



PLANNING COMMISSION
HERITAGE RESOURCE COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

3

DATE: March 22, 2011

ITEM: DEV10-0064; VAR10-0016; SR10-0024; TR10-0022; SD 9292
Danville Hotel Redevelopment Project

RECOMMENDATION:

Planning Commission: Recommend the Heritage Resource Commission approve Final Development Plan request DEV10-0064; Variance request VAR10-0016; Master Sign Program Sign Review request SR10-0024; Tree Removal request TR10-0022; and Major Subdivision request SD 9292, subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained within Planning Commission Resolution No. 2011-05.

Heritage Resource Commission: Approve Final Development Plan request DEV10-0064; Variance request VAR10-0016; Master Sign Program Sign Review request SR10-0024; Tree Removal request TR10-0022; and Major Subdivision request SD 9292 subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained within Heritage Resource Commission Resolution No. 2011-01. Recommend that the Town Council approve the Historic Preservation Incentive Package contained within Heritage Resource Commission Resolution No. 2011-02.

NOTIFICATION:

Public notice of the March 22, 2011 meeting was mailed to property owners within 750 feet (137 notices)(see Exhibit D). Posting of the meeting agenda serves as notice to the general public.

PROPOSAL:

Final Development Plan, Variance, Master Sign Program Sign Permit; Tree Removal, and Major Subdivision requests for the proposed redevelopment of the 1.124 acre Danville Hotel site, involving properties identified as 411 Hartz Avenue and 111 & 165 East Prospect Avenue.

The **Final Development Plan** request would provide for the demolition of 14,387+/- square feet of existing retail, office, restaurant, and personal service use space and the construction of approximately 34,585 square feet of new

residential (up to 18 individual residential units), retail, and restaurant use space - which is proposed to be served by the corresponding construction of a 9,450+/- square foot at-grade parking structure (28 parking spaces), 2,250+/- square feet of common, conditioned elevator/stairwell support area, 2,250+/- square feet of common, conditioned residential support area, 1,050+/- square feet of common, unconditioned mechanical support area, and construction of associated new landscaping and parking/driveway improvements and construction of new and replacement project public frontage improvements (i.e., curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light, mid-block lighted crosswalk "bulb-outs" improvements and associated project frontage and offsite storm drain and storm water treatment and storage improvements).

The **Variance** request would allow: **(a)** building height variances (38' height requested at several locations and 44' height requested for two elevator towers - where a maximum 37' building height standard applies); **(b)** average front yard building setback variances along Hartz Avenue (2'-8" to 12'-0" setbacks with a 5'-0" average setback requested - where a 10'-0" minimum average setback standard applies), along Prospect Avenue (5'-0" to 17'-0" setbacks with a 6'-3" average setback requested - where a 10'-0" minimum average setback standard applies), and along Railroad Avenue (0'-0" to 3'-0" setbacks with a 2'-0" average setback requested - where a 10'-0" minimum average setback standard applies); **(c)** numerical parking variance for the proposed residential component of the project (28 parking spaces proposed where a 36 parking space standard applies); **(d)** dimensional parking variances (to allow use of tandem loaded parking spaces within the onsite parking structure that will serve the residential component of the project); **(e)** variance from the minimum required coverage of landscape improvements (<5% requested where a 20% minimum landscape area standard applies); and **(f)** numerical parking variance to allow a heightened dependency on municipal parking facilities (providing 119 of 153 parking space demand to be handled by dependency on municipal parking facilities where historic dependency has been 96 of 129 parking space demand and where dependency on municipal parking facilities for that portion of a project exceeding a floor area ratio (FAR) of 80% is required to be handled through provision of onsite parking).

The **Master Sign Program Sign Permit** request seeks conceptual approval of tenant wall-mounted signs, shingle signs, and mini-pole freestanding signs and for center freestanding and directory signs.

The **Tree Removal Permit** request seeks authorization to remove a 38"-diameter Heritage Tree (Redwood tree).

The **Major Subdivision** request seeks approval to divide the property through recordation of one or more condominium maps for financing purposes and/or for the purpose of creating lots and/or condominium lots to facilitate the phasing of project construction and/or sale of the residential units proposed in the project.

