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SUMMARY

The City of Davis has prepared this Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process (SCH #2006012026) ("Final EIR") certified June 12, 2007, to address additional modifications and amendments to the PD 2-86B zoning standards for the district and Core Area Specific Plan as part of the proposed Mission Residences project ("Project") located at 225-229 B Street, Davis, CA.

The proposed project includes the following:
1. Construction of a new 4-story, 45-foot tall building ("Mission Residences") consisting of 25,870 square feet for 14 condominium units and common areas plus a 7,800 square feet for a basement garage;
2. Demolition of two single-family dwellings;
3. Amendment to the Core Area Specific Plan to allow an increase in the density for projects within the B Street Transitional District subject to certain criteria;
4. Amendment to Planned Development (PD) 2-86B zoning standards to allow an increase in the allowable floor area ratio subject to certain criteria and to increase the allowable height; and
5. A Tentative Map Waiver to combine two parcels.

The discussion in this Addendum of the EIR analysis and the prior project approval of the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process focuses on the analysis, impacts and discussion as they relate to the B Street Transitional District properties which are affected by this proposed project. Discussion of impacts and analysis of other properties which were a part of the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process, but which are not included in the B Street Transitional District PD 2-86B subarea are excluded for the purposes of this Addendum.

ADDENDA UNDER CEQA

This document has been prepared as an Addendum to the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process EIR in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15164. Section 15164(a) provides that the Lead Agency "shall prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred."

Pursuant to Section 15164(e) an analysis and explanation is provided herein documenting the City's decision that preparation of a subsequent EIR is not required. The Guidelines further state that: 1) the addendum need not be circulated, but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR (Section 15164(c)); and 2) the City Council must consider the addendum with the Final EIR (Section 15164(d)).

Section 15164 was created in response to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21166 which provides that no subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be required unless "substantial changes" in the project or the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken will necessitate "major
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revisions" of the EIR, or "new information" which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified, becomes available. The requirements of the Guidelines are described in more detail in Attachment 2. For the subject situation, use of an Addendum is justified by the PRC (Section 21166).

This document demonstrates that the circumstances, impacts, and mitigation requirements identified in the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process EIR remain substantively applicable to the proposed project for the Mission Residences condominiums and related amendments, and supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues or exceed the level of impacts identified in the EIR and that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 requiring preparation of a subsequent EIR apply.

BACKGROUND

On June 12, 2007, the City of Davis approved the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process project, which consisted of amendments to the General Plan, Core Area Specific Plan and zoning of 22 properties located within the Core Area Specific Plan boundaries near downtown Davis. The approval included adoption of Resolution No. 07-093 certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process (SCH #2006012026) and determining that it adequately assessed the impacts of the proposed changes.

FEIR Project Description
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process changes allowed an increase in the development potential of the sites with modifications to the list of permitted uses and site development parameters for 22 properties located within Planned Development (PD) 2-86B zoning district. Several different subareas within the district were affected by the changes to the development standards which allowed for larger scaled development, with increased densities, increased floor area ratios, reduced building setbacks, increased building heights, higher density residential and mixed-use development.

Development of the B Street Visioning Process area analyzed in the EIR envisioned approximately 79 net additional dwelling units (attached units) with 150 net new bedrooms (assuming two bedrooms per unit on average) and 25,770 square feet of new non-residential development (17,800 square feet of office space and 7,970 net new square feet of commercial development). New residential townhouse and condominium projects were assumed along B Street. Up to 31 existing structures (including 17 principal and 14 accessory buildings) might be demolished including one structure that was eligible for historic listing (311 B Street) and one listed historic resource assumed to be relocated (232 3rd Street) as a part of the project. Potential demolition of one other eligible structure (301 B Street) and one other listed historic resource (337 B Street) was evaluated in the EIR. An in-lieu fee parking program was considered. The zoning or land use for a number of properties were rezoned to a different PD subarea and/or redesignated in the Core Area Specific Plan.
B Street Transitional District Development Assumptions

Approval of the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process included creation of the B Street Transitional District which is composed of 11 properties comprising approximately 1.93 acres (Figure 1). Development assumptions (DEIR page 3-22) for the B Street properties used in the DEIR analysis included:

Figure 1. PD 2-86B Zoning District with B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process Project Area
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- Retain existing designated historic structure at 337 B Street.
- Removing other structures or possibly relocating eligible historic structures.
- Redevelopment of 239 2nd Street property with a small mixed-use project.
- No change to the existing 3-story apartment building at 217 B Street.
- A new 3-story (45-foot maximum height) senior only residential condominium project at 225-229 B Street with a minimum 15-foot front setback, 5-foot side yard setback, 10-foot 1st and 2nd story alley setback and a 20-foot average 3rd story front and alley setback.
- Construction of 3-story (38-foot high) townhomes along B Street.
- Limited 4th story under some conditions. It should be noted that this option was considered for the Retail with Offices District along B Street and did not apply to the B Street Transitional District.
- Base floor area ratio (FAR) of 1:1 with bonuses up to 2:1 FAR under certain conditions.
- Density of 22-40 units per net acre depending on parcel size and project type with a density bonus for owner-occupied senior condominiums up to 50 dwelling units per net acre (DEIR page 4.4-9).

Impact Analysis and Mitigation

Adoption of the FEIR included mitigation measures relative to cultural resources, circulation and parking, historic resources, land use and aesthetics, and noise. The measures were included in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan that was adopted as part of the EIR certification (Resolution 07-093) and the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process approval. The approval also included changes to the project made by the Davis City Council and described in the specific findings of Exhibit B (Statement of Overriding Considerations) of Resolution 07-093. The project changes included eliminating the optional fourth story, eliminating the density bonus for ownership condominium projects, and eliminating the option for in-lieu parking fees for residential uses.

The mitigation measures and project changes helped to minimize potential conflicts and reduce the project’s impacts. However, even with the mitigation measures and project changes it was determined that the changes resulting from the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. The Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for impacts to traffic, parking demand, historic resources, aesthetics, and noise. All other impacts were determined to be less than significant or fully mitigated.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT COMPONENTS

The proposed project includes changes to the development parameters for height, density, and floor area, which would apply to the 11 properties that make up the B Street Transitional District. The proposed amendments consist of the following:

1. Amendment to the Core Area Specific Plan (CASP) to allow increased density on the west side of B Street up to 42.4 units/acre (where 24 units per acre is allowed) as a bonus for developments providing underground parking, 1-2 bedroom units, and open space greater than required by the zoning.
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2. Amendment to the Planned Development (PD) 2-86B zoning standards for the B Street Transitional District subarea to allow:
   - a floor area ratio of 2.0 (where 1.1 is permitted unless there is a bonus) as a bonus for developments providing underground parking, 1-2 bedroom units, and open space greater than required by the zoning; and
   - an increase in building height to 4 stories and 45 feet (where 38 feet is the subarea height limit).

Potential impacts of the changes are evaluated and addressed in the context of the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process EIR and the approval of that project. Table 1 below summarizes the property information and development potential for the B Street Transitional District properties under the higher density and would potentially result in 10 additional dwelling units.

Table 1. B Street Transitional District Properties: Development Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Lot Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>“Existing” Development</th>
<th>Assumed Development Potential in EIR</th>
<th>New Development Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246 4th St.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>No Change 1 unit (3 bdrms)</td>
<td>No Change 1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 B St. (Historic)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>No Change 1 unit (3 bdrms)</td>
<td>No Change 1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333 B St.</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>7 units (14 bdrms)</td>
<td>15 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325-327 B St.</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3 units (5 bdrms)</td>
<td>7 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 B St.</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>7 units (19 bdrms)</td>
<td>Constructed 7 townhouse units (21 bedrooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 B St. (relocated)</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>7 units (19 bdrms)</td>
<td>Proposed Mission Residences 14 condo units (28 bedrooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 B St. (relocated)</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>7 units (19 bdrms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229 B St.</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>18 units (34 bdrms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 B St.</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4 units (8 bdrms)</td>
<td>6 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 B St.</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>No Change 17 units (34 bdrms)</td>
<td>No Change 17 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 2nd St.</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>Retail Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84,150 s.f. (1.93 acres)</td>
<td>27 units (62 bdrms)</td>
<td>58 units (120 bdrms)</td>
<td>68 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 “Existing” Development information taken from Table 3-1 in B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process DEIR.
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2 Assumed Development Potential and lot size is taken from Data Tables in DEIR Appendix 7.4. It assumed certain parcels, as indicated, would be combined as part of a potential development project.

