

Addendum to the Solano Landing Mitigated Negative Declaration For the Fruit Stand Project

State Clearinghouse No. 2023080100

Solano County

Department of Resource Management
Planning Services Division
675 Texas Street Suite 5500 Fairfield, CA 94533

Contact: Eric Wilberg, Senior Planner

May 2024

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This Addendum has been prepared to analyze whether the proposed Solano Landing Fruit Stand (Project) is within the scope of Solano Landing Mitigated Negative Declaration (Solano Landing MND) and whether additional environmental review is required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.).

1.2 Environmental Analysis and Conclusions

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (a) provides that the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or adopted Negative Declaration (ND) if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or ND have occurred (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164, subd. (a)).

An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or ND (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (c)). The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the Final EIR or adopted ND prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (d)). An agency must also include a brief explanation, supported by substantial evidence, of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR or ND pursuant to Section 15162 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (e)).

Consequently, once an EIR or ND has been certified for a project, no subsequent EIR or ND is required under CEQA unless, based on substantial evidence:

- 1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;¹
- 2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- 3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete . . . shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more

¹ CEQA Guidelines Section 15382 defines “significant effect on the environment” as “. . . a substantial, or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance . . .” (see also Public Resources Code, Section 21068).

- significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162, subd. (a); see also Pub. Resources Code, Section 21166).

This addendum, and attached documents constitute substantial evidence supporting the conclusion that preparation of a supplemental or subsequent MND for the Solano Landing Project is not required prior to approval of the amendment.

Section 2: Project Description

This Project is in the Suisun Valley, one of several designated agricultural regions in western Solano County identified in the County's General Plan. The subject property is located at 2316 Rockville Road on the corner of Rockville Road and Suisun Valley Road, 1.7 miles west of the city of Fairfield.

The Project will replace the current Fruit Stand structure on the subject property with a new building with the same footprint and location as the current structure. It is being processed separately from the recently approved Solano Landing Project (approved by the Solano County Board of Supervisors on January 23, 2024), but because it is located on the same parcel and is related to the larger project, it is included in this Addendum.

The Solano Landing MND indicated that there would be no impacts to the Fruit Stand as a result of that larger project. However, since adoption of the Solano Landing Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), the Applicant determined that previous fire damage to the Fruit Stand made keeping the Fruit Stand structure infeasible. Therefore, this Addendum updates the Solano Landing MND to address removal of the Fruit Stand and construction of a new building.

The proposed new Fruit Stand building will keep the general design and characteristics of the current building. This building is adjacent to the Ice House building which will continue to not be impacted by the project.

The project will have two components: (1) a 1,392 square foot area, which will be used as a tasting room; and (2) a 1,037 square foot area, which will be used as a preview/welcome center for the Solano Landing project. The project will serve no more than 60 people per day. The intent is to have the tasting room and preview center available for use while the previously approved Solano Landing Project is constructed. The approved Solano Landing Project includes a hotel resort, tasting rooms, vineyards, a boutique hotel, restaurant and market.

Parking

Parking will be provided proximate to the Fruit Stand building to the west and northeast on existing paved areas and within the Rockville Road right away. Twelve spaces and one Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant parking space are required and are provided.

Waste Disposal

Solid waste will be disposed of in a dumpster at the rear of the building which will include a typical wood fence and gate and constructed on a concrete slab.

Sewer

As was discussed in the Solano Landing MND, there is currently no sewer service to the property. The applicant is in discussions with the Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) to hook up to the existing main sewer line which is adjacent to the project site in the Rockville Corners area. The FSSD has indicated that they would serve the subject property. The proposed project does not include any residential development and, therefore, would not result in any growth inducement, and would be consistent with the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan. The proposed project would not increase demand for wastewater treatment such that new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities would be required.

Water

The applicant shall provide a Will Serve letter from a Public Water System (PWS) or shall obtain an approved PWS operation permit from the CA State Division of Drinking Water (DDW), for commercial water service. The Applicant is continuing to have ongoing dialogue with the City of Vallejo regarding utilization of City of Vallejo water for this project. The Applicant understands that either City of Vallejo water or approval from the CA State Division of Drinking Water (DDW) is necessary in order to get a certificate of occupancy for the building, consistent with the conditions of approval.

Pacific Gas and Electric services would be utilized for gas and electricity for the property.

