burke
BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP



Kevin D. Siegel

Partner
San Francisco
1 California Street
Suite 3050
San Francisco, CA 94111-5432

ksiegel@bwslaw.com
D: +1 415.655.8121
T: +1 415.655.8100

Pronouns: he, him, his

Kevin represents cities and other local agencies in a wide range of public law litigation matters, including land use and planning, inverse condemnation, CEQA, Public Records Act, Brown Act, taxes and fees, elections and initiatives, contracts, and due process, equal protection and other constitutional law issues. Kevin specializes in writs and appeals and has had great success in both trial and appellate courts. Kevin also provides special counsel advisory services on these and other public law matters.

Kevin joined Burke, Williams & Sorensen in August 2012. Prior to joining Burke, Kevin was a Deputy City Attorney for the City of Oakland, where he specialized in writs and appeals. Previously, Kevin was a shareholder at McDonough Holland & Allen, where he litigated cases for public agencies across the State, and a Legal Research Attorney for the San Francisco Superior Court, where he advised judges regarding complex litigation.

Kevin endeavors to reach positive outcomes for his clients, without unnecessary litigation. But when necessary, Kevin zealously pursues successful outcomes in both state and federal court.

PRACTICES

Eminent Domain and Inverse Condemnation

Environmental Land Use and Natural Resources

Inverse Condemnation

Litigation

Public Law

EDUCATION

J.D., magna cum laude, University of California, Hastings College of the Law, 1997

B.A., Columbia University, 1988

ADMISSION

State Bar of California

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

United States District Courts for the Central, Eastern and Northern Districts of California

INSIGHTS

Public Law Update – Court of Appeal Upholds Order Compelling Public Agency Board Member to Return Confidential Reports

PUBLICATIONS

Court of Appeal Rejects City’s Reliance on Setback Standard Under Housing Accountability Act

Local Public Agencies Must Ensure Emails and Other Documents Are Retained Throughout CEQA Process and Override Automated Deletion Policies

Gov. Code Section 65009 Bars Challenge to Agreement Authorizing PG&E to Cut Trees on ROW; Plaintiff Failed to Serve Complaint within

© 2025 Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP. All rights reserved.

90 Days

Propositions 26 and 218 Implementation Guide

Inclusionary Zoning for Affordable Housing Under Attack

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

The following is a representative list of cases Kevin has handled in state and federal trial and appellate courts:

Appellate and District Court Decisions

- ***Ventura County Citizens Against Mega Gas v. City of Camarillo*,** 2026 WL 266279 (Cal. Ct. App. Feb. 2, 2026)—successfully defended against CEQA challenge to approval of Costco warehouse and gas station project
- ***Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. et al. v. City of Los Angeles*,** 116 Cal.App.5th 1208 (2025)—successfully defended voter initiative imposing real property transfer taxes, defeating Proposition 13, Proposition 218, preemption, equal protection, and other claims
- ***Schali v. Beougher*,** 2025 WL 3002895 (Cal. Ct. App. Oct. 27, 2025)—secured opinion reversing superior court order denying anti-SLAPP motion and directing entry of order granting motion
- ***Little Woods Mobile Villa LLC v. City of Petaluma,*** 736 F.Supp 3d 757 (N.D. Cal. 2024)—successfully moved to dismiss takings challenge to mobilehome park closure and rent control regulations
- ***Lafayette Bollinger Dev. LLC v. Town of Moraga***, 93 Cal.App.5th 752 (2023)—prevailed in trial and appellate courts against writ and takings challenges to town's denial of greenfield development project
- ***Host International, Inc. v. City of Oakland***, 70 Cal.App.5th 695 (2021)—defeated challenge to Tax Board's determination that plaintiff-appellant owed business license taxes, penalties and interest for unreported business activity
- ***Stancil v. Superior Court (Redwood City)*,** 11 Cal.5th 381 (2021)—Successfully argued in California Supreme Court that motions to quash service of summons and complaint may not challenge merits of unlawful detainer complaints
- ***Building Industry Association-Bay Area v. City of Oakland***, 289 F.Supp.3d 1056 (N.D. Cal. 2018), *aff'd sub nom. Building Industry Association v. City of Oakland*, 775 F. App'x 348 (9th Cir. 2019) defeated takings challenge to ordinance requiring developers to install publicly accessible art or pay in-lieu fees
- ***San Bruno Committee for Economic Justice v. City of San Bruno***, 15 Cal.App.5th 524 (2017)—successfully defended City's refusal to place referendum on ballot regarding City Council's approval of an agreement to sell real property for development

© 2025 Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP. All rights reserved.

