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Project Summary

- 410 Acres
- 69 Homes
- Development Areas: 7%
- Permanent Open Space: 93%
- Dedicated easements for public trails
Background: SummerHill Proposal (v.1)

First Submittal:
- **85 units** (October 2010)
  - 64 lots (near entrance)
  - 11 lots (across Fairway)
  - 6 lots (off Diablo)
  - 4 lots (McCauley)
Second Submittal:

- **78 units** (October 2011)
  - 64 lots (near entrance)
  - 5 lots (across Fairway)
  - 6 lots (off Diablo)
  - 3 lots (McCauley)
Final Submittal:
- **69 units** (September 2012)
  - 66 lots (east)
  - 3 lots (west)

Project Approvals:
- Planning Commission (May 2013)
- Town Council (July 2013)
Litigation

California Superior Court (July 2014) and Court of Appeal (September 2015).

Appellate court upheld the Town’s decisions and all aspects of the EIR except on the matter where it ruled that the Town failed to “adequately investigate bicycle safety and discuss it in the EIR.”
Davidon Homes Proposal

Nearly Identical

- **69 units** (2017)
  - 66 lots (east)
  - 3 lots (west)
- Smaller development area
- More permanent open space
Project Review

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CONSISTENCY
Project Review Framework

LAND USE REGULATIONS

General Plan
- Allowable land use (e.g., residential)
- Density and intensity (e.g., 5 units/acre)
- Policy direction (Special Concern Areas)

Zoning Ordinance
- Development regulations (e.g., how buildings relate to their surroundings)
- Must be consistent with General Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- Requires agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of projects
- Establishes *baseline* conditions
- Determines *project’s impacts to baseline* conditions
- Avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible
Allowable Land Uses

- Most of property is designated in the General Plan for Agricultural and Residential land uses
- Agricultural lands are not public open space
- Agricultural lands have development potential, including single family residential

Upheld by the Court of Appeal

**32-37 A-2 GENERAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT.**

32-37.1 General.

a. General Provisions. All of the land lying within an A-2 general agricultural district may be used for any of the following uses, under the following regulations set forth in this section.

32-37.2 Uses.

a. Uses Permitted. Uses permitted in the A-2 district shall be as follows:

1. All types of agriculture, including general farming, horticulture, floriculture, nurseries and greenhouses, mushroom rooms, dairying, livestock production, for farms, poultry raising, animal breeding, aviaries, apiaries, forestry, and similar activities.

2. Other agricultural uses, including the erection of granaries, dehydration plants, bullers, fruit and vegetable grading and storage of agricultural products and equipment.

3. A stand not exceeding two hundred (200) square feet for sale of agricultural products grown on the premises. The stand shall be set back at least twenty-five (25') feet from the front property line;

4. A detached single family dwelling on each parcel and the accessory structures and uses normally auxiliary to it;

5. Foster home or family care home operated by a public agency, or by a private agency which has obtained State or local approval (license) for the proposed operation, where not more than six (6) minors reside on the premises with not more than two (2) supervisory persons.

b. Uses With Land Use Permit:

1. In an A-2 district, a land use permit may allow the following uses.

2. Allowable uses include those listed in paragraph b of subsection 32-36.7.

3. Other allowable uses are:

(a) Merchandising of agricultural supplies and services incidental to an agricultural use;

(b) Canners, wineries, and processing of agricultural products;

(c) Cold storage plants;

(d) Slaughterhouses and stockyards;
Maximum Allowable Density

78 residential units

Upheld by the Court of Appeal
Chapter 7 Planning and Development

General Plan

Policy Directives

SPECIAL CONCERN AREA: MAGEE RANCH

- Recognizes underlying residential development potential
- Guides specific development of Magee Ranch property
- Discourages 5-acre ranchettes (minimize grading/visual impacts)
- Transfer allowable development to the least sensitive areas
- Establish park/trail connections; preserve open space

Upheld by the Court of Appeal

As on the other large undeveloped hillside sites in Danville, protection of scenic slopes and ridgelines is imperative. Despite the A-2 (General Agricultural) zoning on much of the site, subdivision of this Special Concern Area into five-acre "ranchette" sites similar to those in the Tassajara Lane/Sherburne Hills area is strongly discouraged. Such development would require grading and road construction that could substantially diminish the visual qualities of the area. On the other hand, transferring allowable densities to a limited number of parcels within the ranch would enable the bulk of the site to be set aside as permanent open space. This would also provide opportunities to establish park and trail connections and to preserve wildlife corridors between this area and the Sycamore Valley Open Space.
P-1; Planned Unit Development

