

Significant and Unavoidable Impact:  
Loss of 17 Acres of "Prime Farmland"  
the highest designation.

# Draft Environmental Impact Report Santa Clara Gardens Development Project



**VOLUME I**  
DEIR Text and Appendices A, K and M

Lead Agency



City of Santa Clara  
SCH #2003072093

March 9, 2006



### **7.3 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – CURRENT ZONING**

The No Project Alternative–Current Zoning assumes that the project would be developed with land uses that are consistent with existing zoning designations versus state uses. The project site is currently designated in the City General Plan as moderate density residential, which allows the development of up to 25 dwelling units per acre. However, the City’s Zoning Ordinance designates the site as “A” agricultural zone district, which would allow the development of one residence to support agricultural operations, including livestock farming, row crops, ranches, dairies, nurseries, and greenhouses. The project site could be used for row crop, nursery, and green house uses as infrastructure exists on the site to support those uses. Further, because the site is completely surrounded by urban development, the establishment of a ranch or dairy would be unlikely because of conflicting adjacent land uses, and would require additional approvals from the City. Therefore, this alternative assumes that the site would be developed with active farming, nursery, and greenhouse uses. It is likely that new structures would be constructed under this alternative to support proposed uses, and that heavy equipment (e.g., tractors, plows, forklifts) would be used as part of site operations. In the event the State sought to develop the site with other uses, the State would first be required to comply with CEQA for any new proposal. Because the project site would not be sold to private developers, funding would not be available for the clean up of contaminated soils on the site.

#### **7.3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

##### **LAND USE**

This alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts related to alteration of land uses and land use compatibility because this alternative would continue agricultural uses on the project site. However, activities at the site could be more or less intense compared to previous conditions depending on the specific types of agricultural operations that occur. This alternative would eliminate the project’s significant and unavoidable prime farmland impact as the project site would continue to be used for agricultural operations. Although some new buildings would be constructed, these buildings would support agricultural operations and, therefore, would be consistent with land use and zoning designations for the site.

##### **VISUAL RESOURCES**

This alternative would result in reduced visual impacts as the site would generally be unchanged from existing conditions. No changes in the overall visual character of the project site and surrounding area would occur under this alternative.

##### **AIR QUALITY**

This alternative would result in reduced construction-related air quality impacts compared to the proposed project because less construction (e.g., construction of buildings to support agricultural operations on portions of the site) would occur. This alternative would not result in substantial long-term vehicle emissions because no new residences are proposed. However,

## 6 OTHER CEQA-MANDATED SECTIONS

### 6.1 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

CEQA Section 21100(b)(2)(A) provides that an EIR shall include a detailed statement setting forth “in a separate section: any significant effect on the environment that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented.” Accordingly, this section provides a summary of significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Significant unavoidable environmental impacts of the proposed project and cumulative development include:

**Impact 4.1.2: Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use.** The project would involve development of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance with residential land uses. Conversion of farmland to urban uses would be a significant impact.

**No feasible mitigation is available to mitigate the loss of prime farmland or the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.**

**Impact 4.10-3: Vehicular Site Access and Onsite Circulation Impacts.** Proposed vehicular circulation routes for the project would adequately serve the onsite housing units. The addition of a project roadway as a new leg could result in potential operational and safety problems at the Winchester Boulevard/Forest Avenue (east) intersection, if the signal remains in its current configuration. This would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation recommended in the EIR, Mitigation Measure 4.10-3, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-3: Vehicular Site Access and Onsite Circulation Impacts. The project developers shall coordinate with the City of Santa Clara Public Works Department and the City of San Jose Public Works Department to re-design the traffic signal control of the Forest Avenue (west) intersection with Winchester Boulevard. The redesign could include restricting this intersection to right-turns only (Exhibit 4-11a) so that the developments northerly roadway becomes the west approach to the modified intersection. The project driveway could then be accommodated at the Winchester Boulevard/Forest Avenue (east) intersection in a more typical configuration with fewer conflicting turning movements. With this modification, all of the existing traffic that is currently turning left at the Winchester Boulevard/Forest Avenue (west) intersection would be redirected to other routes, including the intersections of Winchester Boulevard with Pruneridge Avenue/Hedding Street and Winchester Boulevard with Dorcich Street. Traffic modeling for these intersections with the additional project-related trips indicates that all three intersections would operate at acceptable levels. The recommended intersection improvements would result in the Winchester Boulevard intersection with Pruneridge Avenue/Hedding Street continuing to operate at LOS C and D, and intersections of Winchester Boulevard at Forest Avenue (east) and at Dorcich Street are projected to operate at LOS B and C, respectively. An alternate design concept for this

