

1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

1.1 FINDINGS PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21081 AND THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15090 AND 15091:

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), 05EIR-00000-00011, was presented to the Planning Commission and all voting members of the Commission have reviewed and considered the EIR, 05EIR -00000-00011, including its appendices and EIR Errata dated February 21, 2006, prior to approving this proposal. In addition, all voting Commissioners have reviewed and considered testimony and additional information presented at or prior to public hearing on February 1, 2006. The EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Planning Commission and is adequate for this proposal.

The Planning Commission finds and certifies that the Final EIR, including the EIR Errata dated February 21, 2006, constitutes a complete, accurate, adequate and good faith effort at full disclosure under CEQA. The Commission further finds and certifies the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.

The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Secretary of the Planning Commission, Mr. Steve Chase, of Planning and Development located at 123 E. Anapamu St., Santa Barbara, CA 93101.

1.2 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS ARE MITIGATED TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT FEASIBLE

The Final Environmental Impact Report on the St. Athanasius proposed project identifies several environmental impacts which cannot be fully mitigated and are therefore considered unavoidable. Those impact areas are: aesthetic/visual resources, agricultural resources, and land use. To the extent the impacts remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, legal, technical, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations included herein. Each of these "Class I" impacts identified by the Final EIR are discussed below, along with the appropriate findings as per CEQA Section 15091:

1. *Aesthetics/Visual Resources*: Development of the proposed project would substantially alter the visual qualities of the site and obstruct views of important scenic attributes currently experienced from Hollister Avenue by pedestrians and bicyclists, including open agricultural fields, Atascadero Creek riparian vegeta~ and the More Mesa landform. In addition, development of the project would substantially change the open agricultural character of the project parcel to that of institutional development of considerable size that would be highly visible from Hollister Avenue. Furthermore, introduction of the proposed church complex would be visually incompatible with the character of the surrounding South Patterson Agricultural Area. Lastly, the proposed 280-

foot setback from Hollister Avenue would be visually incompatible with adjacent development's proximity to the urban roadway corridor, with the exception of the Mentor property which has a similarly large front setback. From a cumulative perspective, the proposed church complex, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development projects in the area, would have significant impacts on the visual resources of the area and loss of open space and agricultural landscapes. No mitigations are available to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. The Planning Commission finds that no feasible mitigation is available to substantially reduce these impacts. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the Planning Commission further finds that to the extent the impacts remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the social and public benefits of the project, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 1.6 of these findings;

2. *Agricultural Resources:* Development of the proposed project would result in the permanent conversion of approximately 4.6 acres of land designated as Prime Farmland to a non-agricultural use. This represents roughly 20% of the project parcel. An additional 0.12 acres of Prime Farmland would be converted to a detention basin on-site in order to collect storm water runoff from the proposed church facilities. This could partly be mitigated by the elimination of the detention basin and allowing for the conjunctive use of the 17.15-acre agricultural area south of the church complex for detention of storm water runoff. Despite this mitigation, this impact would remain significant. In addition to the project-specific impacts of this proposal, there is also the potential for the proposed project to be precedent-setting by encouraging the future conversion of other agricultural lands in the area to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have a significant cumulative impact on agricultural resources as well. While these impacts would remain significant, the recordation of an agricultural easement on the remaining 17.15 acres south of the proposed church complex would ensure that that portion of the property would not be converted to a non-agricultural use until such time as the County rezoned the property out of agriculture. The Planning Commission finds that the identified impacts would be substantially reduced by implementation of the mitigation measures stated above, which are incorporated into the project conditions. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the Planning Commission further finds that to the extent the impacts remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the social and public benefits of the project, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 1.6 of these findings.
3. *Land Use:* Development of the proposed project would conflict with the urban agricultural character of the South Patterson Agricultural Area to the south and west of the project site. Conversion of the northern 4.6 acres of the project parcel would be inconsistent with the agricultural protection policies in the Goleta Community Plan which require that lands designated for agriculture within the urban boundary be preserved for agricultural use, unless the County finds that the land is no longer appropriate for agriculture or there is an overriding public need for conversion to other uses for which there is no other land available in the Goleta urban area. In addition to the potential land use conflict created by construction of the proposed church facility on the northern portion of the agricultural parcel, the extension of water and sewer lines to serve the proposed complex would remove an obstacle to future development of the remaining southern portion of the property. The potential for the project to set a precedent for similar urban development throughout the South Patterson Agricultural Area would result in a cumulatively significant impact to land use in the area. No mitigations are available to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. However, recordation of the agricultural easement over the southern portion of the property remaining in agriculture

