

## 4.6 LAND USE AND PLANNING

---

### 4.6.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses the land use and planning impacts of the proposed project, focusing in particular on the consistency of the proposed Green Valley II Mixed-use project (“proposed project”) with applicable local and regional land use policies. The proposed project is subject to the City’s General Plan (Land Use and Housing Elements) and the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

Public and agency comments related to land use and planning received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) issued for this EIR are summarized below.

- The project site should remain zoned for business park uses as to attract more businesses to employ local citizens.
- The environmental document should include all mitigation required to address the loss of open space to high-density residential development.

The comment that the project site should remain zoned for business park uses will be forwarded to the City’s decision makers for review and consideration as it does not relate to the CEQA analysis. With respect to the loss of open space, as discussed below, while the project site is vacant, it is designated and zoned for development and is not designated and zoned for open space. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of open space for purposes of land use and planning.

### 4.6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### 4.6.2.1 Existing Project Site Land Uses

The project site is presently undeveloped. Vegetation on the site consists of ruderal non-native grasses that are mowed on occasion. In addition, a single oak tree is located in the western portion of the site near Business Center Drive and scattered trees are located along the eastern border of the site along Suisun Valley Road.

#### 4.6.2.2 Existing Adjacent Land Uses

The area surrounding the project site is partially developed and consists mainly of business park and office uses. An office complex consisting of two buildings is located to the north of the project site, across Business Center Drive and Mangels Boulevard, while a residential neighborhood is located to the northwest of the project site, across the intersection of Business Center Drive and Suisun Valley Road. A vacant parcel is located to the east of the project site across Suisun Valley Road while another vacant

parcel adjoins the project site to the south. Finally, an office complex consisting of two buildings is located to the west of the project site, across Business Center Drive.

Other nearby land uses include residential and office uses located 1,300 feet to the north, Interstate 80 (I-80) located 650 feet to the east, a large commercial-retail center located 1,500 feet across I-80 to the east, vacant land and office uses located 1,000 feet to the south, an assisted living center, located 1,050 feet to the southwest, and a large residential subdivision located 1,300 feet to the northwest across Mangels Boulevard.

#### **4.6.2.3 Existing Land Use Designations and Zoning**

The City of Fairfield's General Plan designates the project site as Business and Industrial Park while the Fairfield Zoning Ordinance designates the site as IBP-NC (Industrial Business Park-North Cordelia Overlay).

#### **4.6.2.4 Adjacent Land Use Designations and Zoning**

The area to the north of the project site, across Business Center Drive and Mangels Boulevard, is designated by the General Plan as Office Commercial and is zoned CO-NC (Office Commercial- North Cordelia Overlay). The area to the northeast across the intersection of Business Center Drive and Suisun Valley Road is designated by the General Plan as Residential Medium and is zoned RM (Medium Density Residential).

The area to the east of the project site, across Suisun Valley Road is designated by the General Plan as Highway and Regional Commercial and zoned CR (Regional Commercial) and PF (Public Facilities). The area to the south and west of the project site is designated by the General Plan as Business and Industrial Park and is zoned IBP-NC (Industrial Business Park - North Cordelia Overlay).

### **4.6.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

#### **4.6.3.1 Regional Plans**

##### ***Plan Bay Area 2040***

Plan Bay Area 2040 is the state-mandated, long-range transportation and land use plan for the region. In 2008, California passed the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375). This law requires metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the regional transportation plan, which identifies policies and strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles to targets set by the California Air Resources

Board (CARB). In the Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) are jointly responsible for developing and adopting a SCS along with the area's regional transportation plan.

MTC is the transportation planning and financing agency for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay area. MTC is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization and the state designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the region. As such, MTC is responsible for preparing and updating a long-range regional transportation plan that identifies strategies needed to manage and improve the region's transportation network.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) serves as the Council of Governments for the region. As required by the state, ABAG updates the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) every eight years, allocates specific housing targets to individual cities and counties, and develops the regional forecast of jobs, population and housing.

Plan Bay Area 2040's core strategy is "focused growth" in existing communities along the existing transportation network. This strategy builds upon existing community characteristics and leverages existing infrastructure to mitigate impacts on less developed areas. By promoting compact development in established communities with high-quality transportation access, there is less development pressure on the region's vast and varied open spaces and agricultural lands.

