one dwelling per parcel). This is the basic mitigation measure for General Plan Update. Until site specific and project specific analysis is provided by the required EIR, the maximum development would be limited to 1 dwelling per parcel.

Regarding alternatives, the Update attempts to avoid use of the PD General Plan classification as it does not identify intended use without research into zoning and Development Code provisions. The C/OS-PD, Conservation/Open Space Planned Development classification alone would be an environmentally superior alternative, allowing one dwelling per parcel or 1 du per 10 acres allowing 5 dwellings or 1 du per 5 acres allowing 10 units maximum, subject to PD zoning amendment. Fewer units imply less disruption to the natural environment and more opportunity for avoiding sensitive resources with cluster residential Planned Development. The classification as SFR-VLD-PD, while reducing potential maximum Planned Development to 1 du/2.5 acres or approximately 21 dwellings, also implies possible conventional subdivision into 2.5 acre “equestrian estate lots”. If Planned Development does not require cluster residential and substantial portions of the property to remain as natural hillside and wetland, then the lower density could actually increase potential impacts due to greater site area disturbance. Lower density may also be less feasible due to required urban improvements for streets, access driveways, trails, underground utilities, drainage and siltation basin, recreational commons and other residential amenities. The additional alternatives of SFR-LD-PD at 1 du/acre or SFR-LM-PD and Conservation/Open Space on the sloping and wetland areas of the property, enabling 53 dwelling units or more would require General Plan amendment as well as PD rezoning to exceed the 35 dwelling unit maximum prescribed by the Update. This higher density residential Planned Development may be evaluated as an alternative in the project EIR, but the City anticipates that the cluster concentration and design involving more than 35 dwellings would be inconsistent with “rural character” objectives of the General Plan. The higher intensity development also appears to exceed the intent of the original Rancho Grande master plan and development agreement which provided for a total of 527 dwelling units.

In any event, the on-site environmental resources, irreversible changes and growth-inducing impacts of more than two dwellings must be evaluated by project specific EIR prior to implementation of the SFR-LD-PD and C/OS development potential.

3.) Rancho Grande – La Canada

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

This un-subdivided 26.6-acre, vegetated canyon and ridge adjoining single family subdivisions to the northwest and southeast is part of the Rancho Grande Planned Development on the 1990 General Plan, zoned PD 1.2. The Rancho Grande Conceptual Master Plan implied a 40-unit cluster residential subdivision for a central portion of this parcel with the perimeter shown as open space. The 2000 Land Use Policy draft map showed this parcel as Open Space/Restricted, normally applied to public owned property or involving open space easement or similar land use restriction. There is a proposed Vesting Tentative Tract Map 1998 (VTTM) application also
proposing a 40-dwelling unit cluster Planned Development which would be affected by this General Plan Update.

The VTTM 1998 proposes approximately 16.5 acres (62%) of the total site as private open space. Access and secondary emergency access would loop off La Canada Drive, requiring two bridges or culverts over the creek traversing the west edge of the property, while the other creek to the southeast would remain in the open space area. The project EIR for VTTM 1998 has not yet been completed for public review and comment and it appears that some lots involve grading that would encroach on both creek areas and require removal of Pismo Clarkia, Oak Woodland and Riparian vegetation to enable residential construction. At least seven of the proposed lots lack standard frontage on the proposed public street, instead accessed by "flag lot" shared private driveways. Lot sizes ranging from 5,500 to 30,000 square feet would compose the 40 homesites which may be enabled by Planned Development variation of conventional single-family detached subdivision standards.

**Impacts of Proposed General Plan**

The 26.6-acre property is an undeveloped parcel traversed by two branches of Meadow Creek separated by a ridge known to contain significant biological resources, including sensitive plant species. The tentative tract map for a 40-unit cluster residential subdivision, VTTM 1998, provided site survey but a project EIR has not been completed. The proposed land use appears to be more intensive than adjoining low-density residential subdivisions despite the site sensitivity. Access and building areas are not resolved, and mitigation measures and alternatives not yet considered.

The relatively flat ridge occupies the central portion of the site, separated from adjoining roads and residential subdivisions to the northwest and southeast by steep slopes, heavy Riparian vegetation and creek canyons. Thus, access and circulation are not easily connected to existing streets.

If development is confined to the relatively level ridge area, the potential for slope stability and landslide hazards as well as erosion and siltation would be reduced, but on-site mitigation such as siltation basins appears infeasible without reduction of residential development proposed. Meadow Creek drains to very sensitive Pismo Lagoon habitat, and prior developments have not adequately mitigated erosion and siltation impacts to surface water quality of Meadow Creek. Water supply to cumulative residential development is also a potential impact issue since General Plan buildout approaches or exceeds current water entitlements if per capita consumption exceeds 160 gpd. The low density residential development, whether 1 or 40 units is inherently automobile oriented, but this pattern is established by adjoining development, not feasible altered by this residual property. A 40 home project, if approved, would contribute 400 trips to the local streets and require traffic study to determine possible mitigation measures for James Way and La Canada Drive or other collector streets. Bike, pedestrian and equestrian trials are proposed to traverse the property and partially mitigate automobile trip impacts, but these are not clearly proposed or provided by VTTM 1998 at this time. The General Plan proposal as Conservation/Open Space not to exceed 5 dwellings implies 50 trips, less than significant.

Biological resources evident on-site would be adversely affected by previously proposed Planned Development of 40 dwellings including lots encroaching on Pismo Clarkia and requiring reduction of Oak and Riparian Woodlands. Until an environmental determination is completed, for Planned Development of 5 or fewer dwellings the appropriate development density and configuration as well as possible mitigation measures for development impacts are unresolved. Cluster Planned Development has better potential to avoid or reduce environmental impacts than conventional residential subdivision but the density and distribution of development are unresolved.
Energy and mineral resources are not at issue. Exposure to hazards such as landslide, flooding and fire are dependent on the development design relative to site constraints. Access limitations and proximity of proposed homes to heavy vegetation on steep slopes implies substantial wildland fire hazard exposure. Noise exposure for Planned Development residential is not at issue on this residual site nor is provision of public services and utilities already established to the northwest and southeast. Aesthetics of potential Planned Development would be generally better than conventional residential subdivision but either will degrade existing natural environment. No archeological or cultural resources are known on this site, but would also be subject to project EIR if more than 5 dwellings Planned Development is proposed. The property is near the Rancho Grande Park and Planned Development contributed land rather than in-lieu fees for park improvements. Additionally, proposed recreational trails traverse the property for bike, pedestrian and equestrian circulation. **Conclusion:** Any Planned Development exceeding 5 dwellings would require a project EIR. The General Plan Update can minimize potential impacts by classification of the property as Conservation Open Space allowing 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres which might enable up to 5 units subject to PD approval. A project EIR would be required and General Plan Amendment for PD approval.

**Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations**

Alternatives considered reasonable for this property range from 1 to 40 units, all subject to Planned Development approval. Population and housing would range from 3 to 120 residents assuming normal household population for single-family dwellings, depending on which alternative is approved and included:

- a. Create a PD classification similar to the 1990 plan allowing one house per existing parcel unless a PD amendment is approved;

- b. Classify as Conservation/Open Space-PD and allow 1 du per parcel, 1 du/10 ac. or 1 du/5 ac. enabling 1 to 5 units subject to planned development approval;

- c. Classify as SFR-VLD-PD at 1 du/2.5 ac. for approximately 10 units subject to planned development approval;

- d. Classify as SFR-LD-PD at 1 du/1.5 ac. or 1 du/ac. enabling consideration of a planned development of 17 or 26 units, depending on PD and subdivision approval; and,

- e. Classify as SFR-MLD-PD and C/OS enabling consideration of a medium low density single family residential planned development on a portion of the ridge preserving the canyons and vegetated areas as Conservation/Open Space. This might enable up to 33 units at 2.5 du/ac. if half of the parcel were determined developable and the other half preserved as open space.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes alternative 'b', to classify the property as C/OS-PD, Conservation/Open Space, Planned Development allowing 1 du per 5 acres which would enable up to 5 units subject to PD approval.

Regarding other alternatives, the General Plan Update attempts to avoid the PD classification used in the 1990 plan since that classification did not identify the actual uses allowed by Planned Development, revealed only by research of relate zoning and Development Code regulations. The alternative of C/OS-PD allowing 1 du per parcel or 1 du per 10 acres subject to Planned Development approval would be considered environmentally superior alternatives considering that only one or two homes rather than 5 dwellings would be enabled. However, the feasibility...
of providing access and other required improvements for only 2 dwellings is in question, the extent of other environmental constraints is not resolved. A project EIR would be required for General Plan Amendment and PD, Planned Development for any alternative exceeding 5 dwelling units.

By restricting Planned Development to 5 units, the City intends to avoid irreversible changes on the sensitive environmental resources evident on the bulk of this property which would be further protected by the Conservation/Open Space classification. Because the property is otherwise surrounded by existing residential subdivisions and no urban service extensions are required for this limited additional residential development, the project is not considered growth inducing.

4.) Royal Oaks Estates

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

This vegetated hillside and creek canyon parallel to and west of Rodeo Drive was designated "Estate" residential as part of the Royal Oaks Estates Planned Development on the adopted General Plan. The area was subdivided into 4 large parcels ranging from 5 to 15 acres in size, each allowing 1 house unless converted to institutional uses such as church as occurred at the north and south end, adjoining Rodeo Drive. The church use on the north end was constructed on 10 acres rather than the original 13-acre lot, enlarging the undeveloped two lots to the south by 3 acres creating a 29-acre single ownership parcel with a "flag lot" frontage on Rodeo Drive to the south. The 7.5-acre southern parcel, approved for church use but not developed has subsequently been sold to a private rather than institutional owner. Existing PD zoning and Development Code allow only one house per parcel unless PD amendment approved by the City enables institutional use: Assuming that 3 undeveloped parcels exist, the current zoning would allow 3 dwellings, exclusive of the area containing the Coastal Oak Woodland grove on the steep hillside protected by a tree preservation easement. The 2000 draft map indicated both church parcels and the two estate lots as "Open Space", but only the oak grove on the steep hillside to the east is protected by tree preservation easement.

Impacts of the Proposed General Plan

The proposed General Plan Update provides for Community Facility classification on the existing church property, while the 3 residential "estate" lots would be designated SFR-LD-PD, Single Family Residential, Low Density (Hillside), Planned Development. The 13-acre vegetated hillside and creek area, including the Landmark Royal Oak tree protection easement would be classified as Conservation/Open Space. SFR-LD-PD would enable Planned Development at a maximum of 1 du/1.5 acres, or 20 dwellings maximum on both existing parcels.