3 New Development Potential is based on the higher proposed density of 42.4 units/acre for the applicable properties.

- Consistent with the EIR, no change is assumed for the properties containing the existing 17-unit apartment building, the recently completed 7 townhouse units, the historic property at 337 B Street and the height and size restricted property at 246 4th Street.
- The development potential on the Mission Residences project site is shown as proposed.
- Four additional properties could be developed under the higher density. Proposed development would be subject to site-specific discretionary review which may include site constraints and design requirements resulting in fewer units than potentially allowed.

Mission Residences Project Description
In addition to the proposed amendments, the project includes the following planning entitlements to allow construction of the proposed four-story, 14-unit Mission Residences condominium project on two combined residential parcels located at 225 and 229 B Street (Attachment 3 - Project Plans).

1. A Tentative Map to combine the two parcels (225 and 229 B Street); and
2. A Design Review for the project’s specific building and site design described below.

The project is oriented to senior residents and is designed with the needs of seniors in mind, but it is not proposed to be age-restricted. Target residents would include empty-nest households and working professionals. The two existing residential structures would be relocated or demolished. The project would include 14 two-bedroom flats, with an elevator, common rooms, underground parking, and balconies for each unit. The proposed 25,870 square-foot building, not including the basement garage, would consist of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Floor</td>
<td>7,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor</td>
<td>7,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Floor</td>
<td>6,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Floor</td>
<td>3,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basement: 7,800 square feet for parking garage

The building is two-stories at the street, rising to 45 feet and four stories in the rear half. The elevator shaft would project an additional 5 feet above that. Proposed building setbacks are as follows:
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Front (Building) 18 feet to 1st floor, 15 feet to 2nd floor, 23 feet to 3rd floor
Front (Balcony) 10 feet to 1st floor, 7 feet to 2nd floor
Side (South) 5 feet
Side (North) 19 feet at courtyard, 5 feet behind courtyard
Rear 10 feet to recessed parking, 20 feet to building

Entry to the building as well as outdoor open space would be provided by a patio adjacent to B Street on the south side of the building. A total of 20 parking spaces would be provided in the underground parking garage. Access to the garage would be from the alley at the rear of the parcel.

The proposed building is designed to reflect the Mission Revival style of architecture of several historic Davis buildings, including the Davis Community Church, Historic City Hall, and Depot. Characteristics include thick arches, stucco walls and tile roofs, and an enclosed courtyard with an exterior arcade. The project is required to comply with Tier 1 requirements of the CALGreen Building Code and City Council resolution 09-043 adopting greenhouse gas reduction standards for new residential projects. However, the project will meet a higher building standard and has committed to complying with the Tier 2 CALGreen requirements for greater efficiencies. In addition to other conditions of approval, the project will be required to dedicate seven feet along the west property line to the City for future alley widening.

CHANGES TO THE PRIOR APPROVED PROJECT

Certification of the FEIR for the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process included adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations for traffic, noise, historical resources and aesthetics. Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1), one of the required findings for a Statement of Overriding Considerations addresses project changes that avoid or substantially less the significant environmental effects identified in the FEIR. In approving the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process, the Davis City Council made several project changes which include:

- Elimination of the optional fourth story;
- Elimination of the density bonus for ownership condominium projects; and
- Elimination of the option for in-lieu parking fees for residential uses.

These changes are referred to in the specific findings for the overriding considerations and have the effect of lessening impacts from the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process. The proposed Mission Residences project and amendments potentially affect the approved project changes and therefore additional analysis is required.

ANALYSIS

In order to assess whether additional CEQA review is required for the proposed Mission Residences project, the following analysis is provided:
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1. Evaluation of the proposed project impacts under the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process EIR for each resource area.

2. Evaluation of the proposed project impacts relative to the approved B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process project changes.

3. Determine whether the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

The text below and attached documents examines each of these items.

1. B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process EIR Scope

The B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process EIR analyzed the environmental impacts related to the changes in the development parameters for project area. The EIR that was prepared examined the cumulative effects that would occur from the new requirements to the various environmental resources as a result of redevelopment of the area under the new standards. As described above, the proposed project and amendments fall within the scope of EIR analysis.

Proposed changes would potentially allow increased development and higher density on the 11 properties within the B Street Transitional District, but actual development is anticipated to be less because of limitations on the properties and qualifying projects (Table 1 above). Due the historic nature, special height limitations, and existing development, no new or additional development is anticipated on 5 of the properties. A special 30-foot height restriction applies to 246 4th Street and 337 B Street and a portion of 333 B Street. In addition to the proposed Mission Residences condominium development at 225-229 B Street addressed in this document, four remaining properties could potentially accommodate increased development under the new standards which could result in 10 additional dwelling units as shown in Table 1. Actual development may be lower than potentially projected due to owner’s desires and the review process. For example, 333 B Street is included with the increased development potential despite the partial height restriction which would limit potential development.

The increased development potential for 10 more units is a small increase above the 79 net additional units for the B and 3rd Streets project area (58 additional units in B Street Transitional District) assumed in the EIR. Any proposed project is subject to discretionary review and would need to meet specific criteria to be able to take advantage of the increased development potential. Additionally, any increase in the number of units would generally be accomplished through smaller 1-2 bedroom multi-family units instead of larger 2-4 bedroom townhouse units. Although the actual number of units might be greater, the number of bedrooms or number of residents would be expected to be comparable. It would be a nonsubstantial increase and the proposed project and amendments are considered to be consistent with the EIR analysis and its conclusions. See Attachment 1 for a detailed analysis of the proposed project impacts by resource area.
2. **B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process Project Changes**

This section addresses changes to the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process that were incorporated as part of the findings to support certification of the EIR and are discussed below. The proposed amendments are necessary to better implement City plans and policies for infill development and redevelopment of the project area. The proposed project and amendments are within the general scope of the approved project for the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process, but entails this Addendum and clarification to evaluate the changes and potential impacts. The proposed changes to the height, density and FAR standards would only apply to project on a limited number of sites under specific criteria. It does not result in any new or additional significant impacts and does not alter the conclusions of the EIR. The additional or incremental impacts from increased density potential or increased height are minimal and do not significantly alter the findings for the statement of overriding considerations adopted for B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process.

**Fourth Story Option**

The EIR analyzed a fourth story option for the Retail with Offices District, but it was not discussed for the B Street Transitional District. It is not impacted by the proposed changes, but is discussed here because the proposed amendments raise similar issues. Development within the B Street Transitional District was generally envisioned as three stories and 38 feet high, but also included analysis of a stacked flat condominium project up to 45 feet high. The maximum allowable height was limited to 38 feet for the district, but would be increased to 4 stories and 45 feet by this amendment. Of the 11 properties within the B Street Transitional District, only 5 of the properties could potentially take advantage of the increased height. The remaining 6 properties (246 4th and 337, 333, 315, 311, 217 B Street) have existing development and/or are subject to a special 30-foot height restriction.

Of the 5 properties, 2 of them would contain the proposed Mission Residences condominium building which would be 4 stories and 45 feet tall. However, the massing of the building and aesthetic impacts would not be substantially greater compared to a 3-story 38-foot tall townhouse. The 4th floor of the proposed building is small portion of the building, comprising 3,560 square feet of 25,870 square-foot building, and is stepped back from the 3rd story to minimize visibility by the public. See attached sight line exhibits for the Mission Residences condominium project (Attachment 3).

Development proposals on the 3 remaining properties (325 and 319 B Street and 239 2nd Street), which could utilize the increased building height, would be subject to discretionary design review to evaluate the appropriateness of the design and specific privacy and aesthetic issues. There would be minimal additional impact from the proposed amendments. It would be a modification to the approved project, but would not substantially alter the analysis or conclusions of the EIR.

**Density Bonus**

Changes to the original project approval eliminated a proposed density bonus and slightly reduced the overall development intensity that would occur. However, the proposed project
includes amendments that would increase the allowable density and floor area ratio within the project area. As mentioned above, it would potentially allow for increased development on 3 properties in addition to the proposed Mission Residences site and result in approximately 10 additional net new units. The density and use analysis along B Street for the specific Mission Residences condominium project demonstrates that specific development would be compatible for the area. See attached FAR analysis exhibit (Attachment 3).

While the additional units would have additional incremental impacts, it is a minor increase that does not result in any new or significant impacts and does not alter that analysis of the EIR. The density and FAR provisions only apply to a minimal number of properties under specific and limited conditions.

In-Lieu Residential Parking Fee
Parking for the Mission Residences building is being provided in accordance with the development standards and no changes to the parking standards are proposed.