Key to implementing the focused growth strategy are Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) identified, recommended and approved by local governments. The Plan Bay Area 2040 focuses growth and development in nearly 200 PDAs. These existing neighborhoods are served by public transit and have been identified as appropriate for additional, compact development. The Plan Bay Area 2040 helps preserve over 100 regionally significant open spaces which have a broad consensus for long-term protection but which face nearer-term development pressures. The project site is not located within a PDA or a PCA.

### ***Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan***

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the regional agency that regulates sources of air pollutants within the nine-county Bay Area region. The BAAQMD prepares clean air plans as required under state and federal law. The Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP) provides a comprehensive plan to improve Bay Area air quality and protect public health. The 2010 CAP defines a control strategy that the District and its partners will implement to: (1) reduce emissions and decrease ambient concentrations of harmful pollutants; (2) safeguard public health by reducing exposure to air pollutants

that pose the greatest health risk, with an emphasis on protecting the communities most heavily impacted by air pollution; and (3) reduce greenhouse gas emissions to protect global climate.

### ***San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Plan***

The San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (San Francisco RWQCB) regulates water quality in the San Francisco Bay Area region. The San Francisco RWQCB regulates surface water quality in the Bay Area via the Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan), which was last amended in December 2010. The Basin Plan lists the beneficial uses which the San Francisco RWQCB has identified for local aquifers, streams, marshes, rivers, and the Bay, as well as water quality objectives, and criteria that must be met to protect these uses. The San Francisco RWQCB implements the Basin Plan by issuing and enforcing waste discharge requirements to control water quality and protect beneficial uses. These can include permits for “point sources” such as wastewater treatment plants or “non-point sources” such as the urban runoff discharged by a City’s stormwater drainage system.

#### **4.6.3.2 Local Plans and Policies**

##### ***City of Fairfield General Plan***

Development in the City is subject to the City’s General Plan. The State of California mandates that every city and county prepare a general plan. A general plan is a comprehensive policy document outlining the capacity of future development in a city or county. The City’s General Plan contains 10 chapters: Agriculture, Circulation, Economic Development, Health and Safety, Housing, Land Use, Open Space, Conservation and Recreation, Public Facilities and Services, Travis Air Force Base Protection, and Urban Design. These chapters establish goals and policies that guide development and redevelopment within the General Plan boundaries.

##### **Land Use Element**

The Land Use Element in the General Plan designates land uses for existing and proposed land use activities. The Land Use Element has the broadest scope of the seven mandatory elements. It plays the central role of correlating all land use issues into a set of coherent and consistent development policies. The Land Use element includes a diagram which maps the general proposed distribution of the land uses by land use categories. It is intended to serve as a general guide to the future land use distribution rather than as a parcel-specific map of allowable land uses. Zoning classifications, consistent with the land use categories, are established for this purpose in the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map.

General Plan land use policies applicable to the proposed project are listed below in **Table 4.6-1, General Plan Land Use Element Consistency Analysis**.

### **Housing Element**

The State Housing Element Law, enacted in 1969, mandates that local governments in California adopt housing elements as part of their general plans and submit draft and adopted elements to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review of compliance with state law. The City General Plan 2014–2022 Housing Element, which was reviewed and approved by HCD in May 2015, guides the City’s decisions related to the City’s housing needs through October 2022.

Analysis of the proposed project’s consistency with the relevant Housing Element policies is provided below in **Table 4.6-2, General Plan Housing Element Consistency Analysis**.

### ***Green Valley Corporate Park & Commercial Center Master Plan***

The Green Valley Corporate Park & Commercial Center Master Plan was prepared in 1995 to guide development within a 239-acre area on the western edge of the City. The Master Plan area is divided into two acres, the 111-acre Green Valley Commercial Center located to the west of Green Valley Road and the 128-acre Green Valley Corporate Park located to the east of Green Valley Road. The Green Valley Commercial Center is intended for highway and regional commercial development while the Green Valley Corporate Park is intended for a mixture of employment-intensive development in a campus setting, including office, research and development, and light industrial uses with ancillary warehousing. The Green Valley Commercial Center is almost completely built out while the Green Valley Corporate Park is only partially built out.

### ***City of Fairfield Zoning Ordinance***

The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Fairfield carries out the policies of the Fairfield General Plan by classifying and regulating the uses of land and structures within the City of Fairfield. The Zoning Ordinance is the primary tool used by the City of Fairfield to implement the goals, objectives, and policies of the Fairfield General Plan and any Specific Plans adopted to guide development in key areas of the City.