would reduce the project's growth-inducing impacts and help to ensure the remaining land does not get prematurely developed for a non-agricultural use, thereby ensuring consistency of the project with the agricultural protection policies in the Goleta Community Plan. While this would protect the southern portion of the property from urban development, the easement would do little to protect other agricultural lands in the vicinity from further urban encroachment. The Planning Commission finds that the identified impacts would be substantially reduced by implementation of the mitigation measures stated above, which are incorporated into the project conditions. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the Planning Commission further finds that to the extent the impacts remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the social and public benefits of the project, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 1.6 of these findings.

FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN IMPACTS ARE

INSIGNIFICANCE BY CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The Final EIR (05EIR-00000-00011) identified several subject areas for which the project is considered to cause or contribute to significant, but mitigable environmental impacts. Each of these impacts are discussed below along with the appropriate findings as per CEQA Section 15091:

1. *Aesthetics/Visual Resources*: Short-term significant but mitigable impacts to visual resources would result during construction of the proposed project. Mitigation to address this impact would include the use of covered receptacles to prevent trash from blowing off-site and the use of clean-up crews to ensure that trash and excess construction debris is collected and disposed of properly. The proposed project would also introduce new sources of light and glare that would degrade existing visual conditions in the vicinity, which would be considered a significant but mitigable impact. Mitigation available to address this impact would include the preparation of a lighting plan for the project that would incorporate the use of low intensity, low glare, fully hooded and shielded lights that would help to prevent light spillover onto adjacent parcels, as well as the incorporation of dimming lights after 10 p.m. Mitigation requiring lighting fixtures to be lower than the proposed screen hedge along the perimeter of the project site would also address this impact. These mitigations would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Lastly, the proposed red-tile roofs and Parish Hall trash enclosure would be potentially incompatible in appearance with surrounding development, thereby resulting in a significant but mitigable impact. Mitigations to address this impact would be to replace the proposed red-tile roof with a darker earth-tone color that is compatible with the surrounding agricultural land uses, as well as ensuring that the trash enclosure is architecturally compatible with the overall project design and is adequately screened by a solid wall and maintained in good condition. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.
2. *Agricultural Resources*: Implementation of the proposed project could create potentially significant conflicts between the proposed urban uses on-site and the adjacent agricultural operations to the south and west, including the operations on the undeveloped southerly portion of the subject parcel. Mitigation to address this impact includes the recordation of an agricultural easement over the remaining 17.15 acres not proposed for development. This easement would ensure that these 17.15 acres would remain available for agriculture and not be converted to urban uses, until such time as the land were rezoned by the County from agriculture to an urban use. In addition, the installation of fencing between the church and the lemon orchard to the west to prevent trespass onto the adjacent agricultural operation would be required if it were found that the vegetation screening

was not sufficient to deter such trespass. The Planning Commission finds that implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

3. **Biological Resources:** Development of the proposed project would result in a degradation of water quality downstream within Atascadero Creek and the Goleta Slough, thus impacting sensitive habitat for fish and wildlife. This would be considered a significant but mitigable impact. Mitigation to reduce this impact would include the incorporation of best management practices associated with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), including water quality monitoring, establishment of bioswales, oil-water separators, erosion control measures and spill prevention and containment measures to reduce potential water quality impacts from pollutant inputs associated with project construction and operation. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Due to the proximity of the proposed project to known white-tailed kite roosting habitat, the proposed project (both construction and operations) could result in the abandonment of this habitat adjacent to the church complex, thereby resulting in a significant but mitigable impact to sensitive wildlife. Mitigation to reduce this impact includes the retention of a County-approved wildlife biologist if construction is proposed between September 15 and February 15. The biologist would be retained prior to and during construction to identify the precise location of white tailed kite roosts on the western property boundary so that a 500-foot no construction disturbance zone, as measured from the active roosting trees, could be determined and maintained. In addition, the landscape design for the project shall include a screened hedge designed to reach a minimum height of 15 to 20 feet, so as to reduce noise and lighting impacts from the church facilities. These mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. The increase in human activity associated with the proposed project could also result in adverse impacts to white-tailed kite behavior and roosting, thus resulting in a significant but. mitigable impact to this species. This impact would be mitigated by requiring all lighting to be hooded to direct light away from known roosting sites, as well as requiring that all lighting be lower than the screened hedge.

