



CITY OF BANNING STAFF REPORT

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: Elizabeth Gibbs, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Mary Yaryan, Senior Planner

MEETING DATE: March 10, 2026

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution 2026-40 , Adopting Address-Related Fees Pursuant to BMC Chapter 12.32 and Update the City Master Fee Schedule

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolution No. 2026-40, establishing fees for address-related services pursuant to Banning Municipal Code Chapter 12.32.

BACKGROUND:

Project Summary:

This is a request for City Council to adopt a fee resolution establishing cost-recovery fees for City addressing services administered by the Community Development Department, including address assignment, change of address, address verification, and street naming-related services. Chapter 12.32 requires these fees to be established by City Council resolution and included in the Master Fee Schedule.

Related Actions:

- On December 9, 2025, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2025-165, approving the Citywide Addressing Policy.
- On December 9, 2025, the City Council introduced (first reading) Ordinance No. 1614, repealing the existing Chapter 12.32 and adopting a new Chapter 12.32 (House Numbering System) of Title 12 of the Banning Municipal Code related to the addressing and house numbering system.
- On January 13, 2026, the City Council conducted second reading and adopted Ordinance No. 1614.
- Chapter 12.32 provides that addressing fees shall be set by City Council resolution and included in the Master Fee Schedule.
- On November 17, 2025, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2025-156, approving the Comprehensive User Fee Study (Matrix Consulting Group, October 2025) and adopting an updated City Master User Fee Schedule. The Master Fee Schedule did not include the address-related fees established under BMC Chapter 12.32 because the updated Chapter 12.32 had not yet been adopted at that time.

This action establishes the address-related fees required by BMC Chapter 12.32 and directs inclusion of the adopted fees into the City Master Fee Schedule as an update.

DESCRIPTION:

Staff reviewed addressing fee structures used by other Southern California jurisdictions to compare fee types and service categories. The benchmarking confirms that the City’s proposed structure (base fee, additional-address tiers, address change/verification, and street naming/street name change) is consistent with common municipal practice, while Banning’s proposed amounts are based on the City’s own cost-of-service methodology and staffing model

Staff prepared a time-based fee analysis using fully burdened hourly rates:

- Assistant Planner (T63): \$187.53/hour
- Senior Planner (T81): \$214.08/hour

Proposed fees are based on average staff processing time for each service type and are intended to recover reasonable costs of service.

Proposed Addressing Fee Schedule

| FEE NAME | PROPOSED FEE |
|--|---------------------|
| ADDRESSING MIN. FEE (FIRST) | \$242 |
| EACH ADDRESS 2-10 (EACH) | \$148 |
| EACH ADDRESS 11 OR MORE (EACH) | \$69 |
| CHANGE OF ADDRESS (EACH) | \$242 |
| ADDRESS VERIFICATION | \$242 |
| NEW STREET NAMING MIN. FEE (EACH) | \$429 |
| EACH STREET AFTER FIRST | \$215 |
| CHANGE OF STREET NAME + PUBLIC HEARING(SEPERATE FEE) (EACH) | \$2,141 |

*Fees are rounded up to the nearest whole dollar.

How the addressing tiers are applied:

The Addressing Minimum Fee is charged once per addressing request (e.g., a subdivision/addressing package) and covers the first address. Additional addresses processed under the same request are charged per address using the tiered rates: addresses 2–10 at the “Each Address 2–10” rate, and addresses 11 and above at the “Each Address 11 or More” rate.

Example Calculations (Subdivision / New Lot Addressing)

Assumption: All new addresses are processed under one addressing request.

Tier logic:

- 1st address = \$242 (Addressing Minimum Fee)
- Addresses 2–10 = \$148 each
- Addresses 11+ = \$69 each

| Example Scenario | Calculation | Total Fee |
|--|---|-----------|
| Street with 8 new lots (8 addresses) | $\$242 + (7 \times \$148)$ | \$1,278 |
| Developer with 18 new lots (18 addresses) | $\$242 + (9 \times \$148) + (8 \times \$69)$ | \$2,126 |
| Subdivision with one 8-lot street + one 12-lot street (20 addresses total) | $\$242 + (9 \times \$148) + (10 \times \$69)$ | \$2,264 |

Multiple streets / phased submittals: For subdivisions with multiple streets, staff applies the tiered addressing rates based on the total number of new addresses included in the same addressing request, not separately by street. If a developer submits separate addressing requests at different times, each request is charged its own Addressing Minimum Fee, and the tiers apply within that request.

FINDINGS:

- Consistency with Municipal Code. The proposed fees are consistent with BMC Chapter 12.32, which authorizes City Council to establish addressing-related fees by resolution and include them in the Master Fee Schedule.
- Reasonable Cost Recovery. The proposed fee amounts are based on estimated staff time and adopted fully burdened hourly rates for applicable classifications and are reasonably related to the City’s cost of providing each service.
- Regional Benchmarking Support. Staff reviewed fee types used by other Southern California cities. The proposed fee categories are consistent with regional practice, while fee amounts are tailored to Banning’s local processing costs.
- Administrative Implementation. Adoption of the fee schedule is necessary to implement the previously adopted ordinance and addressing policy and to ensure uniform, transparent administration of addressing requests.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (CEQA):

This action is not a “project” under CEQA pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(5), as it involves administrative/governmental fiscal activity that does not result in direct or indirect physical changes to the environment.

Additionally, this action is exempt under the common-sense exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3), because it can be seen with certainty there is no possibility this fee adoption may have a significant effect on the environment.

JUSTIFICATION:

Adoption of Resolution No. 2026-40 is required to implement BMC Chapter 12.32 and incorporate address-related fees into the Master Fee Schedule, consistent with Ordinance No. 1614 and Resolution No. 2025-165. The proposed fees are cost-based, reasonably related to staff processing time, and supported by a review of fee types used by other Southern California cities. Adoption will improve consistency, transparency, and cost recovery for addressing services.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Adoption of the proposed fees will improve cost recovery for address-related services and reduce subsidy from the General Fund for user-driven processing activities. Annual revenue will vary based on service demand and application volume.

ALTERNATIVES:

BUDGETED?:

No

CONTRACT/AGREEMENT:

No

ATTACHMENTS:

1. [Draft Resolution 2026-40](#)
2. [Exhibit A. Addressing Fee Schedule.docx](#)
3. [Addressing Fee Calculation Table.docx](#)
4. [Ordinance No. 1614.pdf](#)
5. [CC Resolution No. 2025-165.pdf](#)
6. [column_affidavit_ezrxNoYZi94HUm4R5p58.pdf](#)