### **North Cordelia Overlay District**

The project site is also within the North Cordelia Overlay District (NCOD) purpose and intent of the NCOD is to implement the Green Valley Settlement Agreement (GVSA), which was an agreement reached between the City and community groups that required development in the district to comply

with area-specific design and traffic standards. The GVSA also stipulated that development include public art or pay an in-lieu fee.

### ***Solano County Habitat Conservation Plan***

The Solano County Water Agency developed the Solano Habitat Conservation Plan (Solano HCP), which establishes a framework for complying with state and federal endangered species regulations while accommodating future urban growth, development of infrastructure, and ongoing operations and maintenance activities associated with flood control, irrigation facilities, and other public infrastructure undertaken by or under the permitting authority/control of the Plan Participants within Solano County over the next 30 years. The Solano HCP has not been adopted; however, participating agencies are following the mitigation guidelines. Plan adoption is not anticipated until late 2019 at the earliest.

## **4.6.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **4.6.4.1 Significance Criteria**

In accordance with Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impact of the proposed project related to land use and planning would be considered significant if it would:

- physically divide an established community; or
- 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 effect.

### **4.6.4.2 Methodology**

To determine the potential for the proposed project to result in conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, the proposed project's consistency with the applicable plans and policies was evaluated.

### **4.6.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Impact LU-1:                   The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.  
(No Impact)**

The project site is located in a developing area of western Fairfield on a vacant site located at the intersection of Business Center Drive and Suisun Valley Road. Development of the proposed project would not involve the vacation of any public streets or pedestrian access ways. As a result, development

of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact with regard to this criterion.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

---

**Impact LU-2:**            **The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (*Less than Significant*)**

The project applicant is proposing to develop the site with a 270-unit apartment complex and a 22,600 square-foot commercial complex. Specifically, the proposed apartment complex would include four apartment buildings, a clubhouse, recreation areas, parking, and associated site improvements while the commercial complex would consist of four buildings, parking, and associated site improvements.

The City of Fairfield’s General Plan currently designates the project site as Business and Industrial Park while the Fairfield Zoning Ordinance currently designates the site as IBP-NC (Industrial Business Park-North Cordelia Overlay). As no residential or commercial uses are permitted under the existing land use designation and zoning, the applicant is requesting that the residential component of the site be re-designated Very High Density Residential and rezoned RVH (Very High Density) and the commercial component of the site be re-designated Community Commercial and rezoned CC (Community Commercial). The analysis below focuses on the consistency of the proposed project and applicable land use plans.

### ***Plan Bay Area***

The proposed project is not located within a PDA or PCA. Therefore, there is no density or land use requirement within the Plan Bay Area that applies to the project site. No conflicts with the Plan Bay Area would result, and the impact would be less than significant.

### ***Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan***

An analysis of the proposed project’s consistency with the 2010 Clean Air Plan is provided in **Section 4.1, Air Quality**. Projects that result in operational air pollutant emissions below BAAQMD thresholds are considered not to conflict with the Clean Air Plan. As discussed in **Section 4.1**, the proposed project would not result in operational emissions of criteria pollutants that would exceed BAAQMD thresholds, and with mitigation to control fugitive dust and toxic air contaminant emissions, the proposed project

would not have an adverse impact on air quality during construction. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

### ***San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)***

A discussion of the proposed project's potential impacts on water quality is provided in **Section 4.12, Other Resource Topics**. As discussed in **Section 4.12**, with the implementation of mitigation during construction and adherence to National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements during construction and operation, implementation of the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on water quality. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the Basin Plan, and this impact would be less than significant.

### ***City of Fairfield General Plan***

#### **Consistency with the General Plan Land Use Designation**

The City's General Plan land use designation for the project site is Business and Industrial Park and residential and commercial uses are not permitted under these land use designations. For this reason the applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment (GPA) that would re-designate the residential component of the site as Very High Density Residential and re-designate the commercial component of the site as Community Commercial.