3. Section 15162 Thresholds

The proposed project includes adjustments to the development standards that were established as part of the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process. The potential environmental effects of the proposed project fit within the range of impact analysis of the certified EIR for the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process, but it requires evaluation because the proposed amendments affect the project changes that were referenced in the findings for the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted for the project. In order for the City to approve the amendments, an update and clarification of the findings are necessary.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(a), an addendum to a previously certified EIR shall be prepared “if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.” Attachment 2 provides verbatim wording from the State CEQA Guidelines and an analysis of the applicability of the particular language to the proposed project and amendments. The evidence supports, and the analysis concludes, that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred, and thus an Addendum is appropriate.
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ATTACHMENT 1

B AND 3RD STREET VISIONING PROCESS EIR ADDENDUM
IMPACT ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED
MISSION RESIDENCES PROJECT AND AMENDMENTS

This analysis examines the proposed Mission Residences project and amendments relative to the scope of the Final EIR certified as part of the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process. It evaluates the proposed project changes and impacts for each environmental resource area.

Aesthetics
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR analyzed impacts to visual character of the area from the anticipated redevelopment (DEIR Land Use and Aesthetics Section, pages 4.4-13 through 4.4-17). Under Impact 4.4-5, it determined that the project would result in a significant impact to the existing visual character and quality of the project area due to:

- The increased heights and densities allowed;
- The removal of existing older structures;
- The removal of existing neighborhood trees;
- A loss of privacy enjoyed by adjoining parcels;
- A loss of the sense of openness;
- Increased activity along the alley; and
- Increased scale of development, lighting, noise and activity in general.

The EIR included Mitigation Measure 4.4-5(a) to be included in the design review for individual projects and adopted as part of the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan. The mitigation measure required actions to reduce impacts to privacy, trees and aesthetics and are incorporated and required as part of the subject project. However, the EIR concluded that even with implementation of the mitigation measure, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The proposed amendments would increase the allowable height and number of stories on 11 parcels within the project area. Although structures within the B Street Transitional District were assumed to be 3 stories in the analysis, a 45-foot height standard for the district was considered as part the EIR analysis, but was eliminated as part of the approval. The proposed amendment would increase the allowable height to 45 feet and allow a fourth story. The increased height is within the scope of the EIR analysis and allowing a fourth story would not result in any significant new impact. Any proposed project would be subject to discretionary design review that would evaluate the proposed building’s height for the specific privacy and design issues and would also be subject to the above mitigation measure.

The final project approval limited the building height to 38 feet. However, the proposed project does not result in any new specific aesthetic impacts which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any aesthetic impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. The project is located on a developed site in an urbanized area. It is not located within any designated scenic vista and does not contain or affect any scenic resources. The project is a residential project located in a mixed residential and commercial area and does not create any new substantial light or glare. Therefore, it is considered to have no impact and no additional review is required.
**Agricultural Resources**
The project is located on an already developed site in an urbanized area. It will have no impact on farmland, forestland or agricultural activities.

**Air Quality**
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to air quality from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Air Quality). The Initial Study, dated January 12, 2006, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have a less than significant impact relative to an air quality plan, criteria pollutant increases or sensitive receptors exposure to pollutants. The document found that demolition and construction activities would have temporary impacts, but that they would not be significant and would be addressed through standard air quality construction requirements. It determined that additional vehicle traffic from increased development would contribute to cumulative air quality impacts, but the contribution would be within the range of development projected for the area in the General Plan and Core Area Specific Plan. Additionally, General Plan policies addressing the location of housing, access to transit, shopping and work would help to reduce air quality impacts. However, the EIRs certified for the General Plan and Core Area Specific Plan adopted findings of overriding considerations for cumulative air quality impacts. The EIR determined that project contribution to the above impacts from increased development of the area would be less than significant and/or were already addressed by the General Plan and Specific Plan EIRs.

The proposed project does not result in any new specific air quality impacts which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any air quality impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. The project is a residential project located in a mixed residential and commercial area and will not create any objectionable odors. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Biological Resources**
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to biological resources from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Biological Resources). The Initial Study, dated January 12, 2006, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have no impact on biological resources relative to riparian habitat or natural communities, protected wetlands, migratory species, conflicts with biological policies or any conservation plans. The project site is already developed and is located in an urbanized area. It does not contain or impact any sensitive wildlife species.

The Initial Study noted that redevelopment could affect protected trees which are identified in the Core Area Specific Plan as “Landmark Trees” or “Trees Worth Saving.” However, it noted that there are no “Landmark Trees” in the project area and only four “Trees Worth Saving.” None of them are located on the subject site at 225 or 229 B Street. It further noted that specific development projects would undergo Design Review and would be required to comply with the City’s Tree Protection Ordinance and standard conditions for tree protection and replacement.
The proposed project does not result in any new specific biological resource impacts which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any biological impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Cultural Resources**

**Archaeological**
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to cultural resources from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Cultural Resources). The Initial Study, dated January 12, 2006, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have less than significant impacts with mitigation relative to archaeological resources, unique paleontological or geologic features, or the disturbance of human remains. It identified mitigation that was incorporated in the EIR as mitigation measures (IS-1 and IS-2) and adopted as part of the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

The mitigation measure required a qualified archaeologist to be on site during periods of subsurface disturbance and for all site work to cease and the appropriate experts to be consulted in the event that any archaeological or cultural resources are uncovered. The Initial Study concluded that implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. These measures are incorporated and required as part of the subject project.

The proposed project does not result in any new specific impacts to archaeological or cultural resources which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Historical**
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed potentially significant impacts to historic resources from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Section 4.3 Historic Resources). The EIR (page 4.3-11) included the following summary of historic resources in the project area:

The project area is comprised of 22 parcels with 23 principal structures. Six of these structures were built after 1945 and are not considered potential historic resources. Sixteen of the 17 principal structures constructed prior to 1945 are considered to retain historic integrity, while one (241 B Street) has been altered and is not considered to retain historic integrity. Twelve of the 16 structures with integrity (including one that was previously deemed not eligible for designation) are considered contributors to a historic district, if such a district existed. Two of these 16 structures are already recognized as Merit Resources (337 B Street and 232 3rd Street). One structure (315 B Street) has been recently identified as eligible for designation as a Merit Resource. Another structure (301 B Street) has been identified as eligible for designation as a Landmark.
Following certification of the EIR, the structure at 301 B Street was designated by the City of Davis as a Landmark. The structure at 315 B Street was designated as a Merit Resource after it was relocated as part of a 7-unit townhouse project (339-351 B Street) which replaced the structure on that property.

Impacts & Mitigation
The EIR identified the following potentially significant impacts relative to historic resources (DEIR pages 4.3-18 through 4.3.28):

- Demolition or relocation of individual eligible or designated Landmark.
- Additions or alterations to an individual Landmark that would result in loss of its Landmark status.
- Changes to the physical characteristics of the immediate surroundings of an individual Landmark that would adversely affect the historic significance and result in loss of its status.
- Demolition or relocation of an individual Merit Resource.
- Substantial alteration to an individual Merit Resource that would result in loss of its status.
- Demolition, relocation or substantial alteration to a group of pre-1945 "contributor" resources that could have a potentially significant adverse cumulative impact on the integrity of the historic setting of a designated Merit Resource or Landmark.
- Substantial change to the physical characteristics of a historic district or eligible district that adversely affects the integrity of the historic setting.

The historic review of the project area determined that the two structures on the subject site (225 & 229 B Street) were not eligible for designation as historic resources. The impacts and mitigation measures identified in the EIR that address Merit Resource or Landmark structures do not apply to the subject project. However, the two structures were identified as contributing structures to a historic district, if a district existed. The analysis and determination of impacts to the "contributor" structures is relevant and included mitigation adopted as part of the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan:

- **Impact 4.3-5: Demolition or relocation of a contributor resource.** The impact was determined to be **less than significant** and no mitigation was identified or required.

- **Impact 4.3-6: Alterations to a contributor resource that could impact the historic setting of a Merit Resource or Landmark.** The impact was determined to be **less than significant** and no mitigation was identified or required.

- **Impact 4.3-7: Demolition or relocation of a group of contributor structures that could have a cumulative impact on the historic setting of a Merit Resource or Landmark.** This impact was considered a significant impact and included Mitigation Measure 4.3-7(a), to pursue relocation of the contributor structures. However, it was determined that the mitigation would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level and therefore, the impact was considered to be **significant and unavoidable**. A statement of overriding considerations was adopted for this impact.
• Impact 4.3-8: Alterations to a group of contributor structures that could have a cumulative impact on the historic setting of a Merit Resource or Landmark. The impact was determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was identified or required.

