



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors

From: John Kopchik, Director, Conservation & Development Department

Date: May 23, 2017

Subject: Appeal of the County Planning Commission's Approval of SD16-9429, for a 9-Lot Subdivision in the Lafayette Area (3198 Gloria Terrace)

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. OPEN the hearing on the appeal of the County Planning Commission's approval of County File #SD16-9429, ACCEPT public testimony, and CLOSE the hearing.
2. FIND that on the basis of the whole record before the County that there is no substantial evidence that the Gloria Terrace Estates subdivision project as mitigated will have a significant effect on the environment and that the September 21, 2016, Mitigated Negative Declaration is adequate for the purpose of compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and reflects the County's independent judgment and analysis.
3. ADOPT the September 21, 2016, Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the project.
4. APPROVE the revised Vesting Tentative Map received April 14, 2017, based on the attached Findings and Conditions of Approval for Gloria Terrace Estates, Lafayette (County File #SD16-9429).
5. DENY the appeal of Bruce A. Last and Hanna and Prem Cervenka.
6. DIRECT the Department of Conservation and Development to post the Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

FISCAL IMPACT:

☐ APPROVE

☒ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **05/23/2017** ☐ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: May 23, 2017

Contact: Francisco Avila,
(925) 674-7801

David Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of
Supervisors

By: , Deputy

cc:

None. The applicant is responsible for the costs of processing this application.

BACKGROUND:

This is a joint appeal filed by two neighboring property owners of the County Planning Commission's (CPC) decision approving a proposal to subdivide a 7.5 acre site into 9 new residential lots.

In February 2016, the applicant submitted this 9-lot subdivision application requesting to develop the subject property located within the unincorporated Lafayette area. The design of the subdivision map has been modified several times as a result of neighborhood feedback. Modifications to the project to include: a) selective window placement, b) lower building pad elevations, c) re-orientation of the access road, d) re-location of the building pads, e) addition of 6 on-street parking spaces, and f) planting of 24 trees. Each of these modifications was aimed at providing increased privacy for neighbors and greater distance between existing and proposed homes. At the County's request, the applicant has also added a pedestrian sidewalk along the entire length of the project's access road, agreed to improve pedestrian safety along Gloria Terrace and has produced a visual simulation of the project.

County Planning Commission (CPC) Hearing, January 25, 2017

At the January 25, 2017, CPC hearing, the Commission took testimony from the applicant, and members of the public. The main issues raised during testimony were: grading, drainage, biology, traffic, and privacy. Members of the public commented that during grading activities, the site's rainwater should not be allowed to affect downhill properties. In response, Public Works Department staff indicated that all stormwater runoff from this project will be diverted to existing stormwater facilities. Additionally, several members of the public had concerns with the lack of on-street parking for the subdivision. In response, the applicant indicated that each new home will include a three-car garage and three additional guest parking spaces on each lot. After considering all of the testimony, the Commission modified condition of approval #3, to require submittal of a parking plan prior to the recordation of the map. The parking plan must show 6 parking spaces on each newly created lot (including three in each garage for 54 parking spaces total). The Commission also required that each new home be constructed with a fire suppression sprinkler system which is compliant with the applicable California Building Code. After modifying the conditions of approval, the CPC unanimously approved the 9-lot Vesting Tentative Map, County File Number SD16-9429. Since the January 2017, CPC hearing, the applicant has revised the subdivision map to include an additional 6 on-street parking spaces along the access road and 24 new screening trees. The 6 on-street parking spaces are beyond the Commission's requirement to show the 6 parking spaces on each lot. Additionally, staff is proposing to modify condition of approval #14, to explicitly limit retaining wall height to 3 feet tall within the required setbacks.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

1. Project Description: The applicant is requesting approval of a 9-lot Vesting Tentative Map. The details of the request are described below:

A. Subdivision

The proposed tentative map identifies 9 lots ranging in size from 22,608 to 73,301 square feet in area. The lots will be accessed via a new private road located on the subject site. A 220-foot section of the new private road will be located on the adjacent parcel to the south, within an existing 20-foot-wide access easement. The new private road will be constructed to County private road standards and will include a sidewalk, curbs and gutters. The new road will intersect with Gloria Terrace at a single location. All drainage features, streets and other common areas will be maintained by a homeowner's association created for the subdivision. The applicant is also proposing to grade approximately 18,000 cubic yards of soil, which will be balanced on-site in order to create the building pads, roadway and related subdivision improvements.