The slopes of the western portion of the undeveloped area would require grading for access and development which would depend on density and design. Potential for increased landslide and slope stability exposure and erosion are inherent in hillside development, whether residential or institutional. Erosion and siltation are potential hillside development impact issues, which would impact Arroyo Grande Creek rather than Meadow Creek drainage and require on-site or off-site mitigation. A drainage detention and siltation settlement pond may be feasible and appropriate on-site. Water supply as well as water quality due to increased development potential is a cumulative impact issue, as noted above. Low-density residential development anticipated for the site is inherently automobile oriented but the pattern was established by adjoining subdivisions, not feasibly altered by this residual property. A 20 dwelling Planned Development project, if approved, would contribute 200 trips to Rodeo Drive and possibly require traffic study to determine off-site mitigation measures.
Alternative institutional uses would be expected to generate more significant traffic, depending on type of use and would require specific evaluation for air quality and circulation impacts. One possible benefit from additional Planned Development might be traffic reduction on the residential segment of Rodeo Drive if a parallel relief collector or local street were extended through this property. The biological resources of the undeveloped 37 acres have not been surveyed nor evaluated, but approximately 13 acres of Oak Woodland are protected by the tree protection easement for the “Landmark” grove east of the creek, while the remainder is not well vegetated.

Energy and mineral resources are not impact issues for potential planned development, but exposure to landslide and slope stability would be inherent in hillside development. Noise from this potential Planned Development is a concern to adjoining residents, but has not been evaluated for other low density residential or possible institutional uses. Public services and utilities are capable of service to the undeveloped properties, already surrounded by more intensive residential and institutional uses. Aesthetics of additional low-density residential development or alternative institutional uses are not a significant impact issue, assuming tree preservation and considering the isolated visual exposure for most of the property. Archeological resources have not been identified on-site but would be considered by project EIR for Planned Development. The property is near Rancho Grande Park and Planned Development would be required to contribute impact fees for park improvement. Additionally, proposed recreational trail traverses the property adjoining the creek, connecting the West Branch Regional Community Facilities to the park and church to the north.

*Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:*

The range of land use and planning considered reasonable for these parcels range from 3 to 20 dwelling units subject to PD approval and General Plan Update. Population and housing would range from 9 to approximately 60 residents depending on number of homes allowed.

1. Create a PD classification similar to the 1990 and allow one house per existing parcel unless a PD amendment is approved;
2. Classify as C/OS-PD and allow 1 house per parcel or 1 du/5 ac enabling 3 or more units depending on whether the tree preservation agreement area is included in the PD;
3. Classify as C/OS and SFR-VLD-PD or 1 du/2.5 ac. enabling 2 or 3 units per parcel, exclusive of the oak grove for a total of 6 to 8 homes subject to PD approval; and,
4. Classify as SFR-LD-PD and C/OS at 1 du/1.5 ac. or 1 du/ac. enabling consideration of subdivision to approximately 20 homesites on the three parcels exclusive of the oak grove.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes alternative ‘d’, CF Community Facility classification on the church lot while the 3 residential lots would be designated Single Family Residential, Low Density, Planned Development, limited to a maximum of 20 dwellings total. The vegetated hillside and creek area subject to tree preservation easement would be shown as Conservation/Open Space. A project EIR would be required.

Regarding other alternatives, the General Plan Update attempts to avoid the PD classification used in the 1990 plan because that classification did not identify the actual uses allowed by Planned Development, revealed only by research of related zoning and Development Code regulations.
The C/OS classification or the SFR-VLD-PD classification enabling from 3 to 8 dwellings would be environmentally superior alternatives due to reduced residential potential. (Fewer dwellings generally create less impact both on-site and cumulative). The feasibility of these lower density alternatives is, however, questionable due to required access and infrastructure improvements such as street, underground utilities, water, sewer, drainage and proposed recreational trail.

Higher density Planned Development alternatives, such as 1 du/ac or 2.5 du/ac are considered incompatible with adjoining Rancho Grande low density single family subdivisions to the west that overview the undeveloped subject properties.

The prerequisite for project EIR is considered the basic mitigation measure to determine potential impacts and appropriate design and density of proposed PD consistent with the General Plan Update.

5.) Printz, Noyes and Oak Park Roads – Northern Sphere of Influence

**Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations**

North of the City limits, the adopted LAFCO plans include a large portion of the San Luis Bay-Inland Land Use Element's Residential Suburban "Arroyo Grande Fringe Area" as within the City's Sphere of Influence, implying potential annexation. Most of the properties along Printz, Noyes and Oak Park Roads and numerous local streets and private driveways branching from these three County roads have been fragmented into parcels ranging from 1 to 5 acres, making future conversion to urban residential improbable. Water, sewer, roads, drainage systems, fire and police services associated with annexation and urban use would be very expensive and require areawide improvements unlikely with hundreds of partially developed Residential Suburban fragmented parcels.

The City's 1990 General Plan did not include this area as part of the Urban Land Use Element, but it is nonetheless within both the City's and South County Sanitation District's Sphere of Influence (SOI) approved by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Composed of more than 760 acres (1.2 square miles) the western two thirds of this large area involves approximately 500 acres of Canyons No. 1 and No. 2, including Oak Park Road and Noyes Road respectively, within the Meadow Creek watershed. The eastern third of the area, containing approximately 200 acres of Poorman Canyon and 60 acres of Carpenter Canyon traversed by Printz Road and Carpenter Canyon Road/Highway 227 respectively, are part of the Tally Ho/Arroyo Grande Creek watershed. These three separate drainage areas are identified by examination of Map EIR-1, which is an excerpt of the USGS Arroyo Grande quadrangle map used to depict the Planning Area known as the Area of Environmental Concern.

This Sphere of Influence area implies a potential "Northern Expansion Area" of the City into only a small portion of the large County Residential Suburban and Residential Rural Arroyo Grande Fringe Area, involving approximately 2,865 acres, and 3,585 acres, respectively. As noted above, however, the feasibility of this large Northern Expansion is very doubtful, due to fragmentation. This 1.2 square mile Northern Expansion Area is both deceptive and detrimental in that it falsely implies potential for more than a 20% geographic addition to the City's current 5.5 square mile area for future urban growth and development.
Impacts of the Proposed General Plan

The General Plan Update proposes to exclude this area from the City's SOI and URL except adjoining Highway 227 where SFR-LD-PD would be considered subject to annexation. Additionally, the South County Sanitation District's SOI would be requested for amendment to exclude this area and the County would be requested to amend the San Luis Bay Inland LUE to include a minimum Planning Area Standard for Residential Suburban to 1 du/2.5 ac., rather than 1 to 3 acre parcels.

The land use and planning of this portion of the Arroyo Grande Fringe area is essentially committed to County Residential Suburban standards ranging from 1 to 3-acre lots on private wells and septic systems. The established pattern of 1 to 3-acre lots, each a Residential Suburban homesite, and the lack of urban infrastructure in the entire area makes this Sphere of Influence for potential urban expansion almost totally unrealistic. Population and housing impacts of this Fringe Area development are not considered part of this General Plan Update, but would be substantial and adverse if the Urban Land Use Element extended to the 760 acres of very low density Residential Suburban north of the City. More intensive urban development would increase exposure to natural hazards such as landslide and slope stability risks on steeper slopes and flooding and erosion on lesser slopes lacking adequate drainage improvements. Water resources available to the City are already at a maximum potential buildout excluding this area, which may contribute to groundwater overdraft of the aquifer used by the City and downstream agricultural uses. More intensive Residential Suburban development would only increase this water deficiency and further contribute to potential groundwater and surface water contamination due to excessive septic systems and inadequate drainage and erosion control. This type of very low-density residential development is totally automobile dependent and contributes to regional air quality problems caused by vehicle emissions. More appropriate mixed-use urban expansion opportunities or additional mixed-use developments within the current urban area are preferable alternatives to Residential Suburban sprawl based on air quality, circulation and public service and facility impacts. Printz Road functions as a collector connection between Highway 227 and Oak Park Road regardless of whether inside or outside the City, and is clearly deficient for existing and potential circulation: The County will be requested to address this and other road improvement needs, apparent in the Arroyo Grande Fringe Area. The biological resources of this area have not been surveyed nor evaluated but would be impacted by substantial intensification of potential County Residential Suburban development. The cumulative impacts on water, drainage, plants and wildlife habitat are qualitatively increased proportional to allowed development, and unless additional Planning Area Standards are added to the Arroyo Grande Fringe Area for Residential Suburban, the potential could be more than double or triple the existing. This allowance for further 1 du per acre parcelization is a potential significant environmental impact that should be avoided, but is outside the jurisdiction of the City. As noted previously, the County Residential Suburban land use extends much further north than the City's Sphere of Influence into Canyons No. 1 and 2, Carpenter and Corbett Canyons. Energy and Mineral Resources are not at issue in this area. The apparent hazards of slope stability and fire safety are additional reasons that increased development on 1 and 2 acre lots should not be continued. The area is more than 15 minutes fire response time from County CDF stations in Nipomo and San Luis Obispo and slopes, limited access, and very flammable vegetation combine to make it a hazardous wildland fire area also interfacing with urban areas. Noise is not an impact issue in the area.

As previously noted, the provision of public services such as schools, and utilities such as water, sewer or drainage are inefficient and expensive for such low density partially developed areas. The only portion of this Sphere of Influence area that might be considered feasible for urban expansion is the frontage of Highway 227 at the eastern end of the SOI. If retained in the SOI, this 60-acre portion of the area would be considered for Single Family Residential Low-Density
Planned Development subject to annexation and extension of urban services. This Planned Development potential and annexation would require project EIR to determine possible impacts and mitigation measures, dependent on development proposed. Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Recreation and other urban service and infrastructure concerns would be addressed in the project EIR. Cumulative and growth-inducing impacts would also be addressed in a project EIR prior to consideration for annexation to the City.

The 2000 draft land use map proposed this Sphere of Influence as within the Urban Reserve Limit but classified Estate or very low density Single Family Residential.

Alternatives, Evaluation and Explanations:

a. If not annexed, the County area could remain RS, allowing 1 ac. lots, unless slopes exceed 16 or 30% requiring 2 or 3 acre lots;

b. If the County concurs with service constraints and environmental concerns noted by the City, the minimum lot size could be increased to 1 du/2.5 ac. similar to RS areas southeast of Arroyo Grande, by County LUE amendment of Planning Area Standards. Alternatively, the properties could be considered for annexation and classified as SFR-VLD allowing 1 du/2.5 ac. in the City, but not provided water, sewer or other urban services;

c. If the City, owners and LAFCO agree to annexation and classification for SFR-LD development, the City could enable continued subdivision to 1 du/1.5ac. or 1 du/ac.; and,

d. More urban density single-family lots or planned developments could be considered subject to annexation but would require extensive infrastructure improvements such as water, sewer, drainage, streets, fire, police and park facilities. This type of potential appears feasible on only the few parcels fronting on Highway 227, subject to annexation.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes to exclude approximately 700 acres of this area, except the 60-acre portion fronting on Highway 227 which would remain within the URL & SOI to enable possible annexation, subject to SFR-LD-PD, Single-Family Residential, Low Density, Planned Development.