• Impact 4.3-9: Cumulative substantial change to the physical characteristics of a portion of the Davis Downtown and Traditional Residential Neighborhood Conservation District that could affect the integrity of the historic setting that portion of the district. This impact was considered a significant impact and included Mitigation Measures 4.3.9(a),(b), and (c) for review of projects according to the adopted design guidelines, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-5a for the design, and consideration of establishing a historic impact mitigation fee. However, it was determined that the mitigation would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level and therefore, the impact was considered to be significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations was adopted for this impact.

• Impact 4.3-10: Removal of a group of contributing structures that would remove the potential for the project area to be designated or listed as a historic district. This impact was considered a significant impact and no mitigation was identified that would reduce the impact. Therefore, it was determined to be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact and statement of overriding considerations was adopted for this impact.

The EIR adequately analyzed the impacts to historical resources from redevelopment of the project area, including the subject site. The applicable mitigation measures identified above would be incorporated and apply to the subject project. There are no new specific project impacts to historical resources that have not already been addressed and no impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

Geology and Soils
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to geology and soils from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Geology and Soils). The Initial Study, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process, determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have no impact or a less than significant impact relative to geology and soil hazards.

The subject project would not increase exposure to identified geologic hazards. There are no known earthquake fault lines located within the City. The San Andreas fault system is to the west and the Eastern Sierra fault system is to the east. As identified in the General Plan EIR (pg. 51-2), the city is identified as being in Seismic Risk Zone III. This means the maximum intensity of an earthquake that would be experienced in the area would be a VII or VII on the modified Mercalli intensity scale. An earthquake of such magnitude could result in slight to moderate damage in specially designed or standard structures. The project is required to provide and comply with a site-specific soils report prior to construction and be appropriately designed to meet all earthquake standards as required by building codes.
Demolition and construction activities will disrupt site soils but the EIR noted that there would be a standard condition for an erosion control plan required at the project level and determined that there would be a less than significant impact. The Class 1 soils in the project area (General Plan EIR pg. 51) have predominantly moderate to high shrink swell potential and do not represent a substantial risk to life or property. The site is an urbanized area where connections to existing sewer systems are available. Therefore, the project is considered to have no impact or impacts adequately analyzed in the EIR and no additional review is required.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
The EIR did not include an analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from the anticipated redevelopment of the project area.

**City of Davis Climate Action Plan**
In June 2010, the City of Davis adopted a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan which included reduction targets for greenhouse gas emissions (City of Davis. City Council Staff Report: Climate Action and Adaptation Plan Adoption. June 1, 2010; City Council Resolution 10-072). The plan adopted a target range that uses the State targets as a minimum goal and deeper reductions as the desired outcome. For example, the 2020 target reduction ranged from the State target of 1990 GHG emission levels to the more desired target of 28% below 1990 levels. The 2050 emission targets ranged from the State target of 80% below 1990 levels to the more desired outcome of being carbon neutral. The table below from the Davis Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (page 3) summarizes the targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target Range*</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td><strong>Davis</strong>**</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2000 levels</td>
<td>1990 levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum: State target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired: Provides baseline for subsequent average annual reductions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1998 levels</td>
<td>7% below 1990 levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum: State does not establish target for this year; linear interpolation from 2010 target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired: Consistent with Kyoto – Mayors Climate Protection Agreement Pledge – City of Davis Reso. 2006.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1995 levels</td>
<td>15% below 1990 levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum: State does not establish target for this year; linear interpolation from 2010 target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired: Consistent with initial ICLEI modeling conducted by the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 to 2020</td>
<td>Average annual reduction</td>
<td>Average of 2.6% reduction/year to achieve 80% below 1990 levels by 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum: State does not establish target for these years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired: Average reduction encourages monitoring of progress and some flexibility in implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Minimum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1990 levels</td>
<td>State target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 to 2040</td>
<td>No formal target, but must reduce an average of 2.66%/year to achieve 80% below 1990 levels by 2050</td>
<td>State does not establish target for these years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>80% below 1990 levels.</td>
<td>State target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is anticipated that Davis will achieve reductions within the range of the state targets (minimum) and local targets (desired).

**Due to residency time of GHG gasses in the atmosphere, early GHG reduction is generally more beneficial for mitigation of the most severe impacts of climate change.

The plan includes a number of actions under different sector categories for implementation in order to begin achieving the emission reduction goals. In the sector addressing land use and buildings, the plan acknowledges the benefits of good community design that allows for fewer and shorter trips for daily needs and that also incorporates energy conservation in its community design and the buildings. These elements are already supported by General Plan policies. Target actions in the plan include developing policies to achieve carbon neutral projects by 2050. It uses 1990 emission levels, which would be a 44% reduction from 2010 baseline levels, as the initial target for new projects, with increasing reduction targets each year until carbon neutral projects are achieved in 2050.

According to the GHG Inventory prepared for the city, more than three-quarters of the total GHG emissions generated in Davis are associated with energy used in residences (33%) and for transportation (53%) associated with the residential land uses. Standards and measures to reduce emissions from residential land uses were adopted starting from a 2010 base year level (City of Davis, City Council Staff Report: Greenhouse Gas Standards for Residential Development. April 21, 2009; City Council Resolution 09-043). The standards grant a per unit carbon “allowance” equal to the target level for that year. Measures incorporated as part of the project or required as mitigation would be expected to reduce emission levels to the targeted amount with credit given for certain project characteristics such as the density level and proximity to transit. Under the standards a residential project 13-25 units in size, which is the size range of the subject Mission
Residences project, would be required to reduce their current estimated GHG emissions (5.5 Metric Tons (MT) of CO₂e per unit) by 2.4 Metric Tons of CO₂e per unit to meet the 1990 levels. Credits would reduce the required reduction amount.

Proposed Project
The proposed 14-unit Mission Residences project would comply with the GHG emission standards and reduction targets in the adopted Climate Action Plan for an individual residential project. The specific project’s calculations for compliance with the reduction standard are attached and summarized below.

Mitigation to reduce total project emissions by 25.9 MT CO₂ is required based on:

- GHG Required Reduction
  2.4 MT/unit)(14 units) 33.6 MT
- Minus 10% credit for density and transit proximity
  5.5 MT/unit)(14 units)(0.10 credit) -7.7 MT
- Required Reduction 25.9 MT

The proposed project would meet the reduction requirement by incorporating energy efficiency upgrades to the units 35% above Title 24. It is one of the mitigation options listed in the adopted standards for residential projects and would provide a total reduction of 26.5 MT CO₂ by the project.

- Exceed Title 24 Standard by 35%
  1.9 MT CO₂/unit reduction)(14 units) 26.5 MT

The proposed project is required to and able to comply with these standards which would be included as a condition of approval. The proposed project does not conflict with any adopted plan or regulation for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and no additional review is required.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
The project would replace two single-family residences with a 14-unit condominium project in an established residential area. It does not involve or create any hazards, hazardous materials or emissions. It is not located on a list of hazardous material sites. It is not located within an airport plan or within the vicinity of an airstrip. It will not impair the implementation of any emergency response plan and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of wildland fires. Therefore, no additional review is required.

Hydrology and Water Quality
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to hydrology and water quality from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Hydrology and Water Quality). The Initial Study, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process, determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have no impact or a less than significant impact relative to hydrology and water quality.

The EIR noted that changes to the project parcels from anticipated redevelopment would result in minor changes to the drainage patterns and increased runoff from increased impervious areas, but determined that it would less than significant. Individual projects would be subject to State
Storm Water Pollution Control requirements and be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for implementation. The EIR noted that the City was undertaking storm drainage improvements in the area and that project properties would be required to help finance major water, sewer, and drainage projects through project impacts fees per standard city requirements. Since adoption of the EIR, the City has continued to make storm drainage improvements in the project area.

The site is not located in a Specific Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) per the most recent FEMA flood zone map dated December 19, 2008. The site has not been identified as being within a 100-year flood zone, and is not located near any levees, dams, hillsides, streams or waterbodies. There will be no change in surface water or any body of water. There will be no change to the direction or rate of flow or quality of groundwater from the project. The project impacts were adequately analyzed in the EIR and no additional review is required.

**Land Use and Planning**

The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to land use and planning from the anticipated redevelopment of the area and at the programmatic level (DEIR Section 4.4 Land Use and Aesthetics). It identified potentially significant land use and planning impacts related to:

- Change in intensity of use.
- Change in type of use.
- Increased bulk and height of new development.
- Loss of trees.