mitigation would include the implementation of planned roadway improvements to the Stevens Creek Boulevard/ San Tomas Expressway by the County and contributions to the fair share funding of separate overlap phase for northbound right turns at the Stevens Creek Boulevard/ Monroe Street intersection. These improvements would reduce the project's cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. However, because these improvements are under the jurisdiction of the County and the City of San Jose and are not under the control of the City of Santa Clara, it is unknown at this time whether the mitigation would be implemented. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA conclusions, that is treated as a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

The project in combination with future cumulative development would result in the deterioration of the Level of Service (LOS) of the intersections of Pruneridge Avenue/San Tomas Expressway and Hedding Street/Bascom Avenue under cumulative conditions. Mitigation was recommended that would add an eastbound left-turn lane to the Pruneridge Avenue/San Tomas Expressway intersection and restriping to provide one shared left through turn lane at the Hedding Street/Bascom Avenue intersection (Fehr & Peers 2005a). With implementation of this mitigation, the project's cumulative transportation impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, because these improvements are in the jurisdiction of the City of San Jose and not under the control of the City of Santa Clara, it is unknown at this time whether the mitigation measure would be implemented. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA conclusions, this is treated as a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

### **Agricultural Resources**

The project would develop approximately 17 acres of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance for which there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

## **6.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS**

CEQA Section 21100(b)(5) specifies that the growth-inducing impacts of a project must be addressed in an EIR. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d) states that a proposed project is growth-inducing if it could “foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.” Included in the definition are projects that would remove obstacles to population growth. Examples of growth-inducing actions include developing water, wastewater, fire, or other types of service areas in previously unserved areas, extending transportation routes into previously undeveloped areas, and establishing major new employment opportunities.

The proposed project would not foster economic growth as no long-term employment opportunities would be created by the proposed project. The project would generate only limited short-term additional employment opportunities associated with construction.

### **PACIFIC BELL PROJECT**

The Pacific Bell project would develop a new 236,000-square-foot office building and a parking structure located on South Monroe Street approximately 1 mile southeast of the project site.

### **KIDZ ACADEMY PROJECT**

The Kidz Academy Project would establish a 2,400-square-foot child care facility in an existing church on a 9.6-gross-acre site, located at 1224 North Winchester Boulevard approximately 0.15 mile south of the project site.

### **FEDERAL REALTY INVESTMENT TRUST TOWN AND COUNTRY PROJECT**

The Federal Realty Investment Trust Town and Country Project would develop a new 650,000-square-foot retail complex and 1,200 residential units on approximately 39 acres located at the southeast corner of Stevens Creek Boulevard and Winchester Boulevard approximately 0.75 mile south of the project site.

### **NORTH FIRST STREET REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The North First Street Redevelopment plan includes construction of approximately 4,000 condominiums and apartments in the North First Street industrial corridor, mostly proposed as mid- and high-rise structures. The plan area is 285 acres and is located approximately 4 miles north of the project site.

### **SHELTERCRAFT PROJECT**

The Sheltercraft Project would develop a new 158 unit multi-family housing development at 801 South Winchester Boulevard approximately 1 mile south of the project site.

### **O'CONNOR HOSPITAL EXPANSION PROJECT**

The O'Connor Hospital Expansion Project would develop a 90,000-square-foot expansion to the existing hospital located at 2105 Forest Avenue approximately 0.75 mile east of the project site.