LOCATION: Danville Hotel Property
411 Hartz Ave. and 111 & 165 E. Prospect Ave.

APNs: 208-023-003; -004; -008; -009; and -024

ACREAGE: 1.124 acres

OWNERS: Danville Hotel Holdings, Ltd.
12885 Alcosta Boulevard, Suite A
San Ramon, CA 94583

APPLICANTS: Castle Companies, Inc.
Attn.: Thomas Baldacci
12885 Alcosta Boulevard, Suite A
San Ramon, CA 94583

PROJECT ARCHITECTS: William Hezmalhalch Architects, Inc.
Attn.: Robert Lee
3875 Hopyard Rd., Ste. 325
Pleasanton, CA 94588

PROJECT ENGINEERS: Carlson, Barbee & Gibson, Inc.
Attn.: David Carlson
6111 Bolinger Canyon Rd., Ste. 150
San Ramon, CA 94583

PREVIOUS ACTIONS:

In 2005 the subject site was rezoned from a 50%/50% split of DBD; Downtown Business District Area 1 - Old Town Retail and DBD; Downtown Business District Area 2; Old Town Retail Transition to DBD; Downtown Business District

Area 11 - Special Opportunity Site. Area 1 provides for up to 100% dependency on municipal parking facilities. Area 2 provides for up to a 25% dependency on municipal parking facilities. [Note: As indicated in Exhibit W, the existing mixed use development, where fully all buildings were fully occupied, would meet just over 25% of its parking need by onsite parking - i.e., 33 onsite spaces serving a 129 space parking demand.)

A formal submittal to redevelop the site was filed with the Town in late 2007. After receiving input on that development plan submittal (notably through a study session conducted in May 2008), the application "went dark" for a couple of years. The subsequent economic downtown ultimately rendered the prior development plan, which proposed a more aggressive mixed use project for the site, non-viable. The current development plan, reflecting a scaled down redevelopment project, received preliminary review and comment at a study session conducted in June 2010. At that study session, attended by the Town Council, the Planning Commission, the Heritage Resource Commission, and the Design Review Board, the Town underscored how importantly it viewed the site's redevelopment. The status of the property as one of three DBD Area 11 properties, coupled with an acknowledgment of the physical decline of the buildings and site amenities over the recent years, lead to a Town-commitment to facilitate the development entitlement review process. The Town committed to utilize a "linear" review process, allowing more developer certainty as plans were prepared going into, and beyond, the public hearing layer for the project. This linear review process expresses itself in many of the proposed project conditions of approval, as many of the preliminary architectural details of the project are being allowed to be pushed forward into a post-project approval timeframe.

CEQA REVIEW STATUS:

Pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance has been prepared for the project indicating that, as mitigated through project conditions of approval, no significant environmental impacts are expected to be associated with this project (see Exhibit E).

GENERAL PLAN: Downtown Master Plan

ZONING: DBD; Downtown Business District Area 11 - Special Opportunity Site

LAND USE:

The site is occupied by numerous commercial buildings, collectively providing approximately 8,200 square feet of retail use, 6,850 square feet of restaurant use, 2,100 square feet of office use, 1,000 square feet of common support use, and 450 square feet of personal service use. Total current development is approximately 18,600 square feet, with the large restaurant space (formerly "Celia's") having been vacant for the past several years.

DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND

The owners and applicants seek approval of Final Development Plan, Variance, Master Sign Program Sign Review, Tree Removal and Major Subdivision requests for a mixed use commercial and residential project that would add approximately 49,600 square feet of new development to the approximately 4,200 square feet of to-be-retained existing commercial space. Inclusive in the total of new development area is an at-grade parking structure of approximately 9,500 square feet and over 4,500 square feet of common "support" area.

The to-be-retained commercial space constitutes the historic Danville Hotel structure (proposed for partial demolition, modification and rehabilitation) and the historic McCauley House (proposed for modification and rehabilitation). The two historic structures are proposed for Heritage Resource designation under the Town's Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Since the project involves buildings that have been found to have historic significance, the Town's Heritage Resource Commission has final review authority over the planning entitlement requests. As provided for under to the Town's Historic Preservation Ordinance, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the Heritage Resource Commission related to project land use issues. The Heritage Resource Commission will consider the Planning Commission's recommendation, consider issues related to historic preservation, and take final action on the project. Since the Town is committed to streamlining applications related to historic properties, this meeting is being conducted as a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and Heritage Resource Commission, allowing both Commissions to receive public testimony and to take action on the application at the same meeting.