B. Building Design

The Gloria Terrace Estates development will offer custom built homes specifically designed for each lot. According to the architectural renderings for the project, two story split-level homes will be constructed on the majority of lots. Lots 1 through 4 are at lower elevations compared to the majority of the surrounding properties, therefore, no height restrictions have been placed on those lots other than those normally required for the R-20 Single-Family Residential Zoning District. As lots 5 through 9 are at higher elevations, specific, more restrictive height limitations have been recommended for those lots as follows (COA #14):

- Residential buildings on lots 5, 7, 8 and 9 shall not exceed 18 feet in height above the 440-foot elevation level. Overall heights within stepped down portions of residences may exceed 18 feet but not more than 35 feet in height.
- Residential buildings on lots 5, 7, 8 and 9 shall be of a split level design to reduce effective visual bulk.
- Residential buildings on lot 6 shall not exceed 28 feet in height above the 437-foot elevation level.

C. Trees/Landscaping

The removal of 16 trees is requested in order to create the new lots and related subdivision improvements. Work within the dripline of 30 other trees will also be required as a result of grading, roadway construction, and installation of drainage facilities. A Tree Survey, dated February 4, 2016, prepared by

Timothy Ghirardelli, has been submitted with the project and includes recommended tree and root zone protection guidelines. No specific landscaping plans have been submitted for individual lots, however, as home sites are developed, landscaping plans may be necessary if required by County Ordinance (square-footage of new landscaping etc.).

D. Inclusionary Housing

Residential development applications proposing 5 through 125 for-sale units, are subject to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Chapter 822-4. In this case, the project must include the required number of Inclusionary Housing units or pay the in-lieu fee. Thus, the applicant has elected to pay the total in-lieu fee of \$34,874 in order to satisfy ordinance requirements.

E. Sidewalk Extension, Within the Gloria Terrace Right-of-Way

Off-site roadway improvements will consist of shoulder improvements along Gloria Terrace between Reliez Valley Road and Taylor Boulevard, as detailed in the June 16, 2016, Gloria Terrace Shoulder Improvements exhibit (attached). The aim of the improvements will be to improve pedestrian safety along this stretch of road.

2. Site and Area: The subject site is located on the east side of Gloria Terrace, 1,250 feet northwest of the Taylor Boulevard/Gloria Terrace intersection. The assessor's parcel numbers for the site are 166-200-032 and 166-210-008. The property consists of 7.5 total acres and is currently vacant. There are a total of 83 trees scattered throughout the property. The site is generally rectangular in shape, 900 feet long, 400 feet wide and straddles the top and steep sides of a natural ridgeline. The top of the ridgeline has an elevation of 457 feet. There is a linear valley approximately 60 feet wide along the southeastern portion of the property. This valley begins at an elevation of approximately 300 feet and extends up to an elevation of 380 feet. The site is accessed by a panhandle shaped portion of the property (200 feet long by 50 feet wide), which abuts Gloria Terrace and a parallel 20-foot wide access easement over APN: 166-200-026. Parcels in the vicinity range in size from 0.50-acre to over 3-acres and tend to be developed with residential uses.

3. General Plan and Zoning: The site has a general plan designation of Single-Family Residential-Low Density (SL), which has a density range of 1.0 to 2.9 units per net acre. According to section 3.7 of the 2005-2020 County General Plan, "Net acreage includes all land area used exclusively for residential purposes, and excludes streets, highways, and all other public rights-of-way". Given that the net acreage for the property is 6.5 acres (7.5 gross acres minus 1.0 acre of improvements), the site is allowed 18 total units. However, due to several steep areas of the site, the project proponent has proposed 9 lots which conform to the physical characteristics of the site. Furthermore, each lot meets or exceeds the

minimum lot area, depth and average width requirements as required by the R-20 zoning district. No specific residential plans have been submitted as part of this application, however, condition of approval #13 requires an administrative review of new home plans (e.g., site plan, floor plan and elevations) prior to issuance of building permits. Each review will insure all yard setbacks and height limits have been met, as well as, compliance with any applicable subdivision requirements (geological, tree preservation, and landscaping, etc.) including off-street parking space requirement.