The Very High Density Residential designation permits densities ranging from 22 to 32 dwelling units per acre while the Community Commercial designation permits a floor-to-area ratio (FAR) of 0.2 to 1.5. The residential component of the proposed project would include a density of approximately 26 dwelling units per acre while the commercial component would include a FAR of about 0.2. As a result, with the approval of the GPA, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designations for the project site. The environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the proposed GPA are analyzed in **Sections 4.1** through **4.12** of this Draft EIR. As the analysis shows, with mitigation, most significant environmental impacts associated with the development of the proposed multi-family residential and commercial project supported by the proposed GPA amendments would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, as discussed in **Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic**, the proposed project would result in a significant impact at three study area intersections, and while mitigation exists to reduce impacts at these intersections to a less than significant level, the improvements listed in the mitigation measures have yet to be programmed and funded. However, the general plan does not contain any policy that states that a development project cannot have a significant impact on any City intersection, and thus the impacts to study area intersections would not conflict with the general plan. This impact would be less than significant.

### Consistency with General Plan Land Use Policies

The proposed project would develop a multi-family residential and commercial project on the vacant site. A detailed analysis of the proposed project's potential consistency with applicable General Plan land use policies is provided in **Table 4.6-1, General Plan Land Use Element Consistency Analysis**. The City Council is the ultimate decision-maker regarding consistency with the City's General Plan, therefore, this discussion provides recommendations for the Council's consideration. As shown in this table, the proposed project would be potentially consistent with the policies included in the Land Use Element, and, if approved by the City Council, the impact would be less than significant.

**Table 4.6-1  
General Plan Land Use Element Consistency Analysis**

Applicable Policies	Project Consistency
<p><b>Objective LU 1: Achieve a level of population and employment which preserves and enhances the desired character of the City.</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU 1.1:</b> Only allow development that is consistent with the Land Use Diagram and the Land Use Category definitions.</p> <p><b>Policy LU 1.2:</b> Provide a mixture of uses throughout the City that provide adequate housing, employment, shopping, and social and leisure activities for their respective populations.</p> <p><b>Objective LU 8: Develop and maintain a pattern of residential land uses which provides for a variety and balance of densities and opportunities for a mixture of different dwelling and tenure types. (See Policy HO 1.1)</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU 8.1:</b> Residential development shall be consistent with the gross density ranges included in the Land Use Diagram. Lower densities may be permitted only when the City Council makes all of the following findings:</p> <p>A. The development would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and would not have a detrimental effect on existing or future multi-family development.</p> <p>B. The development would be equal or superior to the higher density development with respect to site planning and to preservation of natural topography, mature trees, and other natural resource.</p> <p>C. The density reduction will not prevent the City from achieving its goals for low and moderate income housing as defined in the Housing Element.</p> <p>Higher densities may be permitted that are consistent with State density bonus requirements.</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The proposed project is seeking approval of GPA to re-designate the project site to allow the residential and commercial uses. The GPA is intended to achieve consistency with this policy.</p> <p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The proposed project provides a mix of residential and commercial uses that is consistent with the intent of this policy.</p> <p><b>Potentially Consistent.</b> With the approval of the GPA, the density of the residential component and the intensity of the commercial component would be consistent with the requested General Plan designations for the project site. As discussed in <b>Section 4.12</b>, the height and scale of the proposed project would be consistent with the height and scale of existing and planned development in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Finally, the proposed project would incorporate an existing oak tree along the western border of the project site into its design.</p>
<p><b>Objective LU 11: Provide multi-family ownership and rental units in a variety of cost ranges dispersed throughout the City.</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU 11.1:</b> Encourage the development of a wide variety of higher density multi-family residential uses. (See HO 1.3)</p> <p><b>Policy LU 11.2:</b> Multi-family residential land uses shall be developed with a balance of open space, landscaping and recreational amenities and shall be accessible to commercial and recreational areas, and public transportation facilities.</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The residential portion of the proposed project would include high-density housing.</p> <p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The proposed project includes both residential and commercial uses. The entire site would be landscaped and include recreational amenities.</p>