## **5.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS**

### **LAND USE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

The project is located in an urbanized area with residential and commercial development completely surrounding the project site. The project would construct single-family residential housing that is similar to surrounding residential neighborhoods and senior housing facilities that are compatible to adjacent retail and commercial facilities. Development of the project would not substantially change the development intensity of the area or overall land use patterns. Cumulative projects are sufficiently distant from the project site such that

development of the project would not combine or contribute to the cumulative changed development intensity of the area. This would be a less-than-significant cumulative land use impact. The project would convert approximately 17 acres of prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance to urban uses. No other farmland resources are located within the City of Santa Clara and the City has no adopted policies that protect or preserve farmland resources. Development of the project in conjunction with development of the cumulative projects and buildout of the City of Santa Clara and City of San Jose General Plan would result in a significant cumulative loss of agricultural land. This agricultural land conversion would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact and the project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative farmland impact.

## **VISUAL RESOURCES**

Implementation of cumulative projects would result in new development of some previously undeveloped areas in the project vicinity. The cities of Santa Clara and San Jose are highly urbanized areas consisting of residential, commercial, and retail centers. Although the project would develop a previously undeveloped site, this site does not provide public views of these undeveloped areas and development of the site would not substantially change the visual character of the local area. Some of the cumulative projects would convert large open space areas to urban uses (i.e., projects located in the northern part of the city); however, the project site is sufficiently distant from these developments that it would not contribute to the loss of these open space views. Because the project site is isolated from cumulative development projects that would convert open space and undeveloped areas to developed land uses, it would not result in a considerable cumulative contribution to the changed local viewshed. The project would include nighttime lighting sources that would be designed in accordance with city lighting design standards. Because of the highly urbanized character of the project area, the project's nighttime lighting sources would not be a new substantial source of light or glare in the area. Further, because the project site is isolated from other cumulative developments with nighttime lighting, it would not combine with these projects to result in a cumulatively significant nighttime lighting impact. Therefore, the project's cumulative visual resource impacts would be less than significant.

## **AIR QUALITY**

Automobile use by residents of the project and residents and employees of the cumulative projects would increase vehicle trips in the surrounding area. As described in Section 4.3, Air Quality, the project would not substantially increase the number of vehicle trips on project area roadways and would not contribute to the degradation of LOS, delay, or volume-to-capacity ratios of these roadways. Project-related operational air emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would not exceed BAAQMD or California significance thresholds. Although the project would require general plan amendments, the project would develop residential land uses at reduced densities compared to what is allowed under existing general plan land use designations for the site (i.e., moderate density residential). Therefore, the project would be within and below planned development levels analyzed by the City of Santa Clara in its General Plan and BAAQMD in the Clean Air Plan. Cumulative CO concentrations were

As proposed, the project (110 market rate residential units and 165 senior housing units [60% of the total unit count]), qualifies for status as a Density Bonus Project, in accordance with the City's Zoning Ordinance and State law. Section 18.78.010 of the Zoning Ordinance states:

These Residential Density Bonus Standards are intended, in conjunction with a rezoning to PD – Planned Development and Combining Zoning District (Chapter 18.54), to provide incentives for the construction of housing for very low income, lower income, or senior households in accordance with applicable sections of the California Government Code [Section 65915 et seq.], or successor code. It is the intent of the City to facilitate the development of affordable housing and to implement the goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan Housing Element.

The Density Bonus Standards provide that the developer shall be granted an increase in the allowable density for the site, as stipulated by the General Plan, of up to 25%. The proposed General Plan amendment would allow up to 18 dwelling units per acre. Under the proposed project, the senior housing component, with 165 units on 6 acres, results in a density of 27.5 units per acre on that portion of the site and brings the project density for the approximately 16-acre site (less the 1 acre park dedication) to 17.19 units per acre.

In addition to a density bonus, the development may be granted exception from zoning and design standards of the Zoning Ordinance. In the case of the proposed project (i.e., with senior housing), it is anticipated that zoning exceptions could include building setbacks, building heights, building coverage allowances parking requirements, and right-of-way dimensions. The City could also provide financial incentives to the proposed development by funding, in part, the senior housing project through the City's Redevelopment Agency housing set-aside funds.

