

**Addendum to Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
For: Patterson Downtown Master Plan**

1. Project Title:

Patterson Downtown Master Plan

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Patterson Planning Division
1 Plaza, P.O. Box 667
Patterson, CA 95363

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Bryan Stice, Planning & Community Development Director
(209) 895-8074

4. Project Location:

Downtown Patterson as shown in Exhibit A – generally south of “I” Street on the north, S. 6th Street on the west, “E” Street on the south, and S. 1st Street on the east.

5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:

Bryan Stice, Planning & Community Development Director
1 Plaza, P.O. Box 667
Patterson, CA 95363

6. Proposed General Plan Designations:

Downtown Core, Light Industrial, Public/Quasi Public, Parks/Open Space

7. Proposed Zoning Districts:

Downtown Core, Light Industrial, Public/Quasi Public, Parks/Open Space

8. Description of the Project:

The Patterson Downtown Master Plan (Master Plan) documents current retail trends that affect and influence the types of businesses and land uses in the downtown and strategies to enhance the sense of place to create a unique destination that is attractive for residents, visitors, and businesses. The Master Plan is a companion document to complement the General Plan, Municipal Code, and Community Downtown Design Guidelines, and it builds upon these existing documents. The Master Plan has been prepared to establish an achievable vision, shape future development, and implement an action plan for the City of Patterson. The Master Plan outlines future actions to accomplish the following:

- Provide a framework with which to inspire future private development and public improvements based on Patterson’s community values and vision;
- Expand the local economy;
- House residents of all income levels;
- Create community gathering and recreational places; and
- Address relationships between land use, transportation, and the environment.

The Land Use Element presents policies and implementation measures to revitalize Downtown Patterson as the “civic, cultural, financial, and entertainment center of the City.” As non-regulatory City document, the Master Plan has been crafted to further this vision and support the General Plan’s policies.

9. Project Requested:

The project is the adoption of the Downtown Master Plan. The review of the project includes acceptance of the previously approved Final General Plan EIR, as amended by this Addendum.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:

The Master Plan area is the Downtown Core which covers 63.6 acres and includes residential housing, numerous businesses and services, and important cultural and civic uses.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

None

12. Previous Environmental Review

On November 30, 2010, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2010-84 which certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Patterson General Plan. A Notice of Determination was filed with the County Clerk on December 1, 2010.

Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines allows a lead agency to prepare an addendum to a previously adopted EIR for a project if only “minor technical changes or additions” will be created that do not result in new significant impacts on the environment since the EIR was originally prepared. Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines describes the conditions requiring the need for either a Mitigated Negative Declaration or a Subsequent EIR which are:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) 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, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) 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
 - (D) 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

In addition, Section 15262 of the CEQA Guidelines, Feasibility and Planning Studies, cites that a project which involves only feasibility or planning studies for possible future actions which the City has not approved, adopted, or funded does not require the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration but does require consideration of environmental factors.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The Downtown Master Plan has been designed to be consistent with the General Plan and builds on the goals and policies of that document. Therefore, the Master Plan does not raise any new environmental issues beyond those already addressed in the General Plan EIR.

The following discussion analyzes specific issue area topics that are included in the General Plan EIR and reinforces how the two plans are consistent with one another. References are made to relevant questions for relevant issue areas that may be impacted in a downtown setting from the Environmental Checklist in the CEQA Guidelines.

1. Aesthetics

The Environmental Checklist in the CEQA Guidelines asks the following questions regarding Aesthetic factors in evaluating potential project impacts:

Would the project:

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*
- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources – such as historic buildings in the context of a downtown setting?*
- d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Downtown Patterson has a varied mix of uses within a development pattern that is formed by a unique street grid in a circle and spoke pattern similar to Washington D.C. and Paris. The downtown includes a variety of important civic buildings including city hall, public library, post office, and police and fire departments. Several of the buildings date back to the early part of the 20th century including the Carnegie Library built in 1921, and the Center Building built in 1910 that occupies the center of Circle Plaza and was formerly the Patterson Ranch Company Office, which all add to the pleasing aesthetics, interest, and historical character of downtown.

The focus of the aesthetics analysis in the General Plan EIR was on how new development in outlying areas of the city would impact scenic vistas from Interstate 5 and affect scenic qualities on the area over time. However, several relevant policies were highlighted in the EIR that relate to aesthetics

in the downtown that are pertinent to the Downtown Master Plan and are listed below:

CD-1.6 Scenic palm-lined corridor. *The City shall create and maintain a continuous scenic corridor lined with palm trees extending along East Las Palmas Avenue from near the San Joaquin River west along Las Palmas Avenue through downtown to its planned intersection with Sperry Avenue, and then west along Sperry Avenue to Interstate 5.*

Analysis: Section 4.3.3, Landscaping, of the Master Plan includes the following reference to palm trees reinforcing Policy CD-1.6:

6. Palm trees are recommended along Las Palmas and Plaza Circle to accentuate this central roadway as the main downtown arterial.