Applicable Policies	Project Consistency
<p><b>Objective LU 13: Minimize conflicts between land uses</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU 13.2:</b> Appropriate buffers shall be established between industrial and non-industrial lands.</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The proposed project identifies the use of setbacks and landscaping to buffer the proposed residential uses from surrounding land uses where necessary, including future business park uses to the south.</p>
<p><b>Objective LU 14: Develop sufficient employment generating uses to maintain a positive City fiscal condition and housing balance.</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU 14.3:</b> Commercial areas shall be provided to accommodate the needs of the City's present and anticipated population.</p> <p><b>Policy LU 14.4:</b> New strip commercial development shall be discouraged</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The proposed project would provide commercial uses in a portion of the City that is not presently served by local serving retail.</p> <p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The proposed commercial structures would front along Business Center Drive and provide parking in the interior of the site.</p>
<p><b>Objective LU 18 Encourage infill development and compact growth.</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU 18.1:</b> Utilize land within the existing city limits as efficiently as possible, allowing for a wider variety of housing types and densities within the same zone district, and economical use of public services and infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent:</b> The project site is located within the existing city limits and is contemplated for future urban development by the General Plan. Approximately 69 percent of the housing in Fairfield consists of detached single-family homes (City of Fairfield 2015) and the 270 multi-family residential units proposed by the project would add to the variety of housing in the City.</p>

Source: *City of Fairfield General Plan, Land Use Element, 2016*

### Consistency with General Plan Housing Policies

The proposed project would include a multi-family residential component. **Table 4.6-2, General Plan Housing Element Consistency Analysis**, lists the relevant 2014 Housing Element policies and provides an analysis of the proposed project's consistency with these policies. As shown this table, the proposed project would be potentially consistent with the policies included in the 2014 Housing Element, and, if approved by the City Council, the impact would be less than significant.

**Table 4.6-2**  
**General Plan Housing Element Consistency Analysis**

Applicable Policies	Project Consistency
<p><b>Goal HO-1: Provide for varied housing opportunities, in terms of type, price, amenities, neighborhood design, and location, for all income groups and family types.</b></p> <p><b>Policy HO-1.1:</b> Encourage multifamily housing at appropriate locations and densities, focusing where possible such new housing near employment, transportation, services, and recreational amenities.</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent.</b> With a density of approximately 26 units per acre, the proposed project would be within the range of densities allowed under the Very High Density Residential designation. In addition, the proposed housing would be located within close proximity to existing office and commercial uses.</p>

Applicable Policies	Project Consistency
<p><b>Policy HO-1.2:</b> Encourage mixed use development that provides unique housing types, pedestrian friendly design, home ownership, opportunities for entrepreneurship and employment, and access to transit and services such as childcare.</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent.</b> Approximately 69 percent of the residential units in Fairfield consist of detached single-family homes (City of Fairfield 2015). As a result, the 270 multi-family residential units provided by the proposed project would add to the variety of housing in the City. In addition, it is estimated that the commercial component of the project would generate the need to hire 45 employees, thus providing opportunities for local employment.</p>
<p><b>Goal HO-7: Promote energy conservation</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent.</b> The proposed project's structures would be constructed in accordance with the latest adopted edition of Title 24.</p>
<p><b>Policy HO-5.1:</b> Implement state energy conservation standards.</p>	<p><b>Potentially Consistent.</b> The proposed project's structures would be constructed in accordance with the latest adopted edition of Title 24.</p>

Source: City of Fairfield General Plan, Housing Element, 2014

### *Green Valley Corporate Park & Commercial Center Master Plan*

The project site is located with Subarea 6C of the Green Valley Corporate Park. The master plan allows for the development of a small (approximately 5 acre or smaller) mixed-use commercial retail center at the northeast corner of the sub area as an appropriate transition to the north. The commercial component of the proposed project would provide 22,600 square feet of local serving retail and would occupy approximately 2.77 acres of the project site in the area that was envisioned for retail uses by the master plan. For these reasons, the commercial component of the proposed project would be potentially consistent with the intent of the master plan. In addition, as discussed in **Section 4.12, Other Resource Topics**, the commercial component of the proposed project would be designed in compliance with the Master Plan's design standards.

The multi-family units that are proposed as part of the proposed project were not envisioned by the master plan. However, one of the master plan's goals does include language stating that the plan should create a character which responds to setting and market direction. While the master plan was adopted more than 20 years ago, the Green Valley Corporate Park still only remains partially developed. In addition, the demand for housing has increased over the last ten years given the shortage of housing in the region. As a result, the proposed housing may be determined to meet the intent of the master plan as it is responding to a change in market demand from commercial to housing. In addition, as discussed in **Section 4.12, Other Resource Topics**, the residential component of the proposed project would be designed in compliance with the Master Plan's design standards.

For the reasons presented above, both components of the proposed project potentially would not conflict with the Green Valley Corporate Park & Commercial Center Master Plan. This impact would be less than significant.