- Only land use mechanism available to transfer allowable development

- Mechanism used to protect ridgelines and secure permanent open space throughout the Sycamore Valley, examples:
  - Magee Ranch (existing)
  - Anderson Ranch
  - Diablo Highlands
  - Hidden Valley
  - Northridge
  - Northridge Estates

*Upheld by the Court of Appeal*
P-1; Planned Unit District

USED THROUGHOUT SYCAMORE VALLEY TO CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT, PROTECT RIDGELINES, AND SECURE PERMANENT OPEN SPACE
Revised Environmental Impact Report

Trial and appellate courts upheld all aspects of the 2013 EIR except for claim related to bike safety.

Direction of court is to “adequately investigate bicycle safety and discuss it in the EIR.”

As part of process, Revised EIR also:

- Updated traffic counts and traffic analysis
- Other components to reflect clarity provided by recent case law
Transportation Impact Analysis

Analysis Studied

- 10 Study Intersections
- 4 Traffic Scenarios
- 3 Peak Periods
- Used the more conservative “Danville” Trip Generation Rate

Evaluation Standards:

- 2030 General Plan - Acceptable LOS standard of “D”
- Threshold of Significance: >5% change in V/C for intersections currently operating unacceptably
Transportation Impact Analysis

VEHICLE LEVEL OF SERVICE

- Project impacts less than significant on all intersections except for Mt. Diablo Scenic/Blackhawk Road
- Additional Analysis - Intersection Control Evaluation (“ICE”)
  - Traffic Signal and Roundabout
  - Traffic Signal most effect in reducing congestion
  - No upstream/downstream intersection impacts
  - 100% funded by Developer

EXISTING CONDITIONS
- AM PEAK: LOS “E”
- SCHOOL PM PEAK: LOS “F”

EXISTING + PROJECT CONDITIONS
- UNACCEPTABLE: >5% V/C

MITIGATION MEASURE
- TRAFFIC SIGNAL
- LOS “A” and “B”
- 86 – 96% DELAY REDUCTION
Diablo/Green Valley (existing)

Existing Conditions

- Operates at LOS “D” in AM peak, LOS “E” in future
- Short (@60 LF) WB thru lanes creates capacity constraints during AM and School PM peak hours
- Restricts access to WB Left Turn Lane
Diablo/Green Valley (proposed)

Project Contribution (not required mitigation)

- Adds 210 feet WB through lane capacity
- Enhances intersection efficiency for vehicles
- Enhances safety for pedestrians and bicycles at intersection

Add 210 feet to one through lane (270 feet total) for more queuing storage for through movements.
Transportation Impact Study

BICYCLE SAFETY ANALYSIS

Selecting a Methodology

1. Prescribed in *CCTA Technical Procedures (2013)*, the governing the preparation of transportation impact analyses in Contra Costa

2. Quantifies baseline conditions and project’s impacts on the established baseline conditions

3. Nationally recognized; backed by research and testing of the Transportation Research Board (reflects 2,500+ miles of evaluated roads across North America)
Transportation Impact Study

BICYCLE LEVEL OF SERVICE (BLOS)

A measurement of roadway factors affecting bicycle safety, including:

- Lane and should widths
- Vehicle volumes and speeds (during peak bicycle periods)
- Heavy vehicle (truck) percentage
- Pavement condition
- Access point density (number of intersecting side streets)
SCENARIO: EXISTING PLUS PROJECT
- No changes in BLOS letter grades for all periods and segments
- Less than 1% change in BLOS score under all periods and scenarios
- Conclusion: No Significant Project Impacts to Bicycle Safety

SCENARIO: CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT
- No changes in BLOS letter grades for all periods and segments
- Less than 1% change in BLOS score under all periods and scenarios
- Conclusion: No Significant Project Impacts to Bicycle Safety
Trail Gap Closures

Project Trail
- Paved multi-purpose trail (green segment)

Public Dedications
- Pedestrian access easements (yellow segments)
- Future multi-purpose trail easement (blue segment)
Hydrology

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Consistent with state and federal laws
- All runoff collected and conveyed to a new detention pond
- No increase to existing peak flows to Green Valley Creek
Summary & Recommendation

❖ General Plan and zoning consistency
❖ Updated environmental analysis
❖ Public benefits
Questions?