## **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES REGULATION**

### **California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program**

The California Department of Conservation (CDC) sponsors the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), which delineates important farmland resources in the state based on a particular set of criteria related primarily to soil type and the availability of water. Farmland that meets the specified criteria is placed in one of four main categories: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance (CDC 2001).

The CDC classifies a portion of the project site as Prime Farmland and the remainder as Farmland of Statewide Importance (CDC 2001). Prime Farmland is defined by CDC as “the best combination of physical and chemical features to sustain long-term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields” (CDC 2001). Farmland of Statewide Importance is defined by CDC as “Farmland similar to Prime Farmland but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture” (CDC 2001). Based on conversations with FMMP

staff, the specific delineation of Prime versus Statewide Important Farmlands on the project site cannot be determined with any certainty based on available data and maps (Vink, pers. comm., 2003). Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis the entire site is considered Prime Farmland.

CDC is also responsible for establishing agricultural easements in accordance with Public Resources Code Sections 10250–10255. Site selection criteria include the expected future use of the site, the commitment of the local jurisdiction to protecting agricultural resources, and the likelihood that the land would be converted to non-agricultural uses. Based on conversations with FMMP staff, the project site would not meet conservation easement eligibility requirements (Vink, pers. comm., 2003).

### **Williamson Act**

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, is the State of California’s principal method for encouraging the preservation of agricultural lands. The Williamson Act enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners who agree to maintain specified parcels of land in agricultural or related open space use in exchange for tax benefits. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract.

## **4.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

### **THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The project would result in significant land use or agricultural impacts if it would:

- ▶ conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
- ▶ conflict with adjacent land uses;
- ▶ physically divide an established community;
- ▶ convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;
- ▶ conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; or
- ▶ involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

### Impact 4.1-1

**Conflict with Adjacent Land Uses.** *The project would develop the site with residential development that is compatible with existing surrounding residential and commercial areas (i.e., detached single-family residential and retail development). The project would not conflict with adjacent land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.*

Conversion of approximately 17 acres of land previously used for agricultural research purposes to urban residential uses (i.e., senior housing, single-family residential homes, and park uses) would occur as a result of the project. The project site is surrounded by single-family residential and commercial development, and is designated for residential uses in the General Plan. No other agricultural lands are located in the vicinity of the project site. In general, the project would result in infill residential development in a primarily residential area of the City. A zoning amendment is proposed to change the zoning designation to Planned Development District. This zoning designation requires that the development project be compatible with surrounding development. Because the project would construct residential land uses that are compatible with surrounding land uses (i.e., residential and commercial), development of the project would not conflict with adjacent land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

### Impact 4.1-2

**Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use.** *The project would involve development of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance with residential land uses. Conversion of farmland to urban uses would be a significant impact.*

The CDC classifies the site as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Remnants of fruit orchards are found on the site. No other important Farmlands or agricultural lands are located in the project vicinity and the city has no adopted policies for the protection of farmland resources. Agricultural operations at the site ceased in January 2003. Although the project site is not in active agricultural production, the project site is still considered to be a farmland resource because of the presence of suitable soils; however, it is likely that this parcel would not be economically feasible to farm because of its proximity to urban development and the limited size of the site. The project would result in the conversion of prime and important farmlands to non-agricultural uses. This would be a significant impact.

### Impact 4.1-3

**Physical Division of an Established Community.** *The project would not physically divide an established community. Activities at the former research center predate the surrounding neighborhoods. With the project as proposed, the site and its amenities (parks and open space) would be accessible to surrounding residents, allowing the property to be integrated into the neighborhood. This would be a beneficial impact of the project.*

The project would not physically divide an established community. Activities at the former research center predate the surrounding neighborhood. Presently, public access to the site is prohibited because the site is fenced and secured to prevent trespassers from gaining access to

FALSE-->

<---FALSE!!!!