CD-2.1 Downtown character. *The City shall promote the development of a well-defined, pedestrian-oriented downtown by preserving and enhancing the existing downtown. The downtown shall include commercial, civic, residential, cultural, and recreational uses, and shall serve all segments of the community. The commercial/civic core of downtown shall be defined as the existing downtown area, focused on the circle.*

Analysis: The Downtown Master Plan is consistent with this policy as it describes much of the focus and content of the document to preserve and enhance downtown's land uses and integrity.

CD-4.1 Street trees. *The City shall endeavor to protect the urban forest created by mature trees in existing developed areas and in newly developing areas.*

Analysis: Section 4.3.3, Landscaping - Trees, of the Master Plan includes guidance on tree planting to protect the urban forest.

Conclusion: As demonstrated by the analysis of specific policies highlighted within the General Plan EIR, the Master Plan is consistent with and further builds on these planning principles. In addition, Section 3.2, Building Form Concepts, of the Master Plan guides new development to include articulation, quality materials, and attention to facade details to create new structures that add to the character and scale of existing buildings. Therefore, the Master Plan does not have an adverse impact on scenic vistas or scenic resources but rather helps protect the aesthetics and quality of development in the downtown. In addition, Section 4.3.2, Lighting, of the Master Plan provides guidance on appropriate styles of lighting that illuminate areas for nighttime activities and security but not create glare.

Therefore, the Master Plan does not have an adverse impact on creating new sources of substantial light or glare.

2. Cultural Resources

The Environmental Checklist in the CEQA Guidelines asks the following questions regarding Cultural Resource factors in evaluating potential project impacts:

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource per Section 15064.5?

One of the main tenets of the Master Plan is to maintain the small-town, historic character unique to Patterson while also allowing incremental change that complements the existing downtown environment. The Cultural Resources section of the General Plan EIR includes Figure 5.15 which notes certain buildings and plaza areas that are part of the Downtown Historic District. The boundary of the existing historic district is located within the Downtown Master Plan Boundary.

The General Plan EIR includes the following policies that relate to the protection and preservation of the City's historic resources:

PR-4.1 Protection of significant structures. *The City shall set as a high priority the protection and enhancement of Patterson's historically and architecturally significant buildings.*

PR-4.2 Historic district. *The City shall maintain a historic district in the downtown area and along East Las Palmas Avenue and develop standards for the preservation and rehabilitation of historic structures and compatible infill development. New development near designated historic landmark structures and sites shall be designed to be compatible with the character of the designated historic resource.*

PR-4.3 Registration of historic structures. *The City shall work with property owners in seeking registration of historical structures and sites as State Historic Landmarks or listing on the National Register of Historic Sites.*

PR-4.4 Support for private historic preservation. *The City shall support the efforts of property owners to preserve and renovate historic and architecturally significant structures. Where such buildings cannot be preserved intact, the City shall seek to preserve the building facades.*

PR-4.5 Demolition. *The City shall consider demolition of historic resources as a last resort, to be permitted only if the following findings are made: rehabilitation and/or relocation are not feasible; the demolition of the resource is necessary to protect the health and safety of the public; or the public benefits of demolition outweigh the cost of preserving the resource. In all instances, the City shall gather and report input from the public prior to preparing a recommendation (for or against demolition) to decision-makers.*

PR-4.6 Agricultural heritage museum. *The City shall explore the possibility of establishing a living history center or museum to focus on Patterson’s agricultural heritage.*

PR-4.7 Patterson Historical Society. *The City shall support the efforts of the Patterson Township Historical Society to keep the Center Building Historical Museum open and accessible to the public.*

Conclusion: The number and quality of historic resources in the downtown are of intrinsic value to creating a focal point for the community and elevating the charm and character of the City’s downtown. Section 1.3 of the Downtown Master Plan documents the importance of the historic resources to the beauty, heritage, and popularity of the downtown. References are made throughout the document to the maintenance of the downtown’s historic atmosphere and its small-town character through the selection of improvements such as hardscape materials, lighting, landscaping, signage, and public art. Additionally, the Master Plan identifies potential opportunities to enhance the City’s agricultural history, such as Opportunity Site D in Section 3.3. In conclusion, the adoption of the Downtown Master Plan is consistent with noted General Plan policies and is another tool to enhance the historic interest and character of the downtown. Therefore, the Master Plan would result in a positive impact to the protection of historic resources and will not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of any specific historical resource.