3. Analysis

This addendum analyzes the proposed Project revisions as required under the CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15164. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, an addendum to an adopted negative declaration shall be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) have occurred. Under Section 15162, the lead agency shall prepare an EIR if there are any new significant environmental effects associated with the refined project. With respect to the proposed Project, the revisions are only minor technical changes that do not result in any new significant environmental effect(s); therefore, the revised Project does not require a new Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR.

The County, as the lead agency under CEQA, will consider the potential environmental impacts of the revised project when it considers whether or not to approve these changes as part of the original project. This Addendum is an informational document, intended to be used in the planning and decision-making process as provided for under Section 15164 of the CEQA.

The project site has been previously disturbed. The Fruit Stand project will not substantially increase building square footage or disturb natural vegetation. The building footprint will remain the same. Adequate access and parking would be provided.

The only potential impact would be to historic resources. The Fruit Stand is an early to mid-20th Century structure. The structure, along with its counterpart the "Ice House" which rests immediately adjacent to the west, was identified on historic aerial photography and dates as early as 1948. Local

residents contend the building was constructed in the 1930s. USGS topographic quadrangles first show this complex in 1950 but no other developments are shown in the project area between the earliest topographic quadrangle printed in 1898, and those dated 1901, 1906, 1911, 1926, and 1933.

The fruit stand currently stands as an “L”-shaped structure exhibiting a closed store window section facing north and two garage doors along the east side. The structure is made of wooden planking and a corrugated metal roof. The structure is painted burgundy with white trim, and a “Fruit Stand” sign is prominently displayed along the north side above the closed shopping window. The Fruit Stand has had obvious modifications to it, including modern electrical and building hardware. As a result, the structure appears to lack historic integrity, and is not a significant historic resource.

In order to qualify as an historic resource, buildings or structures must be:

- Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States (Criterion 1).
- Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history (Criterion 2).
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values (Criterion 3).
- Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation (Criterion 4). (Pub. Res. Code, §5024.1; 14 Cal. Code Regs. §4852.)

The Fruit Stand is not associated with any events that have made an important contribution to local history, nor is the Fruit Stand a distinct architectural work that would qualify it as an historic resource. An analysis was completed on State of California Parks and Recreation Form DPR 523b Building, Structure, Object Record, that determined that the original Fruit Stand building did not qualify as an historic structure, therefore there will be no significant cultural resources impacts.

With the implementation of standard County conditions of approval, the development and operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant effects on the environment.

This Addendum neither recommends approval or denial of the proposed revisions to the Project nor will it be the sole basis for the County’s action on the revised Project. The fundamental conclusion of this Addendum is that the proposed changes to the original Project will not result in new significant impacts nor substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed impacts beyond those already identified in the original Project. Thus, a subsequent or supplemental Negative Declaration need not be prepared.

4.- Findings

There are no substantial changes proposed by the project or under circumstances in which the project will be undertaken that require major revisions of the existing MND, or preparation of a new

subsequent or supplemental EIR or ND, that are due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. No circumstances outlined in CEQA Guidelines 15162 would occur as a result of the project that would result in a Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration:

1. No substantial changes are proposed which require major revisions to the Mitigated Negative Declaration that would create a new significant impact of a substantial increase in the severity of a significant effect previously discussed.
2. New information would not cause one or more significant effects or cause a substantially greater impact or result in new mitigation measures or alternatives not previously discussed.

As illustrated herein, the project is within the scope of the MND and would involve only minor changes.

5.- Conclusion

Based on substantial evidence documented in this Addendum, Solano County, as lead agency, has determined that the proposed Fruit Stand project necessitates only minor technical changes or additions to the adopted Solano Landing MND. Solano County has further determined that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or ND have occurred.

The adopted Solano Landing MND evaluated the environmental impacts that might reasonably be anticipated to result from the implementation of the larger Solano Landing Project. No new significant information or changes in circumstances surrounding the Solano Landing Project have occurred since the certification of the MND. The set of mitigation measures to be implemented by the Solano Landing Project remain applicable and now extend to the proposed Fruit Stand Project.

The proposed Fruit Stand only requires minor revisions to the MND to update the status of the Fruit Stand building and does not result in new or substantially more severe significant effects or the need for new mitigation measures. Therefore, preparation of an Addendum to the adopted MND provides an appropriate level of environmental review and Solano County may approve a Minor Use Permit for the Fruit Stand based on this Addendum.