As noted above, the proposed design, footprint, and mix of uses of the Danville Hotel redevelopment project has changed measurably since the initial application to redevelop the site was first formally filed in late 2007. Building height and building massing proposed under the initial submittal has been substantially scaled back in response to staff review and direction provided to the applicant at a joint study session conducted in May 2008, attended by the Town Council, the Planning Commission, the Heritage Resource Commission, and the Design Review Board. The project has also been modified to remove previously proposed basement parking and to remove all previously proposed new second floor office space. At grade parking in the center of the site is now proposed in place of basement parking and the office space originally envisioned for development has been displaced by a proposal to provide between 16 and 18 residential units in the project.

In 2005, the Town Council approved amendments to the Downtown Business District (DBD) Ordinance. As part of the changes to the DBD, a new sub-area was established - DBD; Downtown Business District Area 11 - Special Opportunity Site. Three sites in the Downtown core were rezoned to the DBD Area 11 designation, including the subject property, the property containing the Beverages and More use, and the property containing Faz Restaurant. [Note: Additional sites at the north end of the Downtown were rezoned to the DBD Area 11 designation for a three-year period ending on October 31, 2008, wherein the properties reverted to the original DBD; Downtown Business District Area 4 - Residential Serving Commercial designation.] The rezoning action to DBD Area 11 was intended to stimulate redevelopment on identified key Downtown properties.

The Town's Historic Design Review Committee (HDRC) and the Design Review Board (DRB) reviewed the preliminary architectural plans for the project at separate December 1, 2010 meetings (see Exhibit F and Exhibit G). At a joint HDRC/DRB meeting conducted on March 10, 2011, the two bodies reviewed the project's Conceptual Landscape Plan (see Exhibit H and Exhibit R). Recommendations for project design revisions and follow-up detailed HDRC and/or DRB reviews have been incorporated into the draft project conditions of approval (see Exhibit A and Exhibit B). Consistent with the commitment to allow a "linear review" of the project's preliminary architectural drawings (and conceptual landscape plans), much of the more typical HDRC and/or DRB reviews are slated to occur after project approval - but prior to formal initiation of the building permit process. A large number of the proposed project conditions approval spell out the process for this "extra" layer of design review and/or provide specificity to the developer of submittal requirements for later project design reviews.

EVALUATION

Conformance with General Plan and Zoning

The General Plan land use designation for the site is Downtown Master Plan. The site is within DBD: Downtown Business District Area 11 – Special Opportunity Site. Allowable uses within DBD Area 11 include retail and restaurant uses as ground floor uses and retail, restaurant, night clubs, cocktail lounges, and hotel/motel/bed and breakfast uses. Area 11 directs that a minimum of 75% of ground floor space be occupied by retail or restaurant uses and makes provision for limited outdoor display of merchandise. Residential uses are provided as an allowable use for non-ground floor conditions.

Building Height Variance Request

As indicated above, proposed project building heights and building massing have been measurably scaled back between the initial project submittal made in 2007 and the current development plans. DBD Area 11 provides for a 37 foot maximum building height (as compared to the 35 foot maximum building height generally applicable to the remainder of the Downtown). As submitted, the project would have a few locations where the maximum building height would be 38 feet. Additionally, the building heights necessary to accommodate the two project elevators, if the elevator structure designs are to be architecturally compatible with the remainder of the project, would need to be in the range of proposed building height of 44 feet.

The draft project conditions of approval call for a Project Architect-effort to reduce the maximum building height to the 37 foot height standard – if such modification can be made without compromising the architectural design integrity of the project (See Condition of Approval #D.16 in Exhibit A). The building height variance request for the elevator towers is recommended to be supported as submitted.

Setback Variance Request

Setbacks in DBD Area 11 are as established through a site specific Development Plan approval. The discussion of front setbacks has been framed in the context of a variance request to provide framework for this site specific review. The setback discussion/findings relate the minimum setbacks and average setbacks for all three public street frontages back to the DBD Area 1 setback standard – which calls for observance of a ten foot minimum average setback for primary street frontages.

