AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING

CITY OF FAIRFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION

FAIRFIELD-SUISUN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT                 SEPTEMBER 23, 2020
2490 HILBORN ROAD, FAIRFIELD CA 94534                     6:00 P.M.

Notice to Public
Consistent with the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 regarding public meetings during the COVID-19 emergency, Planning Commissioners may attend the meeting telephonically. Members of the public can observe the meeting on Comcast Cable Channel 26, ATT U-Verse 99, and web-streamed live http://www.fairfield.ca.gov/live, or at www.youtube.com/user/FFCATV/live.

Due to COVID-19, a mask is required for entry and must be worn for the duration of the meeting when 6-foot distance from others is not possible. Please do not attend this meeting if you are experiencing symptoms such as coughing, sneezing, fever, difficulty breathing, or other flu-like symptoms.

Members of the public who wish to comment on matters before the Planning Commission, in lieu of doing so in person, may submit comments by emailing planning@fairfield.ca.gov.

I. ROLL CALL

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. INFORMATION ON PROVIDING PUBLIC COMMENTS
The public may comment on items not on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, provided that NO action may be taken on off-agenda items except as authorized by law. Off-agenda items from the public will be taken under consideration without discussion by the Commission and may be referred to staff. Comments will be accepted in person or by email at planning@fairfield.ca.gov. Identify your name, the item you wish to comment on, and the date of the meeting. All comments received by email prior to the start of an item will be read aloud for up to three minutes. For adjudicative public hearing items, e-mailed comments will be accepted and read aloud for up to three/four minutes if received prior to the close of the public hearing.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 12, 2020

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VII. SCHEDULED MATTERS

A. **7 FLAGS CAR WASH ELECTRONIC MESSAGE BOARD**
   Resolution No. 2020-13
   Sign Permit (SN2020-027)
   Location: 1206 N Texas Street (APN: 030-172-040)
   Applicant: Mark Barber, Fastsigns
   Owner: Jack Anthony

   Request by Mark Barber of Fastsigns for the approval of a Sign Permit to install a monument sign with an electronic message board for the new 7 Flags Car Wash at 1206 N Texas Street (APN: 030-172-040). The project has been deemed categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Section 15301. (Anna Noel, 707-428-7387, anoel@fairfield.ca.gov)

B. **SB743 IMPLEMENTATION (CEQA TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS THROUGH VEHICLE MILES TRAVELLED)**
   Resolution No. 2020-15
   Special Study: SS2020-003
   Location: Citywide
   Applicant: Rick Rosenbaum
   Property Owners: N/A

   Public Hearing on request by the City of Fairfield recommending the City Council Adopt The City Of Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures and the Thresholds of Significance and Mitigation Measures for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as Required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Implementing SB743 Addressing Environmental Review Of Transportation Impacts Under CEQA (Planner Brian K. Miller, 707-428-7446, bkmiller@fairfield.ca.gov; Transportation Engineer Garland Wong, 707-434-3803, gwong@fairfield.ca.gov)

C. **2020 BOARDING HOUSE REGULATIONS UPDATE (ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT)**
   Resolution No. 2020-16
   Ordinance Amendments (OA2020-009)
   Location: Citywide
   Applicant: City of Fairfield
   Property Owners: N/A
Public Hearing on request by the City of Fairfield for an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Fairfield amending various sections of Chapter 25, Article I of the Fairfield City Code (also known as the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Fairfield) amending the Definition Of “Boarding House,” amending the Development Standards for Boarding Houses, amending the Land Use Tables Permitting “Boarding House, Small” in all Residential Zoning Districts, Conditionally Permitting “Boarding House, Large” in the RM, RH, And RVH Zoning Districts, Conditionally Permitting “Boarding Houses, Small” and “Boarding Houses, Large” in the CN, CO, CT, CC, and CM Zoning Districts, Permitting “Boarding Houses, Small” in the HO, HR, and HWT Zoning Districts, and Permitting “Boarding Houses, Large” in the HWT And HTD Zoning Districts (Planner Brian K. Miller, 707-428-7446, bkmiller@fairfield.ca.gov)

VIII. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Director’s Report and Commissioner’s Comments

IX. ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT MEETING OF OCTOBER 14, 2020

SPECIAL NOTICES

PLEASE NOTE: The Planning Commission ordinarily does not take up any item on the agenda after 10:00 p.m. Discussion of any item which began before 10:00 p.m. will be completed regardless of time. If you have any item which is not discussed before the 10:00 p.m. cut-off, it will be among the first items discussed at the next meeting. The agendas have been prepared with the hope that all items scheduled will be able to be discussed within the time allowed.

PLEASE NOTE: Any party aggrieved or affected by a decision or determination by the Planning Commission in the administration of the City’s Development Regulations may file an appeal within 14 business days of the decision or determination using the appeal form available from the Community Development Department. To file an appeal, complete the form and submit it with the appropriate fee to: Community Development Department, 1000 Webster Street, Second Floor, Fairfield, CA 94533 no later than 14 business days from the date of this hearing. No postmarks will be accepted. For additional information, please contact the Community Development Department, 1000 Webster Street, Second Floor, Fairfield, CA 94533, or phone 707-428-7461.

PLEASE NOTE: The City of Fairfield is committed to providing meeting facilities that are accessible to persons with disabilities and/or have language barriers. To request meeting materials in alternative formats or other accommodation, please contact Lucia Morales, Administrative Assistant, at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting at 707-428-7466 or lmorales@fairfield.ca.gov.
I. ROLL CALL
Present:  Chairperson WOOD, Chuck
          Vice-Chairperson MATTHEWS, Chris
          Commissioner CHILDS, Jerome
          Commissioner COAN, Michael
          Commissioner CRUZEN, Melissa
          Commissioner EVANS, Lerecia
          Commissioner WESLEY, William

Absent:  None

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Cruzen

III. INFORMATION ON SPEAKER CARDS

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Commissioner Coan made a motion to approve the agenda as proposed. The motion was
seconded by Vice-Chairperson Matthews. Voting was done by roll call, and the motion was
approved unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 8, 2020
Vice-Chairperson Matthews made a motion to approve the minutes of July 8, 2020 as
proposed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Childs. Voting was done by roll
call, and the motion was approved unanimously, with Commissioner Coan abstaining.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS
No persons spoke during Public Comments, and no comments were received via the
planning@fairfield.ca.gov inbox.

VII. SCHEDULED MATTERS

ITEM A   7 FLAGS ELECTRONIC MESSAGE BOARD
Prior to the staff presentation, Commissioner Coan noted that he had a conflict on the
item and recused himself from the matter.

Associate Planner Anna Noel made a presentation on the item and answered questions.

The following person spoke during the public hearing:
• Mark Barber, Fast Signs, 600 Pennsylvania Street, Vallejo
• Jack Anthony, Valle Visa, Vallejo

No comments were received via the planning@fairfield.ca.gov inbox.

Vice-Chairperson Matthews made a motion to direct staff to return with a resolution to approve the project. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Childs. Voting was done by roll call, and the motion was approved unanimously, with Commissioner Coan abstaining.

ITEM B TRAIN STATION SPECIFIC PLAN OVERLAY DISTRICT AMENDMENT

RESOLUTION 2020-14

Senior Planner Meily Sheehan made a presentation on the item and answered questions.

The following person spoke during the public hearing:
• Rick Rosenbaum, 3675 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Lafayette

No comments were received via the planning@fairfield.ca.gov inbox.

Commissioner Coan made a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-14. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Childs. Voting was done by roll call, and the motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

ITEM A DIRECTOR’S REPORT AND COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS

Planning Division Manager Dave Feinstein noted that the August 26, 2020 meeting would likely be cancelled, but that there will be items for discussion in September, including a presentation on new requirements from the State on how to evaluate traffic impacts, and a discussion of options for facilitating “tiny houses”, including matters pertaining to building heights.

The Commission agreed that the 7-Flags sign should return at the next meeting that has other matters on its agenda.