Development of the proposed church complex, in combination with other probable future development in the Goleta Community Plan area, including the Cabrillo Business Park, Monarch Point Reserve, Ellwood-Devereux Joint Proposal, and Sandpiper Residences, would contribute to the incremental loss of raptor foraging habitat. As identified in the Goleta Community Plan EIR, this is considered a significant and unavoidable cumulative biological impact. Requiring as mitigation the presence of a County-qualified biologist on-site during construction during the white tailed kite roosting season and institution of a 500-foot no construction zone from any roosting sites, as well as requiring additional vegetation screening into the project design, would ensure that the project's contribution to these cumulative biological impacts would not be considerable. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

4. **Cultural Resources:** No cultural resources were identified within the proposed project area during the Phase 1 archaeological survey. However, if intact buried cultural remains were encountered during project site preparation and construction, the potential impact on these resources would be considered significant but mitigable. The contribution of this project to cumulative cultural resources impacts would also be considered significant but mitigable in the event that undetected cultural remains were encountered during site

preparation or construction. Mitigation to reduce these impacts would include a requirement that excavation shall be temporarily halted if archaeological remains or historic artifacts are encountered during construction or site preparation, until a County-approved archaeologist and Native American representative (if remains are prehistoric) are retained to evaluate the find pursuant to County guidelines. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measure would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

5. **Fire Protection:** The proposed project would convert the existing agricultural use of the northerly portion of the property to a church complex, increasing the need for fire protection, particularly for emergency response. Primary access to the site would be directly off of Hollister Avenue within a designated 32-ft. wide roadway right-of-way (ROW). County Fire Department staffing levels are considered adequate to serve this additional demand. Although adequate staffing exists, the project parcel currently lacks sufficient infrastructure to allow fire suppression activities onsite. Impacts to fire protection are considered significant but mitigable. Mitigation to address this impact includes installation of sprinkler systems in any buildings greater than 5,000 square feet, installation of an adequate number of fire hydrants, and minimum road widths for all access roads into the project site. In addition, development impact mitigation fees would be applied to the project to offset the costs of providing fire service to the new church complex. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
6. **Geological Resources:** Grading associated with the proposed project would result in a short-term increase in the amount of soil exposed to wind and water erosion. Mitigation to address this impact would include the implementation of a grading and erosion control plan designed to minimize erosion and reduce the associated effects of surface runoff. The proposed project would also result in a cumulative significant but mitigable impact to geological resources, in conjunction with other planned and pending projects in the vicinity. This cumulative impact would be addressed through implementation of a grading and erosion control plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, prepared in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program adopted by the County. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.
7. **Noise:** Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels within the project vicinity that would be considered a significant but mitigable impact on noise sensitive receptors. Mitigations to address this impact include restrictions on the hours and days available for construction, the shielding of stationary construction equipment, and the notification of noise sensitive receptors 48 hours in advance of any and all noise-generating construction activities. The proposed project would also result in the exposure of church congregants and visitors to interior noise levels exceeding 45 dBA CNEL, resulting in a significant but mitigable impact. Mitigation to address this impact would be to incorporate solid core doors and double paned glass windows with other noise-attenuating design elements in order to ensure interior noise exposure is maintained at 45 dBA CNEL or below. Cumulative projects in the vicinity of the proposed project where construction activities could also coincide with the project include the Sumida Gardens residential project and the Sumida storage building on the north side of Hollister Avenue north of the proposed project, and the Por La Mar NurselY project (located immediately south of the project site). Because each of these projects would be required to implement construction noise control measures, cumulative construction related short-term noise impacts would be significant but mitigable. The project's contribution to this short-term cumulative noise impact would be reduced to a

less than significant level by the implementation of measures limiting hour of construction and implementing noise control devices during construction. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