Approximately 2865 acres of County LUE Residential Suburban properties in the Arroyo Grande Fringe Area to the north would be recommended for an increased minimum parcel size of 2½ acres rather than 1 acre as currently allowed, similar to the Planning Area standard established by the County for the RS area southeast of the City. This new Planning Area Standard would require County LUE amendment to implement but is more consistent with water, drainage, grading and traffic constraints apparent in the Fringe Area.

Regarding alternatives, if not annexed and continued to develop in the County at current Residential Suburban standards allowing 1, 2 and 3 acre lots, this 760 acre SOI area alone implies a potential for more than 500 rural homes, about triple the existing. The total RS area, 2,865 acres of the Arroyo Grande Fringe has an apparent potential of more than 2,000 dwellings if divided into 1-acre homesites as currently enabled. Further, the 3,585 acres of Residential Rural Arroyo Grande Fringe Area implies a potential for an additional 700 dwellings at 1 du/5 acres allowed by the County, when fully developed. Combined, this Arroyo Grande Fringe Area could contain 2700 rural dwellings and a population in excess of 8,000 residents, a community about 50% of the current City of Arroyo Grande population within a 10 square mile area, almost twice the geographic size of the City. The adverse impacts of this Residential Rural and
Suburban sprawl, at a potential population density about 25% of the urban area is almost beyond comprehension. Water, traffic and drainage impacts would be at least double the current deficient conditions. Whether continued with individual wells and septic systems or provided by potential community systems, the water consumption of this Fringe area should be estimated to require 1500 acre feet per year, not currently allocated in safe annual yield evaluation of the Arroyo Grande basin. Traffic from 2,700 rural dwellings would involve approximately 27,000 trips per day on already deficient roads and Highway 227 traversing the area. Drainage from the concentration of septic systems and disturbance of highly erosive soils by double the existing amount of Residential Rural and Suburban developments would, unless mitigated, substantially damage Tally Ho and Arroyo Grande Creek riparian water quality as well as internal drainage and wetland areas. Public services for this potential unincorporated Fringe Area community of 8,000 residents would overwhelm available Lucia Mar Schools located in the City of Arroyo Grande, all requiring student transportation. Doubling the existing number of dwellings in the Arroyo Grande Fringe Area, approximately 15 minutes response time from both the San Luis Obispo airport or Nipomo CDF fire stations, would require a permanent new fire station, manned and equipped year around for increased wildland and structural fire hazards. These examples are only a few of the major environmental impact implications of County Fringe Area development without urban intensification.

County LUE amendment should evaluate alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce rather than increase development intensity within the Arroyo Grande Fringe area, but this is clearly not a logical expansion area for the City of Arroyo Grande. If annexed and developed at SFR-LD development density of 1 du/ac. the 10 square mile Fringe Area would be twice the size as the existing City and potentially equal to the current urban area population potential. More intensive urban density development could double or triple these overwhelming implications. The cumulative and growth-inducing impacts of urban expansion into only the 760 acre SOI portion of the Fringe area are beyond the scope of this Program EIR that proposes to exclude all but 60 acres of the current SOI for City and South County Sanitation District expansions.

The impacts of this 60-acre SOI will require a project EIR to evaluate annexation and development alternatives and mitigation measures.

6.) Camino Mercado

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

Three undeveloped lots remain on the north side of Camino Mercado adjoining Open Space and Single Family Residential as well as cemetery, office, motel and Five Cities Center Regional Commercial uses. The 1990 General Plan indicates these parcels as part of the Oak Park Acres PD, designated for convalescent hospital, club and office uses by the approved PD1.1 zoning. The 2000 draft Land Use Policy map showed Regional Commercial for the entire Camino Mercado area, including the cemetery, motel and office complex and undeveloped parcels.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes Mixed-Use, Planned Development as a more appropriate designation enabling residential, office or other MU-PD proposals rather than Regional Commercial. The cemetery would be classified as Community Facility.

Impacts of the Proposed General Plan –

The three remaining undeveloped lots on Camino Mercado are sloping hillside sites ranging from 1.4 to 4 acres each, with scattered coastal oaks and grassland vegetation. One lot has an approved office complex not yet constructed and another office development is being considered for the corner of West Branch and Camino Mercado, not yet approved. A senior housing
Development was recently denied on the third undeveloped lot with traffic impacts and hillside design being impact issues.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes Mixed-Use, Planned Development for residential, institutional, office and other MU-PD proposals including possible small scale visitor-serving and community commercial uses. The cemetery would be classified as Community Facility.

The slopes on these lots are generally gradual and not subject to landslide or slope stability concerns with required building design standards. Erosion potential would cumulatively contribute to Meadow Creek siltation unless on-site or off-site mitigation is required. Water supply is an additional impact concern with all development because General Plan buildout projections approach or exceed current water entitlements if per capita consumption exceeds 160 gpd. Water conservation mitigation measures or supplemental supply will be required for full buildout. Air quality impact criteria for Mixed-Use projects do not appear to involve further analysis unless commercial uses are proposed requiring APCD review. Traffic studies will be required for any project involving 20 or more peak hour trips and impacts to Camino Mercado, West Branch and other area intersections that do not meet LOS 'C' criteria with mitigation would be considered significant.

Biological resources do not appear to be involved on-site in the potential Mixed-Use Planned Development of Camino Mercado lots, but off-site water quality due to erosion, siltation and/or urban pollutants in storm water is a cumulative impact issue. Energy and mineral resources are not at issue with potential development of these remaining lots, nor are hazards such as landslide, flooding or wildland fires applicable to these sites. Noise may be a concern if residential use is proposed due to commercial and freeway noise exposure. Public services and utilities systems appear adequate for potential Mixed-Use Planned Development, but project specific review would be required prior to approval. The sites are located on a hillside visible from much of Freeway 101 and major streets and aesthetics of proposed development and compatibility with neighbors to the east will be impact issues. Design review requirements will mitigate this visual impact. Cultural resources are not known to exist on the undeveloped lots. Recreation impacts would be relevant if residential use is proposed but mitigation fees would reduce this concern to less than significant. Conclusion: Mixed-Use Planned Development of undeveloped lots totaling approximately 10 acres is generally considered less than significant impact potential except cumulative erosion, traffic and aesthetic concerns which would require mitigation measures, depending on uses and project design. Project specific environmental determinations will be required on each of the three undeveloped lots when Mixed-Use Planned Developments are proposed.

Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:

a. Create a PD classification similar to the 1990 plan and allow office, institutional and/or residential uses, subject to PD approval;

b. Classify as CF and/or O and allow Community Facilities and/or Office;

c. Classify as SFR or MFR and encourage single family residential subdivision, planned developments or multiple family development. Density could range from SFR-LD having 1 du/1.5 ac. or 1 du/ac to MFR-MH or HD enabling 9 du/ac or 14 du/ac.;

d. Classify as MU-PD, Mixed Use Planned Development enabling consideration of commercial, office, institutional and/or residential planned developments; and,
e. Classify as RC, enabling Regional Commercial uses between the nearby Five Cities (Walmart) and Oak Park (K-Mart) Shopping Centers.

Regarding alternative 'a.', the General Plan Update attempts to avoid the PD classification used in the 1990 plan because that classification did not identify the actual uses allowed by Planned Development, revealed only by research of related zoning and Development Code regulations. Alternative 'b.' to enable Community Facility and/or Office uses would not reflect the diversity of existing development that includes a motel and office complex. Neither CF nor O classification would enable the opportunity for special needs residential or small scale visitor-serving or community-serving commercial uses such as hotels, restaurants, convenience and specialty stores. Alternative 'c.' classification as SFR-or MFR-PD would also restrict development to residential Planned Development, making existing development legally non-confirming precluding further non-residential Planned Development. Traffic, noise and other compatibility issues and impacts make Single-Family Residential or Multi-Family Residential subdivision or Planned Developments unlikely and less feasible than alternative Mixed-Uses. Alternate 'e.' classification as Regional Commercial would enable and encourage remaining undeveloped lots to be developed for regional shopping. The undeveloped lots are generally too small and sloping for retail commercial development which would cause major grading, tree removal, aesthetic, traffic, drainage and land use compatibility problems with existing office and motel and adjoining Single Family Residential uses.

While Mixed-Use Planned Development may also involve commercial uses with similar impact implications, the diversity of existing use and nearby Oak Park Plaza and adjacent Five Cities shopping centers may warrant small scale regional commercial uses among the MU-PD potential uses considered at this location. Commercial Mixed-Uses would probably require project specific EIR, depending on type, design and site modifications required. Cumulative and growth inducing impacts would be considered as part of possible commercial project EIRs but smaller scale, less intensive MU-PD appear to involve less than significant impact potential.

7.) Village Mixed-Use Boundaries and Uses

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

The 1990 adopted General Plan has a Village Commercial specific boundary defined on the land use map which includes several PF, SR and O zones but excludes adjoining Residential and General Commercial areas to the west, north, east and south. The 2000 draft map expanded the Village Center classification to include these internal and adjoining areas, but the enlarged boundaries and allowed uses may create numerous non-conforming developments unless clarified. For example two automobile sales agencies and at least 3 service stations exist on Traffic Way and East Branch/Grand Avenue entrances to the Village. If classified VC, these would be legally non-conforming and constrained from expansion or replacement if destroyed or discontinued. These areas are currently zoned Highway Commercial which allows vehicle-oriented and general commercial uses.

The 21-acre Myrtle and Cherry SFR-LD area was shown as SFR-MD on the 2000 draft map, implying increase from 20du to approximately 100du potential.

Existing Single Family Residential development adjoining the Village to the west, north and east are not logical candidates for Mixed-Use expansion, particularly commercial uses of the type encouraged in the Village. The Office district southeast of the Village also extends to Whitely Avenue which is also exclusively Single Family Residential use.
The 2000 draft map indicated Single Family Residential and Village Center land use on a 12-14 acre remaining 1990 Agriculture designated property south of Cherry Avenue east of Traffic Way and a 5-acre adjoining hillside property. This subarea south of the Village is a significant Ag preservation or conversion issue that must be addressed.

Each of these expansion areas is separately considered in the following descriptions because each is already developed differently.