### 4.1.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are necessary for the following less-than-significant impacts.

- 4.1-1: Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses.
- 4.1-3: Physical Division of an Established Community.
- 4.1-4: Conflict with Applicable Plans and Policies.

No feasible mitigation measures are available for the following significant impact.

- 4.1-2: Conversion of Farmland to Non-agricultural Use.

Large- or small-scale agricultural operations in Santa Clara County would not be economically viable in the long run because of many factors including: high land prices, which in turn creates high property taxes, increasing local and state regulations, high water and labor costs, competition in the agriculture market by foreign and other state areas, and the presence of predominantly urban land uses in the surrounding neighborhood. Further, the project site is designated by the General Plan for residential development and the City's Housing Element identifies the project site as an important opportunity for housing (City of Santa Clara 2002). Retention of the site in agricultural uses could impede the City from achieving its housing goals.

Currently, there are 156 acres of undeveloped land in the City of which 116 have approved office and commercial development projects. The remaining 23 acres, (40 acres minus the 17-acre project site) are planned for commercial and industrial/mixed use development and would not provide suitable soils for agricultural production. Because no other farmland resources are located in the city or surrounding areas that are not being developed, or are not already planned for development, no farmland areas are available to preserve or grant easements to protect their farmland status, which is an important consideration for determining mitigation feasibility under CEQA (Defend the Bay vs. City of Irvine 119 CA4 1261; 15 CR 3d 76). Based on the above evidence, this Draft EIR has determined that no feasible measures are available to mitigate the loss of prime farmland or the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

### 4.1.4 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

With the exception of impacts to farmland, the project's land use impacts would be less than significant (Impacts 4.1-1, 4.1-3, and 4.1-4.)

## **SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT**

As discussed in Section 5.1, Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts, of this Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in five significant and unavoidable project and cumulative impacts, as summarized below:

**Conversion of Farmland to Non-agricultural Use.** The California Department of Conservation classifies the project site as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Because the proposed project would result in conversion of important farmland to non-agricultural use, this would be a significant impact. No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist that can avoid this significant impact.

**Vehicular Site Access and Onsite Circulation Impacts.** Proposed vehicular circulation routes for the project and the development option would adequately serve the onsite housing units. The addition of a project roadway as a new leg could result in potential operational and safety problems at the Winchester Boulevard/Forest Avenue (east) intersection, if the signal remains in its current configuration. This would be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation recommended in the EIR would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The mitigation improvements to the Winchester Boulevard/Forest Avenue intersection are under the jurisdiction of the City of San Jose and not subject to the control of the City of Santa Clara. It is uncertain at this time whether this mitigation would be implemented. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA conclusion, this is treated as a potentially significant and unavoidable impact of the project.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The project would result in three significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts including cumulative impacts to construction-related air quality, cumulative roadway intersection impacts, and cumulative farmland impacts. These significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts are described in greater detail below.

## **SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

The project would result in cumulative impacts primarily related to cumulative construction in the local area. These impacts include construction-related PM<sub>10</sub> emissions, traffic congestion, and loss of agricultural land. Most of the project's impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level and therefore, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

### **Air Quality**

The project would result in construction-related PM<sub>10</sub> emissions. Mitigation has been incorporated into the project to reduce these emissions to a less-than-significant level. However, the air basin is currently in non-attainment for PM<sub>10</sub> emissions. Therefore, the project's PM<sub>10</sub> emissions (although reduced by mitigation) would contribute to the continued exceedance of state and federal air quality thresholds. This would be a significant cumulative air quality impact of the project. No additional mitigation is available to reduce this cumulative impact. Therefore, this would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impact.

