

CHAPTER VI

Alternatives

1 The analysis of project alternatives in this EIR focuses on a reasonable range of
2 alternatives consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a). Section 15126.6(a)
3 states:

4 *An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the*
5 *location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the*
6 *project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the*
7 *project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not*
8 *consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a*
9 *reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed*
10 *decisionmaking and public participation. The lead agency is responsible for selecting*
11 *a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its*
12 *reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the*
13 *nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.*

14 Five alternatives to the proposed project have been identified and assessed in this EIR.

- 15 1. No Project
- 16 2. Half Project
- 17 3. All Residential
- 18 4. No Restaurant
- 19 5. Residential and Retail; No Restaurant, No Theater, No Fitness/Health Care
- 20 Facility

21 Analysis of the alternatives follows.

22 **Alternative 1: No Project**

23 CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(e)(1) and (e)(2) provides guidance on how the No Project
24 Alternative is to be assessed. The assessment of the No Project alternative’s impacts
25 evaluates “what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the
26 project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available
27 infrastructure and community services.” As the project site has been historically used for
28 commercial retail land uses consistent with the existing zoning designations, it is
29 reasonable to assume that the site in the future would be redeveloped consistent with
30 current City of Santa Maria General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Land Use Designations of
31 General Commercial (PD/C-2). This would provide a combination of general
32 commercial land uses. The existing structures onsite have not been in operation since
33 2003; therefore, if utilization of the subject property were to occur, it would likely involve
34 the demolition of existing features followed by the construction of new commercial
35 buildings.

36 Based on a reasonable worst case assumption of floor to area (FAR) ratio of 0.26, based on
37 the City's historical FARs for this type use (personal communication, Bill Shipsey, 2008),
38 the No Project Alternative would result in 106,460 s.f. (9.4 acre site x 43560 x 0.26 FAR =
39 106,460 s.f.) of commercial development, including a combination of retail and service
40 establishments. Please see Appendix B, for a more detailed comparison of General Plan
41 Land Use and Lakeview Promenade Land Use trip generation estimates.

1 Alternative 2: Half Project

2 The Half Project Alternative is intended to minimize significant, adverse impacts on air
3 quality and traffic associated with the proposed project. Alternative 2 would involve a
4 50% reduction of all proposed project and uses, resulting in the following:

- 5 • 133 residential units;
- 6 • 19,724 SF retail space;
- 7 • 6,967 SF restaurant space;
- 8 • 125-seat movie theater; and
- 9 • 6,900 SF of Fitness/Health Care Facility.

10 Though project-related environmental impacts would be reduced, the 50% reduction in
11 land uses would potentially make a Movie Theater economically infeasible.
12 Additionally, the reduction in total restaurant area would likely require eliminating one
13 of the three proposed restaurants.

14 Alternative 3: All Residential

15 Alternative 3 would eliminate all non-residential uses to minimize significant, adverse
16 impacts on air quality and traffic. In addition, the number of residential uses would be
17 reduced such that the overall ROC and NO_x emissions would be reduced below Santa
18 Barbara County APCD thresholds. The All Residential Alternative would result in 215
19 condominiums on 9.41 acres of property.

20 Alternative 4: No Restaurant

21 Alternative 4 would be consistent with all of the land use components of the proposed
22 project, with the exception of the removal of the proposed restaurant space. This
23 Alternative, as with the other potential project alternatives, is intended to reduce the
24 amount of trips generated by development at the subject property, and resulting air
25 quality and traffic impacts. A high-turnover, sit-down restaurant, analogous to what
26 would be developed as part of the proposed Lakeview Promenade project, is estimated
27 to generate around 127 trips per 1,000 square feet of restaurant space each day, the
28 highest generation rate of all proposed commercial uses. Accordingly, the elimination
29 restaurant space would result in a reduction of project-generated traffic, as well as
30 reductions in other potential impacts directly related to traffic.

**31 Alternative 5: Residential /Retail Only; No Restaurants, No Theater, or
32 Fitness/Health Care facility**

33 Alternative 5 would consist of the proposed residential and retail project components;
34 however, it would not include restaurant space, a movie theater, or a fitness/health care
35 facility. As this alternative would maintain the mixed-use element of the proposed
36 project by providing residential and commercial uses adjacent to one another, it would
37 achieve key objectives of the project, including the development of commercial uses
38 within the Lakeview Promenade project; this would help reduce automobile trips
39 overall and to help the City assure sufficient development potential to accommodate
40 future residential growth and construction as the project implements the City's goal to
41 encourage mixed use development.

1 Table VIII-1 summarizes the way in which the five alternatives defined above would be
2 capable of reducing environmental impacts relative to the proposed project.
3 Environmental impacts associated with each alternative are briefly summarized. Within
4 each environmental resource, each alternative is ranked as to how effective it is in
5 reducing environmental impacts. A rank of 1 denotes the greatest reduction in
6 environmental impact, and a rank of 5 is associated with the least reduction in
7 environmental impact. A short summary of the alternative impact rankings is also
8 provided.

1

Table VIII-1 Project Alternatives Summary Table

<i>Potential Effect</i>	<i>Alternative</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>1 No Project.</i>	<i>2 Half Project.</i>	<i>3 All Residential</i>	<i>4 No Restaurant.</i>	<i>5 Residential + Retail Only</i>	
Transportation	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	Residential land uses generate fewer vehicular trips than commercial uses. Therefore, transportation impacts are reduced to the maximum extent under exclusive residential development under Alternative 3. Eliminating the restaurant, health/fitness center, and movie theater commercial vehicular trips (Alts. 4 and 5) results in the next greatest reduction to transportation impacts.
Air Quality	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	Air Quality impact reductions are directly related to minimizing vehicular trips. Therefore, air quality impacts are reduced to the maximum extent under exclusive residential development under Alternative 3. Eliminating the restaurant, health/fitness center, and movie theater commercial vehicular trips (Alts. 4 and 5) results in the next greatest reduction to air quality impacts. The restaurant has the greatest potential for odors of any commercial use.
Noise	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	Noise impact reductions are directly related to minimizing vehicular trips. Therefore, noise impacts are reduced to the maximum extent under exclusive residential development under Alternative 3. Eliminating the restaurant, health/fitness center, and movie theater commercial vehicular trips (Alts. 4 and 5) results in the next greatest reduction to noise impacts. The restaurant use is the highest generator of traffic and noise of any proposed commercial use.
Hazardous Materials	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	Commercial uses generate greater impacts on hazardous materials storage than residential uses. Therefore, hazardous material impacts are reduced to the maximum extent under exclusive residential development (Alternative 3). Eliminating the restaurant, health/fitness center, and movie theater commercial uses (Alts. 4 and 5) would also reduce demands on hazardous materials storage.
Utilities	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)	Residential uses have a generally higher water demand and solid waste generation rate compared to general commercial uses. Minimizing the size of the mixed use project (Alt. 2) results in the greatest reduction of impacts. Removing the restaurant use result is the greatest reduction of impacts associated with mixed use commercial uses. Exclusive residential use (Alt. 3) has the greatest impact on utilities.