8. *Public Facilities:* Construction debris associated with construction of the proposed project would result in significant but mitigable solid waste impacts due to the increase in demand it would place on the constrained Tajiguas Landfill. Mitigations to address this impact include the required on-site separation of construction debris for reuse/recycling or proper disposal, as well as the use of recyclable material in project construction where feasible. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
9. *Transportation/Circulation:* The proposed Hollister Avenue/Plaza Del Centro

intersection associated with the project would potentially provide insufficient capacity for projected traffic volumes accessing proposed structures and adjacent parking lots. This would be considered a significant but mitigable impact. Mitigation to address this would include median improvements on Hollister Avenue, such that Plaza Del Centro would serve as a one-way, stop sign controlled intersection. The Sumida Gardens project across Hollister Avenue from the project site would (if built) install a traffic light at the Hollister A venue/Plaza Del Centro intersection. In addition, the proposed Plaza Del Centro ingress/egress would not provide adequate pedestrian access from Hollister Avenue, resulting in a significant but mitigable impact. This would be mitigated by requiring a 6foot wide sidewalk along the entire western side of the project driveway in the Plaza Del Centro right-of-way. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

10. *Water Resources/Flooding:* Proposed drainage facilities associated with the proposed project would not be sufficient to accommodate peak flows, resulting in a significant but mitigable impact to water resources and flooding. Mitigation to address this impact would include the conjunctive use of the approximately 17.15 acres of remaining agricultural land to detain project-related storm water runoff. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in the disturbance of approximately 4.6 acres, causing potential storm water sediment and non-point source pollution transport off-site into Atascadero Creek during storm events. This would be considered a significant but mitigable impact to water resources. Mitigation to address this impact includes the implementation of best management practices to control erosion and sedimentation; prompt revegetation of graded areas; the proper disposal and handling of construction materials and waste; the proper containment and removal of polluted water resulting from washing of concrete trucks, paint, and other similar activities; and the containment of sediment from being tracked off-site.

The proposed project would result in an additional 2.6 acres of impervious surfaces on the project site, which would increase storm water runoff and pollutant transport off-site, resulting in a significant but mitigable impact. Mitigation to address this impact includes the implementation of a drainage plan incorporating best management practices to reduce impervious surfaces and reduce off-site storm water runoff and the creation of a grasslined bioswale to aid in storm water infiltration onsite. Lastly, the proposed project would generate non-point pollution sources in the parking areas that could result in the transport of pollutants to Atascadero Creek and the Goleta Slough, identified as an "impaired" water body by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This would be considered a significant but mitigable impact to water quality. Mitigations identified to address this impact include the proper design of the parking areas to minimize the

transport of pollutants off-site (e.g. the installation of oil/water separators or sand filters to intercept pollutants before they enter the stormwater drainage system); implementation of a parking lot cleaning program; and development of an Integrated Pest Management plan to minimize the use of pesticides and herbicides in areas of landscaping and parking lot pavers.

The cumulative impacts on water resources and flooding would be considered significant but mitigable as this and other projects in the vicinity contribute to the loss of pervious surfaces in this area and exacerbate downstream drainage and erosion impacts. Impacts would be mitigated by compliance of all projects with Flood Control specifications for sufficient retention of surface runoff, implementation of project-specific mitigations identified above, and compliance with NPDES Phase II water quality regulations for discretionary projects. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. The Planning Commission finds that the identified mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

1.4 FINDING THAT MITIGATION OF CERTAIN IMPACTS IS WITHIN THE RESPONSIBILITY AND JURISDICTION OF ANOTHER PUBLIC AGENCY

This finding does not apply to this project as mitigation of impacts is within the sole responsibility and jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara. The proposed project would not result in any impacts to schools or other such institutions which are beyond the scope of the County's authority.