Variance Request From Minimum Landscape Improvements Coverage Standard

While the DBD standards call for the provision of a minimum of 20% of the project area as landscape area (with 25% of this total allowed to be in hardscape surfacing), the existing site development condition would make imposition of this development standard extremely prohibitive – potentially necessitating the introduction of three-story building elements into the project.

Given a current condition that has onsite impervious surface material coverage at close to 94%, the proposal to retain approximately 5% of the site in planted and maintained landscaping is considered reasonable and appropriate. Partially offsetting the high amount of impervious surface area will be the provision of new offsite stormwater landscape treatment areas – preliminarily envisioned to be areas contained in the Railroad Avenue Municipal Parking Lot.

Variations Associated with Proposed Project FAR and Proposed Onsite Parking

DBD Area 11 allows for projects with up to a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 80%, inclusive of all conditioned space – meaning the 9,500+/- square foot proposed at-grade parking structure would not be included in the project's FAR calculation. Without the parking structure, the project FAR is proposed at 90% (see Exhibit W). For reference purposes, the project FAR inclusive of the building massing created by the at-grade parking structure increases to slightly over 109%.

Site development beyond the 80% FAR level may be considered on a case-by-case basis in Area 11, with authorization for the enhanced level of development linked to the provision of up to 100% off onsite parking for that portion of the project area beyond the 80% FAR level. Providing the enhanced onsite parking effectively presupposes provision of underground or structured parking to supplement parking that can be provided as at-grade onsite parking. As indicated earlier in the report, the prior development plan proposed a more aggressive project, largely possible as a result of the proposed provision of a 70-plus space basement parking area. Requiring the provision of any basement parking with the current project would most likely render the project infeasible.

The project's request for a FAR above 80% triggers a variance as project onsite parking will not meet the Area 11 standard where an FAR in excess of 80% is requested. The largest amount of the deviation is attributable to the current legal

non-conforming parking condition as the current project supplies only 25%+/- of its required parking as onsite parking.

Numerical and Dimensional Parking Variances

The proposed development plan would create a numerical parking demand of 158.75 parking spaces based on a strict application of the DBD parking requirements. This parking total does not factor in any reduction in the numerical parking requirement for the residential units (i.e., it applies an average 2.11 parking spaces per unit standard - reflecting the mix of one- and two-bedroom units proposed in the project).

Under the current development proposal, the residential units are proposed to be developed as for-sale units with reserved/assigned parking in the at-grade parking structure. As such, the residential component in the project may be assumed to create a slightly higher parking need than might be assumed for for-rent units that would share unreserved parking. Even with this acknowledgement, the project's Downtown location gives merit to setting the parking requirement for the residential units at slightly less than the otherwise applicable 2.11 spaces per unit standard.

The proposed 1.75 parking spaces per unit parking standard lowers the project parking requirement for the residential portion of the project from 33.75 spaces to 28 spaces, for a 5.75 space numerical parking variance. This adjustment would take the overall parking demand for the proposed development plan to 153 spaces - while recognizing and accounting for the dynamics of a mixed-use project and the assumed reduced parking need for the residential uses resulting from the project's Downtown setting.

In parallel to the numerical parking variance, the creation of six pairings of tandem parking spaces in the at-grade parking structure creates a need for a dimensional parking variance. The fact that parking in the at-grade parking structure will be reserved for the residential units - and will be assigned parking - makes the presence of the tandem spaces reasonable and supportable. Their presence is important to the overall site efficiency as denial of the requested dimensional variance would most likely result in a measurable reduction in project development yield.

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

The existing historic buildings on the site, the "Danville Hotel" and the "McCauley House" are not designated Heritage Resource buildings. Through the adoption of Town Council Resolution No. 19-2002 in February 2002, both buildings have been previously placed on the Town's *Survey of Historically Significant Resources*.

In order to determine the historic significance of the buildings, a third-party historic architect evaluation entitled "Historical Evaluation - Rehabilitation of the Danville Hotel & Danville Hotel Territories" was prepared (i.e., the Knapp & Ver Plank Preservation Architects review dated November 15, 2010 - see Exhibit M).

The buildings were found to have historical significance and therefore are eligible for designation as Town of Danville Heritage Resources. As such, the proposed development is subject to the requirements and standards contained within the Town's Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Town's Design Guidelines for Heritage Resources.