Lastly, the project includes the off-site physical improvement of the Gloria Terrace right-of-way. Currently, there are "patches" of Gloria Terrace that do not have pedestrian walkways or shoulders to accommodate safe pedestrian travel. Per condition of approval #35, the applicant will be required to install the subject pedestrian improvements (per the Public Works Department's review and approval) prior to the filing of the Final Map for this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

In accordance with the state *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)*, an initial study was prepared to determine potential environmental impacts of the Gloria Terrace Estates project. Upon completion of the initial study, it was determined that mitigation measures could be incorporated into the project description that would reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.

The Initial Study and Notice of Public Review and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration was posted with the County Recorder and circulated for public review from September 21, 2016 through October 21, 2016. A total of 14 letters and one petition with 23 signatories were received opposing the project during the comment period. Topics of concern were related to Traffic, Aesthetics, Noise, Air/Dust and Geology. A complete review of the issues of concern and staff's response is provided in Section IX of the attached January 25, 2017, County Planning Commission staff report.

APPEAL OF COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION'S (CPC) DECISION

The County received an appeal, filed by two neighboring property owners, dated February 6, 2017, of the CPC's decision approving the subject project. The appellants cite eight general areas of opposition. Staff has summarized the appeal points contained in the appeal letter and has provided a discussion of each point below.

Review of Points Raised in Appellant's Appeal Letter

1. Environmental Impact Report Required – The appellant contends that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared for the project.

Staff Response: In September 2016, staff completed an initial study (Mitigated Negative Declaration - MND) for the project. The following studies were utilized in preparation of the MND:

- Tree Survey, prepared by Timothy C. Ghirardelli, dated February 4, 2016;
- Preliminary Geologic and Geotechnical Investigation for Gloria Terrace Estates, prepared by GFK & Associates, Inc., dated February 4, 2016;
- Preliminary Storm Water Control Plan for Gloria Terrace Estates, prepared by Humann Company Inc., dated June 2016;
- Biological Resource Analysis prepared for Gloria Terrace Estates, prepared by Monk & Associates, Inc., dated 9, 2016;
- Gloria Terrace Right-of-Way Improvement Exhibit, dated June 16, 2016;
- Gloria Terrace Estates Architectural Renderings, dated June 16, 2016.

The MND was posted and circulated for comments and review. According to Section 15002 (a) of the California Environmental Quality Act, the basic purposes of CEQA are to identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced and to inform governmental decision makers and the general public of ways this has been achieved. As part of the initial study for this project, potential impacts have been identified in the areas of: a) Aesthetics, b) Air Quality, c) Biological Resources, d) Cultural Resources, and e) Geology. There are no County designated scenic vistas/resources within the project area. Nevertheless, height restrictions and design guidelines (terracing of retaining walls, muted color choices, and split level home designs) have been incorporated into the project to ensure the project will be compatible with the existing neighborhood. Best Management Practices have been incorporated into the project to limit air impacts during construction (watering of exposed surfaces, limiting of onsite traffic speeds and limiting truck idling times to 5 minutes). Nesting bird surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance to ensure that no protected species are present when grading or tree removal activities begin. If human remains or other historically significant artifacts are found during grading, the project applicant is required to stop all work within 50 feet of the find until a certified professional has had an opportunity to determine the proper treatment of the situation. Geologically, numerous borings have been taken at this site and laboratory tested. Based on these laboratory results, it has been determined that while the uppermost two feet of soil may be loose and subject to "soil creep" when saturated, the underlying material at the site consists of compacted sandstone. To ensure, home foundations are secure, the project has been required to have a geotechnical engineer onsite during pier hole drilling to ensure that piers penetrate deep into bedrock.