Impacts and mitigation measures were analyzed in the DEIR (pages 4.4-7 through 4.4-17) and included:

- **Impact 4.4-1: Amendments to various adopted plans.** Amendments to the General Plan and Core Area Specific Plan were needed to clarify development policies for the project area and implement City goals for reinvestment and infill development, support the downtown and strengthen the pedestrian connections. The land use and zoning changes were found to be consistent with the majority of land use goals and development guidelines. The analysis noted that the increase in the scale and density of development and the likely removal of existing single family structures were policy changes, but needed to be addressed because of competing policies between retention of existing structures and support for new mixed-use development. The DEIR stated (page 4.4-8) that the amendments would help to "resolve the 'tension' between these competing policies in favor of taller, denser development that may in some cases necessitate demolition of existing structures." Because the amendments were intended to increase consistency between planning policies and zoning regulations and were needed to implement existing policies, the impact was considered to be less than significant. No mitigation was identified or required.

The proposed amendments for the subject project would further refine the previous changes for the same purpose and reasons. The changes would apply to a limited portion
of the project area. The proposed amendments would be consistent with the above analysis.

- **Impact 4.4-2: Amendments to various adopted regulations.** Modifications to the regulations addressing density, required setbacks and possible demolition or relocation of existing structures were made to accommodate infill development in the project area. The analysis (page 4.4-10) determined that the changes would result in taller, denser development, but that "it would result in a more efficient land use of existing land resources dedicated to urban uses and is therefore considered beneficial." It cited benefits of accommodating more people on less land, greater affordability, improved sustainability, wiser use of land resources, avoidance of sprawl, improved mobility alternatives, and improved air quality. The impact was considered to be less than significant and no mitigation was identified or required.

The proposed changes for the subject project are minor adjustments to a limited portion of the project area and the changes would be consistent with prior analysis. For example, the EIR land use analysis considered changes that included a density bonus for owner-occupied senior units up to 50 units per net acre, increased FAR up to 1:1 with added bonus amounts up to 2:1 FAR as incentives and considered stacked flat condominiums up to 45 feet tall (page 4.4.9).

- **Impact 4.4-3: Changes in land use within the project area.** The impact was related to changes in the allowable land uses within the project area that would allow an increase in the development potential in the form of infill development and a greater mix of housing types for the affected parcels. The impact was considered to be less than significant because of the transition in land uses that was already occurring in the area was similar to what was proposed. Additionally, it was determined that it would result in greater certainty about future projects and greater regulatory controls with the beneficial result of furthering the policy goals for the area. The impact was considered to be less than significant and no mitigation was identified or required.

As the subject project does not propose any further changes to the list of allowable uses, this impact and its analysis is not affected by the proposed project.

- **Impact 4.4-4: Increased density and intensity of development in the project area.** The EIR analysis did not consider the added growth and anticipated development in the project area to be substantial in the overall context of the city because it fell within the land use projections of the Core Area Specific Plan and implemented other policies supporting development of the area. While redevelopment of the area would increase the supply of housing in the Downtown area, the new units were not expected to substantially increase population pressure. However, the DEIR (page 4.4-13) noted that the increase in the number of dwelling units within project area itself would be substantial, resulting in 117 total units for a 200 percent increase. This would be in addition to the commercial square footage increase and increased parking demand. The analysis noted that considering the existing context, qualities, and neighborhood history, and the subjective nature of this type of impact, the impact was considered significant and unavoidable.
No mitigation was identified or required and a statement of overriding considerations was adopted for this project.

Proposed amendments would allow for increased density of approximately 10 additional units, subject to site-specific discretionary review. It is a minor increase with the development potential limited to projects meeting specific criteria on a limited number of properties. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact 4.4-5: Changes to the existing visual character of the project area.** This impact which addressed changes to the area's visual character from increased bulk and height of new development and the loss of trees was discussed above in Section I - Aesthetics.

The EIR adequately analyzed the land use and planning impacts from redevelopment of the project area, including the scope of the subject project and its proposed changes, which does not alter the analysis or conclusions of the EIR. The specific project would combine two existing residential lots for redevelopment with a 14-unit condominium project within an established neighborhood. It does not physically divide an established community. There is no applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan that applies to the project site or that would be affected by the project. The proposed project is oriented to senior residents and is designed with the needs of seniors in mind, but it is not proposed to be age-restricted and the analysis and determination of the project’s potential impacts are not significantly changed by whether the project is age-restricted or not.

Proposed amendments would increase the allowable density and development potential, but would not alter the general conclusions and analysis. There are no new specific project impacts that have not already been addressed or any impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Mineral and Energy Resources**

The project site is located in a built urban environment and contains no known mineral resources. The category of energy conservation and use of non-renewable resources was not specifically addressed in the EIR and related documents, but it is not an impact that was unknown at the time the EIR was prepared. The proposed project for a residential infill project does not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plan. The project would include the demolition or relocation of two existing residences and the construction of a new 14-unit condominium project. It would result in the disposal and consumption of non-renewable resources during demolition, construction and operation.

However, the subject project is consistent with City policies for infill development intended to help reduce the consumption resources. The project is also required to comply with the following standards and requirements:

- City Council resolution 09-043 adopting greenhouse gas reduction standards for new residential projects.
- Tier 1 requirements of the CALGreen Building Code per City requirements. However, the applicant has committed to meeting a higher building standard by complying with
Tier 2 CALGreen requirements, which will result in greater building efficiencies, less waste and less energy use.

- Submit a Debris Diversion Plan to reduce demolition and construction debris from the landfill per standard city requirements.

Standard City requirements for new construction or demolition relative to energy resources and demolition debris ensure that the impacts are minimized. Therefore, no further review is required.

**Noise**

The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed noise impacts and exposure related to the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Section 4.5 Noise). It identified and analyzed the following potentially significant noise impacts (pages 4.5-15 through 4.5-23):

- **Impact 4.5-1: Increased traffic noise levels at existing noise-sensitive uses in the project vicinity.** Traffic noise level modeling to calculate the increased traffic noise levels under the project buildout indicated that the increase would not exceed five dB on the project-area roadways when compared to no-project conditions. The impact was considered less than significant.

- **Impact 4.5-2: Expose new residences to traffic noise levels that exceed City of Davis exterior and interior noise level standards.** New noise-sensitive uses along B Street could be affected by noise levels that exceed City standards. Traffic noise level modeling indicated that uses would be exposed to levels exceeding the City’s “normally acceptable” exterior noise level standard for residential uses and that predicted levels would be within the “conditionally acceptable” exterior noise limits. The EIR noted that noise attenuation could be achieved through careful site design and building placement for exterior noise levels, while building practices and materials for building facades, wall thicknesses, windows, doorways, and roofing would reduce interior noise levels. It identified Mitigation Measure 4.5-2(a) addressing acoustical design and determined that implementation of the measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

- **Impact 4.5-3: Expose new noise-sensitive uses to noise levels from stationary noise sources that exceed City of Davis exterior noise level standards.** New residential units in the project area would be in the vicinity of U.C. Davis Toomey Field located at the southwest corner of Russell Boulevard and A Street and the City of Davis Central Park located at the northeast corner of B Street and Third Street. The EIR observed that special events at these two locations may occasionally exceed Davis City Code noise limits. It noted that the City has no control over activities occurring on the UC Davis Campus, and that the Central Park activities receive approval as special events serving the broad community and are within the range of normal uses. New residents to the area generally accept the tradeoffs between the convenience of the location and the increased activity of the area. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure 4.5-3(a) to provide disclosure to new rental housing about noise levels from special events that may occur. However, the EIR determined that the mitigation for the disclosure would not eliminate the impact and the
impact was considered **significant and unavoidable**. A statement of overriding considerations was adopted for this impact and would apply to the subject project.

- **Impact 4.5-4:** *Create new commercial, office, and residential uses which would contribute to ambient noise levels.* Increased development of the area has the potential in create noise levels exceeding City noise standards or that disturb existing and future noise-sensitive developments. The EIR recognized that commercial and office uses would be the typical noise-generating uses, but noted that concern was expressed over the increased density of residential uses that could occur in the project area which could result in associated residential traffic and nuisance noise issues. The analysis pointed out that traffic noise levels were addressed in the transportation section and that nuisance noise issues could not be eliminated, but were subject to City code enforcement on a case-by-case basis. The EIR did not find that residential uses would contribute a significant amount of noise to ambient levels, but stated (page 4.5-21) that, *“the focus is on the impacts of neighborhood commercial and office uses on existing and proposed residential uses in the project area.”* The EIR identified Mitigation Measures 4.5-4(a),(b), and (c), which addressed noise generated from commercial projects and determined that the mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a **less than significant** level.