## **Transportation**

The project in combination with cumulative development would contribute new vehicle trips to the intersections of Stevens Creek Boulevard/San Tomas Expressway and Stevens Creek Boulevard/ Monroe Street. These intersections are currently operating at unacceptable levels. Therefore, the project would contribute vehicle trips that would exacerbate existing unacceptable traffic conditions. This would be a significant cumulative impact. Mitigation has been recommended to reduce the project's contribution to the cumulative impact. This mitigation would include the implementation of planned roadway improvements to the Stevens Creek Boulevard/San Tomas Expressway by the County and contribution to the Fair Share Funding of a separate overlap phase for northbound right-turns at the Stevens Creek Boulevard/Monroe Street intersection. These improvements would reduce the project's cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. However, because these improvements are under the jurisdiction of the County and the City of San Jose and are not under the control of the City of Santa Clara, it is unknown at this time whether the mitigation would be implemented. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA conclusions, that is treated as a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

The project in combination with future cumulative development would result in the deterioration of the Level of Service (LOS) of the intersections of Pruneridge Avenue/San Tomas Expressway and Hedding Street/Bascom Avenue under cumulative conditions. Mitigation was recommended that would add an eastbound left-turn lane to the Pruneridge Avenue/San Tomas Expressway intersection and restriping to provide one shared left through turn lane at the Hedding Street/Bascom Avenue intersection (Fehr & Peers 2005a). With implementation of this mitigation, the project's cumulative transportation impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, because these improvements are in the jurisdiction of the City of San Jose and not under the control of the City of Santa Clara, it is unknown at this time whether the mitigation measure would be implemented. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA conclusions, this is treated as a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

## **Loss of Land for Agriculture**

The project would develop approximately 17 acres of designated Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance for which there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

## **2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY**

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include "areas of controversy known to the lead agency." The following issues, in no order of importance, are the controversial issues known to the City:

- ▶ The type, density, design of housing units on the site.
- ▶ Traffic congestion in neighborhoods and along local roadways.

**Table 2-1  
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.1 LAND USE</b></p>			
<p><b>4.1-1: Conflict with Adjacent Land Uses.</b> The project would develop the site with residential development that is compatible with existing surrounding residential and commercial areas (i.e., detached single-family residential and retail development). The project would not conflict with adjacent land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
<p><b>4.1-2: Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use.</b> The project would involve development of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance with residential land uses. Conversion of farmland to urban uses would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>There are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the project's important farmland impacts. Large- or small-scale agricultural operations in Santa Clara County would not be economically viable in the long run because of many factors including: high land prices, which in turn creates high property taxes, increasing local and state regulations, high water and labor costs, competition in the agriculture market by foreign and other state areas, and the presence of predominantly urban land uses in the surrounding neighborhood. Further, the project site is designated by the General Plan for residential development and the City's Housing Element identifies the project site as an important opportunity for housing (City of Santa Clara 2002). Retention of the site in agricultural uses could impede the City from achieving its housing goals.</p> <p>Currently, there are 156 acres of undeveloped land in the City of which 116 have approved office and commercial development projects. The remaining 23 acres, (40 acres minus the</p>	SU

B = Beneficial      LTS = Less Than Significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<b>Table 2-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		17-acre project site) are planned for commercial and industrial/mixed use development and would not provide suitable soils for agricultural production. Because no other farmland resources are located in the city or surrounding areas that are not being developed, or are not already planned for development, no farmland areas are available to preserve or grant easements to protect their farmland status, which is an important consideration for determining mitigation feasibility under CEQA (Defend the Bay vs. City of Irvine 119 CA4 1261; 15 CR 3d 76). Based on the above evidence, this Draft EIR has determined that no feasible measures are available to mitigate the loss of prime farmland or the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.	
<b>4.1-3: Physical Division of an Established Community.</b> The project would not physically divide an established community. Activities at the former research center predate the surrounding neighborhoods. With the project as proposed, the site and its amenities (parks and open space) would be accessible to surrounding residents, allowing the property to be integrated into the neighborhood. This would be a beneficial impact of the project.	B	No mitigation is necessary.	B
<b>4.1-4: Conflict with Applicable Plans and Policies.</b> The project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation, but inconsistent with the zoning ordinance. This inconsistency is a land use regulation issue rather than a physical environmental consequence of the project. Therefore, this would not be a significant	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

B = Beneficial      LTS = Less Than Significant      PS = Potentially Significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and Unavoidable