**Impacts of the Proposed General Plan**

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes to classify:

7 W,-N), & E) Single Family residential areas to the west, north, east and southeast of E. Branch commercial and civic uses SFR-MD rather than Village Core.

7 W&S) Existing Highway Commercial and General Commercial uses, both classified as General Commercial on the 1990 plan, will be reclassified as MU, Mixed-Use rather than VC, Village Core because each contains some uses that would become legally non-conforming if classified VC.

7 S The undeveloped 2 acre portion of properties southeast of Traffic Way and Cherry Avenue, classified General Commercial on the 1990 plan reclassified Mixed-Use despite current Agricultural use and prime Ag soils.

This MU classification would require mitigation measures outlined in the General Plan Agriculture, Conservation and Open Space Element text.

The 12 acres south of Cherry Avenue and east of Traffic Way frontage classified Agriculture on the 1990 plan and was proposed as Single Family Residential–Medium Density by the draft 2000 Land Use Policy map, a “widowed” area of prime Ag soils implying exception to or mitigation of loss of prime Ag use and soils. The 2001 General Plan Update proposes retention of the Agriculture classification as an environmentally superior alternative. The adjoining 5 acre hillside property (Hayes) not involving Ag use nor prime Ag soils would be reclassified from Ag to Single Family Residential, Low Density and C/OS, Conservation/Open Space. This parcel is accessible from Cherry Avenue and Huebner Lane, a private drive also used for maintenance access to a City water tank further southeast adjoining Frederick/ALC properties discussed as subarea 8 hereinafter. (The steep vegetated hillside traversed by Huebner Lane off Branch Mill Road is an environmentally sensitive Conservation/Open Space area while the water tank site is classified Community Facility.)

One change to the 1990 General Plan and current zoning different than the prior proposals discussed during formulation of the 2001 General Plan Update, involves the approximately 21-acre area south of Arroyo Grande Creek east of Garden Street along Myrtle and East Cherry Avenue. The 2000 draft Land Use Policy map proposed this area of existing large lots as a potential Single Family Residential, Medium Density, which would enable almost 100 dwellings compared to the existing potential for 22 1-acre lots. The 2001 General Plan instead proposes consideration of alternative from LD to MD ranging form 20 to 100 du [Single Family Residential, Low Medium Density which would enable approximately 55 dwellings at a density of 2.5du/ac., an increase of about 33 over existing potential]. It should be recognized that this fragmented large lot area may require area owners to cooperate for future subdivision planning since street, drainage, water, sewer and other infrastructure for single family residential development are currently inadequate. If coordination or cooperation is lacking or more intensive residential
subdivision is proposed, a project EIR for mitigation of potentially significant impacts would be required.

Other than this subarea and Village Core Mixed Use projects, the impacts of the proposed 2001 General Plan Update are not substantially different than considered with the 1990 General Plan. Avoiding Village expansion into existing Single Family Residential subdivided and developed areas to the west, north and east reduces potential change to less than significant. Similarly, classification as Mixed Use rather than Village Core or General Commercial to the west and south better reflects established existing uses including auto dealerships, service stations, motel, highway and general commercial service uses. The more confined Village Core potential along East Branch, Traffic Way and Station Way may involve potentially significant traffic, parking, flood protection, historic resource and other impact issues discussed below but also associated with the 1990 General Plan, the ‘no project’ alternative.

The most significant proposed land use and planning change and impact potential to the VC classification is allowance for residential uses. The potential for additional population and housing is somewhat speculative and will depend on individual VC Mixed Use developments that will be subject to subsequent environmental determinations and possible project EIRs. Most of the VC area is subject to seismic, safety and building design mitigation measures to address geophysical, fire, flood and other safety hazards. Cumulative water resource concerns associated with projected urban use exceeding current water supply entitlements are relevant with VC intensification or expansion, but the service infrastructure for delivery and fire suppression is already established and required regardless of proposed changes. Water quality impacts due to increased intensity and urban pollution of storm drainage directly into adjoining Tally Ho and Arroyo Grande Creeks is an issue requiring further City analysis and mitigation. Regional Water Quality Control basin plan amendments and recent EPA storm water pollution prevention plan requirements will influence future development project potential and required mitigation measures. The “multi-modal” mixed-use of Village Core development will reduce potential air quality impacts and transportation/circulation issues compared to alternative single purpose Regional Commercial development. But the recognized parking deficiencies and circulation constraints apparent along East Branch Street through the Village Core will obviously complicate proposed expansion or intensification proposals or projects. Specifically, it is very doubtful that Village Core projects could comply with LOS ‘C’ traffic mitigation criteria required by current development policy.

Portions of the Village Core also adjoin Arroyo Grande and Tally Ho Creeks which inherently involve biological resources, flood hazards and drainage/water quality impacts.

Energy and mineral resources are not at issue with Village Core development. Fire, seismic and flood hazards and related mitigation such as unreinforced masonry building retrofit, flood protection and fire suppression problems related to historic buildings are all unavoidable impact issues. If residential uses are integrated into the Village Core, noise, parking and public services and facilities are increasingly complex, regardless of general desirability of such Mixed Uses. Both aesthetics and land use compatibility issues will require refinement of Village Core design guidelines and development standards. Additionally, the preservation of historic buildings is a project-related as well as cumulative impact issue particularly in the Village Core where numerous substandard but historic or culturally significant structures remain. Recreation related impacts can be mitigated to less than significant by project design linking creekside and streetscape pedestrian areas and plazas to the Nelson Green and other urban Village Core amenities as well as contribution to park in-lieu fees for recreation improvements. Village Core intensification and expansion does not introduce new growth inducing or cumulative impact issues despite increased employment and economic development opportunities identified by the Update compared to the 1990 General Plan and EIR.

EIR – 53
Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations

Village Core enhancement and expansion of the historic pedestrian-oriented resident and tourist-serving commercial, office and compatible mixed uses is a basic planning objective. This does not, however, require redevelopment of any areas adjoining the existing Village Core. A gradual transition and more dispersed character, while still pedestrian oriented, is more characteristic of the "rural small town" qualities already evident in these predominantly non-residential areas. Several Core expansion opportunities are apparent without encroaching into the single-family subdivisions and development west of Wesley, north of Le Point, east of the foot of Crown Hill or south of the "Nelson Green" frontage. The basic alternatives focus on Station Way, Traffic Way and E. Branch adjoining the Village Core, excluding established residential areas.

The Station Way commercial development known as "Village Center" is one opportunity for evolution into a more diverse, pedestrian oriented shopping, dining and office complex with different "rural" rather than historic architectural character. As Bridge Street and Traffic Way become more intensive extensions of the Village Core, the Village Center can also evolve into a compatible, connected and more concentrated activity "node" as part of the Village Core area. Similarly, Village Core expansion easterly on E. Branch Street to the foot of the Crown Hill is already in progress and evolving with "Creekside Center" proposed on the 3.5 acre Loomis property. This mixed-use development would contain approximately 33,000 sq.ft. of retail and office use and four dwellings.

The current City Hall, Council Chambers office buildings and convenience store and converted residential structures near Mason Street can all be retained or evolve to a more concentrated pedestrian-oriented shopping, service, dining, civic and cultural activity center with additional buildings added along the street frontage. To the extent feasible, historic buildings should be retained and restored, but if replacement or relocation is necessary, the new structures should emphasize the design characteristics of the historic Village Core: Two or three story, finely detailed storefront and pedestrian streetscape is essential on E. Branch. For the most part, parking behind or beside buildings with minimum driveway crossings of E. Branch Street will best achieve the Village Core expansion and encourage the desired design character.

The preliminary concept of Village Core expansion proposed by 2000 draft Land Use policy, extended south of Poole along Traffic Way to Freeway 101. This alternative would encompass two automobile sales and service agencies which are clearly different character than Village Core. Many other existing uses, including motel, swim club, service station and auto repair shops, storage and various other general and highway commercial uses make this area a diverse Mixed Use area as reflected in the proposed 2001 General Plan Update. Classification as Village Core while an alternative, would make the prevailing use pattern legally non-conforming and imply relocation and redevelopment rather than recycling buildings and retention of many existing uses. Another alternative for the Traffic Way frontage would be to classify it General Commercial or Highway Commercial to encourage these uses rather than enabling offices, retail and residential components in the proposed Mixed-Use district. Either accommodates existing auto sales and service and enables similar automobile-oriented businesses and commercial services in the Traffic Way area.

The most controversial alternative in Land Use study subarea "7-S" involves the 12 acres of residual Agriculture land on the south side of Cherry Avenue, currently cultivated. The range of uses possible on these 12 acres spans from Agriculture preservation to allowing Village Core Mixed Use or Business Park. Because single-family homes front on the north side of Cherry Avenue, adjoin to the east and are above on the hillside along Trinity Avenue, residential is a consistent, compatible development alternative. Neo-traditional or other compact subdivision for
Single-Family Residential, Medium Density, Planned Development would fit the developed environs but involve potential cumulative significant impacts associated with Ag conversion, possibly contrary to Agriculture, Conservation and Open Space Element policies outlined in the General Plan Update. In addition to loss of Ag land, Ag conversion involves land use and planning issues, population and housing policy implications, traffic and circulation impacts and air quality impacts associated with development. It can be estimated that at 5 du/ac, 12 acres of SFR-MD Planned Development would enable a potential for 60 dwellings or 180 residents, 600 trips per day for example.

Geophysical, water resource and water quality and biological resources associated with Planned Development of Ag land conversion are not substantially different than alternative residential development areas, but this illustrates that Ag land conversion is NOT essential or without option. Energy and mineral resources are not at issue nor are hazards and noise significant issues with potential development of this property. The basic justification for Ag conversion is the availability and efficiency of public services, utilities and service systems adjoining and surrounding these 14 acres. Partial conversion for Mixed Use further reduces and isolates the remaining acreage currently cultivated and irrigated despite urban environs. Water, sewer, drainage, garbage, fire, police, parks, schools and other infrastructure and facilities are all established in the area and capable of servicing alternative SFR-MD-PD and Mixed Use development. Design and development mitigations would be determined by site and project specific EIR including aesthetic, cultural resource and recreation impacts and alternatives. No growth inducing impacts are apparent with this possible Ag conversion, but cumulative impacts have been identified as significant as a matter of policy.

As a preferred alternative, the 2001 General Plan Update proposes Single Family Residential Low to Medium Density subdivision of an already fragmented residential area further east on Cherry and Myrtle Avenues.