Conformance with Historic Preservation Ordinance and Design Guidelines

The Historic Report also evaluates the proposed development's compliance with the requirements of the Town's Historic Preservation Ordinance and Design Guidelines.

Certificate of Approval:

The Historic Preservation Ordinance requires the approval of a Certificate of Approval prior to the approval of alteration to historically significant buildings. Standards for review for Certificates of Approval include the following two criteria:

1. The proposed alteration should not adversely affect the historically significant exterior architectural features of the designated heritage resource or contributing property in a designated historic district or the special character, interest or value of its neighboring improvements and surroundings, including facade, setback, roof shapes, scale, height and relationship of material, color and texture.
2. The reviewing body shall rely upon the most current version of the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings," the State Historic Building Code and the Town of Danville's Design Guidelines for Heritage Resources.

The proposal was developed to be consistent with design/development standards contained within the Town's Design Guidelines for Heritage Resources to assure the structures retain their historical integrity. Because the historic integrity of the buildings will be retained, the property is subject to a historic preservation incentive package and designation as a Town Heritage Resource.

Background Information on the Historic Buildings

The historic information for the two structures under consideration for heritage resource designation is as follows:

Danville Hotel

- The Danville Hotel structure was built in 1891, officially opening in 1892 by the McCauley family with eight to ten rooms upstairs and one bathroom.
- The structure was built to replace the Railroad Hotel, which burned to the ground in 1873.
- The structure was mainly used by railroad workers and the occasional transient.
- The existing west (rear) wing of the structure, proposed for removal under the current plan submittal, dates back to at least 1917.
- In 1927 the structure was moved off its original foundation and reoriented 180 degrees to face Hartz Avenue, being located adjacent to the residence the McCauleys had built for themselves.
- Renovations to the structure occurred both prior to its move (i.e., the addition of the veranda at the ground level across the front and one side) and after its move (i.e., the addition of the veranda at the second level across the front and one side).
- In the 1930's the structure's use converted from offering guest rooms to a fully operational fine dining restaurant and boarding house.
- Under an ownership change in 1952 the structure's use again changed, as the new owner (Glenn) changed the restaurant focus from fine dining to a roadside attraction and restaurant, with the upstairs area serving as the owner's living quarters.
- In 1962 Glenn expanded the uses on the property through the addition of a faux-western town around the structure, with the Hotel altered to house office uses upstairs.
- Through subsequent ownership changes, the structure saw further changes, including removal of prior building modifications, and saw more changes and in use and periods of time of non-use.

- The building was placed on the Town's Survey of Historically Significant Resources in 2002 (Town Council Resolution No. 19-2002).

McCauley House

- The building is currently located on Lot 1 of Block 3 in the first subdivision plat map of Danville, recorded by John Hartz in 1891.
- The lot was purchased in 1911 by the McCauley family, who had first moved to the Danville area in 1868 as immigrants.
- The building is representative of Folk Victorian architecture, reflective of the time period in which it was built in Danville.
- Most of the McCauley family worked at the Danville Hotel or at the 160+ acre farm located at the present day McCauley Road.
- In 1920, the mother, Mary Bridgett McCauley, deeded the property to her two daughters Mary Jane and Sarah Ellen McCauley.
- The building was placed on the Town's Survey of Historically Significant Resources in 2002 (Town Council Resolution No. 19-2002).

As proposed, the two existing historic buildings would be preserved and restored, though the non-historic addition to the rear (west) of the Danville Hotel would be removed so the building could be returned to its original size and configuration. The proposed building improvements are generically described in the applicant's narrative communication dated October 25, 2010 (see final page of Exhibit M).

Historic Preservation Incentive Package

The Town Historic Preservation Ordinance states that, "in order to more effectively and equitably achieve the purposes of this section, the Town may offer incentives to the owners of heritage resources and contributing properties in a historic district in order to support the preservation, maintenance and appropriate rehabilitation of those resources. Preservation incentives shall be considered on a case-by-case basis and may include economic assistance, relaxation of otherwise applicable development standards or use restrictions. The Heritage Resource Commission shall adopt by resolution a list of potential preservation incentives."