1.5 FINDINGS THAT IDENTIFIED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT FEASIBLE

The Final EIR, 05EIR-00000-00011, prepared for the project evaluated a no project alternative, a reduced project alternative, and alternative project locations as methods of reducing or eliminating potentially significant environmental impacts. With the exception of the reduced project alternative, these alternatives are infeasible for the following reasons:

1. No Project Alternative: Although identified as the environmentally superior alternative, this alternative would not meet the basic project objectives identified by the applicant.
2. Redesigned On-site Alternative: This alternative would reduce impacts in many issue areas, including aesthetics/visual resources, agricultural resources, biological resources, and land use and is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project. This alternative is economically feasible and would meet the primary objectives of the project as identified by the applicant.
3. Alternative Site - Hollipat: The location is approximately one quarter of a mile east of the proposed project site and is surrounded by urban development. This alternative site would accommodate the same general footprint as that for the proposed project. This alternative would reduce impacts to aesthetics/visual resources, agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous materials, land use, and public facilities, while it would result in slightly greater impacts to geologic resources, transportation/circulation, and water quality/flooding. Overall, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project. However, this parcel is not currently owned by, or under the control of, the project applicant. In addition, this parcel is within the City of Goleta's jurisdiction, so pursuit of this alternative would require an

entirely new review process, costing the applicant significant time and expense. Therefore, this alternative is not practically feasible.

4. Alternative Site - Sumida Gardens: This alternative site is located virtually directly across Hollister Avenue from the proposed project site. It would accommodate a slightly reduced project footprint, as the parcel is only 4.51 acres in size. While this alternative location is currently used in part for agriculture, in the form of small-scale greenhouses and shade structures, it is not part of the South Patterson Agricultural Area. This alternative would result in reduced impacts on aesthetics/visual resources, agricultural resources, biological resources, hazardous materials, land use, noise, and transportation/circulation. This alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project. However, this parcel is not currently owned by, or under the control of, the project applicant. In addition, development has been approved for this site and grading and building permits for an approved storage building and covered parking area are currently being processed by the City of Goleta. Lastly, this parcel is within the City of Goleta's jurisdiction, so pursuit of this alternative would require an entirely new review process, costing the applicant significant time and expense. For these reasons, this alternative is not feasible.

A land swap was considered as part of this alternative that would consist of developing the alternative site with the church complex (as contemplated in the Redesign alternative) in exchange for developing the agricultural storage building and other existing and proposed agricultural structures on the 'proposed project location. This swap would result in reduced impacts to nearly all of the significant environmental impacts analyzed, with the exception of greater noise impacts to the existing residential receptors on the alternative site and greater water quality impacts resulting from greenhouse relocation to the proposed project site. This alternative would also be infeasible as it would not allow the applicant the complete use and control of the property and would require the church complex to be built around two existing residences which could create conflicts between the two uses. In addition, jurisdiction of this property by the City of Goleta make this land swap alternative practically infeasible for reasons stated above.

5. Alternative Site - Cortona Comer: This alternative site is located off Hollister Avenue near Glen Annie Road. There is currently a proposal under review to construct approximately 171,526 square feet of commercial and industrial buildings. It is an 8.82 acre property that would accommodate the same general footprint as that for the proposed project. This alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project in terms of reduced impacts to aesthetics/visual resources, agricultural resources, biological resources, hazardous materials and land use. It would result in increased impacts in the areas of cultural resources and noise. Overall, this project would be environmentally superior to the proposed project. However, this parcel is not currently owned by, or under the control of, the project applicant. In addition, a proposal to construct 171,526 square feet of commercial and industrial buildings is currently under review at the City of Goleta. Lastly, this parcel is within the City of Goleta's jurisdiction, so pursuit of this alternative would require an entirely new review process, costing the applicant significant time and expense. For these reasons, this alternative is not feasible.

The Final EIR for the St. Athanasius Antiochian Orthodox Church project identifies projectspecific impacts to aesthetics/visual resources, agricultural resources, and land use as

significant environmental impacts which are considered unavoidable. The Planning Commission therefore makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations which warrant approval of the project notwithstanding that all identified impacts are not fully mitigated. Pursuant to CEQA Sections 15043, 15092 and 15093, any remaining significant effects on the environment are acceptable due to these overriding considerations:

1.6.1 The project would provide an active and visible philanthropic presence in the community, which would benefit all members of the community, not just those associated with the church.