Commissioner Coan requested information regarding the timing of improvements to Red Top Road. Mr. Feinstein indicated that staff would provide that information at the Commission’s next meeting.
IX. ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT MEETING OF AUGUST 26, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID FEINSTEIN
Planning Commission Secretary
STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: September 23, 2020
To: Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission
From: Community Development Department
Subject: ITEM A: 7 Flags Car Wash Electronic Message Board

Resolution No. 2020-13
Sign Permit (SN2020-027)
Location: 1206 N Texas Street (APN: 030-172-040)
Applicant: Mark Barber, Fastsigns
Owner: Jack Anthony

Request by Mark Barber of Fastsigns for the approval of a Sign Permit to install a monument sign with an electronic message board for the new 7 Flags Car Wash at 1206 N Texas Street (APN: 030-172-040). The project has been deemed categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Section 15301: Existing Facilities. (Anna Noel, 707-428-7387, anoe@fairfield.ca.gov)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project involves the installation of a monument sign with an LED electronic message board for an approved carwash. The monument sign will be installed on the southeasterly corner of the project site, facing N Texas Street. The whole sign structure will measure 8 feet in height by 7 feet in length. The total sign area is 54 square feet, which is below the 60-square-foot maximum size for a monument sign on the site. The electronic message board component of the sign will measure 2 feet in height by 7 feet in length, which is 25% of the total sign area.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
The proposed electronic message board is one of four requested signs - two wall signs and a second monument sign. The electronic message board was reviewed at the August 12, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. While staff recommended denial of the sign, the Planning Commission indicated support of the sign, and directed staff to bring the project back to Commission with a resolution of approval.

ANALYSIS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION
A. Sign Ordinance Consistency: The proposed sign is regulated by the City's Sign Ordinance. The Sign Ordinance allows for the installation of one monument sign per street frontage. Monument signs may be placed on-site, outside of public right-of-way. Because the proposed sign will be located along an arterial street, the total square footage of the sign may be as much as 60 square feet. Of that area, 25%
may be changeable copy signage. The electronic message board on the proposed sign occupies 14 square feet, which is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Sign Ordinance.

B. Environmental Review: Staff has determined that the project is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under CEQA, the State has identified a list of classes of projects, which have been determined to not have a significant effect on the environment and are therefore exempt from the requirements of CEQA, as a result. The proposed project is exempt under Class 1 per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) in that sign installation as part of an approved project is considered a minor modification.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 2020-13 for the proposed monument sign with electronic message board for the 7 Flags Car Wash at 1206 N Texas Street.

Attachments:
1. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2020-13
2. Plans: 8½" x 11"
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FAIRFIELD
APPROVING SIGN PERMIT (SN2020-027) FOR A MONUMENT SIGN WITH
ELECTRONIC MESSAGE BOARD AT 1206 NORTH TEXAS STREET (APN: 030-172-040)

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FAIRFIELD HEREBY RECITES,
FINDS, DETERMINES, ORDERS, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. On May 7, 2020, a Sign Permit application (SN2020-027) for a proposed
monument sign with electronic message board for the future 7-Flags Car Wash located
at 1206 North Texas Street (APN: 030-172-040) (the “Project”) was properly filed with the
Community Development Department in accordance with the rules and regulations
governing the official filing of such applications.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission has held a duly noticed public hearing on
August 12, 2020. The City staff presented substantial factual information regarding the
proposed Project in staff reports and through oral presentations before the Commission,
and the Planning Commission considered all public testimony and information presented
during the public hearing regarding this application.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission has determined that the Project is categorically
exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA),
pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301 Existing Facilities.

SECTION 4. The Planning Commission adopts the following findings in support of this
Sign Permit request:

(a) The project is consistent with the applicable regulations of the Sign Ordinance
as outlined in Section 25.1301. The proposed sign meets or exceeds the
applicable regulations for an electronic message board.

(b) The project is consistent with the overall purpose of the Sign Ordinance as
outlined in Section 25.1301. The sign is of high-quality design, constructed of
durable materials. The proposed sign is appropriate for the context, as the
electronic message board is oriented towards North Texas Street, which is
visible to both north- and south-bound traffic. Finally, the sign is designed to
not impact the life, health, property, and public welfare. The City of Fairfield
reserves the right to require reasonable modification of illumination intensity, if
necessary.
SECTION 5. Based upon the written findings set forth in sections 3 and 4 of this Resolution, the Planning Commission hereby approves:

(a) Plans for the monument sign and electronic message board for Sign Permit SN2020-027, as proposed in Exhibit “A”.

SECTION 6. The record of proceedings shall be located at the City’s Community Development Department and the Director of Community Development shall be the custodian of such documents.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 23th day of September, 2020.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Jerome CHILDS / Michael COAN / Melissa CRUZEN / Lericia EVANS / Chris MATTHEWS (Vice) / William WESLEY / Charles WOOD (Chair)

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: __________________________

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: __________________________

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: __________________________

CHARLES WOOD, Chairperson

ATTEST:

______________________________
DAVID FEINSTEIN, Secretary
PROPOSED LOCATION
7 ft wide Sign, 6' Prop Line Setback
X is center of 24-30" diameter drilled footing
*Depth TBD

1/2" = 10' (at FULL size)
SCOPE: Fabricate & Instll
A: CAR WASH Letters
B: Wall Sign
C: Wall Sign
D: Informational Letters
E: Monument Sign

1206 N Texas St.
Fairfield, CA
Sales: Mark Barber  Design: Gary Stratton
Project: New Signage
SIGN CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS:
6" sq tube pole
Angle iron framing & supports
Aluminum skins
Polycarbonate sign faces
LED modules & power supplies
Stone veneer (to match bldg)

* 8' ht measured from grade adjacent to sign footing, per 25.1310

Electronic Message Center Features:
- Four locks per module
- Redundant/Dual Data Ports
- Redundant/Dual Power Ports
- Module independent power run
- Module independent data run via Ethernet vs. ribbon cable
- Module suspension service cable
- Front removable
- Common module size across pixels allows the upgrade to a higher resolution at a later date
- Zero trim design
- Mil Lab UL-481 listing
- FCC Compliance
- Surge Protection
- Automatic Dimming
- Time and Temperature
- Temperature Controlled Fans
SCOPE: Fabricate & Install
A: CAR WASH Letters
B: Wall Sign
C: Wall Sign
D: Informational Letters
E: Monument Sign

7 Flags Car Wash
1206 N Texas St
Fairfield, CA

Sales: Mark Barber
Design: Gary Stratton
Project: New Signage

FASTSIGNS
600 Pennsylvania St.
Vallejo, CA 94590
Ph: 707-642-2233
www.fastsigns.com/503
C45-1023488
Individual LED illuminated letters
White faces, black returns

31.83 sq ft

Individual LED illuminated letters
White faces, black returns

21 sf ft (Informational Only, NOT visible from Public Right of Way)

LED Class 2 Wiring and Mounting Detail

UL Approved

12v Power Supply
110v On/Off Switch

Disconnect Switch Located on Power Supply Enclosure in Attic (12v LED on exterior)

SCOPE: Fabricate & Install
A: CAR WASH Letters
B: Wall Sign
C: Wall Sign
D: Informational Letters
E: Monument Sign

Project: New Signage
Signage: Sq Footage:
A: CAR WASH Letters 31.83
B: Wall Sign 54
C: Wall Sign 37.5
D: Informational Letters 21" (Not visible from Public Right of Way)
E: Monument Sign 48

Sq Footage: A, B, C, E: 171.33
Sq Footage: D: 21 (informational/directional only)

FRONTAGES: Texas St: 175'
Bell Ave: 85'

SCOPE: Fabricate & Install
A: CAR WASH Letters
B: Wall Sign
C: Wall Sign
D: Informational Letters
E: Monument Sign

FASTSIGNS
600 Pennsylvania St.
Vallejo, CA 94589
Ph: 707-642-2233
www.fastsigns.com/503
C45-1023468
STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: September 23, 2020

To: Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Community Development Department

Subject: ITEM B: SB743 IMPLEMENTATION (CEQA TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS THROUGH VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT))
Resolution No. 2020-15
Special Study: SS2020-003
Location: Citywide
Applicant: City of Fairfield
Property Owners: N/A

Public Hearing on request by the City of Fairfield recommending the City Council Adopt The City Of Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures and the Thresholds of Significance and Mitigation Measures for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as Required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Implementing SB743 Addressing Environmental Review Of Transportation Impacts Under CEQA (Planner Brian K. Miller, 707-428-7446, bkmiller@fairfield.ca.gov; Transportation Engineer Garland Wong, 707-434-3803, gwong@fairfield.ca.gov)

BACKGROUND
A project’s impacts on transportation is one of the key environmental topics reviewed by the City under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). When the City determines that a project may have “significant impacts,” the City may require mitigation measures such as changes in project scope and scale, new or modified traffic signals construction of new turning lanes, or even investment in alternative transportation infrastructure.