The above mitigation measures for commercial projects do not apply and are not required for the subject project which is a residential development. Consistent with the above analysis, the proposed project’s contribution to ambient noise levels is considered **less than significant** as a residential project.

- **Impact 4.5-5:** *Construction activities could result in elevated noise levels at existing noise-sensitive uses.* Construction activities and related truck traffic noise from development projects would add noise to the existing environment, but are considered temporary impacts that would occur during normal daytime working hours and are regulated by City standards. No mitigation was identified or required and the impact was determined to be **less than significant**.

The above mitigation measures were adopted as part of the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan and applicable measures would be required as part of the subject project. The proposed project is consistent with the above analysis and conclusions. The subject project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport and is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. It will not expose people to excessive noise levels. There are no significant sources of groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise in the project area. There are no new specific project impacts that have not already been addressed or any impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Population and Housing**

The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to population and housing from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Population and Housing). The Initial Study, which was prepared for the B and 3rd
Street Visioning Process, determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have a less than significant impact relative to population and housing.

The Initial Study assumed approximately 85 net new dwelling units in the project area for approximately 210 new residents. It was not considered to be a substantial amount of growth and fell within the levels of overall growth for the Core Area Specific Plan 2010 land use projections. Redevelopment of the area was expected to occur incrementally over time and result in the removal of 16-18 existing homes and displacement of existing residents. The majority of the displaced residents were expected to be University students, a transient population able to relocate relatively easily. While new units would likely be more expensive on a per unit basis, new housing projects would also be subject to the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance.

The subject project does not result in any new specific impacts to population or housing which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. The additional units allowed under the amended standards are within the scope of this analysis. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Public Services**

The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to public services from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Public Services). The Initial Study, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process, determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have a less than significant impact relative to public services.

It was determined that police and fire protection services were adequate to serve the expected residential uses. It would result in a minor impact on schools with the new units and could result in an increase of 34 students, but there was adequate school capacity to serve them. Other necessary public infrastructure was available and adequate for the additional units and new development would be subject to major project fees to contribute their fair share towards their impacts.

The subject project does not result in any new specific impacts to public services which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Recreation**

The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to recreation from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Recreation). The Initial Study, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process, determined that the projected residential population increase of 210 people (29 children) would result in a less than significant impact on recreation resources. Ample recreation facilities are located in close proximity to the project area. Additionally, new residential development would be subject to park in-lieu fees to contribute their fair share towards facilities.
The subject project does not result in any new specific impacts to recreational facilities which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

**Transportation and Circulation**

The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents, including traffic modeling conducted for the project buildout, evaluated transportation and circulation impacts from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Section 4.2 Circulation and Parking). It identified and analyzed the following potentially significant impacts (pages 4.2-23 through 4.2-49):

- **Impact 4.2-1: Increased traffic volumes at intersections in the study area.** Redevelopment would increase traffic volumes throughout the project area, but the EIR found that all the study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. No mitigation was identified or required, but it was recommended that the City continue to monitor the intersection at B Street and 2nd Street for signalization. The impact was considered to be less than significant.

- **Impact 4.2-2: Increased traffic levels along the alley requiring modifications to alley improvements.** Redevelopment of the project area would increase use of the alley for site access and parking. The EIR acknowledged that specific trip numbers were difficult to determine given the unique project location, site conditions and alley use. It was expected that daily vehicle trips from new development in the project area would be reduced because of the area’s location between the University and Downtown near transit and services and the proposed office uses focused on uses which did not require substantial client/customer site access. However, the EIR identified Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(a) to widen and improve the alley ROW to 20 feet in order to accommodate the increased alley access and use. The subject project would comply with this mitigation measure and would be required to dedicate 7 feet of ROW in the alley to accommodate the full alley width as part of the project. The EIR determined that implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

- **Impact 4.2-3: Increased transit use in the project area.** Redevelopment of the project area could add trips to the transit system, but the majority of any additional trips were attributed to retail and office land uses. The analysis assumed that people taking transit trips originating in the study area would be riding the bus in an off-peak direction (away from campus and project area during the AM peak and towards it during the PM peak). The project did not plan to improve or take away any existing transit facilities in the area. Even with increased ridership from the retail and office uses, the EIR found that there was sufficient existing capacity to accommodate the additional trips. No mitigation was required and the impact was considered less than significant.

- **Impact 4.2-4: Increase pedestrian and bicycle usage with potential vehicle conflict.** The mix of land uses in the project area would increase pedestrian and bicycle activity along the alleys and surrounding streets where vehicle levels are also expected to rise. The EIR
noted that the increased bicycle and pedestrian use is consistent with various City goals and policies and that Mitigation Measure 4.2-2(a) addressed the alley design and safety. No mitigation was identified or required and the impact was considered less than significant.

**Impact 4.2-5: Parking demand generated by developments may exceed parking spaces provided by them.** Increased development in the area and the zoning changes related to parking, which could include in lieu fees for commercial projects, could result in a parking deficiency. The EIR pointed out that the limited parking provisions were consistent with goals and policies in the Core Area Specific Plan and the Traditional Davis Downtown and Residential Neighborhood Design Guidelines. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure 4.2-5(a) for the use of in-lieu parking fees along with parking programs and coordination with other agencies including the University, and the requirement to provide parking for residential projects. The proposed project is a residential project and will provide on-site parking in conformance with the zoning. The EIR determined that implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact, but that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable for the project area. A statement of overriding considerations was adopted for this impact.

- **Impact 4.2-6: Cumulative traffic growth at intersections in the area.** Increased development of the area could result in cumulative impacts to intersections in the area. The EIR conducted a Cumulative Conditions analysis for the year 2015 based on the City of Davis Travel Demand Model for full build-out under the General Plan with the project. It determined that the cumulative traffic growth would not cause an unacceptable LOS or trigger a signal warrant at any of the intersections studied. No mitigation was required, but it was recommended that the City of Davis continue to monitor the intersection at B Street and 2nd Street. The impact was considered less than significant.

Since certification of the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR in 2007, the recommended questions used in these environmental checklists were modified for transportation-related impacts. It resulted in less emphasis on impacts to parking, motorized vehicles and vehicle congestion and more consideration given to non-motorized transportation and overall system performance. However, the questions provide general guidance. The modifications to the questions do not alter the analysis of the transportation-related impacts in the EIR which included consideration of the overall system and non-motorized transportation and does not alter its conclusions relative to the entire project area or the subject project.

The above mitigation measures were adopted as part of the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan and applicable measures would be required as part of the subject project. The proposed project is consistent with the above analysis and conclusions. The changes proposed by the subject project would allow increased development for an additional 10 multi-family units with 60 additional trips (5.961 daily trips/du for Davis Model Apartment rate). It would add approximately 4 trips to the inbound/outbound AM peak hour and 5 trips to the inbound/outbound PM peak hour. The additional trips are a minimal increase within the general scope of the project analyzed in the EIR and would not alter the analysis or conclusions. There are no new specific project impacts that have not already been addressed or any impacts which are more significant than previously
described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

There are no rail, waterborne or air traffic facilities in the vicinity that would be affected by the proposed project. The subject project does not conflict with any policies or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities and would not create any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. The anticipated redevelopment of the project area, including the proposed residential project, is intended to implement and support policies and programs for alternative transportation by advancing infill development, creating a mixed-use neighborhood with residential uses near the downtown, and supporting a walkable and pedestrian-friendly environment. Individual projects would be subject to review to ensure compliance with applicable standards and guidelines for bicycle facilities, pedestrian access and design. Therefore, the project is considered to have no impact and no additional review is required.

Utilities and Service Systems
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed impacts to utilities and service systems from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Utilities and Service Systems). The Initial Study, which was prepared for the B and 3rd Street Visioning Process, determined that the redevelopment of the project area would have a less than significant impact relative to utilities and service systems. Utilities and services are adequate to serve the project area. No new systems or no substantial alterations would be needed to provide service to the amount of development permitted on the parcels under the proposed changes. Specific project proposals would undergo standard review by City departments to ensure they complied with the necessary requirements.

The project does not result in any new specific impacts to utilities and service systems which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. Therefore, no additional review is required.