1.6.2 The project would provide a meeting location and facility for use by community groups and other members of the public.

1.6.4 The project's gateway plaza would create a public gathering place or resting spot along Hollister Avenue.

1.6.5 The project would offer observance of the St. Athanasius Orthodox Church faith to Goleta residents.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the approved project description for the Redesigned On-site alternative and conditions of approval, with their corresponding permit monitoring requirements, as the monitoring program for this project. The monitoring program is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation and mitigation or avoidance of significant effects on the environment.

2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

2.1 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

Pursuant to Section 35-315.8, a Conditional Use Permit application shall only be approved or conditionally approved if all of the following findings are made:

1. *That the site for the project is adequate in size, shape, location, and physical characteristics to accommodate the type of use and level of development proposed.*

The property is 21.75 acres in size and is generally level with a southwest slope of 0-2%. The property is surrounded by commercial and residential development to the north, office/professional land uses to the east, and agriculture to the south and west. The property is adequate to accommodate the type of use and level of development proposed.

The proposed project would result in project-specific Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts to the following resources: aesthetics/visual resources, agricultural resources, and land use. While mitigations have been identified to reduce impacts to aesthetics, agricultural resources, and land use, impacts would remain significant. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (see Finding 1.6 above) has been adopted by the Planning

Commission which states that the public benefits of the project outweigh the significant environmental impacts that would result.

The project site fronts onto Hollister Avenue. Access to the proposed church complex would be provided by a driveway within the existing Plaza Del Centro right-of-way. The existing and proposed streets and driveways meet City and County design requirements and are adequate to accommodate the level of use anticipated. Roadway improvements are incorporated into the conditions of project approval to ensure safe and adequate access in and out of the site. Therefore, this finding can be made.

4. *That there are adequate public services, including but not limited to fire protection, water supply, sewage disposal, and police protection to serve the project.*

Fire protection services would be provided by the County Fire Department, Fire Station 12 on Calle Real west of Patterson Avenue. Police protection would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff. Water service would be provided by the Goleta Water District. Sewer service would be provided by the Goleta Sanitary District, which would annex the parcel into their district. All of these public services are adequate. Therefore, this finding can be made.

5. *That the project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the neighborhood and will be compatible with the surrounding area.*

The project site is located adjacent to and in close proximity to urban uses, including other religious institutions as well as residential use and commercial/office space. The proposed church complex would be compatible with these uses and would not be detrimental to the health, safety, comfort, convenience, or general welfare of the neighborhood. The proposed project includes a gateway plaza to integrate the project with the Hollister Avenue streetscape and provide a place for the public to enjoy.

The project site is located within the South Patterson Agricultural Area, which receives special consideration under the Goleta Community Plan, and which, up until 2003, was specifically called out for protection. However, the proposed church facility would be in the northeastern most corner of the South Patterson Agricultural Area and would represent a logical extension of urban development idative to surrounding land uses and other development in the vicinity. Given the types of urban uses that could be located in this area, a church poses a relatively low level of conflict with agriculture due to the fact that its use is relatively low-intensity and the population using the facility is transient in nature. In comparison, residential development or a school facility would be of higher intensity and would present greater conflicts with the ongoing agric"Ultural operations to the south and west. The front setback of the proposed project is cOllsistent with other commercial and institutional development to the east. The project would be conditioned to replace the proposed red-tile roofs with a darker earth-tone color to ensure greater compatibility with surrounding development and the agricultural lands to the west and south. Landscaping associated with the project would provide a landscaped buffer between the church complex and Hollister Avenue to reduce any visual impacts to the neighborhood. With incorporation of these project elements, this finding can be made.

6. *That the project is in conformance with the applicable provisions and policies of Article III and the Comprehensive Plan.*

With the exception of the proposed parking spaces, the proposed project is in conformance with the applicable provisions of Article III Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project includes 110 parking spaces, which would provide the minimum number of spaces necessary to accommodate a maximum special event attendance of 250 people.

7. *That in designated rural areas the use is compatible with and subordinate to the scenic and rural character of the area.*

The proposed project is located in a designated urban area. Therefore this finding does not apply.