With regards to cumulative traffic levels in the Reliez Valley Road and Taylor Boulevard corridors, it is apparent that traffic volume has increased over the past few decades. Nevertheless, these current traffic levels serve as the baseline for this

project. As proposed, the 9-lot subdivision is expected to generate less than ten AM or PM peak hour vehicular trips per weekday. Recently, the County Planning Commission approved a four lot subdivision on Gloria Terrace. The project will not individually or cumulatively cause a significant impact to traffic once completed. The Public Works Department has reviewed the project and has not expressed any concerns related to the proposed private roadway, ingress or egress, or traffic levels of service at any nearby intersections. There is a less-than-significant impact on roadways as the project engineer has been able to balance all grading onsite. This approach will reduce the number of construction related vehicles entering or exiting the site since there will be no hauling of dirt from either or from the project site.

Construction vehicles will however, elevate short-term noise levels onsite due to grading or construction of homes. Best Management Practices such as requiring mufflers on equipment, and the prohibition of unnecessary idling engines will reduce the noise impacts to less-than-significant levels. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 limits all construction activity to the hours of 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM, Monday through Friday, and prohibits work on state and federal holidays.

As summarized above, no substantial evidence has been provided to staff that suggests the project will have a significant effect on the environment. Per Section 15384 (b), of the Public Resource Code substantial evidence shall include: facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts. Each environmental area of concern was discussed and presented to the County Planning Commission for consideration. Upon review of the comments, mitigation measures, the project, the Commission determined that in light of the whole record, no substantial evidence has been presented that warranted additional studies, new mitigations, or preparation of an environmental impact report.

2. Fire Protection - The appellant contends that the findings required by California Government Code Section 66474.02 have not been made. Therefore, the application should be denied.

Staff Response: California Government Code Section 66474.02 requires a local agency to demonstrate that contracts are in place if the project location is within a Department of Forestry and Fire Protection “State responsibility area”. “State responsibility areas” means areas of the state in which the financial responsibility of preventing and suppressing fires is upon the Department of Forestry. This section of code has no bearing on this application as the site is within the service boundaries of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has reviewed the application and has not raised any issues of concern. Furthermore, condition of approval # 36, requires that fire suppression sprinkler systems be added to each new home constructed as part of this subdivision. Therefore, no findings or other actions are required with respect to the appellant’s cited section of government code. The applicant will be required to comply with all of the requirements of the Fire District prior to obtaining approval of a building

permit for any building on the site.

3. Geology - The appellant contends that the geotechnical investigation prepared for this project does not address a previous geological study prepared for the site in 2003 or include data on the site's subsurface soil characteristics.

Staff Response: Due to the passage of time and potential change of site characteristics, the applicant retained GFK & Associates to prepare an updated Preliminary Geologic Investigation (Geologic Report) for subject property. The Report was completed in February of 2016. A total of five exploratory borings were drilled and logged as part of the investigation. A thin layer of topsoil about 1 to 1.5 feet thick was identified on Lot 5 and 9. Although portions of this topsoil layer has "crept", laboratory testing of the soil indicated that these lots are underlain by sandstone bedrock. Therefore, although the upper most portion of the site's soil has crept due to heavy moisture content, no evidence has been uncovered that the bedrock is unstable. Nevertheless, based on the soil analysis, GFK & Associates has offered a set of recommendations for the project. County Geologist, Darwin Myers Associates provided staff with a peer review of the Geologic Report and found that sufficient information was provided within the Geologic Report. Recommended geological conditions of approval were provided and incorporated into the project as Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-3. In short, the conditions require that additional lot-by-lot subsurface investigations be conducted prior to final design of each new home. Based on that lot-by-lot investigation, it is required that all grading and foundation recommendations be included in the development plans. Based on the Geologic Report and adopted Mitigation Measures, the County Planning Commission determined that no additional studies or conditions of approval are warranted for this project with respect to geology.

4. Drainage - The appellants contend that a corrugated drainage pipe (no dimension given) runs through the subject property and was not addressed by the developer or environmental review.