3. Land Use & Planning

The Environmental Checklist in the CEQA Guidelines asks the following question regarding Land Use & Planning factors in evaluating potential project impacts:

Would the project:

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?

Goal LU-4 of the Land Use Element presents policies and implementation measures to revitalize Downtown Patterson as the “civic, cultural, financial, and entertainment center of the City.” In addition, Policy LU-1.1 states:

LU-1.11 Protect the downtown. The City shall promote growth that complements, and does not adversely compete with, the downtown.

As a non-regulatory document, the Master Plan has been crafted to further this vision and support the General Plan's policies. Section 3.1.1 includes a list of proposed zoning and land use regulations that provides for a variety of retail, service, and other commercial uses as well as encouraging new housing opportunities. The goals of this mix of uses are to provide a shopping and gathering place downtown and to create a vibrant place to both live and work. In addition, three zone changes are proposed as implementation measures of the Downtown Master Plan in terms of achieving the desired mix of land uses in the downtown.

A zone change is proposed for approximately 8.6 acres of land south of East Las Palmas Avenue and east of South Second Street (Highway 33) and west of South First Street from Heavy Industrial to Light Industrial. The Master Plan notes that these zone changes will be a positive improvement as they provide a mix of land uses that can allow for larger businesses and additional uses which are envisioned to draw in visitors and residents to Downtown Patterson which can increase pedestrian activity and increase safety to better activate this underutilized area.

Another proposed zone change includes rezoning 2.4 acres of General Commercial to Downtown Core. This small area along Highway 33 is contained within the Downtown Master Plan Boundary and immediately adjacent to General Commercial. The benefit of this zone change is that it provides the opportunity to provide additional residential units in the downtown. The last minor zone change is to rezone 0.3 acres of Downtown Commercial to Public/Quasi Public which is more consistent with its intended purpose to accommodate a City public safety center.

The land use analysis included in the General Plan EIR focused on mitigating impacts related to development of agricultural lands on the edge of the city limits. The Master Plan is consistent with Policy NR-2.2 in the General Plan EIR that encourages compact development through infill development within existing urbanized areas of the city to minimize pressure to convert agricultural lands to urban uses. Policy NR-2.2 is consistent with adopted Policy LU-1.7 which gives first priority to the development of vacant or underutilized areas within the current City limits which would include the downtown.

In the General Plan EIR, there is reference to the Patterson Redevelopment Agency and their efforts to address blighted conditions downtown. It notes that substantial progress was made by the agency from 2000-2010 to address blight in the downtown. Considering the State of California eliminated

redevelopment agencies back in 2012, the Master Plan is another tool for the City to use to continue efforts to improve and enhance conditions in the downtown.

Conclusion: Adoption of the Master Plan results in a positive environmental impact as it reinforces existing policies previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR to improve and beautify downtown. Therefore, the project does not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

4. Population & Housing

The Environmental Checklist in the CEQA Guidelines asks the following question regarding Population & Housing factors in evaluating potential project impacts:

Would the project:

- a) *Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly*

Section 3.1.1 of the Master Plan includes the following summary of residential uses in the downtown core:

“Residential homes are necessary to support growth and revitalization of Downtown and encourage residents who can easily walk to places to shop, eat, play, and run daily errands. A variety of homes are allowed in Downtown – everything from residences above commercial uses, duplexes to live/work units, and apartments. An important part of the Downtown vision is the inclusion of a variety of residential types. The provision of additional market rate, workforce, and affordable housing units will provide a solid customer base for Downtown businesses and amenities and encourage more daytime and nighttime activity. Homes may be constructed as standalone buildings or may be located on the second story above a retail business or office.”

A market study for the Master Plan was prepared by the Natelson Dale Group. The study found that the population in Patterson is expected to grow and new multiple-family housing developments in the downtown can be a strong market for enticing development and help to support future retail and restaurant uses. The opportunities for housing in the downtown support the vision of the Master Plan to create compatible land uses and a vibrant 24/7 community.

The General Plan EIR discussed the need for more housing opportunities in Patterson based to a significant degree on many Bay Area workers desiring

to find more affordable housing opportunities in Central Valley communities. The EIR identified several large-scale development projects that could help fulfill the need for additional housing units for projected population increases.

The current Zoning Regulations allow for residential uses in the Downtown Core (DC) Zone with approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Proposed changes to the DC zone would still allow for a range of different housing types as discussed in the cited summary from the Master Plan above but would allow for a streamlined review of proposed new projects through an Administrative Review rather than a CUP process. Individual residential projects would be individually evaluated for potential environmental impacts, and based on that evaluation, the City would determine the appropriate level of CEQA review.