As of July 1, 2020, State law and State CEQA Guidelines mandate a change in how lead agencies review transportation impacts under CEQA. The purpose of this workshop is to review and recommend to Council a strategy for project environmental review consistent with the new State mandate.

CEQA and Thresholds of Significance
CEQA requires a lead agency to review the impacts a project would have on the existing environment, to disclose those impacts to the public and decision makers, and to address those impacts that are deemed "significant". CEQA defines a “significant impact” as a “substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment,” and places potential impacts in four categories: (1) no impact; (2) less than significant impact; (3) less...
than significant impact with the adoption of mitigation measures; and (4) significant and unavoidable impact.

A "threshold of significance" for a given environmental impact defines the level of effect above which the lead agency will consider impacts to be significant, and below which it will consider impacts to be less than significant.

**Level of Service**

In the past, the threshold used by most lead agencies for determining a significant transportation impact under CEQA was through Level of Service (LOS). Level of Service is a measure of the vehicle delay(s) faced by drivers at key intersections or arterials. An analysis of LOS begins by creating a model to study the existing volume and delay data at affected locations and then incorporating vehicle trips anticipated to be generated by the project. Ultimately, the LOS analysis is measuring the impact of new trips on the operation of the existing and proposed transportation network.

The City of Fairfield General Plan establishes a threshold of significance for transportation impacts based on measured delay (Level of Service "A" through "F") on roadways impacted by proposed projects. In Fairfield, the LOS threshold of significance for purposes of CEQA is "D" for arterial streets during peak afternoon commute periods (PM peak hour) which represented some delay but not gridlock, "C" for collector streets, and "B" for local streets.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled**

The State enacted Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) in 2013 with the goal of balancing the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). To accomplish these goals, the legislation directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop different metrics for identifying effects on transportation under CEQA. The final OPR Technical Advisory was released in December of 2018 and identified "vehicle miles traveled" (VMT) per day as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts for land use projects, land use plans, and transportation projects. The Natural Resources Agency also updated the CEQA Guidelines to require lead agencies to use VMT and prohibit the use of LOS or vehicle delay as a criterion for transportation impacts under CEQA. However, Fairfield can continue to review LOS impacts for their consistency with the adopted General Plan standard.

VMT is a measure of the number of trips and total distance in miles that a driver would have to travel between their origin and destination. In general, projects that are farther away from other land uses or that lack nearby transit options tend to generate higher VMT, while projects located closer to a variety of land uses or near high quality transit generate lower VMT. When analyzing proposed projects under CEQA, VMT has previously been used to identify other impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and air quality. Under the updated CEQA Guidelines, VMT per resident, per employee, per student, etc., replaces LOS in measuring impacts on transportation. Whereas LOS was a measure of the delay experienced by users of the transportation infrastructure, VMT
measures the transportation efficiency of the proposed project with respect to the actual vehicle trips generated by the project.

The CEQA Guidelines and OPR Technical Advisory identify how certain types of projects might be presumed to have less than significant VMT impacts. This guidance will expedite review and approval of certain types of projects. Projects that are near transit, infill housing, centrally located office, locally serving retail, transit projects, bike projects, pedestrian enhancements, livability enhancements, street safety improvements (road diets and street calming) are all examples of projects that can typically be screened from further VMT impact review under CEQA. Note, however, that a project could still be found to have a significant transportation impact if it conflicts with existing plans, results in hazardous conditions, or results in inadequate emergency access.

Applying VMT as the measure of transportation impact will help create or encourage better more walkable neighborhoods that have access to everyday needs. The infill and transit-oriented development supported by VMT analysis can potentially help reduce overall vehicle use, reduce energy consumption, help preserve natural and agricultural lands, and reduce water consumption through more compact land use planning. Further, lower VMT is associated with additional benefits such as placemaking (creation of quality public spaces), reduction in other air pollutant emissions and water pollution, long term reduction in traffic congestion, and improvements in safety and public health, among others.

The CEQA Guidelines required lead agencies to begin using the new VMT metric on July 1, 2020. This implementation can occur on a project-by-project basis, but it is more streamlined and effective when adopted as a local threshold of significance. The VMT process requires a significant change in how the City reviews development projects. The City retained DKS Associates to assist the City with developing this new approach for environmental review under SB743. The project included several key elements:

- Identifying current baseline VMT levels for the multiple traffic analysis zones in the City.
- Developing thresholds for significant impacts under CEQA.
- Using VMT screening to identify project sizes or scopes which can be assumed to have less than significant VMT impacts thereby eliminating the need for further review under CEQA.
- Identifying areas where existing VMT levels are below the thresholds of significance and where new development is likely to also have less than significant impacts under the State requirements.
- Developing a range of project-level mitigation measures to reduce VMT.
- Updating the City Transportation Analysis Guidelines to address changes in CEQA.
- Identifying future City-wide or area-wide strategies for reducing VMT levels. This work would be addressed during the forthcoming General Plan Update.
As required by law, staff have already begun using the recommended screening criteria and thresholds identified in the revised Transportation Analysis Guidelines to review new applications. As under current standards, most smaller projects will continue to be “screened out” under the new VMT standards. However, larger and more complex projects that may generate high vehicle miles travelled numbers will now need to undertake comprehensive VMT analyses as part of their project submittals and environmental review.

DISCUSSION
As part of their scope, DKS Associates (Consultant) prepared a series of Technical Memorandums during their SB743 work for the City. The final document, Fairfield SB743 Implementation Procedures (Exhibit A), summarizes the consultants’ recommendations for implanting CEQA review under SB743.

Thresholds of Significance and Screening Projects from Review
In order to fully implement SB743, the City needs to adopt a “threshold of significance” for Vehicle Miles Traveled for use in CEQA review of new projects. Based on State guidance, the consultant and staff are recommending that the threshold of significance be set at 85% of the current calculated baseline VMT per land use unit, as calculated over the Fairfield traffic model area (15% below current calculated VMT levels). The typical VMT rates for various land uses are summarized in Table 1 in the Implementation Procedures memo (Exhibit A).

This threshold of significance will guide staff in identifying impacts under CEQA. As noted in the memo, the City’s review process will also continue to address locally identified transportation issues such as safety, circulation and even LOS analysis, although the latter no longer constitutes a transportation impact under CEQA. The threshold of significance also guides the screening out of projects that may not need further VMT review under CEQA. The process for reviewing and screening projects is illustrated in the flow chart on Page 9 in the Implementation Procedures memo.

Screening can be based on several criteria. Some smaller projects can be screened as less than significant under State guidelines and the consultants’ analysis of existing VMT generation rates in Fairfield. For example, an infill single family subdivision with fewer than 11 units can be presumed to have no significant VMT impacts (Table 3 in the Implementation Procedures Memo (See Exhibit A)). For other land uses, the State guidelines use net increase in VMT as the criteria. What that means in practice is that local-serving retail (typically less than 50,000 square feet) and smaller scale medical office uses can be screened from further environmental review, as these uses generate few new trips and are likely to serve the local population, reducing the need for people to drive farther away. In the case of industrial uses, State guidance specifies that the VMT analysis pertains only to passenger vehicles and light duty trucks, and the analysis does not address heavy truck trips. Buildings with office uses and employment could use the office land use screening threshold (5,000 square feet).

Other project types that State guidelines will allow the City to screen from further review include low income housing and housing within ½ mile of a major transit facility. In
Fairfield, this would include some properties in the Train Station Specific Plan Area as well as much of downtown Fairfield. The guidelines also allow the City to screen from further review transportation and infrastructure projects unlikely to generate significant net VMT, such as maintenance and rehabilitation projects, road diets, and pedestrian, bicycle or transit improvements.