Staff Response: A Stormwater Control Plan (Plan), dated June 2016, has been prepared for the project. The Plan has been designed to minimize the impervious areas and treat the runoff generated from the project. The Plan has been reviewed by the Public Works Department and found to meet the requirements set forth in the County's Stormwater Management Ordinance. The project is required by Condition of Approval #50 to "Collect and Convey" all stormwater to an adequate stormwater system (stormwater generated via corrugated pipe included). In essence, the project is conditioned to maintain peak water flows during storm events to preconstruction conditions. Based on the Public Works Department's review, no additional study or conditions of approval are warranted to accommodate the stormwater runoff generated by the project.

5. Aesthetics - The appellants contend that the CEQA Aesthetics finding of "Less

than Significant with Mitigation” is incorrect due to misleading architectural renderings. Additionally, the appellant is recommending the following restrictions for the project: a) limit the subdivision to a total of 5 lots, b) limit homes to single story designs, and c) irrevocably deed restrict properties against further subdivision.

Staff Response: There are no County designated scenic ridgelines or resources within the area. Nevertheless, to reduce potential aesthetic impacts, the developer has proposed to lower the upper elevation of the site by 17 feet. By lowering building pads of lots 5 to 9, the potential new homes will not significantly protrude into any views currently had by adjacent properties. The architectural renderings demonstrate this fact and give a general sense of building mass. Per the renderings, each home incorporates an architectural design that avoids large plains of unbroken facades. Many of the homes in the area are of a two-story design and incorporate similar design features. Additionally, since the January 25, 2017, CPC hearing, the applicant has added 24 landscaping trees to the Vesting Tentative Map. The location of these new trees will provide additional privacy screening between existing and proposed residences, as well as, block vehicle headlights while utilizing the access road.

Furthermore, according to the net acreage of the site, the site could potentially accommodate up to 18 new residential lots. Notwithstanding that fact, the project sponsor has proposed a 9 lot project which is less dense than much of the surrounding developments. As mentioned above, there are no identified scenic vistas or other protected natural resources that would benefit the overall County if protected. No aesthetic impacts have been brought to staff's attention that would necessitate placement of a deed restriction against further development of the subject property. Based on the project design and adopted mitigation measures, the County Planning Commission unanimously voted to adopt the CEQA findings (including determining that aesthetic impacts are less than significant) and approve the project.

6. Biological Resources - The appellants contend that the biological assessment prepared for this project does not adequately characterize the valley floor of the project site as a marsh or containing a pond. Additionally, the appellant is requesting that the oak trees on Lot 4 be retained by means of irrevocably deed restricting the lot against development.

Staff Response: The appellants have provided a 2011 photograph of the site showing a collection of water within a depression at the eastern edge of the property. According to neighbor testimony at the January 2017, County Planning Commission hearing, the previous owner removed that depression so that water no longer collects in that area. Therefore, the current site conditions provide the baseline for this application and corresponding CEQA review. To confirm the status of site biological resources, the applicant contracted Monk & Associates, Inc. to prepare a Biological Resource Analysis (Biological Report) for the project. The

Biological Report determined that no wetland, pond or marsh communities exist at the site. This determination was based on the definition of a wetland which states: "...those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration to support a prevalence of vegetation adapted for life in saturated soil conditions". The completed CEQA analysis was forwarded to the Department of Fish and Wildlife for review. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife did not return any comments of concern regarding the biological assessment for this project. No evidence has been presented to staff that would justify additional studies or mitigations beyond the Planning Commission's adopted conditions of approval for the project.

Additionally, the appellants are requesting that an irrevocable deed restriction be placed on Lot 4 to prohibit development. The intent of the deed restriction would be to protect the oak trees in that location. As proposed, the project would require the removal of 3 oak trees from Lot 4. Two trees would be removed to install the proposed access road. The third tree would be removed in order to construct the building pad for that lot. As Lot 4 contains 16 trees, the removal of 3 trees will not drastically affect the physical characteristics of that area. Furthermore, the developer has identified 2 significant trees on Lot 4 to be preserved. These trees provide unique opportunities to retain visual screening between existing and proposed residences and are prominent to the site due to their overall health and stature. Nevertheless, there are numerous other trees located in the vicinity of Lot 4 which are either scheduled to be preserved or on adjacent properties. The Planning Commission determined that the removal of 16 total trees for this project is appropriate and will not be a detriment to the overall resource or area in general.