project

- ***Jisser v. City of Palo Alto***, 2016 WL 3456696 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2016)—successfully moved to dismiss Nollan/Dolan takings challenge by Pacific Legal Foundation to closure of mobile home park
- ***Stewart Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Oakland***, 248 Cal.App.4th 410 (2016)—successfully defended against takings and due process claims for damages regarding city's impairment of vested right to construct project following issuance of building permit
- ***Oakland Heritage Alliance v. City of Oakland***, 195 Cal.App.4th 884 (2011)—successful defense of Environmental Impact Report for 3,000-unit mixed use project
- ***Sacks v. City of Oakland***, 190 Cal.App.4th 1070 (2010)—successful defense of lawsuit seeking injunction and refunds of $20 million in annual taxes for alleged violations of provisions in special tax measure authorizing collection and governing expenditures
- ***Woodfin Suite Hotels, LLC v. City of Emeryville***, 2007 WL 81911 (N.D.Cal. 2007)—successful defense of challenge to local living wage ordinance
- ***North Pacifica, LLC v. City of Pacifica***, 234 F.Supp.2d 1053 (N.D.Cal. 2002)—order granting motion for to dismiss due process challenge to city's consideration of development project
- ***Emeryville Redevelopment Agency v. Harcros Pigments***, 101 Cal.App.4th 1083 (2002)—successful defense of trial court rulings on business goodwill and evidence of fair market value in eminent domain proceeding

Superior Court Decisions

- ***Elite-TRC Alhambra Community, LLC et al. v. City of Alhambra, et al.*****,** Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 22STCP00217—defeated Housing Accountability Act challenge to denial of development project
- ***Discovery Builders, Inc. v. City of Brentwood***, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. N21-0980-defeated challenge to denial of development project under Housing Accountability Act, inverse condemnation, due process, and other causes of action
- ***Gallaher v. City of Santa Rosa*****,** Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-265711—successfully defended challenge to ordinance requiring electric-only power and heating systems for new low-rise residential construction (AKA all-electric reach code), under CEQA and California reach code regulations
- ***Maris v. Alameda County****, Alameda Superior Court Case No. HG20082092-successfully moved to dismiss writ petition alleging approval of affordable housing project violated CEQA*

© 2025 Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP. All rights reserved.

- ***Bruzzone v. Town of Moraga,*** Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. MSN18-1166—upheld a Negative Declaration for regulations governing hillside development
- ***San Francisco Bay Marinas for All, Inc. v. City of Redwood City,*** San Mateo County Superior Court Case No. 17CIV00276—confirmed that a plan to terminate residential use of a marina and to relocate liveaboard tenants was exempt from CEQA
- ***West Meadow Oaks, L.P. v. City of Palo Alto***, Santa Clara Superior Court Case No. 1-10-CV-165794—prevailed at trial and on appeal in action challenging inclusionary zoning (affordable housing) condition of approval
- ***Sonoma County Transportation Authority v. Proto*****,** Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-267014—successfully petitioned for writ of mandate to revise false and misleading statements in ballot arguments submitted by opponents of ballot measure to fund transportation projects
- ***Bruzzone v. Town Clerk, Town of Moraga***, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. N15-1376—successfully defended Town of Moraga's decision not to place referendum on the ballot
- ***Loeb v. City of Pacifica,*** San Mateo Superior Court Case No. CIV 522741—successfully demurred to complaint seeking to enjoin City's cooperation with a highway improvement project
- ***Brandywine v. City of Oakland,*** Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG11590075—prevailed a writ hearing/court trial in challenge to business license taxes
- ***Communities for a Better Environment v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case No. RG15788084—prevailed in CEQA action challenging City of Oakland's authority regarding redevelopment of former Army Base
- ***Clean West Oakland Now v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case No. RG14740465—prevailed in CEQA action challenging City of Oakland's approval of refuse and compost hauling and disposal agreements
- ***Kaye v. City of St. Helena***, Napa County Superior Court Case No. 26-67584—prevailed in suit for damages based on denial of a housing project
- ***Sole v. City of Redwood City***, San Mateo Superior Court Case No. CIV 528621—successfully demurred to complaint for a writ of mandate and declaratory relief seeking to compel City to allow houseboat owner to connect to the City's sewer system
- ***Stop the Casino 101 Coalition v. City of Rohnert Park***, Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV 252617—successfully moved for judgment in CEQA action challenging road improvement project
- ***Lantz Properties LLC v. Vera***, Napa County Superior Court Case

© 2025 Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP. All rights reserved.

No. 26-59545—successfully demurred on behalf of City of Calistoga in quiet title action

- ***Friends of Knowland Park v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case no. RG11586554—successful defense of CEQA and General Plan challenge to City's approval of 50-plus acre expansion of Oakland Zoo.
- ***Eco Green Cab v. Santana, City Administrator***, Alameda Superior Court Case no. RG12634130—denial of petition for writ of mandate to invalidate disqualification of applicant for taxicab permits
- ***Fields v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case no. RG11556225—order on motion for summary adjudication regarding Proposition 218 challenge to a Landscaping and Lighting Assessment District
- ***County of Alameda v. City of Oakland***, San Francisco Superior Court Case no. CPF-11-511142—successful defense of claims to enjoin enforcement of tax ordinance at property jointly owned with county
- ***Wells Fargo v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case no. RG10536087—successful demurrer to complaint seeking to invalidate code enforcement assessments
- ***Sheppard Canyon Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case no. RG07343944—successful defense of breach of contract challenge to City decision regarding improvements to real property
- ***Brown v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case no. RG07356843—successful defense to challenge to rent board decision
- ***Coalition of Advocates for Lake Merritt v. City of Oakland***, Alameda Superior Court Case no. RG06-280471—successful defense of challenge to the adoption of a Development Agreement for 3,000-unit mixed use project
- ***City of Corona v. Moreno Valley et. al***, Riverside Superior Court Case no. 351283—defeated effort to re-allocate tax revenue between cities

© 2025 Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP. All rights reserved.