8.) Frederick/ALC and Williams Properties Inside and Outside of City Limits and Sphere of Influence (SOI)

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

The 1990 General Plan designates the portions of the Frederick/ALC properties within the City as Residential Rural and Residential Hillside with the latter requiring Specific Plan and encouraging cluster development possibly including other uses. The portion of Fredericks property outside the City north of Freeway 101 and El Campo Road is classified Agriculture in the County Land Use Element but is within the adopted Sphere of Influence implying potential annexation. The Williams property further southeast is outside the San Luis Bay planning area, designated Agriculture and outside the City’s adopted Sphere of Influence. The Frederick/ALC properties are pending separate Specific Plan and EIR consideration, known as Arroyo Linda Crossroads.

The 2000 draft land use map indicated Business Park and Regional Commercial classifications on most of the Frederick/ALC property within a Specific Plan combining designation, except Open Space and Conservation overlay along the north edge near Branch Mill Road. Residential Hillside integrated into the proposed Specific Plan was not reflected in this prior preliminary General Plan proposal. The Williams property was excluded from the City’s prior 2000 draft map.

Impacts of the Proposed General Plan

The 2001 General Plan Update draft land use map proposes the Frederick/ALC property be classified Specific Plan and Specific Plan Reserve without underlying land uses prescribed within the City limits and within the proposed Urban Reserve Line and existing SOI.
The 2001 General Plan Update also proposes that the 200-acre Williams family property further southeast be classified as SP Reserve, subject to approval of SOI amendment by LAFCO and separate, but coordinated Specific Plan and EIR consideration by the City. These unresolved Specific Planned developments within the City limits and involving 185-acre potential Frederick/ALC Specific Plan Reserve phased expansion and 200-acre future Williams property Specific Plan Reserve for further expansion are a major new and unique urban growth alternative for the City of Arroyo Grande. These are the only remaining substantial sized non-prime Agriculture undeveloped properties adjoining Arroyo Grande not fragmented like Residential Suburban subdivisions to the north and southeast of Freeway 101, nor urban like Oceano, Grover Beach and Pismo Beach.

The magnitude of these potential expansions and the resultant impacts are almost without historic precedent if predominantly non-residential or Mixed-Use development is enabled by Specific Plan. Unlike the three prior large Planned Developments northwest of the older City – Oak Park Acres, Rancho Grande and Royal Oak Estates – Arroyo Linda Crossroads proposes Business Park and certain Regional Commercial Uses oriented to a new El Campo Road Interchange with Freeway 101. With 107 acres undeveloped inside the City and 185 acres outside the City limits but inside the SOI and URL, the Frederick/ALC properties propose 292 acres of employment growth and economic development opportunity previously not considered. If 200 acres of Williams property is added, the 492 acre southeasterly urban expansion potential is almost double that of Frederick/ALC alone. In fact, the City could extend physically to the foot of Picacho Hill, based on geographic constraints alone.

Environmental impacts and resource constraints require careful consideration, development phasing and comprehensive EIR. These are the basic reasons that Specific Plan, SP Reserve and EIRs are essential for proper land use and planning. The pending Specific Plan proposes primarily non-residential development containing 100 dwellings or an approximate residential population of 300. All new construction would conform to building safety standards and avoid possible natural hazards such as slope stability or landslide hazard on steep slopes. Conceptually, as explained in the Specific Plan and EIR for Arroyo Linda Crossroads, the potential project involves approximately 57,000 sq. ft. of offices; 680,000 sq. ft. of research and development business park use; 55,000 sq. ft. of specialty retail; 185,000 sq. ft. of vehicle sales; 210,000 sq. ft. shopping center; 175 hotel/motel rooms; several restaurants and service stations and other visitor and resident-serving commercial uses in two phases of development.

The project EIR estimates that phase 1 development in the City would consume 58 acre feet/year of water resources at full development according to the Specific Plan. Assuming annexation of the 185-acre phase 2 SOI area, without including Williams properties, accounts for an additional 120 acre feet/year of water consumption in this portion of the Specific Plan Reserve. Storm drainage and flood control would be provided on site but Specific Planned Development would cumulatively contribute downstream to 10-year peak storm criteria and urban pollutants and potential degradation of the Arroyo Grande Creek water quality. Both on-site and off-site siltation basins, detention or retention ponding would partially mitigate these water quality concerns intercepting storm drainage prior to discharge into the creek system.

The business park and commercial character of proposed Specific Planned development would potentially generate significant added traffic and an estimated 55 lbs per day of air quality emissions: Traffic and circulation impacts will contribute significantly to air quality impacts both directly and indirectly by provided new jobs in the region, fueling additional housing demand and requiring commuting from jobs to housing. The essential circulation and transportation infrastructure for the project must include El Campo Road interchange with Freeway 101 and Traffic Way extension for local street connection, but regional and local traffic congestion will
impact other routes despite these new proposed facilities. (See project EIR, SCH #97081048 for more information).

Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:

a. The undeveloped City portions, zoned RR and RH, the latter subject to Specific Plan, could be classified as SFR-LD-PD C/OS and to enable single family residential low density planned development and Conservation/Open Space. This would encourage low density residential rather than business park or non-residential planned development at either 1 du/1.5 ac. or 1 du/ac. on the hillside parcels currently in the City, excluding steep or vegetated areas as Conservation/Open Space;

b. The Frederick/ALC properties within the City could be classified as MU-SP, BP-SP or RC-SP to enable or encourage a Mixed Use, Business Park or Regional Commercial focus, subject to Specific Plan approval;

c. The Frederick/ALC properties could be classified as SP and SP Reserve, the latter involving the portion outside the City limits but in the City's Sphere of Influence, without prescribing a primary land use classification. This enables the most flexibility but provides less direction to the property owner regarding potential development alternatives to be considered in the Specific Plan;

d. The portions of Frederick/ALC properties outside the City could be designated differently than those inside the City such as Conservation/Open Space or Agriculture with or without Specific Plan for undefined urban use potential; and,

e. The Williams property further southeast and outside current City Sphere of Influence could be proposed to be added, dependent on coordination or combination with the Frederick/ALC Specific Plan Reserve or the current County Agriculture classification could be retained or it could be reclassified as C/OS, Conservation/Open Space.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes that these subareas be classified Specific Plan and Specific Plan Reserves without prescribing primary land use designations, a combination of alternate 'c' and 'e'. The potential impacts of Specific Planned development will be determined by project specific EIRs required prior to Specific Plan approvals.

Regarding alternatives, the SFR-LD-PD classification alternative 'a.' is essentially the 'no project' alternative, effectively leaving the 1990 residential classifications and substituting Planned Development rather than Specific Plan for the large parcels in the City. Alternative 'b.' would endorse a particular non-residential or mixed-use development option subject to Specific Plan approval. Without benefit of project economic and environmental evaluations, this would be more speculative. Alternative 'd.', with property outside the City retained as Conservation/Open Space or Agriculture, would be the environmentally superior 'no project' alternative. The inclusion of the Williams property as well as Frederick/ALC, increases the potential for urban expansion but unless and until a Specific Plan and project EIR is prepared and adopted and the properties included in the SOI are annexed, the large acreage parcels will continue to be Agricultural classified under County jurisdiction.
9). Valley Road Agriculture

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

South of Fair Oaks Avenue and Arroyo Grande High School, on both sides of Valley Road, outside the City limits, the County Land Use Element classifies the unincorporated properties as Agriculture, partially Flood Hazard combining district along Arroyo Grande Creek. Because of prime soils and agriculture use, the 141-acre area is excluded from the City’s Sphere of Influence despite being literally surrounded by urban developments within the City limits. The 2000 draft land use map excluded this Agriculture enclave reflecting current City limits.

The 2001 draft General Plan Update proposes this surrounded Agriculture area remain outside the City’s Sphere of Influence designated County Agriculture.

The 2001 General Plan Update reflects that inclusion within the Sphere of Influence, implying potential annexation, would be contrary to LAFCO criteria and could be misinterpreted as conducive to Agriculture conversion. The 2001 General Plan Update and EIR propose this area to remain under County jurisdiction and Agriculture classification outside the SOI and Urban Reserve line, to promote Agriculture preservation. The area to the south to the Los Berros drainage and west to Halcyon Road will also be shown on the General Plan Update as County Agriculture classification.

Two relatively minor but important SOI boundary changes are proposed by the 2001 General Plan Update south of current City limits. One involves an existing Church at the southeast corner of Valley Road and Los Berros Road currently outside the City and LAFCO approved Sphere of Influence. The 2001 Update proposes to include this existing church in the SOI enabling annexation to the City. The other involves an undeveloped triangular shaped 1.7 acre parcel on the east side of Halcyon Road south of an unincorporated area Mobile Home Park, both currently included in the adopted Sphere of Influence.

The City does not support the current County Residential Multiple Family classification of the undeveloped triangle nor proposed residential subdivision of the property. Annexation of the undeveloped property is impossible without also including the existing Mobile Home Park adjoining the City, but that has not been proposed. Without annexation, the undeveloped parcel should remain undeveloped, and the City proposes that the 2001 General Plan Update exclude the undeveloped triangle from the SOI and recombined with the County Agriculture classified property to the southeast.

Impacts of the Proposed General Plan

The proposed plan is essentially to leave the property outside City SOI and URL, classified Agriculture in the County jurisdiction. This is the ‘no project’ alternate, involving no change from current conditions or prior plans, but adding the County Agriculture classification on the Urban Land Use Element map to show the actual and planned use of this enclave surrounded by urban use. There are no environmental impacts associated with this ‘no project’ alternative despite the map change to show Agriculture use.

Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:

a. The Agriculture classified areas could be retained as Ag regardless of prime vs. non-prime soils or current use or ownership;

b. The High School owned property could be classified CF, Community Facility and private hillside areas between the High School and Mobile Home Park classified SFR-LD-PD to
enable consideration of single-family residential, low density, planned development at 1 du/1.5 ac. or 1 du/ac.;

c. The properties currently outside the City could remain outside the City's Sphere of Influence and retained as County Agriculture classification; and,

d. The County LUE could be amended to enable Residential Suburban development on hillside portions of the area retaining the bulk of Valley Road for Agriculture outside the City's Sphere of Influence implying no potential additional annexation.

The reclassification of High School owned property as Community Facility alternative 'b.' and retention of Agriculture outside the City's SOI, alternative 'c' is the proposed 2001 Update, and effectively the 'no project' alternative. The hillside non-prime Agriculture as well as the prime cultivated, irrigated bottomlands are retained as Agriculture. This is the environmentally superior, 'no project' alternative compared to possible non-prime Ag land conversion for Residential Hillside or County Residential Suburban development.

10.) Farrell Avenue

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans & Regulations

South of Soto Sports Complex, the 1990 General Plan indicates Residential Suburban within a Specific Plan for an un-subdivided 10-acre agricultural property adjoining residential Planned Development to the west and Multiple Family subdivisions to the south and east along Farrell Avenue. The 2000 draft land use map designated this undeveloped agricultural property as Multiple Family without the PD or SP combining district. The City has received preliminary proposal from the property owner for a Residential Suburban conventional subdivision of this remaining agricultural property, subject to Specific Plan approval required by the 1990 General Plan, enabling 2.5 du/ac. or 25 dwellings.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes SFR-LM-PD with PD rather than Specific Plan combining designation to encourage cluster residential Planned Development, including possible expansion of Soto Sports Complex or private park and recreation or ponding basin potential.

Impacts of the Proposed General Plan

Rather than conventional subdivision into 25 large lots, the proposed 2001 General Plan Update encourages an equal or greater number of smaller Single Family Residential lots on a portion of the property with the remainder devoted to expansion of park and recreation/sports complex and ponding basin facilities. This is similar to the 'no project' alternative, enabling the same density of residential use requiring Specific Plan as provided in the 1990 General Plan, but encouraging cluster to retain functional open space. Despite current agricultural use, the property does not involve prime Ag soils and is level with no apparent geophysical constraints to development. Population and housing would be proportional to the development intensity of residential use. The proposed SFR-LM-PD would accommodate approximately 25 homes, compared to alternative higher density residential potential of 45 or 90 dwellings if classified SFR-MD-PD or MFR-MH-PD. No slope stability risk is apparent and liquefaction risk will be evaluated prior to any Planned Development. Water resources for cumulative development potential is an impact concern, but urban use will reduce water consumption compared to current irrigated agricultural use on this site. Storm drainage and water quality concerns can be mitigated on site with potential ponding and recharge basin or off site.
Potential development of 25 dwellings implies 250 trips per day traffic impacts and less than 10 lbs. per day of air quality emissions. Single Family Residential Planned Development is inherently automobile oriented, a pattern already established by adjoining existing uses. Because of prior agricultural use, there are no biological resources or cultural resources apparent on the property.

There are no apparent safety hazards such as flooding or wildland fire affecting this property and liquefaction/settlement risk will require site-specific geotechnical study. Noise and lighting glare particularly from night events at Soto Sports Complex adjoining to the north is an impact issue that will require mitigation as part of Planned Development. Public services and utilities are available to the property, surrounded by residential development, but impacts on these facilities and services will be off-set by fees for school, park, fire, drainage, water, and sewer. Although Planned Development will be subject to design review and special site planning and cluster development would be aesthetically attractive, the conversion from agricultural use is a degradation to existing rural character. Recreation impacts of potential Planned Development may be mitigated by in-lieu fees, but opportunity for park and ponding expansion and public or private recreational facilities as part of Planned Development is apparent on this site. Provision for public access to Soto Sports Complex off Farrell Avenue should be considered with PD approval.

Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:

a. Classify the parcel Ag and allow one unit;

b. Classify the property SFR-VLD or LD-PD or SP and enable very low or low density single family residential planned development ranging from 1 du/2.5 ac., 1 du/1.5 ac., 1 du/ac. implying from 4 to 10 lots, subject to PD or Specific Plan approval;

c. Classify the parcel SFR-LM or MD enabling single-family residential subdivision at 2.5 du/ac. or 4.5 du/ac. approximately 25 to 45 homes, with or without PD or SP;

d. Classify the ten acres as half CF and half MFR. Community Facilities would imply expansion of Soto Sports Complex park and ponding basins or other recreation or institutional uses. Multiple Family Residential would enable duplex, four-plex or apartment uses at 9 du/ac. or 45+/- units on 5 acres or 90 units on 10 acres; and,

e. Classify as PD or SP without primary land use designation enabling Mixed Use, special housing and/or institutional uses, depending on PD or Specific Plan approval by the City.

Regarding alternatives, the environmentally superior choice would be 'a', retaining agriculture use and allowing only one dwelling under the Ag classification. Lower density Single Family Residential classifications allowing 1 du/2.5 ac. or 1 du/ac., enabling 4 to 10 dwellings, would also reduce development impacts compared to the 25 dwellings proposed. Conversely, allowing 4.5 du/ac. or 9 du/ac., increasing development potential to 45 or 90 homes, are alternatives that would increase development impacts. Any Planned Development will require project environmental determination and may require project EIR if project significant impacts are apparent. The alternative of requiring a Specific Plan on this 10-acre "infill" site is considered equivalent to Planned Development, the latter preferred as a combining zoning designation encouraging cluster residential or variations to conventional subdivision. In any event, the project specific environmental determination or EIR will define mitigation measures appropriate for the PD design.
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11.) East Grand Avenue Mixed-Use Corridor Boundaries

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

The 1990 General Plan land use map classifies most of East Grand Avenue west of Freeway 101 as General Commercial adjoining residential areas to the north and south. A small portion of the GC classified area is shown within a Specific Plan area now known as Berry Gardens. The 2000 draft land use map initiated consideration of a new Mixed Use Corridor classification along East Grand Avenue with Specific Plan combining designations for the Mixed-Use area west of Juniper and a large Specific Plan overlay for the residential and commercial zoned triangle south of 101, east of Halcyon Avenue and including East Grand Avenue frontage.

The boundaries and abutting land uses of the Mixed-Use corridor require clarification or changes to better reflect existing and proposed land use refinements currently being considered by the City without Specific Plan combining designations.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes that the Single Family Residential developed areas south and north of the East Grand Avenue Mixed Use Corridor should remain SFR-MD classifications rather than Multiple Family Residential or Mixed Use. The Update also excludes the Specific Plan overlay or PD combining designation as unnecessary and would duplicate individual property development design review and require cooperation of many separate owners, effectively discouraging Mixed Use. Distinct mixtures of uses and property development standards will be formulated for each segment of the East Grand Avenue corridor; Gateway, Midway and Highway subareas. The City will formulate these design and development guidelines as a refinement to Mixed Use zoning consideration after General Plan Update adoption.

Impacts of the Proposed General Plan

The retention of existing Single-Family Residential developed areas north and south of Grand Avenue Mixed Use corridor eliminates potential significant changes to Multiple Family Residential or Mixed Use implying substantial redevelopment. This is essentially the environmentally superior, 'no project' alternative reflecting existing use. The reclassification of East Grand Avenue corridor as "Mixed-Use" rather than General Commercial is considered a beneficial land use and planning change adding possible retail, office, institutional and residential uses to already allowed general and highway commercial uses. The increased diversity of permitted uses, yet to be resolved by Development Code and zoning amendments, will however, involve some potential adverse impacts as well.

The population and housing enabled by Mixed Use are somewhat speculative to estimate, but clearly enable substantial multi-family units above office and commercial or even intermixed on a property-by-property pattern. This inherently implies potential land use compatibility concerns and increases possible development intensity and density. If multiple family uses are proposed on 25% of current commercial zoned and undeveloped or potentially redeveloped large parcels, the cumulative impacts are considerable for housing and population projections.
Although only estimates, for example, Traffic Analysis Zone land use projections for Gateway, Midway and Highway segments of East Grand Avenue Mixed Use Corridor (TAZ #38, 46 and 51, respectively) are itemized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>MFR</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>Dwelling units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Square ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>Square ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>MFR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Square ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Square ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>MFR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dwelling units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Square ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Square ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Other Commercial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Auto service repair/restaurants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining these three projections for potential use, in addition to existing, indicates approximately 140 new dwelling units, 70,000 square feet of added office space, and 125,000 sq. ft. of new retail space, as well as 15 acres of undefined Mixed Uses and at least 10 auto service commercial establishments or restaurants. Assuming 2.5 persons per multiple family dwelling average household population reveals that the residential component of estimated Mixed Use would accommodate about 350 added population. Almost 200,000 sq. ft. of added office and/or retail also implies at least 400 new jobs (at 1 employee per 500 sq. ft). Mixed Use encourages shorter commutes, live-work combinations and more transit efficient land use but the added residential potential is off-set by reduction of alternative General Commercial uses. The impacts of Mixed Use are substantial compared to undeveloped or underdeveloped existing use but probably similar to or less than alternative General Commercial development. In any event, each Mixed Use project will require an environmental determination to evaluate actual proposed development and resultant impacts.

In general, current construction standards would mitigate seismic and building safety concerns. Water consumption will be determined based on use probably but not substantially different than possible General Commercial: Water resources for cumulative development remains a potential significant issue. Controlled storm drainage from Mixed Use development will not be significantly different than from the General Commercial development alternative, but will increase the cumulative need for additional storm water detention and/or retention. Either on-site private or increased off-site public ponding basin capacity will be needed.

Traffic generation and mitigation is the single most apparent adverse impact issue with either Mixed Use or General Commercial intensification along this already congested corridor. Project mitigation will be evaluated individually to reduce trip generation and correct existing and potential circulation deficiencies to the degree feasible. It is apparent, however, that either Mixed Use or alternative General Commercial developments would contribute to intersections and segments already deficient to LOS 'C' criteria. Even with no additional local development, this corridor is a regional arterial experiencing continued external trip increases despite existing circulation deficiencies.

The continued planning of Mixed Use rather than strip General Commercial development may require a statement of overriding considerations to enable implementation involving significant adverse traffic as well as air quality impacts. APCD is very supportive toward Mixed Use and transit efficient development versus conventional strip commercial use and recognizes the
comparative advantages and trip reduction achieved by the proposed type of development, despite air quality compliance problems on a regional basis.

Biological resources are minimal on most undeveloped or partially developed properties but would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. Similarly, few or no hazards are apparent in the Mixed Use corridor area. Noise is a potential site planning and environmental issue particularly for residential uses exposed to high volume arterial traffic noise sources, but can be mitigated by site planning and construction design measures. Energy and mineral resources are not at issue. Public services, utilities and facilities are generally adequate or planned for deficiency correcting capital improvements in any event. (Some water, sewer, drainage and potential undergrounding of overhead utilities is already part of City Capital Improvement Program and Redevelopment Implementation Strategy). School and park and recreation impacts may be mitigated by fee payments or project level mitigation. Mixed Use is generally more aesthetic and attractive than General Commercial alternative development but mitigated by project design review requirements in any event. Cultural resources are not a major concern in this partially developed General Commercial setting.

Mixed-Use corridor impact potential are cumulatively significant although composed of individual projects which may be less than significant with appropriate traffic, noise, drainage and infrastructure mitigation measures. The impacts of alternative General Commercial, the ‘no project’ alternative would, however, be equal or greater in most regards.

Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:

a. Single family residential developed subdivisions not fronting on Grand Avenue can be excluded from the MU, Mixed Use classification and retained a SFR or reclassified and slowly redeveloped as MFR;

b. The large Specific Plan combining designation overlays at the Gateway and Highway ends of the Grand Avenue Mixed-use corridor could be considered as individual PD, planned developments, rather than a prerequisite Specific Plan;

c. The Grand Avenue corridor could distinguish between Gateway, Midway and Highway segments by different permitted commercial, office, institutional and residential uses;

d. The entire Mixed-Use corridor could be proposed as one or more Specific Plan areas, subject to City approval of unspecified private proposals, but requiring many adjoining owners to coordinate and prepare a cooperative plan prior to substantial development; or,

e. Mixed Use could be proposed on individual parcels without any prerequisite Specific Plan or Planned Development but controlled by site plan and design review.

Regarding alternative 'a', the City does not intend to encourage nor convert stable Single Family Residential neighborhoods or blocks to scattered Multiple Family residential developments or total redevelopment. There is ample inventory of undeveloped and underdeveloped General Commercial property to enable Multiple family residential development as part of Mixed Use corridor. The density of separate MFR within MU classified areas can be 9 to 14 du/ac. or even higher for special needs housing. The proportion of multi-family, office, commercial and other uses in the Mixed-Use developments will be at the discretion of the developer subject to City approval. With 15 acres estimated as Mixed Use, and assuming 25% MFR at 10 du/ac. would enable 375 dwellings in addition to the estimated 140 new dwellings on separate properties. This reveals that more than 500 units could be developed to house more than 1000 residents along
the East Grand Avenue Mixed Use corridor if this type of housing proves marketable. This potential is more than ample without redevelopment or encroachment into stable SFR neighborhoods.

As previously noted, the City intends to avoid redundant Specific Plan or Planned Development processes and believes that Mixed Use design review, development guidelines and environmental determinations on a project specific, property specific basis will be sufficient to achieve coordinated compatible uses and quality design. The City intends to prescribe certain permitted and prohibited uses, pedestrian scale streetscape design and architectural guidelines and where necessary, basic land use and site plan and circulation and parking criteria to enable coordination or cooperation of several adjoining properties. This will avoid the complicated process of prerequisite Specific Plans or Planned Developments involving many owners to prepare a cooperative plan prior to substantial individual development. Such a requirement could deter or delay desired Mixed Use development on parcels already pursuing commercial and office developments.

Mixed Use corridor is considered the environmentally superior alternative compared to General Commercial, but the use controls can be as flexible or rigid and as open or closed to increased intensity as the City defines as desirable, and developers find feasible.

12.) El Camino Real

Existing Conditions, Prior Plans and Regulations

The frontage of El Camino Real along the south side of Freeway 101 is designated with six different land use classifications on the 1990 General Plan land use map. Between Oak Park Road and Brisco Road, the frontage is classified General Commercial, Office, Multiple Family, Single Family and Industrial. From Brisco Road to Grand Avenue, the frontage of El Camino Real is Public Facility for the cemetery and General Commercial east of Halcyon Road to Grand Avenue. The 2000 draft land use map showed most of this corridor as Regional Commercial, but segments were also classified Single and Multi-Family, Community Facility and Mixed-Use with Specific Plan combining designation.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes to classify the entire El Camino Real frontage Mixed Use including residential and office as well as existing Industrial and General Commercial uses. A Specific Plan or Planned Development on these relatively small parcels is unnecessary because it could effectively discourage more appropriate Mixed-Use proposals on individual ownership. The City will instead control Mixed-Use by Conditional Use Permit, a simpler process than PD or SP.

Only the cemetery between Brisco Road and Halcyon Avenue southwest of El Camino Real would be classified Community Facility to reflect its public ownership and specific purpose.

Impacts of the General Plan

Along most of El Camino Real the developed properties, including homes, condos, multiple family residential, office, commercial service, highway and tourist service such as motel and restaurants, service station, auto repair and General Commercial or Industrial uses, lumber, hardware, truck rental and outdoor furniture to name a few would all be conforming uses. New Business Park, Regional Commercial, auto sales and other alternative uses could be considered as permitted or conditional uses when this Mixed Use classification and zoning regulations are prepared for City adoption subsequent to the General Plan.
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Any substantial new Mixed Use commercial or industrial development will require environmental determination and if found to involve potential significant impacts, a project EIR. It is difficult to speculate what such Mixed Use Developments might contain, but if redevelopment of existing uses are proposed, the impacts would consider the net increases in traffic, emissions, noise, drainage, etc. Because of proximity to Freeway 101, additional residential use along the El Camino Real corridor is considered unlikely. In general, office, commercial or industrial construction standards would mitigate seismic and building safety concerns, water resource consumption would be equivalent to Industrial use but cumulative development remains a potential significant issue. Controlled storm drainage from Mixed Use development will be similar to alternative Industrial use, but either would increase the cumulative need for more detention and/or retention ponds.

Traffic generation and mitigation is the single most apparent significant impact issue along this already congested corridor. Project mitigation measures will be evaluated with individual projects to the degree feasible, but substantial new trip generation would impact intersections and segments already seriously deficient to LOS 'C' criteria. Even with no additional area development, Brisco and Halcyon Roads and El Camino Real segments and intersections will continue to experience external trip increases despite these circulation deficiencies. Overriding considerations may be required for traffic and air quality impacts if Mixed Use development proposed is desired.

Biological resources and cultural resources are minimal on these partially developed properties and would be evaluated on a project basis. Few or no hazards are apparent. Noise and aesthetics concerns will be particularly important adjoining either residential or Ocean View Elementary School between Hillcrest Avenue and Brisco Road.

Energy and mineral resources are not at issue, nor are public services, utilities and facilities for anticipated Mixed Uses. Some water, sewer, drainage and utility system undergrounding are part of City Capital Improvement Program and Redevelopment Implementation Strategy. Mixed Use is generally more aesthetically attractive than Industrial alternative but project design review requirement will assure mitigation in any event.

**Alternatives, Evaluations and Explanations:**

a. Existing Office, residential, Community Facility (cemetery), commercial and industrial areas could be classified accordingly as O, SFR, MFR, CF, and RC and/or an Industrial or different service commercial classification created similar to those used in the 1990 plan;

b. The entire frontage, excluding the cemetery which would be classified CF, could be designated MU to enable mixed use including existing and potential residential or precluding new residential;

c. The industrial area could be considered for Regional Commercial with or without Specific Plan or Planned Development combining designation, subject to circulation improvements as part of Brisco and Halcyon Road/Freeway 101 interchange; and,

d. The Industrial area could be classified as a Specific Plan area without prescribing land use but requiring coordination or cooperation from numerous owners prior to further development.

The Mixed Use classification is considered environmentally superior to the 'no project' alternative of retaining the Industrial and General Commercial classifications. MU enables existing uses to remain or diverse Mixed Use to be considered as replacement developments.
alternative 'c', the intensity of Regional Commercial development is considered infeasible without major freeway access and circulation improvement alternative proposed in the Brisco and Halcyon Road and Grand Avenue Project Study Report (PSR). Similarly, requiring a Specific Plan for several adjacent ownerships prior to further development on individual properties could be a deterrent to Mixed Use development and phasing development or traffic mitigation would be difficult, if feasible.
E. Relationship Between Local Short Term Uses and Enhancement of Long Term Productivity

The 2001 General Plan Update continues and reinforces the 1990 General Plan policy of Agriculture Preservation and Open Space Conservation balanced with the need for managed community growth and development. It is recognized that potentially significant impacts are associated with regional population growth and continued urbanization including water resources, air quality, and transportation/circulation. The City believes that unincorporated area Residential Rural and Suburban development alternatives in the County are far more damaging.

The 2001 General Plan Update adds an important optional element to the prior 1990 General Plan defining policies to promote Agriculture preservation in the City and adjoining County areas within the City’s Area of Environmental Concern. The City policies establish prime agricultural soils capability and enhancement of existing or potential long-term productivity as more important objectives than conversion of such natural resources for local short-term urban, suburban or rural uses.

Past development, both in the City and in unincorporated portions of its Area of Environmental Concern, have contributed to some inefficient and incomplete development patterns including "leapfrog" subdivisions, rural and suburban fragmentation and conflicts between agriculture and other uses. But, continuing these patterns would clearly consume some of the richest and most productive soils and displace or diminish important economic and environmental contributions of Agriculture to the community and region.

Conversely, however, the continued development of alternative residential rural and suburban areas adjoining the City to current County standards will result in irreversible environmental changes clearly worse than those of the proposed 2001 General Plan Update. Preservation of agricultural land in the City, for example, will be ineffective if County Ag areas are converted or economical water resources diverted to rural and suburban uses.

Circulation system deficiency correction to achieve acceptable Levels of Service will require Caltrans, SLOCOG and County improvements and regional transportation changes beyond the control of the City. Without such improvements and changes, the traffic congestion and air quality degradation will worsen, regardless of City plans and standards.

The City shares the responsibility of providing public facilities and services such as water, sewer, fire, police, parks and recreation and planning with numerous other adjacent jurisdictions and agencies. City facilities and services are already deficient in many areas due to prior growth and development without adequate mitigation. The potential for mutually beneficial joint powers or even merger of many services to provide more efficient coordinated service systems should be continually considered within the Five Cities area. Concurrently, however, these jurisdictions should recognize the apparent potential of Nipomo and the Mesa area becoming part of even larger regional growth problems unless controlled by the County.

The 2001 General Plan Update proposes both changes to future urban reserve and better Planning Area Standards for the County’s Arroyo Grande Fringe Areas. Without the County’s cooperation in both Agriculture preservation and control of rural and suburban sprawl, the City’s 2001 General Plan Update will be ineffective. The City must promote this long-term perspective and spirit of governmental cooperation to properly manage population growth and development pressures which are regional in nature. The County must be a primary partner with the City of Arroyo Grande in the implementation of the 2001 General Plan Update, and other agencies’ cooperation must be focused to achieve common, beneficial development goals, such as sustainable use within the resource and infrastructure constraints apparent in the region.
F. Effects Determined Not Significant

Of the 15 topics identified in the December 7, 2000 Notice of Preparation, only two (2) were determined "Not Significant:"

VIII) Energy and Mineral Resources — The 2001 Update does not differ from the adopted 1990 General plan regarding impacts on these resources and the EIR will not repeat 1990 EIR discussion; and,

X) Noise — The 2001 General Plan Update and EIR will identify areas of substantial traffic increases that will contribute to increased noise levels, where these differ from the adopted 1990 General Plan Noise Element, if any. None of these changes are expected to involve exposure of people to severe noise levels.

As discussed in C. General Description of Impact Topics, ten (10) of the 15 topics have been described herein as "Potentially Significant unless Mitigated: (or "Significant – but Mitigable" in the 1990 final EIR). The summary Table EIR-1 identifies these as "Less than Significant" assuming recommended mitigation:

I. Land Use and Planning
II. Population and Housing
III. Geophysical
VII. Biological Resources
IX. Hazards
XI. Public Services
XII. Utility and Service Systems
XIII. Aesthetics
XV. Recreation

The three topics found to be "Potentially Significant and Unavoidable" or possibly not capable of mitigation to "Less than Significant" based on currently available information, are:

IV. Water Resources
V. Air Quality
VI. Transportation/Circulation

The 2001 General Plan Update appears to propose population growth and development that will approach or exceed current water resources, air quality standards, circulation system capacities and public service and facility capabilities. The latter impacts may be mitigated to less than significant if the City can secure regional cooperation and growth management, particularly from the County and other involved agencies.

The City of Arroyo Grande is already a victim of urban, suburban and rural sprawl, but, believes that more compact urban form and revitalization of already converted and partially developed urban areas for more intensive Mixed-Use is a more functional land use and circulation plan than continued low density sprawl.

The focus of the City's 2001 General Plan Update is the Urban Area Land Use Element which must be considered in context with the surrounding, mostly unincorporated County Area of Environmental Concern. It is apparent that the short-term local benefit of more compact and efficient urban use will be overwhelmed by degradation of long-term productivity if alternative rural and suburban development patterns prevalent in the County continue.
Pursuant to Section 15064(a)(2) the determination of one or more significant effects shall require the City and other responsible agencies to make findings under Section 15091 for each significant effect and may need to make a statement of overriding considerations under Section 15093 for the project. These sections are cited below to indicate the possible findings:

“15091. Findings.

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been completed which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the findings. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

3) Specific economic, special or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(b) The findings required by subsection (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) The findings in subsection (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.”

“15093. Statement of Overriding Considerations.

(a) CEQA requires the decision-maker to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable”.

(b) Where the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement may be necessary if the agency also makes a finding under Section 15091(a)(2) or (a)(3).

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the records of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination.”
G. Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed 2001 General Plan Update

Planning for future urban growth inherently involves proposals that will foster or accelerate such growth. Land use enhancement and intensification requires infrastructure and public service provision that can be abused or utilized in unintended ways. Construction of additional freeway lanes or ramps to reduce current congestion, for example, can facilitate longer trips, induce new development and transfer congestion to different streets. Expenditures on circulation and parking facilities can encourage more vehicle use rather than alternative transportation.

Similarly, developing supplemental water resources to stabilize Agriculture use of groundwater can be viewed as fundamentally growth-inducing because agriculture cannot economically compete with potential reallocation for urban uses. Major wastewater collection and treatment facilities to improve water quality also tend to induce more construction in the service area to use the available capacity and help pay for operations. Even the provision of improved fire protection, law enforcement and leisure facilities are somewhat growth inducing, attracting, continued growth and development to the areas of improvement.

In this context, it is evident that regional growth management must involve both planned improvements and more effective land use regulation. One without the other is usually counterproductive or “growth inducing”.

H. Cumulative Effects

Section 15130 of CEQA requires that cumulative impacts shall be discussed when they are significant. The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as much detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone.

Chapter D. of this EIR describes the 12 Land Use Study Areas that involve changes from the 1990 adopted General Plan to the proposed 2001 General Plan Update. Base on these proposed changes, the reasonably anticipated future projects producing cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the City are summarized on Table EIR-2.

The summary of the expected environmental effects found significant is contained in Chapter C of this EIR, and the importance of individual changes composing the cumulative impacts can be considered proportional to the relative capacity of the individual change compared to the total of all alternatives combined.

The final analysis of the cumulative impact of the relevant component projects examines the reasonable options available to the City for mitigating or avoiding any significant cumulative effects of the proposed 2001 General Plan Update, contained as the conclusion of this Chapter G.

Table EIR-2 is an approximate summary of cumulative projects in the 12 Land Use Study Areas involving changes from 1990 adopted to proposed 2001 General Plan Update. Although these component projects may or may not be proposed at the individual "impact magnitude estimated", the cumulative impacts would be roughly proportional to the relative size versus the total development accommodated by the 2001 General Plan Update.
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Table EIR – 2 – Land Use Study Area

Refer to Map 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Project Composition</th>
<th>Impact Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Oak Park/James</td>
<td>Church and School</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rancho Grande/Noyes</td>
<td>SFR-LD-Planned Dvt.</td>
<td>35 du max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rancho Grande/LaCanada</td>
<td>C/OS-5-PD</td>
<td>5du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Royal Oak Estates</td>
<td>SFR-LD-PD &amp; C/OS</td>
<td>20du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Northern SOI/County Highway 227 portion</td>
<td>County RS* SFR-LD-PD (if annexed)</td>
<td>280 to 700du* 60du (if annexed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Camino Mercado</td>
<td>MU-PD (10ac +/-)</td>
<td>50du + 100/ksf. Office or comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>N &amp; W Village Core</td>
<td>Existing SFR</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Village Core</td>
<td>Creekside times 2 MFR-HD</td>
<td>8DU – 66 ksf 50 du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Cherry &amp; Myrtle</td>
<td>SFR-LD, to MD</td>
<td>20 to 95 du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Traffic Way</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>50du + 100ksf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry E. of Traffic</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>a. Frederick/ALC</td>
<td>Specific Plan</td>
<td>50du + 500ksf office/BP &amp; RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Fredrick/ALC (185 ac. if annexed)</td>
<td>Specific Plan Reserve*</td>
<td>50du + 1000ksf office BP &amp; RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Williams Prop (201 ac. if added)</td>
<td>Specific Plan Reserve* (if SOI &amp; annexed)</td>
<td>50du +/− 1000ksf (estimated @ same as ALC Phase 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Valley Road Ag.</td>
<td>County Agricultural</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Farrell Avenue</td>
<td>SFR-LM or MD-PD</td>
<td>25 to 45 du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>E. Grand Avenue</td>
<td>Existing SFR</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU-Add to Corridor</td>
<td>140du + 200k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU-Gateway Parcels</td>
<td>375du + 200k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>MU-Add to Corridor</td>
<td>50du + 30k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU-Former Indust.</td>
<td>50du + 100k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adding the estimated additional dwelling units outlined reveals a range of 1350 to 1790 dwellings. Thus a potential individual project proposing 50 dwelling units would be less than 3% to 4% of the cumulative total while a project involving 500 dwellings would represent from 30 to 40% of the total.

Based on these assumptions of relative impact magnitude, it is apparent that the major potential residential impact area involves Land Use Study Area 5, the Northern SOI in the County, proposed to be excluded from the City's Sphere and its potential reduced by 2 1/2 acre minimum lot Planning Area Standard. This area alone accounts for more than 50% of the residential impact potential.
The single-most important potential residential impact area within the City is Land Use Study Area 11, the E. Grand Avenue Mixed Use Corridor where up to 500 new multiple family dwellings are considered possible, representing 30 to 40% of the cumulative total. The impact of all other Land Use Study areas combined is less than 25% of the total, with the typical individual project of less than 50 dwellings composing less than 3 to 4% of the total.

Adding the estimated additional non-residential development outlined in Table EIR-2 reveals a potential for or approximately 3300 ksf or 3.3 million sq ft of office, business park, commercial and other non-residential cumulative development. Thus a potential typical individual project enabling 66,000 sq ft of office and commercial space represents 2% for the cumulative total. (The proposed Creekside Center, on the east side of the Village, for example, proposes 33,000 sq ft of commercial and office space and would be 1% of total cumulative non-residential development included in the estimate).

The significant impacts identified in this EIR include: IV Water resources, V Air Quality and VI Transportation/Circulation, each requiring a statement of overriding considerations pursuant to CEQA Section 15093 and/or one of the findings of CEQA Section 15091.

Regarding Water Resources, the available City-wide water supply of 3490 ac ft should be adequate for projected 2001 General Plan Update build-out population up to 20,000 provided that average pre capita consumption does not exceed 160 gpd/person and current entitlements and allocations are not reduced. Because proposed development is incremental and water use can be monitored annually, the City can determine well in advance whether average per capita use is achieved or exceeded. But because many area agencies and individuals use the groundwater resources including Agriculture and County Residential Rural and Suburban users, this resource may be difficult to monitor, measure and/or reallocate if overdraft is suspected.

Agriculture is the primary user and many opportunities for improved irrigation efficiency and conservation could be considered before reallocation or extended overdrafting produce permanent damage to the groundwater basin capacity. The issue is one of major regional importance but not substantially in the control of the City. Furthermore, the no project alternative, leaving the 1990 General Plan in effect, does not reduce the population potential of the City nor influence the other potential users to avoid significant effects. The City's largest single residential use potential is in the East Grand Avenue Mixed Use Corridor, which probably will not develop the maximum of over 500 dwellings included in this cumulative estimate, nor will multiple family development likely use as much water per capita as historic low density development.

The County has jurisdiction over the unincorporated Arroyo Grande Fringe Area containing the Residential Rural and Residential Suburban areas that represent more than half the estimated cumulative water resource consumption potential and storm drainage degradation to water quality on Meadow, Tally Ho and Arroyo Grande Creeks, upstream of the City of Arroyo Grande.

Regarding Air Quality and Circulation, the projects with the largest individual contributions to regional traffic and therefore mobile pollution emissions are Land Use Study Area 8, the Frederick/ALC and Williams Properties where project Specific Plans and future EIRs and multi-agency approvals will be considered prior to proposed urban development. In the City, the next most significant contributor to cumulative traffic and air quality impacts is the Mixed Use corridor development of East Grand Avenue, but the alternative of retaining General Commercial pursuant to the 1990 plan would produce equal or greater cumulative traffic and air quality impacts. The San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District strongly encourages compact, mixed use development along transit corridors such as Grand Avenue and, along with the City, will have the
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opportunity to review proposed projects to determine appropriate mitigation measures as Mixed Use development is pursued.

While both these non-residential project areas (ALC/Williams and E. Grand Avenue) may appear to be significant contributors to cumulative traffic and air quality generation, in a regional perspective they are also the largest opportunities in South County to reduce trip length. By creating major new employment areas and intercepting or preventing longer commute patterns to San Luis Obispo or Santa Maria, these two potential projects may actually reduce the air quality and circulation problems that continued sprawl and job/housing imbalance characteristics of current plans imply.

In any event, it is again apparent that the County has jurisdiction over Nipomo, the Mesa and Arroyo Grande Fringe Areas where the bulk of the Residential sprawl pattern is now emerging, and that the City cannot control the dispersed regional development pattern. Nonetheless, the City may control the potential for more compact urban alternatives now proposed: The City should carefully evaluate the environmental consequences of not enabling Frederick/ALC and/or Williams Properties expansions along the 101 corridor.
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