Conclusion: Adoption of the Master Plan would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the downtown since residential uses are currently allowed uses in the Downtown Core Zone and proposed zoning amendments would result in a more streamlined review but would still require compliance with City standards as an Administrative Review process.

5. Transportation

The Environmental Checklist in the CEQA Guidelines asks the following questions regarding Transportation factors in evaluating potential project impacts:

- a) *Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

One of the city's most defining characteristics is the unique and distinctive "circle and spoke" street pattern in the downtown core with El Centro Park and the Historical Museum at its core. Roadway "spokes" radiate out from the core, and there is an inner-ring roadway (Plaza Circle), a middle-ring alleyway network, and an outer ring roadway (El Circulo Avenue). There are also alley "spokes" connecting the circular ring with El Circulo Avenue and this pattern of circulation allows for roadway modification opportunities and the potential for varying traffic patterns to occur.

The Downtown Master Plan includes Chapter 5, Circulation, which identifies suggested improvements to existing bicycle and pedestrian mobility in a manner that fulfills the goals and vision of the General Plan and Transportation Infrastructure Master Plan and responds to community feedback. These improvements are recommendations, but not mandatory projects, that are focused on creating pedestrian friendly streets, providing additional bike lanes and racks, narrowing vehicle lanes in certain locations to improve pedestrian safety, and improving alleyways to be more inviting. In

addition, the Master Plan includes recommendations for potential changes and improvements to downtown parking. In addition, the Master Plan provides for additional residential uses in the downtown, which is anticipated to reduce the amount of traffic in the area.

The General Plan EIR includes the following policies that relate to highlighted circulation concepts in the Downtown Master Plan:

T-6.3 Parking lots in the downtown. *In the downtown, the amount of street frontage devoted to parking lots should be minimized, particularly along Las Palmas and Ward Avenue and around the Plaza.*

T-6.4 Public parking in the downtown. *The City shall investigate the purchase of vacant parcels within El Circulo for the development of public parking lots.*

T-7.1 Safe pedestrian and bike pathways. *The City shall create and maintain a safe and convenient system of pedestrian and bicycle pathways that encourages walking and bicycling as an alternative to driving. New development shall be required to pay its share of the costs for development of this pathway system.*

T-7.3 Bike routes. *The City shall establish a safe and convenient network of identified bicycle routes connecting new residential areas by the shortest possible routes with recreation, shopping, and employment areas within the city. The City shall cooperate with surrounding jurisdictions in designing and implementing an area-wide bikeway system.*

T-7.4 Separation of bike routes from motor vehicles. *Bicycle routes shall emphasize paths separated from vehicle traffic (Class I) to the maximum extent possible but shall also include bicycle lanes within public streets (Class II and III). The City shall limit on-street bicycle routes to those streets where the available roadway width and traffic volumes permit safe coexistence of bicycle and motor vehicle traffic.*

Conclusion: The types of Transportation improvements recommended in the Downtown Master Plan are consistent with the cited policies included in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the adoption of the Master Plan does not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and create any significant impacts. However, to further refine and investigate the circulation and transit recommendations in the Master Plan, the Implementation Action Plan includes a recommendation to prepare a traffic study to analyze specific proposals and outline a range of options.

In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(2) states: “Transportation projects that reduce, or have no impact on, vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact.” Furthermore, OPR’s Technical Advisory indicates that transportation projects that promote active transportation, such as transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, are presumed to reduce VMT and can be screened from further analysis. Also, projects that improve safety or traffic operations are not expected to increase VMT. Based on the foregoing, the range of recommendations in the Master Plan are consistent with the types of transportation projects listed in the OPR Technical Advisory that are not likely to lead to a substantial or measurable increase in VMT and are not subject to further VMT analysis.

DETERMINATION

In accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Patterson City Council has determined that this addendum to the Final General Plan EIR (SCH# 2010022035) is necessary to document “minor technical changes or additions” that have occurred in the project description since the General Plan EIR was originally prepared. The City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in this addendum in its consideration of the adoption of the Downtown Master Plan, and finds that the preparation of this Addendum is appropriate because:

1. None of the following circumstances included in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines have occurred which require a subsequent EIR:
 - a. The recommendations included in the Downtown Master Plan project changes do not result in new or more severe environmental impacts.
 - b. The circumstances related to adoption of the Downtown Master Plan will not require major changes to the EIR.
 - c. There is no new information within the Downtown Master Plan of substantial importance which affect the significant effects evaluated in the EIR or require any substantive changes to previously approved mitigation measures.
2. The proposed Downtown Master Plan is consistent with goals and policies of the General Plan and results in positive benefits to the community that do not conflict with the analysis included in the certified General Plan EIR.