A recommended list of historic preservation incentives for the project are contained within Heritage Resource Commission Resolution No. 2011-02 (see Exhibit C).

SPECIAL REPORTS PREPARED TO FACILITATE PROJECT REVIEW

In addition to the third-party historic architect evaluation prepared for the project, several other special reports were prepared to facilitate the review of the development entitlement request and the preparation of the requisite project environmental review.

For analysis of potential project traffic impacts on the adjacent roadway network associated with the proposed project, a **traffic impact study** was prepared. That study (see Exhibit I - *Final Traffic Impact Study for Danville Hotel Expansion*) found that no significant traffic impacts would occur as a result of the project's development. The study did forward traffic-related mitigation measures, which have been incorporated into the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance (Draft MND) (see Exhibit D) and the recommended Project Conditions of Approval (Project COAs)(see Exhibit A and Exhibit B).

As required to address current stormwater pollution prevention requirements a **Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan** was prepared for the project (see Exhibit J). The Plan outlines and analyses project onsite and offsite stormwater treatment options and obligations. The findings and recommendations of the Plan have been incorporated into the Draft MND and the Project COAs.

In addition to these two studies, a **Preliminary Geotechnical Report** (see Exhibit K) and a **Phase I Environmental Site Assessment** (see Exhibit L) were prepared for the project. The findings and recommendations of those two reviews have also been incorporated into the Draft MND and the Project COAs.

PUBLIC CONTACT

Public notice of the March 22, 2011 meeting was mailed to property owners within 750 feet. Posting of the meeting agenda serves as notice to the general public.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission

Recommend the Heritage Resource Commission adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance for the project and approve Final Development Plan request DEV10-0064, Variance request VAR10-0016, Master Sign Program Sign Review request SR10-0024, Tree Removal request TR10-0022, and

Major Subdivision request SD 9292, subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained within Planning Commission Resolution No. 2011-05.

Heritage Resource Commission

Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance for the project and approve Final Development Plan request DEV10-0064, Variance request VAR10-0016, Master Sign Program Sign Review request SR10-0024, Tree Removal request TR10-0022, and Major Subdivision request SD 9292, subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained within Heritage Resource Commission Resolution No. 2011-01.

Recommend that the Town Council approve the Historic Preservation Incentive Package contained within Heritage Resource Commission Resolution No. 2011-02.

Prepared by:



Kevin J. Gailey, AICP
Chief of Planning

EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A: Planning Commission Resol. No. 2011-05
- Exhibit B: Heritage Resource Commission Resol. No. 2011-01
- Exhibit C: Heritage Resource Commission Resol. No. 2011-02 (Incentive Packet)
- Exhibit D: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance
- Exhibit E: Property Owner Notification, Vicinity and Public Notification Map
- Exhibit F: Historic Design Review Committee Memorandum & Notes (12/1/10)
- Exhibit G: Design Review Board Notes (12/1/10)
- Exhibit H: Historic Design Review Committee Notes and Design Review Board Notes - Conceptual Landscape Plan (3/10/11)
- Exhibit I: Final Traffic Impact Study (2/23/11)
- Exhibit J: Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan (2/15/11) and Responses to Comments Memorandum (3/2/11)
- Exhibit K: Preliminary Geotechnical Report (7/13/10)
- Exhibit L: Executive Summary - Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (5/14/10)
- Exhibit M: Third Party Historic Architect Evaluation (11/15/10)
- Exhibit N: Design Review Board Submittal Requirement Checklist (Rev 4/00)
- Exhibit O: Staff Study COA #C.6.(a). (March 10, 2011)
- Exhibit P: Staff Study COA #C.6.(e). (March 10, 2011)
- Exhibit Q: Staff Study COA #D.1. (March 15, 2011)
- Exhibit R: Compliance Checklist - Conceptual Landscape Plans for 3/15/11 HDRC/DRB Review
- Exhibit S: Preliminary Architectural Plans (11/12/10)
- Exhibit T: Tentative Map, Preliminary Grading Plans and Utility Plan (2/16/11)
- Exhibit U: Conceptual Landscape Plan (2/11)
- Exhibit V: Site Photographs - Danville Hotel and McCauley House
- Exhibit W: Danville Hotel Site Redevelopment Plan Summary (REV 3/15/11)