Finally, the recommended *Implementation* program allows the City to take into account those areas in Fairfield where existing VMT levels fall below the 85% threshold. The rationale here is that the area likely already has a good mix of uses and adding additional uses in this area provides for less and/or shorter trips and bundling of trips. State guidelines will allow the City to exempt from further VMT analysis many infill sites in Central Fairfield, as illustrated on the maps in the *Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures* memorandum (Exhibit A).

**Analysis and Mitigation**

Not all projects will be screened from further review under the new VMT metric. For projects in areas identified as “above” the 85% threshold or that do not meet the size or land use screening criteria, further analysis will be required. Project consultants will be required to use the City’s traffic model to analyze VMT generation rates for their project.

Many of these projects will exceed the threshold of significance, meaning that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. As with all CEQA impacts, significant transportation impacts will require mitigation. The State guidelines published by OPR in response to SB743 establish criteria for mitigation measures (Table 4 in the *Implementation Procedures Memo* (Exhibit A)), which include:

- Increasing project density
- Mixed use development (“Diversity of development”)
- Incorporating affordable housing
- Project design (to reduce trips and trip length)
- Pedestrian network improvements
- Parking demand management

As the *Implementation Procedures* memo makes clear, mitigation measures may be of limited effectiveness in mitigating VMT impacts for large projects located in high VMT areas. In cases where it is not clear that impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (or if a project has other types of significant environmental impacts), CEQA may require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Notably, the forthcoming General Plan Update represents an opportunity to fully integrate the VMT concept and larger scale mitigation measures into the City’s development framework. These larger scale strategies have already been proposed for the Train Station Specific Plan, and the City will be working with developers in that area to recognize the inherent VMT reduction strategies in the Plan for their projects. A similar approach to planning would be appropriate for the City’s General Plan Update.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
Adoption of a new local CEQA threshold of significance for VMT impacts and the adoption of the Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures will not have a significant environmental impact and is exempt from CEQA review under Section 15308 of the CEQA Guidelines. The actions are being undertaken to comply with a State mandate (SB 743) and will be used in a regulatory process (CEQA review) that involves procedures for the protection of the natural environment.

RECOMMENDATION
Adopt Resolution 2020-15 recommending the City Council adopt a threshold of significance and mitigation measures for local CEQA review, implementing SB 743, and authorizing the Community Development Director to use the procedures and guidelines found in Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures (Exhibit A).

Attachments:
1. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2020-15, with attached:
   - Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FAIRFIELD RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE CITY OF FAIRFIELD SENATE BILL 743 IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES AND THE THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT) AS REQUIRED BY THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) GUIDELINES IMPLEMENTING SB743, TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS UNDER CEQA

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FAIRFIELD HEREBY RECITES, FINDS, DETERMINES, ORDERS, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Procedural Findings.

A. The California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines) encourage public agencies to develop and publish generally applicable “thresholds of significance” to be used in determining the significance of a project’s environmental effects. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(a) defines a threshold of significance as “an identifiable quantitative, qualitative or performance level of a particular environmental effect, noncompliance with which means the effect will normally be determined to be significant by the agency and compliance with which means the effect normally will be determined to be less than significant.”

B. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(b) requires that thresholds of significance must be adopted by ordinance, resolution, rule, or regulations, developed through a public review process, and be supported by substantial evidence. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(c), when adopting thresholds of significance, a public agency may consider thresholds of significance adopted or recommended by other public agencies provided that the decision of the agency is supported by substantial evidence.

C. Senate Bill (SB) 743, enacted in 2013 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21099, required changes to the CEQA Guidelines regarding the criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects. In 2018, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) proposed, and the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted, new CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 that identifies vehicle miles traveled (VMT) – meaning the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project per land use unit per day – as the most appropriate metric to evaluate a project’s transportation impacts. As a result, automobile delay, as measured by Level of Service (LOS) and other similar metrics, no longer constitutes a significant environmental effect under CEQA. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 went into effect on July 1, 2020.
D. The City of Fairfield retained DKS Associates (Consultant) to develop a strategy for local environmental review of transportation impacts using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), the new metric.

E. Staff and the Consultant team in response to the State guidelines, have developed a *City of Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures* which contains a goal of 15% reduction below current VMT levels and identifies thresholds of significance and screening criteria for new development projects. The screening criteria include project location, size, and land use.

F. Staff and the Consultant team, using State guidelines, have also developed mitigation options for projects which cannot be determined to have less than significant impacts on the environment and screened from further VMT analysis using the screening criteria.

G. The Planning Commission has held a duly noticed public hearing on September 23, 2020. City staff and the Consultant team presented substantial factual information regarding the proposed standards and criteria in staff reports and through oral presentations before the Commission, and the Planning Commission considered all public testimony and information presented during the public hearing regarding this program.

Section 2. Based on the information presented by staff, the Planning Commission has determined that the proposed action, which is consistent with SB 743, is exempt from CEQA review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15308, as an action involving procedures for the protection of the environment.

Section 3. The Planning Commission hereby finds the thresholds of significance and mitigation measures identified in the *City of Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures*, as attached hereto as Exhibit A, have been developed through a public review process and are supported by substantial evidence, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7.

Section 4. The Planning Commission hereby recommends the City Council adopt the *City of Fairfield Senate Bill 743 Implementation Procedures* and the thresholds of significance and mitigation measures contained therein, as attached hereto as Exhibit A.
Section 5. The record of proceedings shall be located at the City's Community Development Department and the Director of Community Development shall be the custodian of such documents.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 23rd day of September, 2020.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Jerome CHILDS / Michael COAN / Melissa CRUZEN / Lerecia EVANS / Chris MATTHEWS (Vice) / William WESLEY / Charles WOOD (Chair)

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: __________________________________________________________________________

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: ______________________________________________________________________

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: ______________________________________________________________________

CHARLES WOOD, Chairperson

ATTEST:

DAVID FEINSTEIN, Secretary
FAIRFIELD SENATE BILL 743 IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES

AUGUST 2020

PREPARED FOR:

CITY OF FAIRFIELD
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BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) and the resulting changes to the CEQA Guidelines published by the Natural Resources Agency, local agencies may no longer use measures of vehicle delay such as Level of Service (LOS) to quantify transportation impacts on the environment. While agencies may continue to maintain LOS standards and similar measures as a matter of local policy and for project analysis, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) has been codified in the CEQA Guidelines as the most appropriate measure for measuring transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act. This change applies statewide as of July 1, 2020.

The change from LOS to VMT for CEQA purposes requires revision of the City’s Transportation Impact Report guidelines, which should address VMT thresholds of significance, screening, and mitigation procedures. This report summarizes previously provided technical material on recommended thresholds of significance and mitigation strategies. Proposed screening and analysis procedures as well as integration into the City’s Transportation Impact Report guidelines are also discussed.

The recommendations on VMT thresholds and mitigation strategies in this report draw heavily on technical guidance published by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and an evaluation of greenhouse gas and VMT mitigation strategies from the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). These documents are listed in the References section. Standards of practice will evolve as jurisdictions use the revised CEQA guidelines and it is expected that the City of Fairfield will refine its procedures over time.

OVERVIEW AND REPORT ORGANIZATION

Evaluation of projects for potential VMT impacts will take place in parallel with the City’s existing transportation analysis procedures.

Section 1 summarizes the recommended thresholds of significance for VMT and approaches to VMT analysis for several types of projects.

Section 2 describes screening of land use projects for VMT impacts. Projects that meet at least one of the screening criteria would not need to perform a formal VMT analysis. Among other screening options, residential and office projects located in low VMT generating areas may be presumed to have less than significant impacts. Rates of VMT per land use unit across different parts of the City have been calculated and can be compared to the recommended thresholds of significance, which are discussed in Section 1.

