

Filed 3/25/10

**CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION**

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

PARCHESTER VILLAGE  
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL et al.,

Plaintiffs and Respondents,

v.


CITY OF RICHMOND et al.,

Defendants and Appellants.

A123859

(Super. Ct. No. CIV MSC07-01090)

**ORDER MODIFYING OPINION  
AND DENYING REHEARING  
[NO CHANGE IN JUDGMENT]**



**THE COURT:**

It is ordered that the opinion filed herein on February 24, 2010, be modified in the following particulars:

1. On page 16, footnote 14 is added at the end of the first sentence. Footnote 14 will read:

In their petition for rehearing, plaintiffs contend CEQA review is required because the city "committed in the MSA to the Station 68 expansion project." The record shows that the City agreed to make the following modification to Station 68, regardless of which fire protection option was ultimately chosen: "Addition of second restroom facility for female staff, additional sleeping quarters for 3 additional staff." There is nothing in the record to suggest that these changes to the station will require any physical expansion of the facility.

2. On page 17, in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph, the words “it does not appear any” are deleted; the words “only a minor portion” are inserted. The sentence will now read:

We first observe that only a minor portion of the traffic improvements specified in this provision are within the City’s boundaries.

3. Additionally, on page 17, at the end of the first sentence, a footnote will be added. The footnote, which will be footnote 15, will read:

These traffic improvements consist solely of repaving two existing streets, a portion of which fall within the City’s boundaries. Taken in isolation, it does not appear that the repaving of an existing paved street constitutes a “project” within the meaning of section 21065.

There is no change in the judgment.

The petition for rehearing is denied.

Date: March 25, 2010

**MARCHIANO, P.J.**  
Marchiano, P. J.

Trial Court:

Contra Costa County Superior Court

Trial Judge:

Hon. Barbara Zúñiga

Attorney for Defendants and Appellants

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE

George A. Yuhas, Esq.

Sarah C. Marriott, Esq.

Attorney for Plaintiffs and Respondents

LAW OFFICES OF STEPHAN C. VOLKER

Stephan C. Volker, Esq.

Joshua A.H. Harris, Esq.

Bridget A. Roberts, Esq.

*Parchester Village Neighborhood Council v. City of Richmond, A123859*

Stephan Coles Volker  
436 14th St., Suite 1300  
Oakland, CA 94612

**NOTICE**

***Please include both the appellate case number and the division number on any written communication or filing submitted to this court.***

*Due to the unprecedented statewide fiscal crisis, and related budget cuts to the judicial branch, the Supreme Court of California, the Courts of Appeal, and all superior courts will be closed the third Wednesday of every month.*

**Court Closure Dates for Fiscal Year 2009-2010**

**Wednesday, September 16, 2009**  
**Wednesday, October 21, 2009**  
**Wednesday, November 18, 2009**  
**Wednesday, December 16, 2009**  
**Wednesday, January 20, 2010**  
**Wednesday, February 17, 2010**  
**Wednesday, March 17, 2010**  
**Wednesday, April 21, 2010**  
**Wednesday, May 19, 2010**  
**Wednesday, June 16, 2010**

**Our website address is**  
**<http://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov>**

pr

adda