Mandatory Findings of Significance
The B and 3rd Street Visioning Process EIR and associated documents analyzed the mandatory findings and cumulative impacts from the anticipated redevelopment of the area (DEIR Appendix 7.1 Initial Study – Mandatory Findings of Significance and DEIR Section 5.1 Cumulative Impacts). The Initial Study stated that the majority of the project impacts would be less than significant or less than significant through application of standard conditions of approval for new development. The cumulative Air Quality and Noise impacts were considered to be adequately addressed in the Core Area Specific Plan and General Plan EIRs and the Statements of Overriding Considerations for those impacts adopted as part of those EIRs. It was determined that the project would have a less than significant impact on human beings from the project's environmental effects. However, the Initial Study referred to the EIR for evaluation of the potential effects on the quality of the environment and the cumulative effects relative to cultural resources, traffic conditions, parking supply and aesthetics. The cumulative impact analysis for each of these topic areas were integrated in the analysis of their respective EIR sections. It included:
• Impacts 4.2-5 and 4.2-6 for cumulative traffic and parking impacts (pages 4.2-36 through 4.2-49);
• Impacts 4.3-7, 4.3-8, 4.3-9 and 4.3-10 for cumulative impacts to historic resources (pages 4.3-22 through 4.3-28); and
• Impacts 4.4-4 and 4.4-5 for cumulative aesthetic impacts as part of the analysis of changes to the project area from increased density and visual character (pages 4.4-12 through 4.4-17).

These cumulative impacts were previously addressed in this document under the applicable sections above. The EIR further determined that the project would have a less than significant impact relative to growth inducing impacts and significant irreversible environmental changes.

The proposed Mission Residences project does not result in any new specific cumulative impacts which have not already been addressed in the EIR or any cumulative impacts which are more significant than previously described based on new information or changed circumstances. The additional development potential from the proposed amendments is minor and the proposed project is consistent with the scope of the project analyzed in the EIR and does alter its analysis or conclusions. Therefore, no additional review is required.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A – Project Compliance with City of Davis GHG Reduction Standards
Attachment A
Project Compliance with City of Davis GHG Reduction Standards

Mission Residences
Davis GHG Reduction Thresholds and Standards: New Residential Projects

Step 1 - PROJECT SIZE
14 Single family dwellings in one structure

Step 2 - Project Credits
High Density… -5%
Less than 1/4 mi to public transit… -5%
Total Credit -10%

Step 3 - PROJECT CALCULATIONS
a) GHG Req’d Reduction
   (14) (2.4 MT/ Dwelling) 33.6 MT (metric ton)
b) Credit (Step 2)
   (5.5 MT/ Dwelling)(14)(0.10) 7.7
   c) Mitigation Required 25.9

Step 4 - MITIGATION PROGRAM
a) Energy efficiency upgrades to exceed
Title 24 (2005) Standards requirement by 35%
   (1.9 MT CO2)(14 Units) 26.5 MT

CONCLUSION
MITIGATION REQUIRED 25.9 MT CO2
MITIGATION DESIGNED 26.5 MT CO2
COMPLIES (0.5) MT CO2
### Davis GHG Reduction Thresholds and Standards: New Residential Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New residential units</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 12 units (less than 5% of total units in given year)</td>
<td>De minimis</td>
<td>No direct mitigation required – required to meet green building ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 25 units (up to 10% of total units in given year)</td>
<td>Reduce to 1990 levels (2.4 Metric Tons of CO2e reduction per unit)</td>
<td>In lieu fee option, LEED ND Gold standard or Individualized program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 26 units (greater than 10% of total units in given year)</td>
<td>Reduce to 1990 levels (2.4 Metric Tons of CO2e reduction per unit)</td>
<td>LEED ND Gold standard or Individualized program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 notes:
1. GHG reductions from 2010 baseline calculation of energy used in average Davis residential unit. GHG calculation excludes transportation.
2. Assume up to 250 units approved per calendar year based on City Council guidelines on residential growth.
3. In-lieu fee based on time of project approval cost of achieving 35% better than 2005 Title 24 plus $1,000/unit to fund implementation of community GHG emission reduction programs.

### Initial list of accepted GHG credit measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Recommended GHG Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Project Density (General Plan density)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- incorporates proximity to employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medium</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low</td>
<td>No credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less than ¼ mile</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ¼ mile to ½ mile</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- over ½ mile to ¾ mile</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Over ¾ mile</td>
<td>No credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Credits are additive. For example, a high density project located near a transit line would receive a 10% credit.
2. Credits applied to total project GHG emissions.
3. Credits based on best available information adapted from SACOG traffic modeling to measure effects of project density and location near employment and transit on VMT. These credits may adjust up or down over time as more accurate data and modeling becomes available.
### Mitigation Scenario 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Credits</th>
<th>GHG Reduction Required to meet 1990</th>
<th>Total project reduction in (GHG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 unit medium density project on transit line</td>
<td>38.5 MT CO2</td>
<td>240 MT</td>
<td>201.5 MT (444,106 lbs/CO2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project GHG (house): (5.5MT)(100 units)=550MT</td>
<td>(550 MT)(7%)= 38.5 MT</td>
<td>(2.4MT)(100 units)=240MT</td>
<td>240MT–38.5MT=201.5MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mitigation Program: Scenario 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
<th>Production Capacity/unit</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Projected Reduction</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency upgrades to new units: 35% above Title 24</td>
<td>4,162 lbs/unit</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>416,200</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>$7,000/unit*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume: 1,882 sq ft home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household PV (4kW ave. system)</td>
<td>3,300 lbs/unit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>15,000/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency upgrades to existing affordable housing units – air duct sealing, dual pane windows, HVAC upgrades, insulation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency upgrades to city buildings – air duct sealing, energy-star lighting and appliances, HVAC upgrades, insulation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid incentives for homeowners</td>
<td>2,900 lbs/unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Electric Vehicle incentives for homeowners</td>
<td>913 lbs/unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local employee designated housing (school district, city, UCD, etc.)</td>
<td>5,218 lbs/unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>499,200</td>
<td>101.1%</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to local PV solar farm (Remaining reduction needed: 0 lbs)</td>
<td>786 lbs/kW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>499,200</td>
<td>101.1%</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* City currently requires 15% better than Title 24 under its Green Building Ordinance. Incremental cost of achieving higher energy efficiencies than the current standard is less than amount shown.

---

*H:\Davis - Sustainable Projects\City Council Update\GHG for New Res - 4-14-09\Summary Chart - Davis GHG Reduction Thresholds and Standards v1.doc*
COMPARISON OF 15162 CEQA REQUIREMENTS AND PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Requirement (Section 15162)</th>
<th>Relationship to Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:</td>
<td>The Final Environmental Impact Report for the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process (SCH #2006012026) was certified June 12, 2007 (Resolution No. 07-093). Section 15090, 15091, 15092, and 15093 findings were made. The information provided in this Addendum identifies the substantial evidence in support of the City's determination that the preparation of a subsequent EIR is not required for the subject project and that the preparation of an Addendum is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;</td>
<td>The proposed project includes modifications and amendments to the PD 2-86B zoning standards for the B Street Transitional District and Core Area Specific Plan to allow increased heights and development intensity and includes the specific proposal for the Mission Residences project, a 14-unit condominium development. The changes would not require major revision to the EIR because there are no new significant environmental effects and no substantial increase in previously identified impacts. The proposed changes are within the general scope of the EIR which included analysis of greater densities and heights within the project area, but was not included in the final project approval as a result of project changes. The proposed changes would apply to a limited number of properties and would allow a limited amount of additional development potential. Specific development proposals would need to meet specific criteria to qualify for the increased development and would be subject to discretionary review for evaluation of specific project issues. The proposed project and amendments do not result in any new or increased impacts. It requires a clarification and minor modification to the approved project, but does not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT 2
### Comparison of 15162 CEQA Requirements and Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Requirement (Section 15162)</th>
<th>Relationship to Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) <em>Substantial changes will occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or</em></td>
<td>The circumstances under which the amendments would be implemented or the Mission Residences development would be undertaken remain substantially the same from the time of adoption of the B Street Visioning Process and does not require any major revisions to the previous EIR. The proposed project and amendments allow for more effective implementation of City policies and goals for redevelopment of the area, infill and economic development, housing. The previous EIR analysis included consideration of senior condominium development. The proposed Mission Residences condominiums is oriented to senior residents and designed with seniors in mind but is not proposed to be age-restricted. The analysis and determination of the project’s potential impacts are not significantly changed by whether the project is age-restricted or not. Project changes relative to density and height standards that were made as part of the approval of the B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process require clarification, but do not require any major revisions to the EIR. There are no new significant environmental effects associated with the proposed changes. There is no substantial change in the severity of previously identified significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) <em>New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:</em></td>
<td>No new information has been identified. The proposed changes involve amendments to the Core Area Specific Plan and the PD 2-86B zoning for the B Street Transitional District and the proposed Mission Residences condominium development to better implement City policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Requirement (Section 15162)</td>
<td>Relationship to Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **(A)** The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration; | All impacts evaluated in the certified EIR were adequately analyzed relative to the proposed project. Although the environmental focus of certain resource areas has shifted in years since the EIR was prepared with less emphasis on parking and automobile impacts for transportation and additional consideration of energy resources, it did not result in any new significant effects. The potential impacts from the proposed amendments fall within the range of impacts analyzed in the EIR and do not substantially alter the analysis or conclusions.