Section 3 covers VMT mitigation strategies for those projects that have been analyzed and found to have VMT impacts. Methods for assessing the effectiveness of mitigation strategies are also addressed in this section.
SECTION 1. APPROACH TO VMT ANALYSIS AND THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Projects that are not screened out (see Section 2) will require a formal VMT analysis. Projects that are not screened or those that would significantly alter existing or planned land uses will require project specific VMT calculations. These projects can be analyzed by incorporating the project land uses into the Fairfield travel demand model and running a project scenario. Scripts and a VMT analysis spreadsheet have been developed to aid in this process. Alternatively, and with approval from the City, projects can be assessed with a stand-alone analysis (e.g. VMT based on the market area of a retail establishment) or use other available tools such as the Napa-Solano Activity Based Model.

RESIDENTIAL AND OFFICE PROJECTS

Table 1 summarizes VMT thresholds calculated as described in Tech Memo #4 – Baseline VMT calculations. The proposed thresholds are 85 percent of the existing baseline VMT per land use unit, as calculated over the Fairfield model area for office and residential uses. These recommendations are consistent with OPR guidance. Projects expected to daily generate VMT per unit under the applicable threshold could be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact for CEQA purposes. Projects expected to generate VMT over the applicable threshold of significance would have to show how VMT could be mitigated to avoid a finding of impact.

For example, a single-family residential development expected to generate 50 VMT per unit could be presumed to have a less than significant impact and no further analysis would be necessary. A single-family residential project expected to generate 70 VMT per unit would need to reduce VMT per unit by 8.2 VMT per unit (12% or 8.2/70). Similarly, a multifamily residential project generating 40 VMT per unit could be presumed to have a less than significant impact while one generating 50 VMT per unit would have to propose 5.9 VMT (12%) per unit in mitigations to avoid an impact. Office projects would be compared to the applicable threshold of significance (54.3 VMT per 1000 square feet) in a similar manner.

Note that for residential and office uses, the thresholds of significance are given in terms of VMT rates and the effectiveness of mitigation measures will be given in terms of percent decrease. More information on the estimation of VMT rates and mitigation measures may be found in the final section of this memorandum.
### TABLE 1: RECOMMENDED VMT THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE
(RECOMMENDED THRESHOLDS IN BOLD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE (UNIT)</th>
<th>AVERAGE VMT PER LAND USE UNIT</th>
<th>85% AVG. VMT/UNIT</th>
<th>85% AVG. VMT/CAPITA OR EMPLOYEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (SFDU)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL (MFDU)</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE (1000 SQUARE FEET)</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a) The VMT rates shown account for VMT that occurs outside the Fairfield area, where applicable.  
b) Conversion from VMT per land use unit as calculated from model output to VMT/capita or VMT/employee is shown for reference and comparison purposes. Occupancy factors are derived from the American Community Survey 2012-2016 Five-Year Estimates. Office employment assumes 325 square feet per employee.

### OTHER LAND USE PROJECT TYPES

**Retail** - The recommended threshold for retail projects is any increase in total VMT that occurs as a result of the project (i.e. any increase in VMT that occurs anywhere as a result of the project). The OPR technical advisory gives 50,000 square feet for an individual retail establishment as a general guideline to distinguishing local from regional serving retail. Projects consisting of multiple spaces totaling more than 50,000 square feet might also be considered local serving retail if no single establishment is larger. For example, neighborhood centers1 - convenience oriented centers of up to 125,000 square feet leasable area and typically anchored by a supermarket - could be considered local-serving.

**Medical** – While calculation of baseline VMT rates for medical land uses is possible using the model outputs, we recommend that medical projects be analyzed in terms of net VMT impacts in a manner similar to retail projects. As with retail, providing additional opportunities for healthcare may reduce the lengths of trips made for this purpose. By this line of reasoning, most freestanding clinics, medical practices, and nursing homes could be assumed less than significant with respect to VMT impacts. Larger or regional-serving facilities such as hospitals would likely require an environmental document that considers employee and patient VMT separately.

**Industrial** – The CEQA guidelines specify that the VMT to be considered when analyzing transportation impacts is passenger vehicle VMT. Truck trips, often the predominant type at industrial facilities, would not come into play as a transportation impact (although they would be considered under noise or air quality). While baseline VMT rates can be developed for industrial

---

land uses using the Fairfield travel demand model, the model does not distinguish between heavy and light duty vehicle traffic and a threshold of significance set using the model is likely to be unnecessarily restrictive. Instead, industrial land uses can be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to determine the net light-duty VMT impacts of proposed projects. If employee travel is the predominant source of light duty trips at a facility, this component might be assessed against the equivalent VMT per employee threshold for office land uses.

**Mixed Use Projects** - For mixed use projects, OPR recommends either analyzing each component of the proposed project separately or focusing on the predominant land use. For example, a multifamily residential project with some convenience retail might focus on the VMT impacts of the residential use, especially since the retail component could potentially be presumed less than significant if small enough.

**Redevelopment Projects** - Analysis of redevelopment projects should consider the VMT of the previously existing use to account for the net impact.

**TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS**

This section discusses the approach to estimating VMT impacts of transportation infrastructure projects. Addition of through lanes or new roadways may induce vehicular travel and thus have a potentially significant VMT impact. The recommended approach for estimating the VMT impacts of such projects is to assess the net change over the area that the new or expanded facility is expected to influence. This calculation may be done with a travel demand model or applying an elasticity of demand as described in the OPR guidelines.

Note that new local roadways built primarily to provide access to individual properties would not need to be analyzed separately as their VMT impact is accounted for in the analysis of the new land use. Also note that there are a wide variety of infrastructure projects that are not expected to induce VMT per OPR guidance. Transportation infrastructure projects that are presumed not to have a significant VMT impact include:

- Maintenance and rehabilitation projects
- Reduction in the number of through lanes (i.e. road diets)
- Addition of capacity on local or collector streets in conjunction with pedestrian, bicycle or transit improvements
- Traffic signal retiming
- Installation of roundabouts or traffic circles
- Facilities for non-motorized travel (bike paths or trails)

Caltrans has published documents related to SB 743 implementation as it applies to state highway system. These include the draft Caltrans Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (Draft TISG, February 28, 2020), the draft Caltrans Transportation Analysis Under CEQA (TAC) and the draft Caltrans Transportation Analysis Framework (TAF).
SECTION 2. SCREENING PROCEDURES AND THE TIR GUIDELINES

Screening procedures will play an important part in streamlining project analysis. First, projects may be presumed to have less than significant VMT impacts due to size, proximity to high quality transit, and housing affordability. Second, projects may be screened according to location (see Figures 1-3). Projects located in areas that have been shown to generate VMT below the selected threshold of significance may be presumed to have less than significant impacts and no further analysis or mitigation would be required.

The City will likely want to retain its existing LOS standards for the time being for consistency with the current General Plan. Therefore, projects may be screened from requiring VMT analysis for CEQA purposes but still require analysis of LOS, safety, access, site circulation, and other topics to meet local requirements. These analyses, which will occur in parallel or in addition to CEQA VMT analysis, can continue to inform conditions of project approval by the City. The flowchart shown as Figure 1 illustrates how the screening process would work in conjunction with local transportation analysis required by the City.

Currently, the City’s Transportation Impact Report Guidelines require only a trip generation memo for smaller projects, defined as those with fewer than 100 peak hour project trips for non-residential uses or 50 peak hour trips for residential uses. Projects generating 50 or 100 peak hour trips or more will continue to require additional local transportation analysis topics to be addressed, including trip distribution, assignment, LOS, and sight distance. Table 2 shows the project size for typical land uses that would fall under the local transportation analysis thresholds.

Once a project’s local transportation analysis requirements are determined, VMT analysis requirements can be determined, following the process shown in the flowchart. The VMT screening criteria are further described below.

SCREENING CRITERION: SMALL OR INFILL PROJECTS

OPR advises that projects generating fewer than 110 trips per day could be presumed to have less than significant VMT impacts. Table 3 shows the maximum project size that would correspond to this threshold based on average ITE trip generation rates for selected land uses. This criterion could be applied in conjunction with the City’s current guidelines that require only a trip generation memorandum for smaller projects.