### *City of Fairfield Zoning Code*

The project site is currently zoned IBP (Industrial Business Park). As described above, the proposed project would develop the site with a 270-unit apartment complex and a 22,000 square-foot commercial complex. The project applicant is requesting a rezone of the residential component of the project site to RVH (Very High Density) and a rezone of the commercial component of the project site to CC (Community Commercial). Should the rezone be approved by the City, the proposed project would be consistent with the zoning for the project site. The environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the proposed zone change are analyzed in **Sections 4.1** through **4.12** of this Draft EIR. As the analysis shows, with mitigation, most significant environmental impacts associated with the development of the proposed multi-family residential and commercial project supported by the proposed GPA amendments would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, as discussed in **Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic**, the proposed project would result in a significant impact at three study area intersections, and while mitigation exists to reduce impacts at these intersections to a less than significant level, the improvements listed in the mitigation measures have yet to be programed and funded. However, the zoning code does not contain any stipulation that a development project cannot have a significant impact on any City intersection, and thus the impacts to study area intersections would not conflict with the zoning code.

In addition, as discussed in **Section 4.12, Other Resource Topics**, the proposed project would be designed in compliance with the design standards for new development within the North Cordelia Overlay District. In addition, the public art requirement stipulated by the North Cordelia Overlay District would be incorporated into the project's conditions of approval.

The traffic standards required under the North Cordelia Overlay District apply to development and disposition agreements or other discretionary permit for commercial development that is greater than 10,000 square feet, or that generates more than 150 daily trips. The standard requires that the calculated LOS for the existing plus project conditions scenario for the five named intersections in the Green Valley Settlement Agreement, at the time of project approval, should be LOS D or better. The project's traffic impacts analysis ("TIA") analyzed the intersections at Green Valley Road and Neitzel Road (as it may be relocated), Green Valley Road and Mangels Boulevard, and Suisun Valley Road and Mangels Boulevard, and the LOS standards were satisfied at each of those intersections. As to the remaining intersections, Red Top Road/I-80 eastbound ramp and Red Top Road/I-80 westbound ramp (as studied by Fehr an Peers), the project trip contributions (if any) are insignificant and, under the City's traffic analysis guidelines, the proposed project cannot result in any significant transportation project- or cumulative-level impacts at these intersections under CEQA. Further, the Red Top Road/I-80 intersections are about 2.5 miles from the project site, and there are other alternative routes between the project site and destinations along Red

Top Road that are more direct. The current traffic analysis addresses the feasible and more likely routes of travel to key destinations in the study area. As such, the project would generally be consistent with the North Cordelia Overlay District standards.

For the reasons presented above, the proposed project would not conflict with the City's zoning ordinance and would generally be consistent with the additional requirements stipulated by the North Cordelia District Overlay. This impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

---

#### 4.6.4.4 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Cumulative Impact C-LU-1:** **The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to land use and planning. (*Less than Significant*)**

The area around the project site is partially developed, and the proposed project would occur on a site adjacent to existing development to the north and west. The planned development occurring within the area is consistent with the plan for this area. Therefore, although the approved and pending projects would alter the land uses in the project area, this cumulative development would not be inconsistent with the City's vision for this area.

As discussed in **Table 4.0-1, Related Projects**, future development in western Fairfield and in the adjacent unincorporated County would result in the addition of approximately 1,900 residential units (including the project's 270 units), and the additional units in the City would help improve the City's jobs/housing balance. In addition, future development in the City would be reviewed for consistency with the General Plan designations and policies by the City, in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the State Zoning and Planning Law, and the State Subdivision Map Act, all of which require findings of plan and policy consistency prior to approval of entitlements for development. For this reason, impacts associated with inconsistency of future development in the City with adopted plans and policies would not be significant. As shown in the analysis above, the proposed project would not conflict with any local or regional plans adopted for avoiding environmental impacts. The proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative land use impacts, and this impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

---

#### 4.6.5 REFERENCES

Association of Bay Area Governments/Metropolitan Transportation Commission. 2017. *Plan Bay Area 2040*. Adopted July.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2010. *Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan*.

City of Fairfield. 2002. *City of Fairfield General Plan*.

City of Fairfield. 2018. *Municipal Code*. June 19.

San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board. 1995. *San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Plan, as amended 2010*.