7. Parking - The appellant contends the project poses a health and safety risk due to lack of on-street parking and access road steepness. To improve the situation, the appellant suggests installation of speed bumps and 3 to 4 on-street parking spaces per lot or deletion of the no parking red-zone along the entire length of the access road.

Staff Response: As proposed, this subdivision will be accessed by a 20-foot wide, two-lane private road. Due to the 20-foot roadway width, the private access road does not allow for on-street parking. As such, the road will have "no parking" signs along its entire length. The road design has been reviewed by the Public Works Department and Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Each of these agencies returned comments with no concerns regarding roadway steepness or design. Nevertheless, during the January 2017 Planning Commission hearing, several members of the public commented that the project could benefit from additional off-street parking. In response, the Planning Commission added Condition of Approval #3, which requires each lot to provide at least six parking spaces. Per the condition, three of these required parking spaces must be available within a garage at all times. The remaining three could be within a driveway or other portion of the lot. Since the January 2017 CPC hearing, the applicant has also

revised the Vesting Tentative Map to include 6 on-street parking spaces within the proposed roadway. These additional parking spaces will provide auxiliary parking spaces for residents during family events etc., and will benefit the entire subdivision.

8. Neighborhood Meetings – The appellant contends that the developer provided false testimony regarding several neighborhood meetings during the January 2017 County Planning Commission hearing for this project.

Staff Response: This appeal point stems from the applicant stating that he met with neighbors three times in order to discuss potential modifications to the project design. According to the applicant, these unofficial neighborhood meetings were held in April, September and November of 2015. As they were organized by a member of the community, there is no record of the attendees or individuals who attended these meetings. Nevertheless, according to the applicant, he has taken the feedback and modified the project to include: selective window placement, lower building pad elevations, re-orientation of the access road and re-location of the proposed home locations. Each of these modifications was aimed at providing increased privacy for neighbors and greater distance between residential buildings.

CONCLUSION

The appeal points are similar to the points presented to the County Planning Commission and do not provide support for overturning the CPC's approval of the proposed 9-lot subdivision. The project is consistent with other recently approved residential developments in the area. The project setting is not within an area where views are protected; however, the architectural renderings for the project indicate the aesthetics of the project will be consistent with the existing character of the neighborhood. Numerous conditions of approval have been added to this project which address concerns raised by the public. The project as proposed and conditioned complies with the development standards as outlined in the County General Plan and R-20 Zoning District for this area of unincorporated Lafayette. Furthermore, the applicant has provided a revised Vesting Tentative Map, date stamped April 14, 2017, which incorporates 6 additional parking spaces and a proposal to plant 24 new trees which will add privacy for existing and proposed residents. Considering these facts, staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors deny the appeal of Bruce Last, and Hanna and Prem Cervenka, and sustain the County Planning Commission's decision and approve the revised Vesting Tentative Map for County File #SD16-9429.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If the Board of Supervisors grants the appeal, the County Planning Commission's approval will be overturned and the applicant will not have the authority to construct the proposed project at 3198 Gloria Terrace in the Lafayette area.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

N/A

CLERK'S ADDENDUM

CLOSED the hearing; FOUND that on the basis of the whole record before the County that there is no substantial evidence that the Gloria Terrace Estates subdivision project as mitigated will have a significant effect on the environment and that the September 21, 2016, Mitigated Negative Declaration is adequate for the purpose of compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and reflects the County's independent judgment and analysis; ADOPTED the September 21, 2016, Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the project; APPROVED the revised Vesting Tentative Map received April 14, 2017; DENIED the appeal of Bruce A. Last and Hanna and Prem Cervenka; DIRECTED the Department of Conservation and Development to post the Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

ATTACHMENTS

Appeal

Reif Ltr to CPC

CPC Resolution

Recommended COA's

Maps

Environmental Review

Agency Comments

Revised Subdivision Map

January 25, 2017, CPC Staff Report

Arborist Report

Geotechnical Investigation

Geotechnical Peer Review

Stormwater Control Plan

Biological Review

Roadway Improvement Plan

Architectural Renderings

Noticing List

Power Point Presentation