SCREENING CRITERION: LOW INCOME HOUSING

OPR advises that residential projects consisting of 100 percent affordable housing units may be presumed to have less than significant VMT impacts. The City may wish to specify additional criteria such as proximity to high quality transit or location within a priority development area for application of this screening option.
FIGURE 1. SCREENING PROCESS FOR TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS
TABLE 2: PROJECT SIZE THRESHOLDS FOR LOCAL TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS SCREENING
(PROJECTS GENERATING NO MORE THAN 50 PEAK HOUR TRIPS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>ITE CODE</th>
<th>SIZE THRESHOLD</th>
<th>AM PEAK HOUR TRIPS</th>
<th>PM PEAK HOUR TRIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTAL</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>50 units</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTAL - LOW RISE</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>90 units</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTAL - MID RISE</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>113 units</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTAL - HIGH RISE</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>138 units</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-RISE RESIDENTIAL WITH 1ST FLOOR COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>138 units</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL OFFICE BUILDING a</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a) Houses single tenant and is no more than 5,000 sf

TABLE 3: PROJECT SIZE THRESHOLDS FOR VMT SCREENING
(GENERATION OF 110 OR FEWER DAILY TRIPS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>ITE CODE</th>
<th>SIZE THRESHOLD</th>
<th>DAILY TRIP GENERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTAL</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>11 units</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTAL - LOW RISE</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15 units</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTAL - MID RISE</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>20.0 units</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTAL - HIGH RISE</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>24 units</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-RISE RESIDENTIAL WITH 1ST FLOOR COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>32 units</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL OFFICE BUILDING</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>5,000 square feet</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE TENANT OFFICE BUILDING</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>9,750 square feet</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SCREENING CRITERION: LOCAL SERVING RETAIL

The OPR technical guidance recommends that retail projects be analyzed in terms of net VMT impacts (i.e. total VMT that would occur with and without the project). By increasing retail opportunities closer to homes and workplaces, local serving retail may decrease overall VMT if it substitutes for longer trips. OPR advises that projects of 50,000 or fewer square feet for an individual retail establishment may be used to distinguish local serving retail from more regional establishments that draw customers from greater distances.
SCREENING CRITERION: PROXIMITY TO TRANSIT

Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that residential or office projects within one-half mile of an existing major transit station or stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor can be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact. Per OPR guidance and Public Resources Code § 21064.3, major transit stops are defined as a site containing an existing rail transit station or the intersection of at least two bus routes with a frequency of service interval of at least 15 minutes during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. High-quality transit corridors are defined as having fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during the peak commute hours. In Fairfield, the two rail stations would meet the definition of major transit stop. None of the bus routes in Fairfield currently operate at 15-minute frequencies but in combination may meet this criterion at the Fairfield Transit Center.

Figure 2 shows parcels with at least 25 percent of their area falling within one-half mile of a major transit stop or rail station. Office or residential projects located within these parcels may be presumed to have less than significant VMT impacts. The City may wish to set additional criteria such as provision or availability of active transportation infrastructure for application of this screening option.

PROJECT LOCATION SCREENING

The OPR technical guidance discusses screening of residential and office projects based on location. Residential and office projects that locate in areas with low VMT, and that incorporate similar features will also tend to generate similarly low VMT. Maps showing areas of the City that exhibit low VMT characteristics can be used to screen residential and office projects from needing to prepare a CEQA VMT analysis.

Baseline VMT maps have been prepared for the City of Fairfield using the City’s travel demand model. Development of the 2020 land use scenario and technical procedures for calculating baseline VMT rates per unit of land use are described in the technical memos compiled as appendices to this report.

Figures 3-5 show the VMT generation rates for residential and office uses across the City with respect to the recommended thresholds of significance. These VMT rates have been calculated for the entire area covered by the Fairfield travel demand model and incorporate estimates of VMT that occurs outside the Fairfield area.

The maps show the VMT generation rates for each land use type by Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ):

- Projects located in TAZs that are shown in green would be presumed to generate VMT at 85 percent or less of the baseline average rate for the Fairfield area, have less than significant transportation impacts, and would require no further VMT analysis.
FIGURE 2. PARCELS WITHIN A HALF MILE OF MAJOR TRANSIT STOPS
FIGURE 3. SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL VMT BY TAZ

VMT Rates by TAZ

- N/A
- Up to 85% Average VMT/SFDU
- Greater than 85% Average to Average VMT/SFDU
- Greater than Average VMT/SFDU

(VMT Rates calculated across model area and with adjusted trip lengths for I-X and X-I trips.)
FIGURE 4. MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL VMT BY TAZ

VMT Rates by TAZ

- 0.000000
- Up to 85% Average VMT/MFDU
- Greater than 85% Average to Average VMT/MFDU
- Greater than Average VMT/MFDU
- City of Fairfield

(VMT Rates calculated across model area and with adjusted trip lengths for I-X and X-I trips.)

Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
FIGURE 5. OFFICE VMT BY TAZ

VMT Rates by TAZ

- N/A
- Up to 85% Average VMT/Office KSF
- Greater than 85% Average to Average VMT/Office KSF
- Greater than Average VMT/Office KSF

(VMT Rates calculated across model area and with adjusted trip lengths for I-X and X-I trips.)

Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
• Projects located in the TAZs shown in yellow would be presumed to generate VMT at more than 85 percent but less than the baseline average rate for the Fairfield area (i.e. above the recommended threshold) and would require VMT analysis.

• Projects located in the TAZs shown in red would be presumed to generate VMT above the baseline average rate for the Fairfield area and would require VMT analysis. Projects located in the “red” TAZs, especially those in suburban greenfield sites, would be the most challenging to mitigate.

Note that many of the parcels within the Train Station Specific Plan (TSSP) area may be presumed to have less than significant VMT impacts due to proximity to the train station. Most of the remaining TSSP parcels falling outside the half mile radius do not have a VMT rate calculated directly from the model. These have been left undefined (shown in gray on the map) since the Train Station Specific Plan has an adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Whether or not projects tiering from a previously adopted environmental document require additional analysis if VMT impacts were not examined is a question that has not been definitively answered from a legal standpoint. Therefore, a conservative approach would be to require VMT analysis for projects in the TSSP area that cannot otherwise be presumed less than significant due to size or transit proximity, or as a local serving retail or affordable housing project.

SECTION 3. VMT MITIGATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

VMT MITIGATION

The CAPCOA report on the effectiveness of various VMT mitigation strategies was used as the operable resource document for identifying the most suitable project level VMT mitigation strategies for the City of Fairfield. Table 4 summarizes the recommended measures and their documented range of effectiveness. Additional detail on the evaluation of effectiveness for each method may be found in the appendix to this report.

Although the effect of multiple mitigation strategies is additive, CAPCOA establishes overall caps on maximum effectiveness when more than one mitigation strategy is applied. The recommended caps vary by land use context as follows:

• Urban settings – 75 percent maximum VMT reduction
• Compact infill settings – 35 percent maximum VMT reduction
• Suburban settings – 15 percent maximum VMT reduction

Consequently, for some very high VMT locations (red TAZs on screening maps), projects could potentially be unmitigable if located within suburban and/or greenfield settings.
MITIGATION FEE PROGRAMS

VMT mitigation banks or exchanges would provide an alternative to mitigating VMT impacts at the project site level. With a mitigation bank, developers would pay a fee in lieu of specific on-site mitigation measures. The combined fees would then be used to pay for mitigation projects across the City. With a mitigation exchange, developers would select from a pre-approved list of mitigation projects throughout the City.

Any such mitigation fee program or exchange would need to support its mitigation estimates with rigorous analysis and would be subject to the legal requirements of CEQA (i.e., CEQA mitigation monitoring requirements) and the California Mitigation Fee Act. As such, this option would not be a quick or easy undertaking.