With the exception of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, no new impact areas have been identified for general CEQA analysis. At the time the EIR was prepared, it was acknowledged that GHG emissions could result in environmental impacts, but the analytical process, thresholds and standards were still being developed and continues to evolve. It is not a new impact, but it was not specifically discussed in the EIR.

This Addendum contains a discussion of the specific Mission Residences project impacts relative to GHG emissions and compliance with the City’s GHG emission standards which have been adopted (EIR Addendum Attachment 1). Additional future development proposals would be required to comply with the standards. It does not require a subsequent EIR analysis. |
| **(B)** Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;     | A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for significant and unavoidable impacts related to traffic, parking demand, historic resources, aesthetics, and noise. All other impacts were determined to be less than significant or fully mitigated. The revised project will not result in the significance level of any impacts previously identified, being more severe than initially described in the EIR. |
## ATTACHMENT 2

Comparison of 15162 CEQA Requirements and Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Requirement (Section 15162)</th>
<th>Relationship to Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C)</strong> Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or</td>
<td>No previously infeasible mitigation measures or alternatives were determined to be feasible. No new mitigation measures have been identified that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(D)</strong> Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.</td>
<td>No new or different mitigation measures or alternatives have been identified beyond those analyzed in the EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b)</strong> If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subsection (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, and addendum, or no further documentation.</td>
<td>A negative declaration was not prepared or adopted for the project, therefore, this section does not apply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT 2
Comparison of 15162 CEQA Requirements and Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Requirement (Section 15162)</th>
<th>Relationship to Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Once a project has been approved, the lead agency’s role in project approval is completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval. If after the project is approved, any of the conditions described in Subsection (a) occurs, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall only be prepared by the public agency which grants the next discretionary approval for the project, if any. In this situation no other responsible agency shall grant an approval for the project until the subsequent EIR has been certified or subsequent negative declaration adopted.</td>
<td>The B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process which involved changes to the permitted uses and development parameters to allow larger scaled development within the project area was approved June 12, 2007. The approval of the proposed project and amendments is a subsequent discretionary action for which a CEQA determination must be made. However, as noted herein, none of the conditions described in Subsection (a) have been triggered, hence a subsequent EIR is not required. Rather, the City has concluded that an Addendum is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A subsequent EIR or subsequent negative declaration shall be given the same notice and public review as required under Section 15087 or Section 15072. A subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall state where the previous document is available and can be reviewed.</td>
<td>A subsequent EIR has been determined not to be required for the proposed project and amendments; therefore, this section is not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3

PROJECT PLANS AND EXHIBITS
PROJECT NARRATIVE

The proposed project, 225 B STREET, was conceived to respond to the needed, rational, residential, densification of the Davis Core Area and the recognized need and demand for senior housing.

225 B STREET addresses that segment of 'seniors' whose children have left home, who are, and want to remain active, who want the amenities of contemporary home ownership without the burden of maintenance repairs and upkeep, and, the social network with others of the same generation and lifestyle.

225 B STREET would offer homeowners:
- A spacious, modern dwelling with a large Great Room, Kitchen with contemporary appliances, Master Bedroom/Bath Suite, Guest Bedroom and Bath, and separate Laundry Room.
- Large, room size, private balconies.
- Common Areas for use as meeting space, physical fitness, library, etc.
- Secure, enclosed, parking with private storage.
- Secure Elevator access to and from all floor levels, parking and street.
- A location within an easy walk to:
  * Central Park
  * Farmer's Market
  * Downtown businesses, offices, restaurants, and entertainment
  * University facilities and activities
  * Public transportation
  * Senior Center

STATISTICS

1. ZONING: 29246A
   SUB-AREA: B STREET TRANSITIONAL DISTRICT

2. PROPOSED USE: MULTIPLE, SINGLE FAMILY (SENIOR) DWELLING UNITS
   W/ CONDOMINIUM OWNERSHIP. 14 UNITS

3. FLOOR AREA(S): (EXCLUSIVE OF BALCONIES)
   BASEMENT (PARKING) 7,800 SF
   FLOOR 1 7,620 SF
   FLOOR 2 7,720 SF
   FLOOR 3 6,830 SF
   FLOOR 4 3,850 SF
   TOTAL 25,870 SF

4. SITE AREA* 14,260 SF (0.33 ACRES)

5. DWELLING UNITS: 2-BED (1,500 +/- SF)
   UNITS 14
   BEDROOMS 28

6. DWELLING UNITS/ACRE* 140.33
   42.4

7. FAR (FLOOR AREA RATIO) 26.870/14,260 = 1.871

8. SITE COVERAGE 8,660/14,260 = 60%

9. OPEN SPACE: 2,100 SF +/-
   (14 BALCONIES W 150 SF EACH)
   1,300 SF +/-
   (COURTYARD)
   3,450 +/- TOTAL

10. BUILDING HEIGHT: 4 STORIES OVER BASEMENT WITH MAX HEIGHT OF 45'-0" (EXCLUSIVE OF ELEVATOR PEN HOUSE)

11. PARKING:
    BASEMENT 21
    ALLEY 2
    TOTAL 23

*BASED ON GROSS AREA PRIOR TO ALLEY WIDENING DEDICATION.
LOW COST HOUSING TO BE SATISFIED BY RELOCATING DUPLEX AND SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE TO NEW LOW COST HOUSING SITE.

BUILDING CODES

1. OCCUPANCY GROUP R-2 RESIDENTIAL
2. CONSTRUCTION TYPE VA-SPRINKLERED (1-HR W/SPRINKLER SUBSTITUTION)
3. MAXIMUM HEIGHT 50 FT MAX
4. MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA 37,440 MAXIMUM (ALL)
5. ACCESSIBILITY (A) BUILDING, DWELLINGS AND PARKING SHALL BE DESIGNED TO COMPLY WITH CHAPTER 11A AND RELATED SECTIONS
   (B) AN ELEVATOR IS PROVIDED FOR ACCESS TO ALL AND STREET LEVELS
6. ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECT SHALL MEET AND EXCEED THE REQUIREMENTS OF TIER 1 OF THE CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING CODE

CONTENTS

1. CONTENTS / STATISTICS / NARRATIVE
2. PROJECT SETTING
3. PLOT / SITE PLAN
4. BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
5. BUILDING SECTIONS
6. BUILDING ELEVATIONS
7. EXTERIOR RENDERINGS
B Street Uses & Density

**KEY**
- Commercial / Mixed Use / Motels
- Retail with Office / Residential (Allowed FAR)
- Apartments (Existing U/A) (Allowed FAR)
- Proposed Development
  - 44 U/A
  - FAR 1.83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed 225/ 229</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong> (Floor Area Ratio)</td>
<td>1.8 - 1.96 FAR (Incl. Balconies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max Height</strong></td>
<td>45 Ft (Excluding Elev Tower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>44 U/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allowed 225/ 229</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong></td>
<td>1.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max Height</strong></td>
<td>38 Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>24 U/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Side Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong></td>
<td>2.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max Height</strong></td>
<td>38 to 45 Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>30 U/A Plus Retail (Ground Floor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Side Allowed M/U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong></td>
<td>2.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max Height</strong></td>
<td>3 Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>Undefined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Envelope/ Setbacks

Rear Profile

Front Profile

Site Plan

B STREET

ALLEY

New Property Line (7ft dedication for alley widening)

Existing property line

Centerline of alley (existing)

45ft Roof Peak
43ft 4th Flr Ceiling

34ft 3rd Flr Ceiling

24ft 2nd Flr Ceiling

14ft 1st Flr Ceiling

5ft 1st Flr Level
0ft Grade

Property line

Property line

Property line
Set-back Comparison

311-315 B STREET  
(EXISTING)

225 B STREET  
(PROPOSED)