CASE STUDY CALCULATIONS

Table 5 provides example projects subject to VMT mitigation under the proposed thresholds. As shown, two of the four example projects are not mitigatable with the candidate strategies and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact under CEQA. The examples illustrate the challenges of mitigating VMT at the project site level. This may have the intended effect for applicants to modify their projects by size, type or location to generate less VMT and align with state objectives for greenhouse gas reduction, land use efficiency, energy efficiency, and less overall reliance on the automobile.
### TABLE 4. MITIGATION STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>REPORTED RANGE OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE MEASURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREASE DENSITY</td>
<td>This measure involves increasing the density of the proposed project.</td>
<td>0.8-30%</td>
<td>Project density will be somewhat determined by zoning. Also, increased project densities may result in LOS or other effects during local transportation analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREASE DIVERSITY OF URBAN AND SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENTS (MIXED USE)</td>
<td>Involves including more than a single land use(s) in the proposed project.</td>
<td>9-30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATE AFFORDABLE AND BELOW MARKET RATE HOUSING</td>
<td>While housing developments that are 100 percent affordable may be presumed less than significant, this method provides credit for partially affordable developments.</td>
<td>10.2 – 32.5%</td>
<td>Based on percent affordable by income category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (INCREASING NETWORK CONNECTIVITY)</td>
<td>This measure is only appropriate for larger developments and should be implemented in conjunction with complete sidewalk coverage, pedestrian crossings, street trees and other design elements that support a pedestrian-oriented environment</td>
<td>3-21%</td>
<td>Based on intersections per square mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD/SITE ENHANCEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Provide a pedestrian access network that internally links all uses and connects to all existing or planned external streets and pedestrian facilities contiguous with the project site, minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity, eliminate physical barriers such as walls, landscaping, and slopes that impede pedestrian circulation.</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
<td>Would need to develop set of standards for pedestrian connections that go &quot;above and beyond&quot; existing requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4. MITIGATION STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>REPORTED RANGE OF EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES</td>
<td>Project design will include pedestrian/bicycle safety and traffic calming measures in excess of jurisdiction requirements.</td>
<td>0.25-1%</td>
<td>Depends on percent of project intersections and streets where improvements are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDE BIKE PARKING IN NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS</td>
<td>A non-residential project will provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking facilities to meet peak season maximum demand.</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>Not recommended as a stand-alone strategy in the CAPCOA report but alternative literature cites a modest 0.625% reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING POLICY/PRICING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMIT PARKING SUPPLY</td>
<td>The project will change parking requirements and types of supply within the project site to encourage “smart growth” development and alternative transportation choices by project residents and employees.</td>
<td>5-12.5%</td>
<td>May conflict with existing parking requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNBUNDLE PARKING COSTS</td>
<td>This project will unbundle parking costs from property costs. Unbundling separates parking from property costs, requiring those who wish to purchase parking spaces to do so at an additional cost from the property cost.</td>
<td>2.6-13%</td>
<td>Unbundle costs for parking from building rent. Fairfield market may not support this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION IN COMMUTE TRIP REDUCTION PROGRAM</td>
<td>Sites participating in a commute trip reduction program apply strategies such as preferential carpool parking and subsidized transit passes.</td>
<td>1-6.2%</td>
<td>Fairfield has a trip reduction ordinance for work sites of more than 100 employees. This program could potentially be offered as an option for mitigation but requires ongoing monitoring on part of City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, August 2010
## TABLE 5. SAMPLE MITIGATION CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>1. MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL, 830-848 GREAT JONES</th>
<th>2. WISEMAN OFFICE BUILDING</th>
<th>3. 100 UNIT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT IN TAZ 354</th>
<th>4. 200 UNIT APARTMENT COMPLEX IN TAZ 347</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE VMT PER UNIT</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT REDUCTIONS (PERCENT):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCORPORATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTIVITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDE BIKE PARKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNBUNDLED PARKING COSTS¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTARY TRIP REDUCTION PROGRAM²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL VMT REDUCTION³</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT RATE AFTER MITIGATION</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATED IMPACT?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Assumes $200 monthly parking charge and $6,000 annual ownership cost
2. Assumes suburban center effectiveness rate and 100% eligibility
3. CAPCOA report recommends capping total reductions at 15% for suburban locations
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STAFF REPORT

Meeting
Date: September 23, 2020

To: Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Community Development Department

Subject: ITEM C: 2020 BOARDING HOUSE REGULATIONS UPDATE (ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT)

Resolution No. 2020-16
Ordinance Amendments (OA2020-009)
Location: Citywide
Applicant: City of Fairfield
Property Owners: N/A

Public Hearing on request by the City of Fairfield for an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Fairfield amending various sections of Chapter 25, Article I of the Fairfield City Code (also known as the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Fairfield) amending the Definition Of “Boarding House,” amending the Development Standards for Boarding Houses, amending the Land Use Tables Permitting “Boarding House, Small” in all Residential Zoning Districts, Conditionally Permitting “Boarding House, Large” in the RM, RH, And RVH Zoning Districts, Conditionally Permitting “Boarding Houses, Small” and “Boarding Houses, Large” in the CN, CO, CT, CC, and CM Zoning Districts, Permitting “Boarding Houses, Small” in the HO, HR, and HWT Zoning Districts, and Permitting “Boarding Houses, Large” in the HWT And HTD Zoning Districts (Planner Brian K. Miller, 707-428-7446, bkmiller@fairfield.ca.gov)

BACKGROUND

Boarding houses are a form of housing in which tenants, be they individuals or households, share a single residential unit, typically a single-family home or small apartment building. Tenants are on separate leases, and typically only common areas such as the kitchen are accessible to all occupants. The Fairfield Zoning Ordinance currently defines Boarding Houses as follows:

“Boarding House. The renting of rooms within a dwelling to three or more separate households where each household is subject to a separate rental or lease agreement or other payment arrangement with the property owner. Boarding house includes but is not limited to fraternity or sorority houses, housing for migrant farm workers, and residential motels and hotels. Meals may or may not be provided, but there is one common kitchen facility. Boarding houses differ from the Community Care Facility-Residential in that they are not licensed by the State of California.”

City of Fairfield
Community Development Department

Prepared by: OF
Reviewed by: OF
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Boarding houses were traditionally a type of communal housing suitable for a variety of households and individuals who could not afford or chose not to rent traditional apartments or single-family homes. As such, they represent a source of flexible, affordable housing for many people. Boarding houses can serve as student or workforce housing, and they can also provide transitional or supportive housing suitable for the disabled, those suffering from addictions, and persons transitioning out of homelessness. Solano County Health and Human Services has made available funding for such facilities, which provide services, counseling, and an affordable place to live for this special needs population.

Fairfield has in the past not been particularly supportive of boarding houses, limiting their location to higher density zones and requiring a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP"). Currently, Boarding Houses are not permitted in Fairfield’s traditional single-family zoning districts. This land use is conditionally permitted in the higher density residential zones (RM, RH, RVH).

Despite their unpermitted status, it is likely that boarding houses are operating throughout the City with no formal approvals, registration, or even City knowledge. In some cases, public and nonprofit funding is available to operators of such boarding houses. City approvals cannot be granted under the current Zoning Ordinance in most cases, which leads to a conflict between public goals of providing a variety of affordable housing options, including transitional and supportive housing, and current regulations. In addition, in areas where boarding houses may be allowed under the current zoning the requirement to obtain a CUP introduces a costly barrier to establishing a legal boarding house. Finally, enforcing code compliance complaints against unpermitted boarding houses can be difficult and legally fraught, which leads to further frustration among homeowners in our residential neighborhoods.

Staff is proposing a menu of amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that attempts to reconcile the need for affordable and special needs housing with neighborhood concerns, while legalizing unpermitted boarding houses.

**DISCUSSION**

The main objectives of the proposed Ordinance include:

- Bring existing non-permitted boarding houses into legal status.
- Provide clear differentiation between smaller boarding houses that can be integrated into traditional single-family neighborhoods with lesser impacts and larger homes more suitable for commercial or higher density neighborhoods.
- Identify appropriate zoning districts for each class of boarding house.
- Develop clear and defensible objective standards, including location and concentration, parking, and design.
- Identify a ministerial process for approving smaller boarding houses while retaining the Conditional Use Permit process for larger boarding houses.
Definitions
The proposed Ordinance defines two classes of Boarding Houses as follows:
- Small: 3-6 separate households and payment arrangements
- Large: 7 or more separate households and payment arrangements

A residential unit with one or two tenancies is not included within the definition of small or large boarding house and continues to be considered a permitted residential use of the property in all zoning districts.

Development Standards
The proposed Ordinance requires boarding houses to meet all life safety and building code requirements. New to this ordinance is separation requirement, which provides that boarding houses must be at least 300 feet apart and cannot be located on the same block, and a parking requirement, which requires one space per household unless a waiver is granted by the Community Development Director.

Approval Process
Staff is recommending a Zoning Clearance for Small Boarding Houses in zoning districts where permitted. For small boarding houses (six or fewer tenancies), the Zoning Clearance is the ministerial approval process required, and no further Planning review is required.

For Large Boarding Houses, the Ordinance requires a Zoning Clearance or a Conditional Use Permit depending on the specific zone.

Note that Zoning Clearance does not replace conformance with City and State housing, building, and fire code requirements.

CORRESPONDENCE
Notice of the proposed Zoning Ordinance revisions was published in the newspaper, as required by state law.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
Staff has determined that the proposed amendments to the text of the Zoning Ordinance are ministerial and exempt from further CEQA review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15305, which categorically exempts Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations; Section 15301, which categorically exempts leasing of existing facilities; and under Section 15061(b)(3), the general rule that CEQA only applies to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 2020-16, which recommends the City Council approve the Zoning Ordinance Amendments.

Attachments:
1. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2020-16, with attached:
   - Exhibit A - Draft City Council Ordinance

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FAIRFIELD HEREBY RECITES, FINDS, DETERMINES, ORDERS, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Planning Commission has found that it is necessary to periodically review and revise the Fairfield City Code to clarify City policy and address changing circumstances.

Section 2. The Planning Commission has held a duly noticed public hearing on September 23, 2020. City staff presented substantial factual information regarding the proposed Ordinance amendments in staff reports and through oral presentations before the Commission, and the Planning Commission considered all public testimony and information presented during the public hearing regarding this application.

Section 3. Based on the information presented by staff, the Planning Commission has determined that the proposed amendments are exempt from further CEQA review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15305, which categorically exempts Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations; Section 15301, which categorically exempts leasing of existing facilities; and under Section 15061(b)(3), the general rule that CEQA only applies to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

Section 4. Based upon factual information, the Planning Commission hereby recommends the City Council adopt the Ordinance amendments, as attached hereto as Exhibit A.
Section 5. The record of proceedings shall be located at the City’s Community Development Department and the Director of Community Development shall be the custodian of such documents.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 23\textsuperscript{rd} day of September, 2020.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Jerome CHILDS / Michael COAN / Melissa CRUZEN / Lerecia EVANS / Chris MATTHEWS (Vice) / William WESLEY / Charles WOOD (Chair)

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: 

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: 

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: 

CHARLES WOOD, Chairperson

ATTEST:

DAVID FEINSTEIN, Secretary
EXHIBIT A
DRAFT
CITY OF FAIRFIELD

ORDINANCE NO. 2020-___


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FAIRFIELD DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Findings and Purpose.

A. The availability of housing is a substantial concern throughout the State of California and Fairfield.

B. Boarding houses in which multiple households or individuals share a single-family home or dwelling unit can offer lower cost housing options to meet the needs of existing and future residents.

C. Boarding houses can provide affordable, flexible housing for students, workers, and others, and offer housing opportunities for persons with special needs, including supportive and transitional housing.

D. The City’s existing regulations limit boarding houses to medium-density and high-density zoning districts and require a Conditional Use Permit in those districts.

E. It is likely that there are many boarding houses operating in the City that do not meet current Zoning requirements but provide affordable housing within the community, including boarding houses providing housing for special needs populations under local or County housing programs.

F. The proposed regulations revise and clarify the City’s requirements for boarding houses, differentiate between small boarding houses with six or fewer households and large boarding houses, permit small boarding houses in all single-family residential
districts, establish minimum standards, and establish a process for review and approval for each boarding house in the City of Fairfield.

SECTION 2. The definition of “Boarding House” in subsection B of Section 25.50.2 (Land Use Definitions) of Chapter 25, Article I is hereby replaced by the following definitions:

"Boarding House, Small. The renting of rooms within a dwelling to three to six separate households where each household is subject to a separate rental or lease agreement or other payment arrangement with the property owner. Small Boarding Houses may include but are not limited to fraternity or sorority houses, housing for migrant farm workers, and supportive and transitional housing programs. Meals may or may not be provided, but there is one common kitchen facility. Small Boarding Houses differ from the Community Care Facility-Residential in that they are not licensed by the State of California.

Boarding House, Large. The renting of rooms within a dwelling to seven or more separate households where each household is subject to a separate rental or lease agreement or other payment arrangement with the property owner. Large Boarding Houses may include but are not limited to fraternity or sorority houses, housing for migrant farm workers, supportive and transitional housing programs, and residential motels and hotels, except for those facilities that meet the Single Room Occupancy land use definition. Meals may or may not be provided, but there is one common kitchen facility. Large Boarding Houses differ from the Community Care Facility-Residential in that they are not licensed by the State of California."

SECTION 3. Chapter 25, Article I Section 25.32.12 is hereby amended as follows, with additions in underline and deletions in strikethrough text:

25.32.12 Boarding Houses

Small Boarding Houses including facilities for single migrant farm workers, shall obtain Zoning Clearance from the Community Development Department prior to establishment of a boarding house use.

Large Boarding Houses shall obtain a Zoning Clearance or a Conditional Use Permit, depending on the Zoning District, prior to initial establishment of the Large Boarding House use.

All boarding houses shall be subject to the following requirements:

1. There shall be no exterior signage indicating the use.
2. All boarding houses shall meet applicable housing, fire, and building codes.
3. Boarding houses shall be separated by a minimum 300-foot distance from each other. No boarding house shall be located in the same block as another boarding house.

4. Boarding houses shall provide one parking space for each household, lease, or payment arrangement. For boarding houses whose residents do not possess drivers' licenses or registered vehicles, the Community Development Director or his designee may waive or reduce this requirement. However, a change in tenancy may require parking spaces be provide for households with additional licenses or registered vehicles. Parking spaces shall meet the following requirements:
   
a. At least two covered parking spaces shall be provided within a garage or accessory structure on the property.

b. Driveways shall not exceed 60% of the width of the property frontage.

c. Tandem parking may meet the parking requirements of this section.

d. On street parking fronting only on the residential property may be used to meet the requirements of this section.

SECTION 4. Table 25-1 (Residential Land Use Regulations) is hereby amended to Permit "Boarding Houses, Small" in all residential zoning districts.

SECTION 5. Table 25-1 (Residential Land Use Regulations) is hereby amended to Conditionally Permit "Boarding Houses, Large" in the RM, RH, and RVH zoning districts.

SECTION 6. Table 25-9 (Commercial Land Use Regulations) is hereby amended to Conditionally Permit "Boarding Houses, Small," and "Boarding Houses, Large," in the CN, CO, CT, CC, and CM Zoning Districts.

SECTION 7. Table 25-H1 (Heart of Fairfield Land Use Regulations) is hereby amended to Permit "Boarding Houses, Small" in the HO, HR, and HWT Zoning Districts.

SECTION 8. Table 25-H1 (Heart of Fairfield Land Use Regulations) is hereby amended to Permit "Boarding Houses, Large" in the HWT and HTD Zoning Districts.

SECTION 9. Table 25-H1 (Heart of Fairfield Land Use Regulations) is hereby amended to Conditionally Permit "Boarding Houses, Large" in the HO and HR Zoning Districts.

SECTION 10. Based on the information presented by staff, the City Council has determined that this ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301 the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures. As this
Ordinance establishes regulations for the operation of existing residential properties, the Ordinance is exempt from further CEQA review.

SECTION 11. This ordinance shall be effective 30 days following its adoption by the City Council. A summary of this ordinance shall, within fifteen (15) days after passage, be published in accordance with Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California with the names of the City Councilmembers voting for and against it.

SECTION 12. The City Clerk is hereby directed to submit a copy of this ordinance to the Department of Housing and Community Development within 60 days after adoption.

INTRODUCED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Fairfield on the ___ day of ________________, 2020, and

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ________________, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: PRICE / BERTANI / MOY / TIMM / VACCARO

NOES: Councilmembers: __________________________

ABSENT: Councilmembers: __________________________

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers: __________________________

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK