



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

This document contains the City of Martinez's response to comments on the November 2021 General Plan Update document. The comment period began on November 5, 2021 and ended on May 27, 2022. Please use the bookmarks below to navigate the comments/responses.

Comments from City Council (CC), Planning Commission (PC), Anti-Racism & Discrimination and Pro-Inclusion & Equity (ARDPIE) Task Force Meetings*

- [1.0 – General Plan Introduction & Vision](#)
- [2.0 – Land Use Element](#)
- [3.0 – Open Space Conservation Element](#)
- [4.0 – Historic, Cultural & Arts Element](#)
- [5.0 – Parks & Community Facilities Element](#)
- [6.0 – Circulation Element](#)
- [8.0 – Public Safety Element](#)
- [9.0 – Noise & Air Quality](#)
- [10.0 – EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element](#)

*These meetings were held on December 1, 2021, December 15, 2021, January 12, 2022, February 22, 2022, March 8, 2022, and March 22, 2022. Copies of agendas, presentation slides, and video footage for these meetings are available on the General Plan "[Past Meetings](#)" webpage.

Separate Comments from the Public

[Lisa Kulchik](#)
[Linda Lang](#)
[Kerry Kilmer](#)
[Jeannine Gendar](#)
[Jane Moore](#)
[Ginger Ogden](#)

[Elaine Jackson](#)
[Debra Reuter](#)
[Cynthia Wight](#)
[Carol Wiley](#)
[Tom O'Brien](#)
[Tina Gonzalez](#)
[Suzanne Chapot](#)
[Susan Gustofson](#)
[Melissa Jacobson](#)
[Max Godino](#)
[Marta Van Loan](#)
[Lucy Snow](#)
[Linda Meza](#)
[Kim Yuers](#)
[George Zamaria](#)
[Deborah White](#)
[Darlene Fleming](#)
[Daniel Lee](#)
[Christine Yarosh](#)
[Chandra Damele](#)
[Camila Goetz](#)
[Asher Wilson](#)
[Alicia Jenson](#)
[Harlan Stricklandd](#)
[Kristin Henderson](#)
[Tim Platt](#)
[Thousand Friends of Martinez](#)

Attachments

[Attachment A – Recommended Revised Vision Statement](#)
[Attachment B – PRMCC Recommended Revisions](#)
[Attachment C – Recommended Economic Development Policies](#)



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
1.0 - General Plan Introduction & Vision				
Vision Statement	CC	12/1/21	The vision statement is still accurate.	Comment noted.
Vision Statement	CC	12/1/21	The entire vision statement should be expanded and equity and environment should be added to the vision.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.
General Comment	CC	12/1/21	Provide the GPU document in a Microsoft Word format to facilitate identification of suggested revisions.	Staff requested that policy makers submit their comments to staff to help maintain version control.
General Comment	CC	12/1/21	Ensure the GPU document is clear and accessible to the public.	The November 2021 and August 2022 versions of GPU are on City website. The August 2022 version uses the track changes feature to help identify changes that have been made in response to stakeholder input.
General Comment	CC	12/1/21	Add hyperlinks to other documents mentioned throughout the GPU.	The August 2022 GPU includes hyperlinks to key reference documents.
Vision Statement	PC	12/1/21	Add social equity and environmental justice to the vision statement.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.
Vision Statement	PC	12/1/21	The words “unique small-town character” are used twice in the vision statement. Consider different wording for second use of “character”.	See response above.
Vision Statement	PC	3/22/22	Include additional language in the vision statement regarding community safety	See response above.
Vision Statement	PC	3/22/22	Vision statement should mention walkability/bike-ability.	See response above.
Vision Statement	PC	3/22/22	Emphasize the following within the vision statement: better walking connection between the waterfront, creek, parks, and pool; and direct walking pathway into the heart of downtown (instead of circuitously around buildings).	See response above.
Vision Statement	PC	3/22/22	Keep the vision statement broad and put the details throughout the GPU.	The August 2022 GPU vision statement remains broad. The policies included throughout the GPU document provide details regarding the vision’s implementation.
Vision Statement	PC	3/22/22	Mention affordable workforce housing in the vision statement. Make sure that definition of affordable housing is broad enough to capture multiple situations (not necessarily in the vision statement).	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE. Staff will ensure the Housing Element Update defines affordable housing broadly enough to capture multiple situations.
Vision Statement	ARDPIE	2/22/22	Add “diversity of people and businesses” to the vision statement.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Vision Statement	ARDPIE	2/22/22	Add “racial justice” to the vision statement.	See response above.
Vision Statement	ARDPIE	2/22/22	Seek input on GP from low-income areas in Pacheco near Highway 4.	The area mentioned is not within City limits or sphere of influence (SOI). If the area is incorporated in the City’s limits or SOI at a future date, input can be obtained at that time.
Vision Statement	ARDPIE	3/22/22	Make sure that the vision statement addresses all of Martinez’s areas/communities and not just those in the incorporated City.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.
General Comment	ARDPIE	3/22/22	Ensure that the General Plan’s economic development policies also apply to areas outside of Downtown.	The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C). If adopted, these policies would apply to citywide decision-making.
Vision Statement	ARDPIE	3/22/22	The vision statement’s use of “vibrant, eclectic downtown” seems to ignore the Marina and the larger waterfront area. Emphasize the waterfront as a key area of the City.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.
Vision Statement	ARDPIE	3/22/22	Revise the vision statement as follows: “Martinez is a welcoming and inclusive community. Visitors will continue to be attracted to our Martinez community because of our unique small-town ambiance, shops, restaurants, waterfront recreation and surrounding natural beauty. Martinez has a strong sense of diversity, safety and inclusivity. This provides a strong sense of belonging for all of its residents. Martinez will retain its qualities for future generations by creating a community that is culturally rich and provides fair and equitable housing, job opportunities and schools for all people in the community. Martinez will be a community where all residents can take pride in being a part of racial and social equality.”	The key words in this suggested rewrite, including “inclusive”, “diversity”, “safety”, “job opportunities”, and “racial and social equity” have been added to the August 2022 GPU vision statement (see Attachment A).
Vision Statement	ARPIE	3/22/22	Mention Martinez’s education system in vision statement.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.
Vision Statement	Public	12/1/21	Parts of vision statement are good; however, too much additional density is proposed for Downtown. These densities are inconsistent with zoning code. Preserve the Downtown’s current density.	The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Vision Statement	Public	12/1/21	Add the word “safe” to vision statement.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.
Vision Statement	Public	12/1/21	The vision statement does not adequately address economic development.	The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C of this document).
Vision Statement	Public	2/22/22	Major development in Marina Waterfront is not appropriate.	Opinion noted. The November 2021 and August 2022 GPU land use designations would set the stage for a vibrant waterfront and more economically self-sufficient marina. The designations would support the potential for ferry service; limited commercial development; improvements for public access; expanded recreation uses; and natural resource preservation. The upcoming Waterfront Marina Trust Land Use Plan process will help determine what level of development is appropriate for the area based on a variety of constraints.
Vision Statement	Public	2/22/22	The City needs revenues from new businesses.	The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C of this document) to, among other things, attract new businesses to the city.
General Comment	Public	1/12/22	The GPU document needs to be easier to navigate. Incorporate plenty of links to reference documents.	The August 2022 GPU includes hyperlinks to key reference documents.
Vision Statement	Public	3/22/22	“Unique, small-town character” should remain in the vision statement.	The August 2022 GPU vision statement retains this phrase. See revised vision statement in Attachment A of this document.
2.0 - Land Use Element				
ou and 10	CC	12/1/21	Add policies addressing SB 9 and SB 10. The City should adopt resolutions/ordinances regarding implementation of the bills. Staff Note: SB 9, also known as the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency Act, is a state bill that requires cities to allow one additional residential unit onto parcels zoned for single-dwelling units. SB 10 enables local governments to rezone parcels in transit-rich areas or urban infill sites for up to ten dwelling units per parcel without CEQA review.	The City Council adopted an urgency ordinance addressing SB 9 requirements in December 2021; therefore, no further action is needed relative to SB 9. Staff will incorporate a policy addressing SB 10 as part of the Housing Element Update.
Alhambra Annexation	CC	12/1/21	Confirm the GPU land use map includes the Alhambra annexation.	This has been confirmed by staff.
FAR/Density Table	CC	12/1/21	The GPU document should include the FAR/density summary table provided as part of the 12/1/21 joint meeting slide deck.	The FAR/density summary table has been added to the August 2022 GPU (Section 2.5 of the Land Use Element)
Enforcement	CC	12/1/21	Are General Plan policies enforceable or require an implementing ordinance?	The City's decision-making must be consistent with its General Plan. The Zoning Ordinance, Specific Plans, and Subdivision Ordinance are the primary implementation tools for the General Plan.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Vision Statement	CC	12/1/21	Ensure the vision statement covers topics discussed throughout the GPU elements.	The vision statement covers the key topic areas discussed throughout the GPU; however, it does not cover every single topic to keep the statement concise.
General Comment	CC	12/1/21	There needs to be further discussion on the Land Use Element.	The Planning Commission held a special meeting on 3/8/22 to further discuss the Land Use Element.
General Comment	CC/PC	12/1/21	The land use map is hard to read. Add an interactive website tool to make land use map easier to research on parcel basis.	The City has added an interactive land use map and user guide to the GPU website. The interactive map allows the user to search for an address or parcel to clearly identify the proposed land use designation for that property. The August 2022 GPU includes poster-size maps to improve legibility.
Downtown Specific Plan	CC	12/1/21	Confirm the Downtown Martinez Specific Plan (DSP) is consistent with GPU Land Use Element.	Once the GPU is adopted, all the City's existing land use plans (including the DSP) will need to be amended to ensure consistency with the GPU.
Housing Accountability Act	PC	12/1/21	Analyze impact of Housing Accountability Act (HAA) on GPU	The HAA will be addressed as part of the Housing Element Update.
Teacher and Affordable Workforce Housing	PC	12/1/21	The Public and Quasi-Public Institutions (PI) land use designation should allow residential development for teacher and affordable workforce housing.	The Land Use Element has been revised to include the following sentence at the end of Land Use Policy LU-P-1.1: "As part of the Housing Element Update, consider allowing multi-family residential uses within the Public and Quasi-Public Institutions (PI) land use designation to create opportunities for teacher and affordable workforce housing."
E-Bikes	PC	12/1/21	Encourage use of e-bikes in implementation measures.	The GPU includes several policies promoting alternative modes of transportation such as bicycles. The term "bicycle" includes "e-bike"; therefore, no change is recommended.
Waterfront Development	PC and Public	3/8/22	Clarify whether 400-500 housing units are proposed for the waterfront area as part of the GPU.	The basis for the public comment is not clear in terms of the area being referred to, and the method for calculating the number of units. Approximately 80% of the waterfront area is proposed to be designated for Open Space, Parks and Recreation or Marina Waterfront which do not allow residential uses. A small area adjacent to the UP Railroad tracks is proposed to have new land use designations of Downtown Shoreline (DS) and Downtown Government (DG) which allow 17-35 units per acre for DS, and 29 – 43 units/acre for DG. These densities are appropriate for areas adjacent to the train station, which should be developed with higher density transit-oriented development, to achieve proper land utilization, and compliance with the City's regional housing production goals.
GPU Schedule	PC	3/8/22	A project schedule should be made available to the public.	The remaining project schedule will be added to the GPU website shortly after the release of the August 2022 GPU.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Historic Preservation	PC	3/8/22	Design standards should be included in the GPU regarding the preservation of the character of historical buildings while also allowing for more efficient/modern construction.	The November 2021 GPU contained several policies regarding preservation of character of historical buildings. These policies are retained in the August 2022 GPU. See Historical, Cultural and Arts Policies HCA-P-1.3, HCA-P-1.7, HCA-P-1.8.
DG Land Use Designation	PC	3/8/22	Provide clarification regarding the Downtown Government (DG) land use designation covering the existing Amtrak station/parking lot and indoor sports complex.	This block is City-owned public parking for the train station. The DG land use designation allows residential, so the block could be developed in the future with ground floor public parking for the train station and residential above.
Form-Based Code	PC	3/8/22	Suggested that the City consider implementing a form-based code for certain areas of the city instead of relying on FAR as the only way to address building mass.	The City will begin a comprehensive update of its Zoning Ordinance after the GPU is adopted. The City will explore whether to change to a form-based code as part of that process.
Height Limits	Public	3/8/22	FAR does not cap heights of buildings. A height limitation should be included within the General Plan in addition to a FAR ratio.	<p>State General Plan law does not require height, setbacks, and lot coverage to be included in general plans as these are normally incorporated into the subsequent zoning code updates designed to implement an adopted general plan. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the importance of setting a height limitation for unique areas like the Downtown and other areas closer to the waterfront; therefore, the land use descriptions for the Downtown Core (DC), Downtown Government (DG), and Downtown Shoreline (DS) have been revised to include the height limitations listed below. It should be noted that these height limitations match what is <u>already</u> established by the Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p><u>Downtown Core (DC)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit.</p> <p><u>Downtown Government (DG)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p> <p><u>Downtown Shoreline (DS)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p>
Housing Element Update	Public	3/8/22	Seems foolhardy to not wait for the Housing Element Update to be finished before proceeding further with the GPU.	The two documents are on different time schedules. After the Housing Element Update is completed next year, the General Plan can be amended for consistency if needed.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
POPO Designation	Public	3/8/22	Three sections of Measure I are not included in the General Plan and should be included.	See discussion of the Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) designation in Section 2.5 of the Land Use Element. Also see Land Use Element Section 2.8 Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures. Policy LU-P-1.2 includes the Measure I POPO language as clarified by the litigation settlement agreement.
General Comment	Public	12/1/21	Make the General Plan clear. How is new General Plan different than the 1973 General Plan? Slow down General Plan review process.	The 1973 General Plan and August 2022 GPU are on City website for comparison. The public review process is on-going to Fall 2022 and provides additional time for public input.
POPO Designation	Public	12/1/21	Measure I POPO overlay designation for open space is not visible enough.	The City added an interactive land use map and user guide to the GPU website. The interactive map allows the user to search for an address or parcel to clearly identify the proposed land use designation for that property. It also allows the user to determine whether that property is in the POPO designation. The August 2022 GPU includes poster-size maps to improve legibility.
Downtown Specific Plan	Public	12/1/21	What plan governs the Downtown area: General Plan or Downtown Specific Plan (DSP)?	General plans establish a broad policy framework. Specific plans and zoning ordinances seek to implement the framework with more specific policies and regulations. Once the General Plan is adopted, the City will have to align its specific plans and zoning ordinance with the newly adopted General Plan.
Historic Preservation	Public	12/1/21	Disagrees with Planning Commissioner comment that preserving community character is more important than preserving existing buildings.	Commented noted (no response necessary).
Density Bonus; Adaptive Reuse	Public	12/1/21	General Plan does not discuss density bonuses or historic adaptive reuse.	Density bonuses are discussed in the City's Housing Element and Municipal Code. The Historic, Cultural and Arts Element has Policy HCA-P-1.8 concerning adaptive reuse of historical structures.
Housing Element Update	Public	12/1/21	The Housing Element Update should be discussed at same time as the rest of GPU. Balance population increase with jobs increase.	The Housing Element Update is underway, but on a later schedule. Housing and land use policies will be made consistent (if needed) when the Housing Element Update is adopted. Housing Element Update will address jobs/housing balance as part of Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goals.
Economic Development	Public	12/1/21	The economic health of the city is a concern. Attract higher paying jobs.	The August 2022 GPU has areas designated for commercial uses that will support businesses and jobs. It also includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C of this document).
Light Industrial Uses	Public	12/1/21	Light industrial land use designations should include more than auto-oriented uses.	The Commercial Light Industrial (CLI) land use designation in the GPU does list other uses: "...building materials, warehouses, distribution, and personal storage located on major arterial streets, as well as retail uses, services and small offices".



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Vision Statement; Special Needs Housing	Public	12/1/21	Add to the vision statement the phrase “a sense of belonging”. The GPU should promote housing for veterans and young people.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates this suggested change. Housing for various need groups is already addressed in the existing Housing Element. This type of housing will be addressed anew as part of the Housing Element Update.
Vision Statement; GPU Goals	Public	12/1/21	There is a lack of connection between the vision and goals for variety of housing opportunities.	The Housing Element Update will include more specific goals and policies addressing housing opportunities.
Economic Development	CC	4/20/22	General Plan needs to include economic development policies.	The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C of this document).
3.0 – Open Space and Conservation Element				
Park Acreage	CC	12/15/21	Section 3.3 of the Open Space and Conservation Element should reflect that the City is a leader in County with over seven acres neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 residents.	Section 3.3 of the Open Space and Conservation Element has been revised to include this information with the data source (June 2021 LAFCO Parks & Recreation Services Municipal Service Review and SOI Updates).
Water Source(s)	CC	12/15/21	Section 3.8 of the Open Space and Conservation Element states that all the City’s water supply is from surface water provided by the Contra Costa Canal. This may not be accurate, please confirm.	This information is accurate. Per the GPU’s 2015 Draft EIR, 99% of the City’s is water supplied from the Contra Costa Water District via the Contra Costa Canal to the Martinez Reservoir.
GPU Maps	CC	12/15/21	All maps and graphics should be made more readable.	The August 2022 GPU includes poster-size maps to improve legibility.
Heat Island Effect	CC	12/15/21	Consider adding a policy regarding solar reflectivity index (SRI) standards for roofs and pavement.	The November 2021 GPU contained a policy regarding materials to reduce heat island effect. This policy has been retained in the August 2022 GPU. See Open Space and Conservation Element Policy OSC-P-1.9.
Park Acquisition	CC	12/15/21	Regarding Open Space and Conservation Policy OSC-P-1.10, what will the process be for identifying future open spaces for acquisition by the City?	Most major open space areas have already been identified and protected. Additional areas may be identified as part of the Waterfront Marina Trust Land Use Plan and update to the 2007-2012 Parks System Master Plan . Note that the land use designation for the Alhambra Highlands Development has been revised to reflect the outcome of Measure F.
Sea Level Rise	CC	12/15/21	Where is discussion of sea level rise found in the GPU?	Primary discussion regarding sea level rise is found in the General Plan Public Safety Element. See Section 8.7 – Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience.
Park Acreage	Public	12/15/21	The City Council’s statement that the City is a leader in the County with over seven acres of neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 residents is false.	The data cited by the City Council comes from the June 2021 LAFCO Parks & Recreation Services Municipal Service Review and SOI Updates document . Figure 2 of the LAFCO document displays both the current neighborhood and community park acreage per 1,000 residents for each of the 18 cities addressed in the document. The figure excludes any undeveloped parkland or open space acreage that may exist in each city. According to Figure 2, the City of Martinez has approximately 7.3 acres of



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
				neighborhood and community park acreage per 1,000 residents. In addition to the neighborhood and community parkland that the City of Martinez maintains and operates, there are park and open space areas that are either within the City's boundaries or in proximity, granting residents access to additional parkland beyond what is captured in Figure 2. These additional park and open space areas effectively increase the parkland acreage per resident for Martinez. Table 30 of the LAFCO document lists the park and open space areas in or near Martinez that are owned, maintained, or operated by other agencies or jurisdictions. For Martinez, these include Briones Regional Park, Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline, Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline, Waterbird Regional Preserve, and John Muir National Historic Site.
Park Acreage	Public	12/15/21	The use of incorrect parkland acreage data will undermine basis for collecting park fees under the Quimby Act.	The Quimby Act standards of 3 to 5 acres of open space per resident applies only to residential subdivisions, where the individual subdivision must meet the standard to provide open space within the development or pay in-lieu fees per the City's Parkland In-lieu Fee Ordinance. It is not a standard for citywide parkland per 1,000 residents, which is a standard that is established by the City's General Plan. Whether the City is in compliance or exceeds its General Plan established City-wide standard does not affect the collection of Parkland Dedication fees which are calculated only on the basis of the open space of a subdivision being considered for approval.
POPO Designation	Public	12/15/21	The Measure I POPO designation shown on various maps is hard to read. The maps have additional deficiencies. The GPU review process should be extended to provide staff an opportunity to correct deficiencies.	The August 2022 GPU includes poster-size maps to improve legibility. There are several months left to address comments in the current GPU adoption schedule, extending the adoption schedule is unnecessary.
Sea Level Rise	Public	12/15/21	The Downtown experiences flooding at high tide. There is no mention of sea level rise which will cause extra flooding. The GPU should have maps and language about sea level rise.	The introductory paragraph in Open Space Section 3.9 – Flood Hazard Management refers the reader to additional policies regarding flooding in the Public Safety Element. Public Safety Element Sections 8.6 and 8.7 discuss flooding and sea level rise in detail, including maps of inundation areas, and policies to prevent damage.
Figure Numbering	Public	12/15/21	The Open Space and Conservation Element figure numbers are out of sync with text references.	The figure numbers have been updated.
Sea Level Rise	Public	12/15/21	What will be the impact of sea level rise on new residential units discussed in Downtown White Paper?	The inundation maps in the Public Safety Element show the areas where potential flooding may affect the Downtown. Public Safety Policy PS-I-9.1e would require that the city "consider the potential for sea level rise when processing development applications that might be affected by rising sea levels".
4.0 – Historic, Cultural & Arts Element				



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Preservation Policies	CC	1/12/22	Historic preservation polices should not be so restrictive as to inhibit development.	As written, the Historic, Cultural & Arts Policies would not inhibit development. The policies are intended to encourage development that is compatible with the historic character of existing buildings.
Preservation Policies	CC	1/12/22	Are there any actionable plans/visions under the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element?	Yes, see the goals, policies, and implementation measures listed throughout the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element.
Landmarks; General History	CC	1/12/22	Consider the social and environmental justice landmarks and history to include in the element.	Section 4.3 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element discusses the general history of the city. The Environmental Justice (EJ) and Disadvantaged Communities Element discusses social and EJ topics.
1982 Historic Resource Inventory	CC	1/12/22	Inclusion of the Historical Society's list in the presentation may be misleading since these are not necessarily in the state or national register of historical buildings	The subsection titled "1982 Historical Resource Inventory" under Section 4.3 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element has been revised to read as follows: "The City of Martinez and Martinez Historical Society prepared a historical resource inventory in 1982. The 1982 Historical Resource Inventory cites structures throughout the City which are considered historically significant on a local level in terms of architecture or as sites of historical events. The Inventory is used as a means of implementing the State Historic Building Code within the City. The State Historic Building Code respects the structural and design limitations of older buildings which limit their applicability to modern building codes. The use of the State Historic Building Code allows many owners of historic structures to renovate structures that were previously restricted by modern Codes."
Design Review	CC	1/12/22	Historic, Cultural & Arts Policy HCA-P-1.8 mentions the design review, but the City does not currently have a Design Review Committee (DRC).	Correct. The DRC has not met since 2017 and its duties are currently carried out by the Planning Commission.
Public Art Ordinance	CC	1/12/22	Reminder to staff that the City has been working on a Public Art Ordinance since 2020. The Ordinance still needs action taken by the City Council.	The Ordinance is not part of the GPU; however, the City Council introduced the Ordinance in August 2022. The Ordinance will become effective 30 days after its adoption (which is scheduled at the end of July).
Historic Resource Definition	CC	1/12/22	How are historical resources defined in the City?	National and state registers have their own criteria for these resources. The Martinez local register was established by the Martinez Historical Society. CEQA also provides that buildings over 50 years old are historical unless proven otherwise.
1982 Historic Resource Inventory	CC	1/12/22	The 1982 Historic Resource Inventory is out of date. The Historic, Cultural & Arts Element should highlight potential resources that should be added. A policy should be added encouraging staff to update the inventory.	The Historic, Cultural & Arts Element acknowledges the 1982 inventory is out of date. It includes Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d which calls on the City to "Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation."



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Bocce Ball	CC	1/12/22	The Section 4.4 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element appears to be missing a mention of bocce ball. This is a big miss.	Bocce ball and the Martinez Bocce Federation is discussed in Section 5.2 of the Parks and Facilities Element.
Contra Costa County Historical Society	CC	1/12/22	The Historic, Cultural & Arts Element makes no mention of the Contra Costa County Historical Society even though it is based out of Martinez.	Section 4.4 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element has been updated with a description of the Contra Costa County Historical Society and the resources it provides.
Campbell Theater	PC	1/12/22	Section 4.4 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element should mention the Campbell Theater.	A reference to the Campbell Theater has been added to Section 4.4 under "Public Art, Music, and Theatre".
Art in Public Places Policy/Ordinance	PC	1/12/22	Will a development fee or art fund be targeted through the GPU process?	The Historic, Cultural & Art Element includes Implementation Measure HCA-I-2.1d calling on the City to "consider adopting an Art in Public Places Policy/Ordinance." Such a policy/ordinance, when developed, would establish a funding mechanism for public art.
Future Historical Resources	PC	1/12/22	Should policies be included to address historical resources that could be identified in the future (25-50 years from now)?	The Historical, Cultural & Arts Element includes Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d, which calls on the City to "assist the Martinez Historical Society with an update of the comprehensive citywide inventory of historical resources and develop a citywide survey to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state, and national historic resource designation." It should also be noted that State environmental law, CEQA, defines buildings over 50 years old as historical unless proven otherwise.
Historic, Cultural and Arts Policies	PRMCC	7/14/21 and 7/29/21	Several policies should be revised or added to improve the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element.	The August 2022 GPU includes policy revisions as recommended by the PRMCC on 7/14/21 and 7/29/21. The revisions made in response to PRMCC input are provided in Attachment B of this document.
Dissatisfaction with Element	Public	12/1/21	One member of the public expressed dissatisfaction with the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element. This person urged policy makers to review higher-quality elements from other cities.	It should be acknowledged the GPU addresses historic preservation to a greater degree than the 1973 General Plan. The GPU includes Historic, Cultural & Arts Goal HCA-G-1 which calls on the City to "foster protection, preservation, and rehabilitation of Martinez's historic and cultural heritage". The element includes several policies and implementation measures for this goal. The 1973 General Plan does not discuss historic preservation, except for historic structures in the Alhambra Valley.
1982 Historic Resource Inventory	Public	12/1/21	The appendix containing the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory was not included with Historical, Cultural & Arts Element. It would be nice to include links for the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) and other reference documents.	The 1982 Historic Resource Inventory has been hyperlinked within the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element. Links have also been added for the DSP and other referenced documents.
Land Use for former Italian Village	Public	12/1/21	The General Plan land use designation for the former Italian Village at Embarcadero and Berrellesa streets is being changed from industrial to high density housing. Ensure the proposed land use designation change does not threaten this historic neighborhood.	Section 2.3 of the Land Use Element includes the following language regarding the historic structures on Berrellesa Avenue: "The Granger's Wharf area retains its historic character from the Italian Fishing Village that existed before commercial fishing was banned along the Carquinez Strait in 1957. The established residential uses and character of Granger's Wharf should be



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
				maintained". The Downtown shoreline area located around the former Italian Village is developed with industrial buildings and it is appropriate to transition those areas to other uses.
Historic Preservation Policies	Public	1/12/22	The historical aspects of Martinez extend far beyond the limited geographic area addressed by the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP). The City should consider applying historic preservation policies on a citywide basis.	Agreed. The Historical, Cultural & Arts Element includes Policy HCA-P-1.8, which calls for the City to encourage the adaptation and compatible reuse of historic buildings in order to preserve the historic resources that are a part of Martinez's heritage. This policy will apply to the entire City not just the Downtown.
Historical, Cultural & Arts Policies	Public	1/12/22	The Historical, Cultural & Arts Element's policy statements appear to be recommendations and not actual requirements. The City should tweak the policy language to make them more enforceable.	General Plan policies are general in nature but are enforceable through the development permit process, and ordinances in the Municipal Code that implement the general policies.
Contra Costa County Jail	Public	1/12/22	The former Contra Costa County Jail is missing from the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory.	Correct. The GPU does not update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory; however, the Historical, Cultural & Arts Element includes Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d which calls for the City to "Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation" As part of the inventory update, the City and historical society may include a reference to the jail, which will be demolished by the County to facilitate construction of a new office building. It should be noted the County will be photographing and documenting the building's interior and will display the jail history at the new office building or nearby.
1982 Historic Resource Inventory	Public	1/12/22	The 1982 Historic Resource Inventory should be updated prior to completing the GPU.	The historic inventory resource update requires allocation of funds, an agreement with the Martinez Historical Society, hiring of a historic consultant, and public review. These steps cannot be accomplished within the GPU schedule. The GPU can be amended to incorporate a new historic inventory after it has been funded and completed.
Environmental Justice	Public	1/12/22	There cannot be environmental justice without doing justice to historical resources since historical resources play such a large role in CEQA.	Comment noted.
Viewsheds	Public	1/12/22	Consider viewshed as a historical resource (e.g., views of Mt. Wanda, views of Carquinez Hills, Views of Alhambra Hills etc.).	The land use designations and open space policies in the GPU work together to protect viewsheds.
City-Owned Lands	Public	1/12/22	The City should think about how to preserve existing City-owned lands for future Martinez residents.	City-owned lands are permanently preserved for future residents unless they are declared surplus by action of the City Council.
5.0 - Parks & Community Facilities Element				



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Park Acreage	CC	1/12/22	Double check park acreage per resident numbers.	Checked. The City currently has 279 acres of City owned, leased or granted parks; and approximately 2,200 additional acres of privately-owned open space within the City limits or its sphere of influence, protected by the Parks and Open Space Protection Overlay (POPO) designation.
Park Acreage	CC	1/12/22	What are ramifications to the City's Parkland Dedication and In-lieu Fee Ordinance of the existing ratio of park land to residents?	The Quimby Act standards of 3 to 5 acres of open space per resident applies only to residential subdivisions, where the individual subdivision must meet the standard to provide open space within the development or pay in-lieu fees per the City's Parkland In-lieu Fee Ordinance. It is not a standard for citywide parkland per 1,000 residents, which is a standard that is established by the City's General Plan. Whether the City is in compliance or exceeds its General Plan established City-wide standard does not affect the collection of Parkland Dedication fees which are calculated only on the basis of the open space of a subdivision being considered for approval.
Parks Map	CC	1/12/22	The Parks & Community Facilities Element does not include a map showing the location of parks maintained by the City.	The Parks & Community Facilities Element has been revised to include a map showing the location of parks maintained by the City (see Figure 5-2).
Trails Map	CC	1/12/22	The Parks & Community Facilities Element does not include a map showing the location of trails in the city.	This is incorrect. The map is provided as Parks & Community Facilities Element Figure 5-1, Trails Map.
Intermodal Station	CC	1/12/22	Why was the intermodal train station included within Parks & Community Facilities Element under public facilities?	It was included under public facilities because the train station is supported by City-owned parking facilities.
Bocce Ball Court Naming	CC	1/12/22	The reference to Waterfront Bocce Courts in Section 5.2 of the Parks & Community Facilities Element needs to be corrected.	The reference has been corrected to "Martinez Bocce Federation Courts".
Future Park Planning; PRMCC Comments	CC	1/12/22	The Parks & Community Facilities Element focuses too much on existing facilities and does not address future plans. Would like to see the element include comments from the PRMCC.	Future park facilities will be addressed as part an update to the City's Park System Master Plan. The August 2022 GPU includes policy revisions as recommended by the PRMCC on 7/14/21 and 7/29/21. The revisions made in response to PRMCC input are provided in Attachment B of this document.
Indoor Sports Facility	CC	1/12/22	The Parks & Community Facilities Element includes a reference to the "Zocchi Sports Facility". The referenced name is not in line with City branding. The facility should be referenced as the "Indoor Sports Facility".	The reference in Section 5.2 of the Parks & Community Facilities Element has been changed to "Indoor Sports Facility".
Access to Parks	PC	1/12/22	The Parks & Community Facilities Element should discuss access to parks not just the parks themselves.	The Parks & Recreation Facilities Element includes Goal PCU-G-3 which calls for an interconnected trails system providing access to recreational opportunities. Goal PCU-G-1 has also been revised to read as follows: "Continue to provide high-quality parks that allow the entire community to access high-quality recreational opportunities."
Park Acreage	PC	1/12/22	How was the standard of five parkland acres per thousand residents (referenced in Parks & Community Facilities Goal PCU-G-2) determined?	The parkland standard is established as part of Martinez Municipal Code Chapter 21.46 (Parkland Dedication and In-lieu Fees). It the maximum standard that can be required per the Quimby Act for new subdivisions.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Cost of New Facilities/Lands	PC	1/12/22	The City should consider ongoing costs of new park facilities/lands, and not just consider the one-time purchase costs when making capital project decisions in the future.	Agreed. The ongoing costs of existing and proposed park facilities/lands are addressed in the City's Park System Master Plan. This level of detail is not appropriate for the GPU as it is meant to be a broader policy document.
Bocce Ball	PC	1/12/22	The Parks & Community Facilities Element mentions bocce but only very briefly.	The text for the Martinez Bocce Federation under Section 5.2 of the Parks & Community Facilities Element has been updated to read as follows: "Martinez is home to the Martinez Bocce Federation. The Federation is the largest bocce league in America with almost 2,000 members and 15 courts located in Waterfront Park. Martinez is considered the bocce ball capital of the United States with its roots in the predominately Sicilian population that occupied the shoreline area in the days of commercial fishing, and brought the sport of bocce to the United States."
School Year Typo	PC	1/12/22	Section 5.3 of the Parks & Community Facilities Element states that "based on student enrollment analysis conducted by MDUSD and MUSD, all facilities were determined to have been able to adequately serve the Martinez Community through the 2019/2020 school year. The school year referenced appears to be a typo.	The school year referenced was not a typo, but it has been updated to reference the most recent school year (2021/2022).
Parks & Community Facilities Policies	PRMCC	7/14/21 and 7/29/21	Several policies should be revised or added to improve the Parks & Community Facilities Element	The August 2022 GPU includes policy revisions as recommended by the PRMCC on 7/14/21 and 7/29/21. The revisions made in response to PRMCC input are provided in Attachment B of this document.
Trails White Paper; Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail	Public	1/12/22	How does the Trails White Paper Parks & Community Facilities Element? The Carquinez Scenic Loop Trail was not mentioned, and this is probably considered a "regional trail" which are required to be included in this element.	The Trails White Paper recommended adding a policy to the GPU as follows: "PCU-P-3.11: Consider preparation and adoption of a Trails Master Plan that inventories and maps existing, planned and proposed trails, trail segments and connections, identifies potential funding sources, and prioritizes trail segments for future development".
Proposed Parks and Designs	Public	1/12/22	Include a discussion of proposed parks and park designs in the Parks & Community Facilities Element	Future parks and park designs will be addressed as part of an update to the City's Park System Master Plan.
Trails Map	Public	1/12/22	The Trail Map in Figure 5-1 of the Parks & Community Facilities Element is hard to read without street names for reference.	The August 2022 GPU includes poster-size maps to improve legibility.
Use of Park Fees	Public	1/12/22	Are park fees only to be used for the acquisition of new parkland or can they be used for park improvements?	According to Martinez Municipal Code Section 21.46.050.C, park fees collected in lieu of parkland dedication are only to be used for the purpose of providing park or recreational facilities reasonably related to serving the subdivision.
6.0 - Circulation Element				
Intermodal Operations	CC	1/12/21	Add a discussion of Downtown intermodal operations to the Circulation Element.	Downtown intermodal facilities and policies are extensively discussed in the Downtown Martinez Community-Based Transportation Plan, which is referenced in a paragraph in the Background section of the Circulation



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
				Element. The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: "C-P-10.6: Implement the intermodal transportation strategies set forth in the Downtown Martinez Community-Based Transportation Plan."
Parking Policies	CC	1/12/22	Where are parking policies discussed in the GPU?	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: "C-P-1.5: Implement short and long-term recommendations set forth in the June 2022 Downtown Martinez Parking Study. Among other things, the study recommends adjusting parking rates and limits along the most popular streets in Downtown; improve parking wayfinding to guide drivers to "right-fit" parking options; explore expanding the supply of parking spaces via private-sector investments; deploy innovative meter technologies; expand bike and micro-mobility infrastructure and amenities; improve the pedestrian experience; consider the implementation of a local circulator and improvements to existing transit routes; and continue to expand city policies that support the use of parklets."
Bicycles and Pedestrians	CC	1/12/22	Strengthen bike/ped portion of the Circulation Element and consider the greater County bike network.	See Section 6.7 of the Circulation Element for discussion of complete streets, bicycle and pedestrian routes. See Circulation Element Figure 6-3 for County-wide bicycle and pedestrian trail network. See extensive discussion in Circulation Element Section 6.7 of existing and proposed local and regional bike and pedestrian routes in the County-wide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. See goals, policies and implementation measures in Section 6.8 for bike and pedestrian facilities.
Bike Racks	CC	1/12/22	Include a policy regarding bicycle racks in the Circulation Element	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new implementation measure which reads as follows: "C-I-8.1n: Ensure the support of bicycle use through the installation of bike racks as part of capital improvement projects, and as a zoning requirement for private development approvals."
BART	CC	1/12/22	The Circulation Element should provide a little more information about BART.	The last sentence of Section 6.9 of the Circulation Element has been revised to read as follows: "The nearby Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) stations at North Concord/Martinez, Concord, Pleasant Hill, and Walnut Creek are all accessible via the provided CCCTA routes from Downtown Martinez and the Amtrak Station. BART serves the Bay Area's major employment and entertainment centers including Walnut Creek, Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose."
Alternative Modes of Transportation	CC	1/12/22	The Circulation Element should include policies promoting alternative modes of transportation.	The Circulation Element does address alternative modes of transportation. See goals, policies, and implementation measures in Circulation Element Section 6.8 - Goals, Policies, And Implementation Programs for Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation; and Section 6.9 Goals, Policies, And Implementation Programs for Public Transportation Circulation.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Marin Clean Energy	CC	1/12/22	The Circulation Element should mention Marin Clean Energy (MCE) as an energy option provided to Martinez residents.	The “Energy” section of the Circulation Element has been revised to read as follows: “PG&E provides residents of Martinez with natural gas and electricity. Their electricity is generated from power plants that utilize both renewable and non-renewable energy sources, while natural gas is sourced from natural gas fields in Northern California. The City’s projected growth is not expected to affect PG&E’s ability to provide reliable energy to residents. Martinez is also served by the Marin Clean Energy (MCE). MCE is a not-for-profit public agency that has been providing clean energy options since 2010. MCE offers more renewable power at stable rates, significantly reducing energy-related greenhouse emissions and reinvesting millions of dollars in local energy programs. MCE provides electricity service and energy programs to more than one million residents and businesses in 37 member communities across four Bay Area counties: Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, and Solano.”
Limited Mobility Users	CC	1/12/22	There’s not enough language about accessible options for limited mobility users in the Circulation Element.	This is not accurate. There are several policies in the Circulation Element that address users with limited mobility. Section 6.7 Complete Streets Pedestrian and Bicycle Routes has language supporting a network of bike and pedestrian facilities for all abilities; supporting street design standards that: “make streets more accessible for persons with disabilities”. Goal C-G-7 and Policy C-P-7.2 concerning the construction or modification of transportation facilities requires the design of the improvements recognize the needs of “persons with disabilities”. Policy C-P-8.2 states: “Recognize and meet the mobility needs of pedestrians and bicyclists of all skill levels and ages, persons using wheelchairs, and those with other mobility limitations”. Implementation Measure C-I-8.1a states: “Provide pedestrian facilities that are accessible to persons with disabilities and ensure that roadway improvement projects address accessibility by employing universal design concepts consistent with ADA requirements”. Policy C-I-8.1d encourages continuous walkways throughout the City; Goal C-G-9 supports the implementation of complete streets that includes “allows safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities”.
Waterfront Access	CC	1/12/22	The Circulation Element is missing a discussion of blockage around the entrance/exits to the waterfront area.	The blockage issue mentioned in this comment will be addressed as part of the Waterfront Marina Trust Land Use Plan.
Railroad Noise	CC	1/12/22	The Circulation Element should include a policy regarding quiet zones.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: “C-P-12.6: Study the feasibility of establishing Railroad Quiet Zones to improve neighborhood quality of life for residents who live in the vicinity of railroad at-grade crossings.”
Freight Traffic Data	CC	1/12/22	The “Freight Traffic” section in Circulation Element needs to provide a data source for the freight traffic cited.	The Circulation Element does provide the data source for this information. The data is from Martinez Railroad Quiet Zone Study dated 2/10/2010.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Multi-modal Transportation	PC	1/12/22	Commissioner expressed that Multi-modal transportation only works when it becomes easier than driving. This is not currently the case in Martinez.	Comment noted. The Circulation Element includes policies that promote a more balanced transportation system.
Multi-modal Transportation	PC	1/12/22	Consider requiring developers to provide infrastructure for alternative modes of transportation.	Section 6.2 of the Circulation Element includes a discussion regarding transportation impact fees. The City already charges impact fees as a condition of approval to defray the cost of public services, facilities, improvements, and amenities that are created as a result of new development.
E-Bikes	PC	1/12/22	E-bikes seem like a great opportunity for removing traditional barriers to bike ridership.	Comment noted. The term “bicycle” includes “e-bike”; therefore, no change is recommended.
CCCTA Transit Services	PC	1/12/22	The Circulation Element should include maps of bus routes.	The Circulation Element includes Figure 6-4, which shows CCCTA transit services in Martinez.
Bicycle Parking	PC	1/12/22	The Circulation Element should include a policy to address bicycle security.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new implementation measure which reads as follows: C-I-9.1e: “Establish zoning standards for safe bike storage/parking in private development and public facilities”.
General Comment	Public	1/12/22	It would be nice to have the Parks & Community Facilities Element contain the same level of detail as the Circulation Element.	The Parks & Community Facilities Element is an optional element that is not required by State law. The Circulation Element is a mandated element; therefore, more information has been included in the element to comply with State requirements.
Parking and Density	Public	1/12/22	The Circulation Element does not include a discussion of parking. Parking is becoming a crisis Downtown. The City is proposing to reduce parking availability while increasing demand through high density housing.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: “C-P-1.5: Implement short and long-term recommendations set forth in the June 2022 Downtown Martinez Parking Study. Among other things, the study recommends adjusting parking rates and limits along the most popular streets in Downtown; improve parking wayfinding to guide drivers to “right-fit” parking options; explore expanding the supply of parking spaces via private-sector investments; deploy innovative meter technologies; expand bike and micro-mobility infrastructure and amenities; improve the pedestrian experience; consider the implementation of a local circulator and improvements to existing transit routes; and continue to expand city policies that support the use of parklets.”
Safe Routes to School	Public	1/12/22	The GPU should be mindful of school locations when thinking about routes for alternative modes of transportation. For example, the neighborhood behind the courthouse Downtown does not have a true/safe walking route across Pacheco Street to the junior high and high school nearby.	The Circulation Element includes Policy C-I-8.1d, which states the following: “Encourage further expansion of the existing network of continuous walkways, and encourage the development of new continuous walkways, between schools and residential areas.”



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Safety at Pacheco and Pine Intersection	Public	1/12/22	The Circulation Element should address the intersection of Pacheco Boulevard and Pine Street, which has several blind corners that make it unsafe.	The Circulation Element includes Goal C-G-1, which states the following: "Encourage safe and convenient access to activities in the community and provide a well-designed local roadway system as well as pedestrian pathways and bicycle lanes." Under this circulation goal, the City's Engineering Division and Public Works Department staff can evaluate this intersection to determine what safety improvements can be made.
8.0 - Public Safety Element				
Safety; Air Pollution; Hazmat Infrastructure	CC	1/12/22	The Public Safety Element needs to further address rail safety, air pollution, and aging hazardous material infrastructure.	The Circulation Element includes Section 6.11, which discusses railroads and policies for rail safety. The Noise & Air Quality Element includes a discussion of air pollution sources, regulatory agencies, and policies for prevention. Section 8-9 of the Public Safety Element discusses hazmat threats, regulatory agencies, and ten policies for hazmat protection.
Martinez Police	CC	1/12/22	The Public Safety Element does not discuss the Martinez Police.	This is not accurate. Section 8.8 of the Public Safety Element discusses the Martinez Police Department's role in community emergency preparedness. The location of Martinez Police stations is shown on Figure 8.5. It should also be noted the Public Safety Element is required by State General Plan law. The topics that are required to be addressed in this element are defined by State law. State law does not require this element to contain a discussion of police services.
Buchanan Field Airport	CC	1/12/22	The Buchanan Field Airport now has commercial air service, but the Public Safety Element says it does not have any. This should be corrected.	Staff is not aware of any scheduled commercial airline use of the airport such as Southwest Airlines flying large jets like the Boeing 737. Semi-commercial, unscheduled private airlines such as NetJets may use the facility for small jet aircraft such as the Lear Jet. The third paragraph under Section 8.10 of the Public Safety Element has been revised to read as follows: "Buchanan Field Airport is a general aviation airport without scheduled commercial air service. Although scheduled air carrier service by Pacific Southwest Airlines (PSA – later USAir) was introduced in 1986, it was discontinued in 1992. As of 2022, there are no plans to re-introduce scheduled commercial air service. Private semi-commercial airlines with unscheduled small jet aircraft may use the airport."
Refinery Future Change of Use	PC	1/12/22	Refineries in Martinez may change uses in the future. These new uses can be dangerous and need to be planned for.	Comment noted. It is not known if and when the refineries may change use. Potential land use changes will be major in nature and will likely require future amendments to the General Plan when they occur. See Attachment C of this document for new economic development policies that have been added to the GPU to address re-use of such facilities.
Sea Level Rise	PC	1/12/22	There needs to be a more regional approach to addressing sea level rise.	Comment noted. Addressing the causes of sea level rise due to global warming requires regional, statewide, nation-wide, and worldwide policy coordination. Local policies to reduce local contributions of greenhouse



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
				gasses are appropriate and are set forth in the Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Public Safety Element, and the City's adopted Climate Action Plan . The City's Climate Action Plan, adopted in 2009, contains recommended actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which cause sea level rise and inundation in coastal areas. Climate Action Plan Chapter 2, Section D sets forth transportation; energy; solid waste and recycling; water conservation; and adaptation and carbon sequestration strategies to target emissions from the sources identified in the 2005 baseline inventory of GHG emissions.
Sea Level Rise	PC	1/12/22	The intersection at Shell and Marina Vista avenues could become a pinch point due to rising tides causing a backlog of hazardous material transportation and should be looked at further.	This intersection is not within the 100 or 500-year flood areas per the FEMA map in Figure 8.6 of the Public Safety Element. It is also not within the dam failure inundation area shown in Figure 8-7, or the inundation area from a three-foot rise in sea level per Figure 8-9.
Sidewalk Gaps	PC	1/12/22	The GPU should address sidewalk gaps and repairs.	The Circulation Element includes Implementation Policy C-I-9.1c which calls on the City prioritize allocation of limited funds for sidewalk improvements (among others). It should also be noted that the City's FY 2019-20 to 2024-25 Capital Improvement Program includes a sidewalk gap closure project and annual sidewalk repair project. The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy, which reads as follows: "C-P-9.3: As part of the Capital Improvement Program, identify and close sidewalk gaps throughout the city."
Fire Station Numbering	PC	1/12/22	Figure 8-5 in the Public Safety Element may not be accurate. Check whether Station #16 should be Station #14.	Figure 8-5 has been revised to relabel the fire stations as follows: Station #11 changed to #9; Station #14 changed to #12; Station #16c hanged to #14; and Station #15 changed to #13.
Hazardous Materials Movement	PC	1/12/22	The Public Safety Element makes no mention of waterways in the discussion about the movement of hazardous materials.	This is not accurate. The first paragraph in section 8.9 of the Public Safety Element mentions hazardous materials movement on waterways. "Further, hazardous chemicals are transported into and out of the area on a daily basis utilizing various transportation routes and systems. These transportation routes and systems include: ...access through San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Straits, and Suisun Bay..."
Sea Level Rise	Public	1/12/22	There doesn't seem to be much discussion regarding sea-level rise in the Public Safety Element. Figures 8-8 and 8-9 are hard to understand and need to be clearer.	This is not accurate. The Public Safety Element includes Section 8.7 discussing climate change adaptation and resilience. That section includes a subsection with considerable discussion about sea level rise. The maps showing inundation areas are from the Bay Area Sea Level Rise Analysis and Mapping Project. The August 2022 GPU includes poster-size maps to improve legibility.
9.0 - Noise & Air Quality				



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Electrical Equipment; Electric Cars	CC	12/15/21	The Noise & Air Quality Element should discuss noise impacts from electrical equipment and electric cars.	<p>Section 9.4 of the Noise & Air Quality Element contains the following discussion about stationary noise sources (which includes electrical equipment): “Although the General Plan does not specifically propose any new stationary noise sources, new development and redevelopment could result in land uses that generate noise levels in excess of City noise standards. Such land uses include commercial loading docks, industrial uses, HVAC equipment, car washes, daycare facilities, auto repair, and recreational uses. The General Plan includes policies and actions that are intended to reduce noise associated with stationary sources.”</p> <p>The “Traffic Noise” subsection has been revised to read as follows to address impacts from further adoption of electric cars: “Future traffic noise levels are predicted for year 2040. As shown in Table 9-2 and Figure 9-4, noise levels for major roadways throughout the planning area are expected to increase. The increase in noise levels is associated with additional traffic on the local roadway network under buildout of the General Plan. It should be noted that future noise impacts may be somewhat reduced with ongoing adoption of electric cars. Propulsion noise from electric cars is quieter compared to cars with internal combustion engines. At low speeds (under 15 miles per hour) sound levels from electric cars are much lower since propulsion noise generated by the vehicle dominates over any aerodynamic and tire-pavement noise.”</p>
Gas-Powered Equipment	CC	12/15/21	Include a policy in the Noise & Air Quality Element for phasing out natural gas-powered equipment.	The Noise & Air Quality Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: “A-P-5.2: Consider adoption of an ordinance to phase out natural gas hookups in new building construction.”
Refineries	CC	12/15/21	The Noise & Air Quality Element makes no mention of refineries.	This is not accurate. Refineries and other industrial facilities are mentioned in Section 9.7 of the Noise & Air Quality Element under “Air Pollution Potential”.
Vehicle Idling	CC	12-15-22	The Noise & Air Quality Element should include policies to decrease vehicle idling.	Discussed in Circulation Element 6.0 policies regarding street and signal design, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled, and in the Climate Action Plan transportation strategies.
Air District Attainment Status	CC	12-15-22	Where is City exceeding air quality standards?	The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) tracks the Bay Area’s attainment status for criteria air pollutants. The district’s current air quality standards and attainment status is available on BAAQMD’s website .
BNSF Line	CC	12-15-22	The railroad noise discussion in Section 9.4 of the Noise & Air Quality Element focuses on Union Pacific (UP) line Downtown; however, it should also discuss the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) line near Highway 4 and Viano Vineyards.	The BSNF lines are mentioned in the Noise & Air Quality Element, but the noise study completed for the GPU did not measure impacts from the railroad line referenced by the commenter. This is because the line has less frequent traffic than the UP line.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Switching Yard Relocation	PC	12/15/21	Is City working with congressional representatives concerning potential relocation of the UP rail switching yard in the waterfront area?	Congressional representatives are aware of the issue. The City's Public Works staff will continue to discuss the issue with Union Pacific.
Air Quality Index	CC	12/15/21	The Noise & Air Quality Element should add language about the use of air quality index levels as a metric for tracking air pollution.	Air quality is a regional issue regulated by BAAQMD which has standards for tracking and regulating pollution. Section 9.9 of the Noise & Air Quality Element contains policies for the City to coordinate with regional agencies to improve air quality and has site specific requirements for development applications to prevent local pollution, such as construction equipment emissions.
Indoor Air Quality	PC	12/15/21	Does the Noise & Air Quality Element address indoor air quality (i.e. smoke-free multi-family housing)?	The Noise & Air Quality Element includes Implementation Measures NA-I-3.1c and NA-I-3.1d, which address site analysis of potential cancer risks and appropriate filtration measures for construction. Martinez Municipal Code Section 8.05.070 addresses prohibition of smoking in multi-family common areas and private open spaces (but not the interior of units).
Section 9.4 Existing and Future Noise Levels	Public	12/15/21	Noise study included with the Noise & Air Quality Element is outdated and does not include Pacheco Boulevard; the Viano Vineyard area; and the area around Embarcadero Street. Train horn noise in these areas exceed the City's acceptable noise threshold of 75 decibels.	Railroad noise is discussed in Section 9.4 of the Noise & Air Quality Element. The existing noise study data is sufficient to support the proposed policies in the GPU. A new city-wide noise study can be undertaken when the General Plan is amended in the future. There are several noise policies in the Noise & Air Quality Element requiring site specific noise analyses for new development. Those policies also provide that development must comply with interior and exterior noise standards set forth in Table 9-5.
10.0 - Environmental Justice (EJ) & Disadvantaged Communities Element				
General Comment	CC	12/1/21	The commenter expressed that the City is behind in terms of Environmental Justice. It was also mentioned that there should be broader discussion of the EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element.	Comment noted. The City is proposing to adopt its first EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element to begin addressing EJ issues in the City. Regarding the second comment, the ARDPIE and PC held meetings 2/22/22 and 3/22/22 to further discuss the EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element.
Public Outreach	PC	12/1/21	The City should increase public outreach on major issues affecting the community. Consider a workshop on developing new communication strategies.	Since this comment was shared, the City has taken several measures to improve its outreach to the community. We launched a new mobile-friendly website in February 2022. We are launching a city e-newsletter at the end of August 2022. We have built a community database made up of business, resident, faith-based, nonprofit and local government stakeholders so we can readily, easily and quickly communicate to our partners. We produce weekly content on City social media to ensure useful information makes its way to the community. We are preparing to launch a bi-weekly digest of policy actions taken at City Council meetings. We engage in bi-weekly communications planning with the support of members of the City Manager's Office so we can identify opportunities for increased communication and take action on them.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Park Access	PC	12/1/21	The EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element should promote park access for disadvantaged communities in Martinez.	Martinez's disadvantaged communities are adjacent to waterfront parks. The Circulation Element includes several policies to enhance pedestrian, bike and transit connections to these and other areas throughout the City.
Setbacks from Emission Sources	PC	12/1/21	The EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element should establish sensitive receptor setbacks from emission sources.	Section 10.3 of the EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element discusses appropriate setbacks from emission sources: "Per BAAQMD Guidelines and the air quality analysis in the Draft EIR for the Martinez General Plan Update, the following minimum setbacks are appropriate: 0.5 miles from oil refineries such as the PBF Refinery; 300 feet for large gasoline dispensing facilities and 50 feet for small facilities; 50 feet or greater from highway sources; and 50 feet or greater from rail lines."
Water Rates	PC	3/22/22	Regarding EJ & Disadvantaged Objective/Policy EJ-10-2.1, it was suggested the City use the term "equitable" or "affordable" rates, not "comparable" rates for water service to low income/disadvantaged communities.	Staff checked this with the City Attorney's Office, which noted this suggested language is illegal under current laws governing water rates. The City Attorney's Office suggested instead that the City could create an internal program to offset the difference in cost (via the City's general fund) and noted that therefore the current language of "comparable rates" is used.
Affordable Housing	PC	3/22/22	One Commissioner asked whether EJ & Disadvantaged Objective/Policy EJ-10-4.1 would limit affordable housing to areas identified as a disadvantaged community.	Policy EJ-10.4.1 (now Policy EJ-P-19) is not meant to concentrate affordable housing in the City's disadvantaged communities. The City's Housing Element promotes affordable housing on a citywide basis. This objective/policy just highlights the importance of building additional and retaining existing affordable housing in the disadvantaged community areas.
Participatory Budgeting Process	PC	3/22/22	EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Objective/Policy EJ-10-6.1 should include additional language about a participatory budgeting process.	Policy EJ-10-6.1 (now Policy EJ-P-34) has been revised to read as follows: "Ensure that residents of disadvantaged and low-income communities have the opportunity to participate in decisions that impact their quality of life including health, diet, housing, education, recreation, and governmental budget allocations of resources and services."
Digital Equity	PC	3/22/22	Include a new policy in the EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element to address digital equity for disadvantaged households.	The following objective/policy has been added to the EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element: "Policy EJ-P-7: Work with school districts to promote digital equity for disadvantaged households, including access to computers and the internet."
Affordable Housing	ARDPIE	3/22/22	It was suggested that the City should think about including affordable housing as close to schools as possible so that families can have easier access to schools. It was also noted that relying on transit can be difficult.	The Land Use Element has been revised to include the following sentence at the end of Land Use Policy LU-P-1.1: "As part of the Housing Element Update, consider allowing multi-family residential uses within the Public and Quasi-Public Institutions (PI) land use designation to create opportunities for teacher and affordable workforce housing."
Affordable Housing	ARDPIE	3/22/22	What is the public relations issue surrounding the term "affordable housing"? A Commissioner clarified that the term "affordable housing" can often be associated with certain rhetoric about decreasing property values etc. which	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update
City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Comment Area:	Source:	Date:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
			can take away from the purpose of housing that is affordable. After clarification, a Task Force member emphasized the need to include the term “affordable housing” in the vision statement.	



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Lisa Mikulchik, 5/18/22, Link to Full Comment		
Materials Available for Review	What GPU materials are available for public review?	The materials available for public review during the comment period included copies of the 1973 General Plan and Revised Draft General Plan 2035 (Released November 2021)
Schedule	What is the schedule for community discussion? What steps are necessary to cement this plan? What are the target dates for each step? At what points will there be public discussion?	Revised Draft General Plan 2035 (Released August 2022) and Revised Draft EIR (also Released August 2022) are currently available for a 45-day public review and comment period. The Planning Commission and City Council will hold meetings to certify the EIR and adopt the General Plan later this year. Specific meeting dates will be posted on the General Plan website when they are scheduled. Public comment may be provided during each General Plan related meeting.
General Comment	The GPU sounds awful.	Opinion noted (no response necessary)
Waterfront & Downtown Area	The waterfront and Downtown areas are what make Martinez unique.	Opinion noted (no response necessary)
Economic Development	Invest in businesses that are already here. Help new businesses get loans.	The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group to support business retention and attraction (see Attachment C).
Housing and Development	Build up in areas that will not be affected by a skyline blockage nor change the tone of the neighborhood. Don't commercialize or develop at the waterfront, downtown or in low-scale vintage neighborhoods	The GPU requires that all major development go through design review to (among other things) evaluate potential impacts to views. Whether or not to commercialize or develop the waterfront or Downtown is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.
Linda Lang, 5/24/22, Link to Full Comment		
Downtown Development	Doesn't want the Downtown area over developed. Wants to preserve the small-town feel, views of hills and bay.	Whether or not to allow further development in the Downtown is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that there are very few remaining vacant lots in the Downtown that would be subject to development densities proposed under the GPU. The General Plan



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.
Downtown Development	Need a height limitation for buildings in this area (avoiding 5 and 6 story buildings)	<p>State General Plan law does not require height, setbacks, and lot coverage to be included in general plans as these are normally incorporated into the subsequent zoning code updates designed to implement an adopted general plan. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the importance of setting a height limitation for unique areas like the Downtown and other areas closer to the waterfront; therefore, the land use descriptions for the Downtown Core (DC), Downtown Government (DG), and Downtown Shoreline (DS) have been revised to include the height limitations listed below. It should be noted that these height limitations match what is already established by the Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p><u>Downtown Core (DC)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit.</p> <p><u>Downtown Government (DG)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p> <p><u>Downtown Shoreline (DS)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p>
Comparison of Plans	Wants opportunity to compare past plans to future general plans.	The 1973 General Plan and proposed GPU are available on the General Plan website for comparison.
Kerry Kilmer, 5/18/22, Link to Full Comment		



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
General Comment	Majority of people in Martinez like it the way it is. Don't take this away with the GPU.	Comment noted.
General Comment	The GPU should capitalize on what makes Martinez so special (small town, historic, quaint, and charming).	The first paragraph of the revised vision statement reflects the desire to retain Martinez unique, small-town character: "The City of Martinez, including the communities within its sphere of influence, will retain a unique, small-town character within its larger suburban context of Central Costa County."
Jeannine Gendar, 5/27/22, Link to Full Comment		
Housing	Using the area north of the railroad tracks in the Downtown shoreline area for housing seems like asking for trouble. Things to consider include pollution from the railroads; danger from the trains; potential for chemical spills; emergency vehicle access; and potential for liquefaction. The area in questions is adjacent to a treasured wetland, why not use it in a way that protects the marsh and accentuates the city's spectacular setting?	Whether or not to allow further housing development in the area north of the railroad tracks is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that the current 1973 General Plan designations and zoning already allow light industrial development on the properties in question. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.
Jane Moore, 5/19/22, Link to Full Comment		
Housing	The commenter is horrified to hear about the prospect of housing north of the railroad tracks in the Downtown and wants this proposal removed. She is concerned about placing housing near freight trains; the seismic safety of the area; and sea level rise.	Whether or not to allow further housing development in the area north of the railroad tracks is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that the current 1973 General Plan designations and zoning already allow light industrial development on the properties in question. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Ginger Ogden, 5/27/22, Link to Full Comment		
Downtown and Waterfront Development	The planned changes will harm Martinez and negatively change the face of our lovely Downtown area and waterfront.	Opinion noted (no response necessary).
Building Height	Allowing 3, 4, 5, and even 6-story buildings in the downtown area will render Martinez, as we know it, unrecognizable!	<p>State General Plan law does not require height, setbacks, and lot coverage to be included in general plans as these are normally incorporated into the subsequent zoning code updates designed to implement an adopted general plan. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the importance of setting a height limitation for unique areas like the Downtown and other areas closer to the waterfront; therefore, the land use descriptions for the Downtown Core (DC), Downtown Government (DG), and Downtown Shoreline (DS) have been revised to include the height limitations listed below. It should be noted that these height limitations match what is already established by the Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p><u>Downtown Core (DC)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit.</p> <p><u>Downtown Government (DG)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p> <p><u>Downtown Shoreline (DS)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p>
Parking	Allowing such huge buildings would bring more customers and residents – what about parking? The GPU does not discuss parking.	Parking standards are set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and the Downtown Specific Plan.
Historic Buildings	The GPU may contribute to bulldozing of historic buildings to create space for tall buildings.	This is inaccurate. Historic structures are protected by policies in the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP). For example, DSP Goal UD-1 calls for the City to “strengthen the identity and character of Downtown using the existing historic and architectural urban character of the community, while allowing for new structures that are architecturally compatible with, and complementary to, the existing architectural and historic fabric.” The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires extensive public review prior to demolition of any potentially historic resource.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Environmental Impacts of Housing	If housing is built in this area, the noise, lights, pets, and sea level rise will ruin the marsh and Waterfront Park.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
Housing	High-density housing would be dangerous due to train blockage, train-car accidents, earthquakes, flooding, liquefaction, and noise.	Same response above.
Housing	Any new housing in this area should comply with the upcoming Very High Fire Hazard Zone designations.	Same response as above.
Park Funding	The GPU undermines park funding for both new and refurbished parks.	This comment does not clarify how the GPU undermines park funding which makes it difficult to respond to.
POPO Designation	Whole sections of Measure I are left out of the GPU.	See discussion of the Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay Designation (POPO) in Section 2.5 of the Land Use Element. Also see Land Use Element Section 2.8 Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures. Policy LU-P-1.2 includes the Measure I POPO language as clarified by the litigation settlement agreement.
POPO Designation	GPU doesn't show Measure I on the maps – what land is protected?	This is incorrect. The land use maps do show the POPO overlay designation. Additionally, the City added an interactive land use map and user guide to the GPU website. The interactive map allows the user to search for an address or parcel to clearly identify the proposed land use designation for that property. It also allows the user to determine whether that property is in the POPO designation. The August 2022 GPU includes poster-size maps to improve legibility.
Housing Element	GPU leaves out the Housing Element	The Housing Element Update is underway, but on a later schedule. Housing and land use policies will be made consistent (if needed) when the Housing Element Update is adopted.
Comparison of Plans	GPU does not compare the 1973 General Plan	The 1973 General Plan and proposed GPU are available on the General Plan website for comparison.
GPU Attachments	The GPU does not have all the attachments it references.	The August 2022 GPU now includes all attachments it references in the text.
Elaine Jackson, 5/18/22, Link to Full Comment		
Housing at NorCal/Amtrak Parking Lot	The GPU proposes housing on the NorCal/Amtrak parking lot. It appears to be designated Downtown Government (DG). What does that designation mean?	Yes, the Intermodal Transit Station (Amtrak station) at Marina Vista on the south side of the railroad tracks, and the intermodal parking lot on the north side of the tracks connected by a pedestrian bridge is designated Downtown Government (DG). This designation is intended to allow mixed-use and other development with an FAR of up to 3.0 and residential densities between 29 and 43 dwelling units per acre.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Environmental Impacts of Housing	The thought of building more housing north of the train tracks is very dangerous. Concerns include unstable marsh land, sea level rise, train blockage, and trains carrying dangerous chemicals.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
Debra Reuter, 5/18/22, Link to Full Comment		
Comparison of Plans	The proposed GPU is hard to understand without comparing it to the current General Plan.	The 1973 General Plan and proposed GPU are available on the General Plan website for comparison.
Building Height	Buildings from 3 to 6 stories will undermine the character of our historic downtown.	<p>State General Plan law does not require height, setbacks, and lot coverage to be included in general plans as these are normally incorporated into the subsequent zoning code updates designed to implement an adopted general plan. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the importance of setting a height limitation for unique areas like the Downtown and other areas closer to the waterfront; therefore, the land use descriptions for the Downtown Core (DC), Downtown Government (DG), and Downtown Shoreline (DS) have been revised to include the height limitations listed below. It should be noted that these height limitations match what is already established by the Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p><u>Downtown Core (DC)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit.</p> <p><u>Downtown Government (DG)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p> <p><u>Downtown Shoreline (DS)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p>
Environmental Impacts of Housing	High-density multi-story housing along the waterfront will impact waterfront open space. I am very concerned about the wildlife that lives there.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	Has liquefaction been taken into consideration for waterfront restaurants and hotels?	Same response above.
Cynthia Wight, 5/23/22, Link to Full Comment		
Housing	Does not support rezoning the waterfront area for the purpose of building new commercial and residential properties on the waterfront, north of the railroad tracks.	Whether or not to allow further housing development in the Downtown is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that there are very few remaining vacant lots in the Downtown that would be subject to development densities proposed under the GPU. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.
Needs of Current Residents	The failure of the city to accommodate our current residents in regard to the downtown area, is a red flag to any potential new development. We have a parking shortage; businesses are closed and still others have not been retrofitted.	Opinion noted (no response necessary).
Environmental Impacts of Housing	Building residential units on the north side of the railroad tracks poses a safety issue with regards to evacuation should that be necessary as it is common to wait for extended periods of time waiting for a freight train to clear the current crossings.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
Carol Wiley, Link to Full Comment		
Housing	It would be a folly to add new development north of the railroad tracks. The Downtown Shoreline (DS) designation 35 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), up to 4 stories high. The Downtown Government (DG) designation shows 43 du/ac, up to 5 stories high???!!!!!	The DS designation would allow between 17 and 35 du/ac while the DG would allow between 29 and 43 du/ac. Whether or not to allow further housing development in the Downtown and waterfront is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that there are very few remaining vacant lots in the Downtown that would be subject to development densities proposed under the GPU. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service;



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.
Environmental Impacts of Housing	the obvious ramifications of building in an area of liquefaction, flooding, earthquake, proximity to railroad tracks, noise, risk of accidents and spills, plus impact of more light and pollution to wildlife. This should be a no brainer and be viewed as criminal proposed destruction of our natural environment.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
Tom O'Brien, 12/1/21, Link to Full Comment		
Loss of Local Control	The State is increasingly passing legislation to take zoning decisions out of the hands of local governments. Laws have already been passed that require cities to give concessions and ignore zoning standards when low-income units are included in large multifamily projects. Single family zoning is under attack. If any of the zoning/neighborhood character goals of this plan are to actually be achievable, zoning authority needs to be clawed back from the State.	Opinion noted (no response necessary).
Ministerial Review of Housing	Regarding Land Use Policy LU-P-1.4 and Implementation Measure LU-I-1.4a: These need to take into account recent legislation that require ministerial review of ADUs, and now, under SB 9, lot splits. Design review is no longer allowed in these cases. With that in mind, the Implementation measure needs to be more than just "considering" objective design standards. In the absence of objective design standards, staff has no authority to impose conditions on developers, and preservation of neighborhood character is solely up to the whims of the developer.	The City Council adopted an urgency ordinance addressing SB 9 requirements in December 2021; therefore, no further action is needed relative to SB 9. Staff will incorporate a policy addressing SB 10 as part of the Housing Element Update.
Objective Design Standards	Regarding Land Use Policy LU-P-2.4: This policy cannot be achieved without objective design standards that can be applied at a ministerial level	Comment noted. The Housing Element Update will include policies calling for the city to develop objective design standards for multifamily housing. It should be noted that some objective design standards were included as part of the SB 9 ordinance adopted by the City in December 2021.
Design Review Committee	Regarding Land Use Implementation Measure LU-I-3.5a and LU-I-4.1b: The Design Review Committee (DRC) appears to have been disbanded at the end of 2019.	According to City records, the DRC has not met since 2017; however, its duties are currently carried out by the Planning Commission.
John Muir Land Trust	Regarding Open Space & Conservation Policy OSC-P-1.5 and Implementation Measure OSC-I-1.10c: I suspect that the "Martinez Land Trust" mentioned is actually the John Muir Land Trust.	The policy and implementation measure have been revised to address the error.
Wildlife Impacts from Flood Hazard Projects	Regarding Open Space & Conservation Goal OSC-G-10: Does the city have a policy regarding beavers?	The City considers impacts on all wildlife when designing flood control projects.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Parking	Regarding the Circulation Element: I don't see mention of, or a goal/implementation for building a downtown parking structure, so people will "park once and walk" downtown instead of circling around and around looking for on street parking.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: "C-P-1.5: Implement short and long-term recommendations set forth in the June 2022 Downtown Martinez Parking Study. Among other things, the study recommends adjusting parking rates and limits along the most popular streets in Downtown; improve parking wayfinding to guide drivers to "right-fit" parking options; explore expanding the supply of parking spaces via private-sector investments; deploy innovative meter technologies; expand bike and micro-mobility infrastructure and amenities; improve the pedestrian experience; consider the implementation of a local circulator and improvements to existing transit routes; and continue to expand city policies that support the use of parklets."
High-Speed Internet	Also regarding the Circulation Element: Perhaps goals/policies related to broadband internet availability should be considered for this element.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: "C-I-10.1f: Coordinate with internet service providers to provide high-speed internet throughout the entire City to support working from home and thereby reducing automobile trips and the need for additional auto-related capital improvements."
Population	The Circulation Element states the following: "Based on the data provided by Census 2020, population in the City has remained relatively stable in recent years, increasing by 2,866 from 35,424 in 2010 to 38,290 in 2020." It should be noted that the Census number used for the recent redistricting process was 37,349	The last sentence of the first paragraph of Section 6.3 of the Circulation Element has been revised to read as follows: "Based on the data provided by Census 2020, population in the City has remained relatively stable in recent years, increasing by 2,866 from 35,424 in 2010 to 38,290 in 2020. The Census number used for the redistricting process completed in 2022 was 37,349."
Homeless Population	The EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element completely leaves out the real Disadvantaged Community in Martinez (the homeless).	A disadvantaged community (DC) is defined as an area which most suffers from a combination of economic, health, and environmental burdens. These burdens include poverty, high unemployment, air and water pollution, presence of hazardous wastes as well as high incidence of asthma and heart disease. Figure 10-1 of the EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element shows the DCs that fall within this geographical definition. The Housing Element Update will include an analysis of housing needs for Martinez's homeless population. The current Housing Element covering the 2015-2013 period, discusses homeless on page 14. It also provides several policies intended to address homelessness locally.
Bus Routes	Section 10.4 of the EJ & Disadvantaged Communities Element states the following: "The low income and disadvantaged areas are served by transit, with a bus stop for the Route 28 bus on Howe Road." Regarding this statement: The Route 28 bus stop at Howe and Parkway drive isn't close to any residences in the defined area. The primary access to the area is from Pacheco Blvd and/or Morello. There are, however, stops for routes 18,19,	The referenced sentence has been revised to read as follows: "The low income and disadvantaged areas are served by transit, with bus stops for Routes 18,19, 316 and 99X on Pacheco Boulevard and a stop for Routes 18 and 316 on Morello Avenue."



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	316 and 99X on Pacheco Blvd and a stop for 18 and 316 on Morello that could be mentioned.	
Tina Gonzalez, 11/27/21, Link to Full Comment		
Alhambra Highlands Subdivision	It is crucial that raw land proposed to be developed for the Alhambra Highlands Subdivision is preserved not only for value of nature but for our wildlife.	Measure F came before voters for consideration on June 7, 2022 and it was passed with over 2/3rds majority. The ballot measure read as follows: "Shall the measure of the City of Martinez to levy a dedicated special tax to prevent development and acquire, create and maintain 297 acres of permanent public parkland and wildlife habitat known as the Alhambra Highlands, at a maximum rate of \$79 annually for single-family parcels and at specified maximum rates for other parcel types, for 30 years, providing approximately \$1.2 million annually, with exemptions for low-income persons, be adopted?" It should also be noted that the land use designation for the Alhambra Highlands Development has been revised to reflect the outcome of Measure F.
Suzanne Chapot, 12/19/21, Link to Full Comment		
Alhambra Highlands Subdivision	No further developments should be approved on the Alhambra ridgeline until attention is paid to and solutions created to deal with the ever increasing fire danger to our town.	Measure F came before voters for consideration on June 7, 2022 and it was passed with over 2/3rds majority. The ballot measure read as follows: "Shall the measure of the City of Martinez to levy a dedicated special tax to prevent development and acquire, create and maintain 297 acres of permanent public parkland and wildlife habitat known as the Alhambra Highlands, at a maximum rate of \$79 annually for single-family parcels and at specified maximum rates for other parcel types, for 30 years, providing approximately \$1.2 million annually, with exemptions for low-income persons, be adopted?" It should also be noted that the land use designation for the Alhambra Highlands Development has been revised to reflect the outcome of Measure F.
Susan Gustofson, 1/13/22, Link to Full Comment		
Ongoing Maintenance Costs	Regarding the Parks & Community Facilities Element: I recommend including a requirement to identify ongoing estimated manpower and costs, and source of this ongoing funding when making the decision to fund capital improvements.	Parks & Community Facilities Implementation Measure PCU-I-1.2a has been revised to read as follows: "Establish priorities and recommend funding for specific park and recreational facilities through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process. Funding information for these improvements shall include estimates for ongoing maintenance costs."
Garbage and Personal Pickups	Regarding the Circulation Element: I recommend including a requirement that new or significantly modified developments include efficient locations for garbage pickup and a centralized location for personal pickups and deliveries such as Doordash, Uber, Lyft, Amazon, USPS, UPS, Garbage pickup services.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy, which reads as follows: "C-P-11.7: Amend the Zoning Ordinance to require that new or significantly modified developments include efficient locations for garbage pickup and a centralized location for personal pickups and deliveries (such as Doordash, Uber, Lyft, Amazon, etc.)."



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Alternative Modes of Transportation	Regarding the Circulation Element: Provide a definitive list of projects to encourage alternate transportation routes throughout the city utilizing pedestrian trails or defined (and safe) bicycle routes.	Many of these projects are listed in the Downtown Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) starting on page 6-1. The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: "C-P-10.6: Implement the intermodal transportation strategies set forth in the Downtown Martinez Community-Based Transportation Plan." The Five-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2019-20 to 2024-25 adopted by City Council on June 5, 2019 also contains some capital projects/programs addressing alternative modes of transportation.
Continuous Sidewalks	Regarding the Circulation Element: Make it a goal to provide safe and contiguous sidewalks, especially around high-density housing and schools.	The Circulation Element includes Implementation Policy C-I-9.1c which calls on the City prioritize allocation of limited funds for sidewalk improvements (among others). It should also be noted that the City's FY 2019-20 to 2024-25 Capital Improvement Program includes a sidewalk gap closure project and annual sidewalk repair project. The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy, which reads as follows: "C-P-9.3: As part of the Capital Improvement Program, identify and close sidewalk gaps throughout the city."
Sidewalk Repair	Regarding the Circulation Element: Possibly include a financial incentive for residents to repair sidewalks that are their responsibility.	The City's FY 2019-20 to 2024-25 Capital Improvement Program includes a sidewalk gap closure project and annual sidewalk repair project.
Wildfire Safety	Regarding the Public Safety Element: I am glad to find that the safety issue associated with wildfires in certain residential areas is being addressed in the General Plan (Table 8.2).	Comment noted.
Bike Improvements	The City should provide more and safer access and egress to the Benicia Bridge bike and walking path and bike paths along major thoroughfares or using alternate streets and pathways.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new implementation measure, which reads as follows: "C-I-7.1e: Develop Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan for the City of Martinez that documents the existing conditions for bicycling and walking and outlines steps needed to improve safety, act on community needs, and improve mobility options for Martinez residents, workers, and visitors."
Bike Improvements	The City should provide a safe, inviting, and well-lit street and bike lanes along Marina Vista and Shell Avenue.	See response above.
Bike Improvements	The City should modify the train track bicycle crossings at the intersection of Marina Vista and Shell Avenue.	See response above.
Bike Improvements	The City should provide more and safer bicycle routes throughout the city.	See response above.
Bike Improvements.	The City should utilize more detailed pedestrian path and design standards from nearby cities and/or Contra Costa County, rather than solely referencing state of California standard.	See response above.
Transportation Impact Fees	New developments pay their portion towards parks and community	Circulation Implementation Measure C-I-9.1d has been revised to read as follows: "Recognize the multi-modal travel needs of the City by allocating



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	facilities and also improve the roads and sidewalks immediately adjacent to that development. These fees are fixed, and must be manually reviewed and amended. The City should change the fixed fee to an automatic fee increase annually (from a baseline fee on a particular date) to one that increases automatically with the annual cost of living adjustment for that particular item.	revenue from the City's Transportation Impact Fee for bikeway and pedestrian facilities. These facilities should be consistent with the Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan until the City of Martinez adopts its own master plan. Explore whether the impact fees can be automatically increased with the annual cost of living adjustment."
Melissa Jacobson, 5/6/22, Link to Full Comment		
Downtown and Waterfront Development	I fully support more dense, downtown housing. It will be great to have more people to frequent downtown business. However, we must preserve the uniqueness of our waterfront access; this is what draws people to Martinez. We also cannot damage the views that current property owners have.	Comment noted.
Max Godino, 2/22/22, Link to Full Comment		
Downtown and Waterfront Development	We all want a safe, friendly, beautiful city with its quirky historic downtown free from congestion and overcrowding. We want to preserve our small town feel with its parks and views while at the same time promoting managed growth. I feel that the new general plan in its current form runs directly counter to this vision. I propose that no housing development be allowed north of the train tracks.	Whether or not to allow further housing development in the Downtown is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process.
Park Acreage	I also propose that the marina be stricken from inclusion within the city's acreage determination for parks and recreation. Including the acreage would mean developers wouldn't be required to contribute to building more park land as part of their projects. This is unacceptable!	The Quimby Act standards of 3 to 5 acres of open space per resident applies only to residential subdivisions, where the individual subdivision must meet the standard to provide open space within the development or pay in-lieu fees per the City's Parkland In-lieu Fee Ordinance. It is not a standard for citywide parkland per 1,000 residents, which is a standard that is established by the City's General Plan. Whether the City is in compliance or exceeds its General Plan established City-wide standard does not affect the collection of Parkland Dedication fees which are calculated only on the basis of the open space of a subdivision being considered for approval.
Marta Van Loan, 12/9/21, Link to Full Comment		
Alhambra Highlands Subdivision	There should be no further development on the west side of town given the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone designation and no evacuation routes for residents along the Alhambra ridgeline.	Measure F came before voters for consideration on June 7, 2022 and it was passed with over 2/3rds majority. The ballot measure read as follows: "Shall the measure of the City of Martinez to levy a dedicated special tax to prevent development and acquire, create and maintain 297 acres of permanent public parkland and wildlife habitat known as the Alhambra Highlands, at a maximum rate of \$79 annually for single-family parcels and at specified maximum rates for other parcel types, for 30 years, providing approximately \$1.2 million annually, with exemptions for low-income persons, be adopted?" It should also be noted that the land use designation for the Alhambra



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		Highlands Development has been revised to reflect the outcome of Measure F. Additionally, most of the area on the western boundary of the City is designated for various types of open space use including Parks/Recreation/Permanent Open Space (PPOS), Environmentally Sensitive Land (ESL), and Open Space and Conservation Use Land (CUL). These land use categories either prohibit development or allow very low-density residential development.
Lucy Snow, 5/8/2022, Link to Full Comment		
Downtown and Waterfront Development	Preserving the general character of Downtown is important to me as a local resident. It's walkable, livable, and I'm on one of the busiest streets... new development will affect this, of course, but consideration of parking, preserving park space, not building on a flood plain, and the safety-noise factors from the trains need to be considered very carefully in any changes especially to the waterfront areas	Whether or not to allow further development in the Downtown is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that there are very few remaining vacant lots in the Downtown that would be subject to development densities proposed under the GPU.
Linda Meza, 12/6/21, Link to Full Comment		
Public Outreach	I agree we need greater public outreach. Social media is a great channel if pages already have a robust and engaged following. Otherwise, money needs to be allocated for social media advertising.	Comment noted.
Kim Yuers, 11/27/21, Link to Full Comment		
Alhambra Highlands Subdivision	Please do not allow the Alhambra Highlands development to move forward, even if we have to pay higher taxes. This area is a gem and it will be gone if the developer is allowed to move forward or if our City doesn't buy it from them.	Measure F came before voters for consideration on June 7, 2022 and it was passed with over 2/3rds majority. The ballot measure read as follows: "Shall the measure of the City of Martinez to levy a dedicated special tax to prevent development and acquire, create and maintain 297 acres of permanent public parkland and wildlife habitat known as the Alhambra Highlands, at a maximum rate of \$79 annually for single-family parcels and at specified maximum rates for other parcel types, for 30 years, providing approximately \$1.2 million annually, with exemptions for low-income persons, be adopted?" It should also be noted that the land use designation for the Alhambra Highlands Development has been revised to reflect the outcome of Measure F.
George Zamaria, 5/6/22, Link to Full Comment		
Downtown and Waterfront Development	Tom and I are extremely concerned about many of the proposals on the General Plan Update. We cannot even imagine our lovely town with high density housing on the waterfront, not to mention the possibility of buildings with multiple stories in our downtown.	Whether or not to allow further development in the Downtown and area north of the railroad tracks is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that: 1) there are very few remaining vacant lots in the Downtown that would be subject to development densities proposed



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		under the GPU; and 2) the current 1973 General Plan designations and zoning already allow light industrial development on the waterfront properties in question. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.
Deborah White, 11/22/21, Link to Full Comment		
Affordable Housing on Church Land	Martinez lacks housing on several tiers. Rising housing rates across the board have made it difficult for people who grew up in our area to afford to live here. Housing for necessary workers is rapidly becoming out of their reach. Groups like veterans and seniors who benefit from low-income housing programs are leaving Martinez because the city's outdated density estimates preclude reasonable building of low-income housing. For example, our church, Grace Episcopal at 130 Muir Station Road, would like to develop an unused portion of our property to provide low-income housing. Unfortunately, we cannot find a developer to work with us because the current General plan allows the church site to be developed at only 7-12 units per acre, which is too low to be financially viable for a developer to partner with us. An update to the General Plan could change this density allowance and thus allow for more units with that change. Upon review, the revised draft general plan update does not include a revision to the church site's designation. We respectfully request that the city talk with us and work with us in order to provide the best possible housing plan for Martinez.	The commenter should discuss with staff the potential for processing an application with a density bonus under the current residential land use designation. It is possible to increase the density by up to 50% if a certain percent of the development is restricted for 55 years with rents that are affordable to very low, low, and/or moderate-income households per Government Code Section 65915. A 50% increase in density could result in a development of up to 18 units per acre which is within the range of density for the Residential High (RH) land use designation requested. It is also worth mentioning that Senator Scott Wiener reintroduced a measure on June 8, 2022 that would make it easier for religious groups to build housing by removing local zoning restrictions. The bill would apply to churches, synagogues, mosques and other faith organizations, as well as nonprofit colleges, that want to build apartments or condos on excess land they own. The City would need to amend the GPU and Zoning Ordinance in the event the bill is signed into law.
Darlene Fleming, 5/8/22, Link to Full Comment		
Downtown and Waterfront Development	I am opposed to any increase in housing density and height limits in the downtown area of Martinez. I also do not support ANY development increase in the waterfront area (north of the railroad tracks).	Whether or not to allow further development in the Downtown and area north of the railroad tracks is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that: 1) there are very few remaining vacant lots in the Downtown that would be subject to development densities proposed under the GPU; and 2) the current 1973 General Plan designations and zoning already allow light industrial development on the waterfront properties in question. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency.
Plan Comparison	I am also asking that the City produce a document for public viewing that compares the current general plan and the proposed updated plan.	The 1973 General Plan and proposed GPU are available on the General Plan website for comparison.
Daniel Lee, 5/9/22, Link to Full Comment		
Protection of History and Open Space	We bought our home in 2017. I feel Martinez is a very special place because of its history and open spaces. I strongly believe these should be protected, as much as it is sensible and affordable to do so.	Comment noted. The GPU includes several policies in its Historical, Cultural & Arts; Land Use; and Open Space & Conservation elements to promote history and protect open spaces. It is also worth noting that Measure F came before voters for consideration on June 7, 2022 and it was passed with over 2/3rds majority. The ballot measure read as follows: "Shall the measure of the City of Martinez to levy a dedicated special tax to prevent development and acquire, create and maintain 297 acres of permanent public parkland and wildlife habitat known as the Alhambra Highlands, at a maximum rate of \$79 annually for single-family parcels and at specified maximum rates for other parcel types, for 30 years, providing approximately \$1.2 million annually, with exemptions for low-income persons, be adopted?"
Underdevelopment	I feel that Martinez is very under-developed and often feels like it is in a time warp, when compared to neighboring East Bay communities. I feel there is a lot of potential for growth and further development in Martinez. And, given the ongoing housing crisis in the Bay Area, the City of Martinez has a responsibility to facilitate the building of more sustainable and affordable housing. My advice to the City is continue with the plan for development.	Opinion noted (no response necessary).
Ferry Service	I remember years ago that there was some talk of a ferry line connecting Martinez to other Bay communities. I realize it's probably not feasible presently, but it would be a game changer, especially with the need to reimagine commuting.	The City is currently soliciting proposals from consultant teams interested in preparing the Waterfront Marina Trust Land Use Plan. The Plan will establish the roadmap for a vibrant waterfront and a more economically self-sufficient marina. It will explore the potential for ferry service; identify sites for limited commercial development; and establish goals for improving public access, expanding recreation uses, and preserving natural resources. The Plan will also identify options, cost estimates, and potential funding sources to perform on-going dredging; replace/repair the marina's docks and breakwaters; restore dockside fueling; and increase the marina's berth capacity. You are



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		welcome to follow the process by visiting the Waterfront Marina Trust Land Use Plan webpage .
Christine Yarosh, 12/22/21, Link to Full Comment		
Train Noise	In reviewing the general plan I was dismayed to see that noise due to trains horns was mentioned as a noise exposure problem that falls into the "clearly unacceptable" range but without a mitigation plan.	The Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy which reads as follows: "C-P-11.6: Study the feasibility of establishing Railroad Quiet Zones to improve neighborhood quality of life for residents who live in the vicinity of railroad at-grade crossings."
Chandra Damele, 11/30/21, Link to Full Comment		
Additional Housing	I hope that you do revise the general plan for Martinez, and change the requirements for the number of units that can be placed on a given amount of property. As it is now, many people are priced out of the housing market, and pushed away from the area they have lived for many years.	Comment noted. The GPU promotes additional housing opportunities throughout the community.
Additional Housing	Seniors especially are hurt by the lack of lower income housing - once a couple or individual retires, their income will just not support a single-family home that seems to be the usual for around Martinez. Physically older people can't maintain they homes once held dear to their hearts. They end up moving away from the place they raised their kids, have old friends, and otherwise would have kept.	Agreed. The Housing Element Update will include more housing policies geared toward seniors and other special needs groups.
Smaller Housing Units	Smaller units without the heavy yardwork are ideal for older people who have less disposable income but are still wanting to stay within their communities. So please consider updating the plan to reflect this demographic, as well as other groups that just can't manage to live in Martinez any longer. It is time.	Agreed. The Housing Element Update will include more housing policies geared toward encouraging a variety of housing types.
Camila Goetz, 11/18/21, Link to Full Comment		
Land Use Designation for Parcel No. 376-010-015	My husband and I bought APN 376-010-015 (3.8 acres) in August 2021. We have been since June 2021 discussing with the city of Martinez Planning Department the plans to build our home in the less than a 1/4 acre available buildable area, currently zoned as R-100 (see image in full comment). We would like to have on the records of the evaluation of the new General Plan that we are against changing this buildable area's zoning from R-100 to 'Open Space - POPO Overlay Designation', as shown in the map down in the full comment. I believe that this goes against Martinez's and California's interest of having more housing and preservation of Open Space areas.	Staff has confirmed that the POPO designation does not cover the portion of parcel currently zoned R-100. The GPU designates that portion of the parcel as RL (Residential Low), which allows residential development at a density between 1.1 and 6.0 dwelling units per acre.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Asher Wilson, 5/10/22, Link to Full Comment		
Building Heights; Floods; Earthquakes	Please go back over and include missing information such as height limits, density limits, flood and earthquake exposures, etc. More work needs to be done before proceeding.	<p>State General Plan law does not require height, setbacks, and lot coverage to be included in general plans as these are normally incorporated into the subsequent zoning code updates designed to implement an adopted general plan. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the importance of setting a height limitation for unique areas like the Downtown and other areas closer to the waterfront; therefore, the land use descriptions for the Downtown Core (DC), Downtown Government (DG), and Downtown Shoreline (DS) have been revised to include the height limitations listed below. It should be noted that these height limitations match what is already established by the Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p><u>Downtown Core (DC)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit.</p> <p><u>Downtown Government (DG)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p> <p><u>Downtown Shoreline (DS)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p>
Alicia Jenson, 11/30/21, Link to Full Comment		
Tavan Estates	According to the draft Land Use Map, the entire neighborhood in which I reside – Tavan Estates – is not listed for residential land use. Rather, it is designated as CUL (Open Space/Conservation Use Land). I believe this is a mistake, and that the correct designation is RL - Residential Low. There are approximately 100 existing residences in this neighborhood. It is not open space.	The CUL land use designation is correct. The POPO overlay district also applies to this land use category and CUL cannot be changed without voter approval. The CUL land use designation allows low density residential. The zoning district which also applies to this area is; Environmental Conservation District (ECD). The ECD district allows densities of one single-family residence per 18,000 square feet or more parcel size. One single-family structure for up to 20 acres; two single family structures for parcels over 20 acres.
Harlan Strickland, 5/27/22 (1), Link to Full Comment		



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Brad Kilger Interview	When our previous City Manager, Brad Kilger, was leaving, he gave an interview to the Gazette, which as of this writing, is still available on the Gazette's website at https://martinezgazette.com/martinez-city-manager-brad-kilger-announces-he-will-be-retiring-in-january/	Staff was unable to access the interview with the link provided. The link appears broken now.
Vision Statement	Martinez' vision statement largely describes the way things are, rather than a vision for some future Martinez. The few mentions of change seem largely to be addressing worries that the General Plan might negatively affect the status quo. It lacks specificity and any significant sense of motivation or direction that one would expect in a vision statement. It is quite short, and, unlike Walnut Creek's vision statement, has no principles.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE. Staff did not receive direction from the CC, PC, and ARDPIE to include an alternate vision like Walnut Creek's.
Word Spellings	The vision statement uses some British spellings (neighbourhood and liveable); 'Carquinez Strait' should be 'Carquinez Strait'; 'smalltown' should be 'small-town'.	The vision statement has been revised to use the words "neighborhood", "livable", "Carquinez Strait", and "small-town".
Harlan Strickland, 5/27/22 (2), Link to Full Comment		
Brad Kilger Interview	When our previous City Manager, Brad Kilger, was leaving, he gave an interview to the Gazette, which as of this writing, is still available on the Gazette's website at https://martinezgazette.com/martinez-city-manager-brad-kilger-announces-he-will-be-retiring-in-january/	Staff was unable to access the interview with the link provided. The link appears broken now.
City Revenues	The City needs more revenue to address the various issues detailed in Mr. Strickland's full comment relative to the Marina; water system; acquisition of Alhambra Hills; City Hall mortgage; potential annexations; sunsetting of Measure D and Measure X; construction of a parking garage Downtown; police funding; and pension obligations.	Comment noted. The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C) which, if implemented, could help improve city revenues in the future.
EDAP	During former City Manager Kilger's tenure, he assembled an Economic Development team, and they produced an Economic Development Action Plan (EDAP), which is still on the City's website. While the merits of the plan and the findings involved in shaping it can be argued, its idea of setting aside sections of the City for economic development is a good one, and, in built-out Martinez, areas that have the potential of generating high revenue should be designated for business in the General Plan.	Comment noted. The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C) that align with the EDAP .
Kristin Henderson, 11/30/21 (1), Link to Full Comment		
General Comment	I understand the Historic Element is optional for cities, but our city is electing to create an element that is not really an element. What do I mean	Opinion noted. The commenter is correct that having this element is not required by State law applicable to general plans. It should be acknowledged the GPU addresses historic preservation to a greater extent than the 1973 General Plan. The Historic, Cultural & Arts Element includes Goal HCA-G-1



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	by this? The element is only a non-technical and conceptually non-substantive two-page history essay undertaken by a college student and does not in any way address the formation or future treatment of the built environment or historic resources.	which calls on the City to “foster protection, preservation, and rehabilitation of Martinez’s historic and cultural heritage”. The element includes several policies and implementation measures for this goal. The 1973 General Plan does not discuss historic preservation, except for historic structures in the Alhambra Valley.
Built Environment	There is nothing in this "element" that discusses the built environment except an attached 40 year old historic inventory that is not academically sound by any measure and even includes things that do not exist.	Comment noted. Since the element is optional, it is not required to have a discussion of the built environment; however, such a section may be included with future updates if desired by the City Council. The City agrees that the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory is very outdated. This is why Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d has been revised to read as follows: “Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation.”
Wording	This consultant has replaced all occurrences of the word "historic" with "historical".	The element has been retitled “Historic, Cultural & Arts Element”. This change has been applied globally to the GPU.
Wording	Moreover, the word "cultural" in "Historical and cultural" resources was completely misused and the document was turned into something the art commission worked on before the consultant.	The word “cultural” is commonly used in General Plans throughout the State. The commenter does not explain why she feels the use of the word is inappropriate.
NPS Contexts	An MPS and its historic contexts were placed on the National Register in 2015 and the City ignores it.	The MPS (Multiple Property Submission) Covers were referenced in order to update Table 4-1 in the Historic, Cultural, & Arts Element.
Kristin Henderson, 11/30/21 (2), Link to Full Comment		
Management Partners	There is nothing on MP's website that it has experience with General Plans and ESPECIALLY NOTHING THAT SHOWS IT HAS HISTORIC PRESERVATION/ELEMENT EXPERIENCE, & city will not answer PRA to showing MP's authority in these matters/	The original version of the GPU was prepared by Baird + Driskell Community Planning and later Christine O'Rourke Community Planning. Both these firms have extensive experience preparing general plans across the State. Patrick O'Keefe of Management Partners was hired by the City to revise the 2015 GPU and provide project management for the GPU. Mr. O'Keefe has 39 years of public sector management experience.
Management Partners	The above is especially true about Patrick O'Keefe. Moreover most historic professionals recite their authority/credentials at the end of their work, e.g. Telfer Hall condos analysis. O'Keefe has none, and it shows.	See response above.
Management Partners	For approximately \$200/hour at guess of \$35,000 an already existing but poorly done Historic Element has been rehashed by O'Keefe and that is	Opinion noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	woefully lacking and illustrates a true lack of knowledge and due diligence. Hector Rojas is from Richmond (?), he knows what a fully developed Historic element and inventory look like. But is he afraid to speak up? Yes.	
Element Author	Dina Tasini told me this document was originally written by a 21 year old architectural student whose parents are favorites in Kiwanis.	Opinion noted.
General Comment	Smashing the "historic", "cultural", and "arts" concepts together is a bad idea. There are huge differences between them and Historic is very very technical. "Cultural resources" often refer to archeological remains, and I wonder if this has gotten confused.	Opinion noted.
Wording	He redlined "Historic" and replaced it with "Historical". This is is factually inaccurate. The correct word is "Historic"--things which have exceptional historic value. "Historical" refers to anything that exists in space/time. He even calls the SHRC the "State HistoricAL Resources Commission".	The element has been retitled "Historic, Cultural & Arts Element". This change has been applied globally to the GPU.
Periods of Significance	There are no periods of significance defined. HISTORIC resources cannot be defined or understood without knowing what historic forces brought them about. Periods of significance define these forces and contextualize historic resources.	The City agrees that having this information included as part of a future update of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element would be very useful. The element has been revised to include a new implementation measure, which reads as follows: "HCA-I-1.1h: Update the Historic, Cultural, & Arts Element to discuss Martinez's periods of significance based on information in the Multiple Property Submission (MPS) Covers on the National Park Service's National Register Database and Research website."
General Comment	There are no "goals policies or implementations" in this element, he simply refers very obtusely to the SHRC.	This is inaccurate. See Section 4.5 of the element under subsection "Historic, Cultural & Arts Element Goals, Policies, and Measures".
Ygnacio Martinez Land Grant	At the bottom of page 3 and top of 4 it misidentifies the boundaries of the Ygnacio Martinez land grant.	The element does not identify the boundaries of the Ygnacio Martinez land grant; however, staff can add this information if it is provided with a data source.
Portuguese Flats	Portuguese Flats" is a term Al Perry made up when he and some other Portuguese descendants lived around Susana Park in the 1970s. The area WAS NOT built by Portuguese. However, they came from all over to practice their specific brand of Catholicism at St. Catherines.	The sixth paragraph under element Section 4.3, subsection "Martinez's Rich History" has been revised to remove the last sentence which read: "Also, an area known as Portuguese Flats grew up around St. Catherine's Church."
Vineyard Coverage	While there were vines around Martinez, the area was not COVERED by vineyards.	The sentence referencing vineyard coverage in early Martinez has been revised to read as follows: "Martinez had a number of wineries in the 1880s period, and vineyards occupied some of the land in the area."
Chinese, Japanese, and Black History	This little essay completely leaves out the Chinese, Japanese, and black history--all of which there are notable examples such as the extant Jones Hotel.	The City agrees that having this information included as part of a future update of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element is critical. The element has been revised to include a new implementation measure, which reads as



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		follows: "HCA-I-1.1i: Update the Historic, Cultural, & Arts Element to discuss the history and experience of all racial and ethnic groups in Martinez."
Urban Legends	Urban Legends, such as the Martini example, do not belong in a General Plan.	Opinion noted.
Fires Affecting Do	Downtown WAS NOT LEVELED BY THE 1904 FIRE. Part of the center was affected but there are pre 1904 commercial buildings in Downtown.	The sentence referencing the fires has been revised to read as follows: "However, Downtown was affected by three fires in the 1890-1904 time periods, so most structures in the Downtown post-date that period."
Wording	IT IS THE CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORIC (NOT HISTORICAL) PLACES	According to the State Office of Historic Preservation, the official name of the State Register is "California Register of Historical Resources". This reference has been corrected.
City Hall Listing	City Hall nor the MPS/Historic Context are listed in this "element" and both are on the National Register of Historic Places.	Table 4-2 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element has been revised to reflect that Martinez City Hall (formerly referred to as the "Martinez Grammar School Annex") is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
Future Downtown District Designation	Since the Verplank/Knapp report, many of the facades on Main Street have been altered beyond even district-level integrity so there is no possibility of a district in the Commercial core. Court Street, The Italian n-hood, other places, maybe.	Opinion noted.
Design Review	The Design Review briefly mentioned is that of the Martinez Historical Society which has demonstrated over and over that it will fight historic preservation if it thinks it will please the City, Dunivan, or its attorney Turnbaugh. MOREOVER, THE 1992 LAW THAT ALLOWS THE HISTORIC SOCIETY TO DO THIS IS BADLY ABUSED AND THE CITY AND THE CURRENT HISTORIC SOCIETY ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE SPIRIT OF THAT LAW.	The Historic, Cultural & Arts Element does not state the Martinez Historical Society is charged with performing design review. Per Martinez Municipal Code Chapter 22.47 – Historic Resource Provisions , the City's Planning Commission is charged with that role.
1982 Historic Resource Inventory	MARTINEZ HISTORIC SOCIETY INVENTORY IS COMPLETELY OUT OF DATE AND WAS ALWAYS ACADEMICALLY UNSOUND. It IS DELETEROUS OF FAVORED PERSONS PROPERTIES, AS WELL.	The City agrees that the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory is very outdated. This is why Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d has been revised to read as follows: "Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation."
Relocation of Buildings	In most cases, MOVED buildings lose their historic context and therefore their integrity. Only rare architectural examples are exempt. That is, buildings moved in less than 50 years time or in the future.	According to the National Parks Service, relocating a historic structure is not recommended unless all other possible ways to save the structure from demolition have been exhausted; however it is still an option that is used for preservation. See the document Moving Historic Buildings , which is available on the NPS website.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
General Comment	I cannot believe he gets paid to cut and paste treatment of archaeological resources	Opinion noted.
General Comment	O'KEEFE'S ERRONEOUS RESPONSES TO PRMC QUESTIONS WHEN THIS "ELEMENT" WAS PRESENTED JULY 14, 2021	Opinion noted.
Kristin Henderson, 11/30/21 (3), Link to Full Comment		
City Hall	City Hall is also attached to the MPS/Historic Context, the commercial portion backbone of which was written by the notable historian Kelly Verplank at a cost to the taxpayers and the encouragement of previous city manager, Don Blubaugh because such surveys make land use PREDICTIVE and that is the purpose of a General or Specific plan--to manage land use with best practices.	Comment noted.
Library	The library, PO, 1933 nee Courthouse, and Finance Building will be added soon to the MPS.	Comment noted.
Planning Commission	The issue with the PLANNING COMMISSION (as well as the City Manager and M. Chandler) is they have no training or education in the value or the practice of historic preservation. Ditto PRMC and no one will study other Historic Elements of other towns.	Opinion noted.
General Comment	Ask yourself, hmmm, whose properties are missing from that inventory? Hmmm, how many more times does the Historic Society President say that name than the word "history"? What citizen appears in all the photos of the police at public coffee klatches? What citizen does not have to follow building code but makes all others? Who is the historic society's attorney subcontracting from? The history of the history of Martinez is one of white male privilege, make no mistake.	Opinion noted. The City agrees that the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory is very outdated. This is why Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d has been revised to read as follows: "Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation." The updated surveys will include all structures surveyed that meet the eligibility requirements for local, state and national designation.
Kristin Henderson, 1/8/22, Link to Full Comment		
Disagreement	I never said "Disagrees with Commissioner Gustafson's comments that character can be preserved through new buildings". What I said was that you cannot create phony historic structures and retain HISTORIC CHARACTER. New types of architecture have character, just not HISTORIC CHARACTER because it is impossible to recreate a historic resource. All built/planted/constructed resources spring from the historic forces of their own	Comment noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	period, hence most historic GPU elements provide PERIODS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	
Lies	It is also a lie that the Office of Historic Preservation/State Historic Preservation Commission reviews or help with Plan Updates. THIS IS A BALD FACE LIE AND MOREOVER IS NOT A POLICY OR A PROGRAM FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC RESOURCES. Once again the City is twisting facts: the General Plan Update is sent to the State Clearing House which does not review the historic element. They just acknowledge they have been sent the Plan. I will warn all City Staff and consultants, that if you allow these lies--if you facilitate these lies--they will follow you to your next job. I promise. They will follow you are your career that you defrauded a city by building lies into its Plan.	Comment noted.
Correction	Moreover, it is incorrect that moved historic structure retain their historic significance/integrity, unless they are a special case/architectural example. This is patently false and either said purposefully to set up a false out for developers AND/or because the consultant is ill equipped to discuss these matters. And the City of course does not educate the Plan Com, staff, nor City Council on these technical issues.	According to the National Parks Service, relocating a historic structure is not recommended unless all other possible ways to save the structure from demolition have been exhausted; however it is still an option that is used for preservation. See the document Moving Historic Buildings , which is available on the NPS website.
Kristin Henderson, 1/9/22, Link to Full Comment		
1982 Historic Resource Inventory	Inventory very old, follows no criteria at all, Dunivan and Turbaugh properties omitted. Does not at all discuss properties that are potential for the National Register. Does not at all mention the Multiple property submission accepted to the National Register of Historic Places replete with potential and integral properties mentioned and with clear cut historic contexts.	The City agrees that the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory is very outdated. This is why Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d has been revised to read as follows: "Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation."
Sharkey Building; City Hall	Multiple factual errors such as the date of Sharkey Building incorrect and City Hall left off. I have repeatedly told you this over and over and over and you do not even fix that much.	Upon further research, staff determined the "Sharkey Building" is not actually listed on the California Register of Historical Resources; therefore Table 4-2 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element has been revised accordingly. Table 4-1 has also been revised to reflect that Martinez City Hall (formerly referred to as the "Martinez Grammar School Annex") is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
General Comment	The State Historic Resources Commission DOES NOT OVERSEE GENERAL PLANS or LOCAL INVENTORIES. CEQA is not a regulatory framework--it is merely an assessment of impacts to historic resources and possible mitigations.	Comment noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Regulation of Historic Buildings	The zoning ordinance in no way protects historic resources and as we can see from so many modifications on Main Street and how the City let the Old Jail go, no "regulations" have been followed at all.	Martinez Municipal Code Chapter 22.47 sets forth provisions for historic resource preservation. The intent of this chapter is to "safeguard the heritage of the City by providing for the protection of significant landmarks and areas, enhance the visual character of the City by encouraging compatible architectural styles which reflect unique and established architectural traditions, foster public appreciation of the historic character of the City, and strengthen the local economy by preserving, enhancing and unifying the City's historic attractions to residents, tourists and visitors."
Historical Eras	In a historic element, the purpose of writing the history is to show what historic forces contributed to the development of the built environment. What you have written in the GPU update has little to do with and does not tie into the extant historic built environment. You also left out the massive contribution the Great Depression New Deal had on the current built environment. The yacht harbor, street and sidewalk pavement, the infill of the shoreline, 100s of our trees, Susana Street Park, Rankin Park, Hall of Records cum Wakefield Taylor courthouse, the Library, Post office and all its art work, and much more were borne from the New Deal.	Historic, Cultural & Arts Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d has been revised to read as follows: "Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation." The City will include the information from the historic contexts that are developed as a result of this implementation measure in future updates of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element.
Starbucks Building	By the way, Starbucks building is not "The Old City Hall Building" it is the OLD CITY HALL APARTMENTS BUILDING. The 1912 City Hall was demolished and sat where the creek runs now.	The caption and picture of the "Old City Hall Building" has been removed from the Element.
Portuguese Flats	Again, Portuguese DID NOT build the area around Susana Street Park. "Portuguese Flats" was a term made up by Al Perry when he and some of his Portuguese friends lived around there in the 60s 70s.	The sixth paragraph under element Section 4.3, subsection "Martinez's Rich History" has been revised to remove the last sentence which read: "Also, an area known as Portuguese Flats grew up around St. Catherine's Church."
Borland House	The Borland Home was built in 1890 and Sanborn maps show this.	The first sentence under Section 4.4 of the Historical, Cultural & Arts Element, subsection "Martinez Historical Society" correctly states the date for the Borland House. It reads as follows: "The Martinez Historical Society was created in 1973 to save the Borland House at 1005 Escobar Street, which was built in 1890, as a repository where papers, documents, photographs and artifacts could be housed."
Design Review	THE DESIGN REVIEW IS THE ABUSE OF THE 1992 LAW BY THE MARTINEZ HISTORIC SOCIETY, IN MY OPINION AND CAN BE SEEN IN THEIR RESPONSE TO THE ITALIAN NEIGHBORHOOD DURING BERRELLESA PALMS PROJECT ASSESSMENT, SHARKEY BUILDING, AND MORE such as not acknowledging its own museum is on the National Register. You give away a really not so historic building like the train station to them and do nothing for the Old Jail. You committ colusion with them, City.	Opinion noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	And your General Plan Element is so fraudulent as to be actionable on that point.	
General Comment	There is not one real goal or implementation policy listed in this historic plan element. Nothing tangible at all, and much more openly deceptive. It does nothing to plan for historic resources.	Opinion noted.
Kristin Henderson, 2/2/22, Link to Full Comment		
Periods of Historic Significance	In a true General Plan historic statement, you would have periods of significance that would show what in the existing built environment (not famous people, not urban legends) was tied to a broad historic force, such as the New Deal agencies (WPA, PWA, Treasury One, etc.) that came from the Great Depression.	The City agrees that having this information included as part of a future update of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element would be very useful. The element has been revised to include a new implementation measure, which reads as follows: "HCA-I-1.1h: Update the Historic, Cultural, & Arts Element to discuss Martinez's periods of significance based on information in the Multiple Property Submission (MPS) Covers on the National Park Service's National Register Database and Research website."
Kristin Henderson, 2/22/22, Link to Full Comment		
Meetings	This is for the City regarding the General Plan Update: You spend at least four meetings on this one social justice element and just 15% of one meeting on the Historic Element which requires extensive technical understanding and yet you teach none of the staff, council, or commission members about historic preservation particularly of the physical/built environment.	Opinion noted.
Neglect	You have completely neglected the Historic Element and/or submerged it in the negligence of ignorant or corrupt handlers. In essence, the City of Martinez and staff and electorate that benefit by neglect of one of the most important and defining elements of the physical town and its psychological identity (for which plans are made) boost themselves up on George Floyd all over again while treating the General Plan unjustly	Opinion noted. The City is not neglecting historic resources, in fact, it is bringing more attention to the importance of historic resources through inclusion of a new element focusing on historic preservation. The Historic, Cultural & Arts Element includes Goal HCA-G-1 which calls on the City to "foster protection, preservation, and rehabilitation of Martinez's historic and cultural heritage". The element includes several policies and implementation measures for this goal. In contrast, the 1973 General Plan does not discuss historic preservation, except for historic structures in the Alhambra Valley. If the commenter's statement were true, the City would continue the status quo and elect not to adopt an optional element setting forth goals, policies, and implementation measures for historic preservation.
General Comment	"Martinez is not a time capsule, it is a continuum. It is not Walnut Creek 100 years ago, it is Martinez NOW. Martinez is where Contra Costa was born, one of the original 27 counties of a state that is now by itself the 5th largest economy in the world. Architecture is the most powerful form of art and the one the public cannot escape. Historic buildings are the perfume bottles of humanity and the Martinez skyline is like the scales of a George Gershwin tune. Historic Martinez IS Martinez identity and is what allows for our vistas,	Comment noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	our watersheds, our trees, the view of the straits. It is the historic streetscapes that form Martinez's physical identity."	
Kristin Henderson, 3/22/22 (1), Link to Full Comment		
Alex Greenwood Group	Please note that he (Alex Greenwood) was a Planning Commission at Pleasant Hill when they ripped the dome down and his comment was that there were only 3 good resources in the whole town (dome was not one of them) and that the developer was superior. And it should be noted, JUST LIKE MARTINEZ, PH has a tract record of IGNORING established guides of identification and treatment of Historic Resources--and other elements.	Opinion noted.
Kristin Henderson, 3/22/22 (2), Link to Full Comment		
Mills Act Program	I do not think there is a privately-owned/commercial majority district intact enough in Martinez for the Mills Act. City has permitted all sorts of Main Street alterations. When Knapp survey was done back in 2009, they felt they were pushing it then--since then so many changes to facades, so....but ask a professional. Good reason to get an Inventory done, and not by interns this time.	Comment noted.
New Market Tax Credits	New Market Tax Credits: Not sure how this works, but have heard it talked about at California Preservation Foundation Seminars. Apparently, even tax experts struggle: https://www.novoco.com/periodicals/articles/what-are-accounting-implications-investors-who-participate-new-markets-tax-credit-incentive and not sure if Martinez remains low income enough: https://www.cdfifund.gov/programs-training/programs/new-markets-tax-credit Also see: https://home.treasury.gov/news/press-releases/jy0340	The element has been revised to include a new implementation measure, which reads as follows: "HCA-I-1.1j: Establish a Mills Act Program to provide economic incentives for the restoration and preservation of qualified historic buildings by private property owners. Explore other economic incentives and programs that may be available such as New Market Tax Credits."
Kristin Henderson, 4/17/22 (1), Link to Full Comment		
Greenwood Group Findings	(The Greenwood Group Findings) Are not attached to the agenda just an announcement that the findings were created are attached to the agenda as the attachment under the greenwood agenda item. It also doesn't say who the peers are p e e r s sorry I'm voice typing here so here we go again the city manager is completely peeing on the brown act of open meeting law and public information for what I don't know he must be getting something from this for himself because he continues to manipulate city council agendas he has no feeling at all that he is in the public space it's not just about his business school it's about the public space it's about the Commonwealth it's about democracy and it's about a public meeting and a general plan update that is supposed to be a public undertaking not something for him to put a notch on his resume or get hired in the future by consultants or developers The Way greenwood is and it's really getting tiring. He hired all Mexicans	Opinions expressed are noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	practically or Hispanics because he's a Hispanic he made our website 50 or more percent Spanish, and now he's taken what is American democracy what is written into California law and he has he has basically just I don't say taking a pee on it because that's not a very good thing to say in these situations but he's basically just stuck his middle finger up at that too I guess it's too European for him I don't know but anyway this is getting ridiculous. And there is no quote economic development unquote general plan element. And the way this general plan update has been conducted is is an abuse of power and that is illegal thing you can't circulate a general plan update twice and then suddenly bring someone in and redo the whole thing so that we end up with the final thing to look at at the same time as you do the draft eir that is just racketeering.	
Kristin Henderson, 4/17/22 (2), Link to Full Comment		
The Greenwood Group	When was the hiring of greenwood consultants ever agendized for City council vote? Am I incorrect in thinking that he was hired without the approval of the city council? I could be wrong.	The Greenwood Group's contract was within the City Manager's signing authority. The City brought on the Greenwood Group in response to the City Council's desire to incorporate economic development policies into the GPU. The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C).
Kristin Henderson, 4/17/22 (3), Link to Full Comment		
Richmond and Benicia General Plans	The Richmond GP is more complex and yet it is the clearest. Both Benicia and Richmond have similarities with Martinez. Richmond's also has better cover artwork as photographed by someone named Hector Rojas. But Seriously, Both Benicia and Richmond's Goals, Policies, Programs, and Implementations are superior, useable, and applicable.	Comment noted.
Periods of Historic Significance	Unlike Martinez's General Plan Update 2.0, Richmond and Benicia's periods of historic significance and the resultant extant historic resources are clearly defined on both counts in the historic periods that produced them. Both Richmond and Benicia have several districts all of which have fully developed contexts (aka MPSs). Martinez has an MPS on the National Register and it used the noted historian Christopher VerPlank's historic context of Martinez's Commercial Core as its backbone and it used Benicia's MPS as a primary example. It is a "white paper" of sorts.	Comment noted. Regarding periods of historic significance, the element has been revised to include a new implementation measure, which reads as follows: "HCA-I-1.1h: Update the Historic, Cultural, & Arts Element to discuss Martinez's periods of significance based on information in the Multiple Property Submission (MPS) Covers on the National Park Service's National Register Database and Research website."
Economic Revitalization	Both Richmond and Benicia's historic element expand and expound upon how historic resources are an invaluable contributor to community identity and explain in detail how the historic resources benefit the economy as well as other aspects of the community (versus Martinez's which purports historic resources are in the way of economic revitalization).	City agrees that historic preservation does not stand in the way of revitalization. To reflect this, the last sentence in the first paragraph under Section 4.1 has been revised to read as follows: "Martinez values its historical and cultural heritage and seeks to encourage economic development through preservation of its historic resources." Policy HCA-P-1.2 has been revised to read as follows: "Strengthen and enhance the historic,



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		natural, and cultural character of Martinez to help support economic development in the Downtown and other areas with historic value.”
Historic Listings	Both of the other GP historic elements define the historic areas boundaries clearly and clearly list the individual historic resources and do so legitimately using fully developed and followed criterion. Pleasant Hill defines these criterion as well but as the article about Greenwood and the tear down of the dome theater pointed out, Pleasant Hill (like Martinez) ignores its own plans when it comes to historic resources.	Tables 4-1 and 4-2 have been revised to match the listings in the State and National registers.
Other General Plans	Ben. & Rich. GP Hist. Elem. Goals, Policies, Programs, and Implementations are distinct, immediate, and actionable/in action FOR THE PURPOSES OF ACTUAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION. Martinez just uses the word "encourage" with no explanation of how that "encouragement" will be implemented or even what the word means.	The goals, policies, and implementation measures contained in the Historic, Cultural & Arts are appropriate given the element’s status as an optional element. Future updates of the element can include more specificity upon direction of the City Council. It should be acknowledged the GPU addresses historic preservation to a greater extent than the 1973 General Plan. The Historic, Cultural & Arts Element includes Goal HCA-G-1 which calls on the City to “foster protection, preservation, and rehabilitation of Martinez’s historic and cultural heritage”. The element includes several policies and implementation measures for this goal. The 1973 General Plan does not discuss historic preservation, except for historic structures in the Alhambra Valley.
Economic Development	Richmond's Historical Resources element has extremely well-defined goals with subsidiary extremely well-defined actions to reach those goals. One of these goals is EXPANDED ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES BASED ON HISTORIC RESOURCES and it also has a section for promoting sustainable and green building practices in historic preservation efforts. Benicia combines its arts with its use of its historic structures as an economic incentive that not only helps preserve BUT also attract/develop economic retail and heritage tourism activity.	City agrees that historic preservation can be used to expand economic opportunity. To reflect this, the last sentence in the first paragraph under Section 4.1 has been revised to read as follows: “Martinez values its historical and cultural heritage and seeks to encourage economic development through preservation of its historic resources.” Policy HCA-P-1.2 has been revised to read as follows: “Strengthen and enhance the historic, natural, and cultural character of Martinez to help support economic development in the Downtown and other areas with historic value.”
General Comment	The other GP Hist. Elements discuss the relative towns in terms of today and where they will fit in the future. The Historic Resources Inventories and MPSs are current and professional and academically sound. Richmond's also includes a pictorially-enhanced timeline.	The text in the Historic, Cultural & Arts is appropriate given the element’s status as an optional element. Future updates of the element can include more specificity upon direction of the City Council.
Martinez Historic Society; Online Library	Martinez Historical Society does not need support to archive, etc. to "properly chronicle the history of Martinez". Building histories are found in about eight places all of which are found online and I can list and link if requested to do so (they used to not be on line and I had to go all over the bay area and Sac and read through mountains of journals and microfiche, no kidding--and yes, uphill both ways in the snow metaphorically speaking). And in Martinez	Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1e has been revised to read as follows: “Continue to work with and support the Martinez Historical Society in their efforts to help preserve Martinez’s history.” City staff likes the commenter’s idea of an online library for historic resources. The element has been revised to include a new implementation measure, which reads as follows: “HCA-I-1.1k: Develop and maintain a webpage listing Martinez’s historic resources and documents associated with each resource.”



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	General Plan we should link and list these resources because there will be no one more driven than property owners/real estate agents to look up their properties' details. City of Richmond GP actually has an online library of documents that discuss the historicism of the resources. What Martinez Historical Society needs is money to get all the documents, etc. out of storage, scanned and catalogued properly so people can find information AND the Society would save money. I have many documents related to historic resource's histories.	
General Comment	The other GP Hist Elems are accurate and do not contain urban legends; there are horrible errors of all sorts in Martinez's GPU 2.0 historic element.	Opinion noted.
Kristin Henderson, 4/17/22 (4), Link to Full Comment		
Staff Request	Also, Hector or whomever, could you make just one folder for all my submitted comments and put them altogether on one level on that folder? On this topic and I am the closest thing you have got for a subject expert and I really want these comments to be read not for my sake, but for the purpose of the General Plan.	This was request completed, see Kristin Henderson comment folder .
Kristin Henderson, 4/19/22, Link to Full Comment		
Education & Training	Other General Plans' Historic Elements also incorporate implementations for educating members of commissions to understand Historic Preservation. Not one person in all of the staffed or elected City departments has undertaken to learn how Historic Preservation works, why it is important to so many other cities, and so forth.	<p>City staff likes the commenter's idea of a training program. The element has been revised to include two new implementation measures, which read as follows:</p> <p>"HCA-I-1.1l: Conduct periodic workshops to educate officials and Community Development Department staff about historic resources and policies. Utilize these forums to clarify which existing codes relate to historic resources and whether they are being adequately enforced."</p> <p>"HCA-I-1.1m: Development an outreach program to communicate information on programs, services, requirements and incentives related to the protection and preservation of historic resources. Provide information for homeowners, contractors and City staff regarding the California Historic Building Code, Mills Act Program, historic preservation tax credits, available grants and other preservation incentives."</p>
Kristin Henderson, 4/24/22 (1), Link to Full Comment		
Martinez Historical Society	Response to the GPU implementation of providing infinite amounts of money to the Historical Society to research properties. City Staff and even more property owners/agents are far more driven and compelled to do quick, accurate research versus handing off to a random Society volunteer and	There is no implementation measure in the element intended to provide "infinite" amounts of money to the society. Tables 4-1 and 4-2 have been revised to match the listings in the State and National registers.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	getting random results in no specific time frame. Some General Plan's have these lists and actual historic documents embedded in their GPU websites/documents.	
Martinez Historical Society	This pertains to the GPU/DTSP survey 40 years old which was just a site survey. The MPS/Historic Contexts The Historic Resources of Martinez, California, the buildings that have integrity are basically inventoried under their relevant periods of significance and resources below used. I am going over that document again today and will resubmit again, along with notes from the OHP. Because there is an academic standard called "what was best known at the time", It is OK to refine information. I have found mistakes in many things produced by Mtz Hist. Soc. including by Charlene Perry. Do you think they want to change the mistakes? No. But I can mine, if any, and am open to any feedback.	Comment noted.
Kristin Henderson, 4/24/22 (2), Link to Full Comment		
The Martinez Cocktail	THE RECIPE IS AT THE BOTTOM OF THE 1ST PARA, I THINK. I do think this was made by someone Italian or Greek for it did involve a green olive. BTW, in 1910 there was someone named "Martini Martinez" in town, he was a laborer. I am sure unrelated to Martini the drink.	Comment noted.
Kristin Henderson, 5/2/22, Link to Full Comment		
Court House	Perhaps my last until EIR or I see something crazy like in the side margin of the Historic Element someone had merged the histories of the 1903 Court House and the 1932 Hall of Records...confused the two buildings. I spoke to the OHP about the attached and nothing in it qualifies to dismiss or rehear the MPS document at this time.	The caption under the Contra Costa County Court House picture has been revised to read as follows: "Contra Costa County Courthouse"
Tim Platt, 12/18/21, Link to Full Comment		
Park Acreage	The City requirement for park acreage is 5 acres per 1000 residents. It has NOT been met. The current ratio is 4.5 acres/1000 residents.	The commenter is correct about the City's standard for park acreage; however, according to the latest data from the June 2021 LAFCO Parks & Recreation Services Municipal Service Review and SOI Updates document , the City has exceeded this standard. Figure 2 of the LAFCO document displays both the current neighborhood and community park acreage per 1,000 residents for each of the 18 cities addressed in the document. According to Figure 2, the City of Martinez has approximately 7.3 acres of neighborhood and community park acreage per 1,000 residents. In addition to the neighborhood and community parkland that the City of Martinez maintains and operates, there are park and open space areas that are either within the City's boundaries or in proximity, granting residents access to additional parkland beyond what is captured in Figure 2. These



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		additional park and open space areas effectively increase the parkland acreage per resident for Martinez. Table 30 of the LAFCO document lists the park and open space areas in or near Martinez that are owned, maintained, or operated by other agencies or jurisdictions. For Martinez, these include Briones Regional Park, Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline, Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline, Waterbird Regional Preserve, and John Muir National Historic Site.
Park Acreage	The total acreage of Martinez parks is verified by page 19 of the most current park inventory in the "Park System Master Plan Update 2007-2012". A copy of that page is below and also attached. As well as listing all parks, it states "The total developed parkland acreage in Martinez is 165.40 acres."	The commenter is correct that the 2007-2012 Parks System Master Plan lists 165.40 acres of developed parks; however, this data was not used in the November 2021 GPU because it is out of date.
Park Acreage	<p>No new park, except the approximately 8.22 acre Pine Meadow park, has been added in the last twenty years. The current total acreage is 174 acres.</p> <p>From the City website, the population of Martinez is 38,402 as of 2018. The ratio is 174 acres/38.402 residents or 4.5 acres/1000 residents---well below the statutory minimum. (174 acres/38.402 residents=4.531 acres per 1000 residents).</p>	<p>The old data in the 2007-2012 Parks System Master Plan is being updated with the Table 5-1 in the Parks & Communities Facilities Element. Table 5-1 includes the Martinez Marina and its 60 acres. The Marina is a community facility which includes a park for which the City has long term rights to use for public open space and recreation purposes and pays to maintain pursuant to the State trust lands grant. The Quimby Act, which established the right for cities to require parkland dedication or in-lieu fees, allows cities to enter into shared use agreements to provide access to parks or recreational facilities. Table 5-1 includes school district owned park facilities that the City has rights to use and maintains per a shared use agreement. It follows that non-fee land use rights, such as the City's trust land grant, would be counted as acreage for the calculation of the ratio of five acres per 1,000 residents set forth in the Parks & Community Facilities Element. This also applies to the Waterfront Park (which includes an amphitheater, dog park, ball fields, bocce courts). It should be noted that Waterfront Park was previously described in Table 5-1 as containing 31 acres. The correct acreage is 76.5 and Table 5-1 has been revised accordingly. The City leases Waterfront Park from the EBRPD. After the corrected acreage is included in Table 5-1 the total acreage of City parks increases to 281.02 acres (281.02 acres/38.297 residents = 7.33 acres/1,000 residents).</p> <p>The first sentence under "Parks" in Section 5.2 of the Parks & Community Facilities Element has been revised to read as follows: "The Public Works Department oversees approximately 281 acres of developed park space (further referred to simply as "park space)."</p> <p>The last paragraph under "Parks" in Section 5.2 of the Parks & Community Facilities Element has been revised to read as follows: "Since the 1980s the City's established General Plan parkland to resident ratio has been 5 acres of</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>park space for every 1,000 residents (191.49 acres for 38,297 residents as of the 2019 U.S. Census estimate). Martinez residents currently enjoy 7.33 acres of park space per every 1,000 residents. Martinez's parks and open space resources also include approximately 2,200 acres of privately-owned open space within the City limits or sphere of influence, protected by the General Plan's Parks and Open Space Protection Overlay (POPO) designation; and thousands of additional acres of adjacent regional open space or parks owned and operated by East Bay Regional Parks and U.S. National Park Service (Briones Regional Park, Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline, Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline, Waterbird Regional Preserve, and John Muir National Historic Site). For more information on open space see the Open Space and Conservation Element.</p>
Park Acreage	<p>Misstating that the current park ratio has been met undermines the drive to secure more Martinez park land and bring that ratio up closer to compliance. It misinforms Martinez residents and potential developers as well. (See pg. 195 of the "Park System Master Plan" for Municipal Code section and an example of this standard.)</p>	<p>This is incorrect. The Quimby Act standards of 3 to 5 acres of open space per resident applies only to residential subdivisions, where the individual subdivision must meet the standard to provide open space within the development or pay in-lieu fees per the City's Parkland In-lieu Fee Ordinance. It is not a standard for citywide parkland per 1,000 residents, which is a standard that is established by the City's General Plan. Whether the City is in compliance or exceeds its General Plan established City-wide standard does not affect the collection of Parkland Dedication fees which are calculated only on the basis of the open space of a subdivision being considered for approval.</p>
Park Acreage	<p>Please excuse my vehement response at the December 15, 2021, GPU Workshop upon hearing a dramatically higher and incorrect ratio of 7.2 acres per 1000 residents, spoken by a City official at the beginning of the public meeting. But I am very concerned about any actions that undermine this parkland goal, a goal that is central to the quality of life of so many of us living in Martinez.</p>	<p>Concern noted. See response above.</p>
Open Space Acreage	<p>Additionally, the General Plan Update implies that there are 2000 acres of open space in Martinez. The same "Park System Master Plan" shows approximately 426 acres of City-owned open space in our town. If this figure has been augmented, can you describe where and when? Otherwise please correct the 2000-acre figure.</p>	<p>The first sentence of Section 3.3 of the Open Space & Conservation Element has been revised to read as follows: "Martinez is fortunate to have substantial open space resources available to its residents, including over 281 acres of City-owned, leased, or granted parks; approximately 2,200 acres of privately-owned open space within the City limits or sphere of influence, protected by the General Plan's Parks and Open Space Protection Overlay (POPO) designation; and thousands of additional acres of adjacent regional open space or parks owned and operated by East Bay Regional Parks and U.S. National Park Service (Briones Regional Park, Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline, Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline, Waterbird Regional Preserve, and John Muir National Historic Site)."</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Martinez Marina Acreage	P.S. The Marina is not included in the "Park System Master Plan" park inventory, as shown by the park list above. The City has never called the Marina a park. The City does not own the Marina. It is owned by the State, and is only held in trust by the City. It is a special use area allowing and encouraging commercial maritime uses, as well as recreational and environmental uses. A portion of its approximately 60 acres is underwater. And this GPU itself shows that part or all of the Marina may be lost to sea-level rise. To now include the Marina in the list of City parks misleads the public and developers alike and may have legal ramifications	Opinion noted.
Tim Platt, 2/6/22, Link to Full Comment		
Waterfront Designations	The City is wrong to change the draft General Plan Update (GPU) land use designation of the waterfront area north of the train tracks to high-density housing. That change would have numerous negative impacts on the marsh and park lands that would be right next to the housing area. Furthermore, that change would be very dangerous for residents of that high-density housing.	Opinion noted. Whether or not to allow further housing development in the Downtown and waterfront is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that: 1) there are very few remaining vacant lots in the Downtown that would be subject to development densities proposed under the GPU; and 2) the current 1973 General Plan designations and zoning already allow light industrial development on the properties in question.
Waterfront Designations	The subject waterfront area is outlined in the map above. The area encompasses the NorCal and Universal sports warehouses and Amtrak parking lot, the extension of Berrellesa where the historic homes are, and the large industrial lots that extend to the west.	Comment noted.
Waterfront Designations	In the General Plan Update (GPU) "Land Use Map Figure 2-4" these areas are now designated for a maximum of 35-43 housing units per acre on top of 2-3 stories of commercial/retail.	Comment noted.
Waterfront Designations	I believe you should retain the current land use designations for all this land (or change the land use designations in a way to facilitate the purchase of the industrial land by EBRPD).	Opinion noted.
Waterfront Designations	Your changing these lands to high-density housing (which has never been done anywhere on the waterfront) is an extremely bad and dangerous idea.	Opinion noted.
Environmental Impacts	The environmental effects of this proposed high-density housing on the animal and plant life in the wetlands and parklands should alone disqualify it for high-density housing.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Environmental Impacts	The proximity of high-density housing to the train tracks poses an on-going danger to residents of the proposed housing should a train accident or spill occur.	See response above.
Environmental Impacts	A separate danger is the lack of access to the waterfront in an emergency.	See response above.
Environmental Impacts	Jeopardy of major damage in an earthquake is another danger at this site.	See response above.
Environmental Impacts	There are dangerous pipelines running throughout our city that are handling toxics and flammable materials	See response above.
Environmental Impacts.	The noise level to the new residents from the frequent trains and the switching yard is potentially in the “do not build housing here” range that the draft GPU calls for.	See response above.
Environmental Impacts	The vibration in the high-density housing area needs to be tested.	See response above.
Environmental Impacts	Flooding of the proposed high-density housing is very likely, but has not been studied or even discussed.	See response above.
Disadvantage Communities; Environmental Impacts	This is a Disadvantaged Community area, and the draft GPU fails to provide the higher level of care that is mandated.	See response above.
NorCal Courts	The area by the NorCal Courts and Universal Sports warehouses that would be converted into high density housing would take away significant parking for our Downtown that is starved for parking now, and will be under increased parking pressure with the high-density housing increases planned for the Downtown in the draft GPU. And the two indoor sports facilities that will be replaced with housing are unique facilities adding to our town’s quality of life, especially for our young people	The City currently has a lease with NorCal Courts for the use of this property. The lease doesn’t expire until November 17, 2036. The GPU would not alter the terms of this agreement.
Homes on Berrellesa Street	The historic homes on the Berrellesa extension would be destroyed by designating that area for high-density housing. They should be preserved, and should be afforded whatever support the City can offer to the owners to maintain their historic character.	Historic, Cultural & Arts Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d has been revised to read as follows to plan for preservation activities related to the former Italian Fishing Village: “Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation.” Furthermore, the residential properties along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks have been redesignated as CRL-B (Central Residential Low – B) in the August 2022 GPU.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Tim Platt, 3/14/22, Link to Full Comment		
Cross-referencing	<p>Measure I and the POPO should be cross-referenced to Element 2.0 in both the Park and Open Space Element under Implementations. The reference should be to the specific area in 2.0 where the Measure I explanation is given and to any maps also in the entire plan that show it, as well as sections that give explanations of Measure I and its history.</p> <p>Right now, this has only been partially done in OSC-P-1.11 of Element 3.0 and under "Open Space Protection" on pg. 3-4. The explanation on pg. 3-4 contains some of the information that should be shown under the Implementation sections of Elements 3 and 5, i.e., explanation of impact of Measure I and notation of the specific Element 2 Policy LU-P-1.2 and any and all maps that show POPO.</p>	The August 2022 GPU has added clearer references where needed.
Open Space Ownership	3.1 Should note clearly that most of the open space in and around Martinez is NOT City-owned, but is held by East Bay Regional Park District, the federal government and similar bodies. City-owned open space in the range of 430 acres existed in the Park System Master Plan 2007-2012 which is the most recent survey of which I am aware.	Suggestion noted.
Environmental Impacts	This Element 3.0 covers key issues like preservation of productive agricultural lands, special status species policies, flooding risks, Alhambra Creek, natural resources and habitat areas, wetlands and fisheries---most of which are directly pertinent to NOT allowing housing and commercial/retail development on the parcels just north of the train tracks.	Comment noted. The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
Open Space Inventory	NO APPENDIX A IS ATTACHED.	Appendix A is attached to the Open Space & Conservation Element in the August 2022 GPU.
PPOS Designation	"FIGURE 3-1 OPEN SPACE INVENTORY" MAP DOES NOT SHOW PPOS (Park & Recreation Public Permanent Open Space) LAND. THIS IS A MAJOR ISSUE, AS IT UNDERMINES THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURE I and misleads the public. "Figure 2-4 LAND USE MAP" has the same deficiency. This is a major error and must be corrected.	This is not correct. Regarding Figure 3-1, the legend clearly shows the PPOS designation. It is the last designation listed. Similarly, Figure 2-4 also lists the PPOS designation in the legend. It is the last designation in the "Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Preservation" series of swatches, right before the "Waterfront and Quasi-Public Institutions" series. The City acknowledges the map legibility can be improved upon. The August 2022 GPU includes a higher-resolution versions the maps in each element.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Open Space Acreage	3.3 This clearly implies that we own 2000 acres of open space, which is just false. For instance the Franklin Hills referenced here are mostly owned by the Park District. We should be accurate about that and not mislead the public. This is the same issue that occurs in the Park Element that may lead to our not being able to collect fees now used to procure and rebuild our parks.	The first sentence of Section 3.3 of the Open Space & Conservation Element has been revised to read as follows: "Martinez is fortunate to have substantial open space resources available to its residents, including over 281 acres of City-owned, leased, or granted parks; approximately 2,200 acres of privately-owned open space within the City limits or sphere of influence, protected by the General Plan's Parks and Open Space Protection Overlay (POPO) designation; and thousands of additional acres of adjacent regional open space or parks owned and operated by East Bay Regional Parks and U.S. National Park Service (Briones Regional Park, Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline, Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline, Waterbird Regional Preserve, and John Muir National Historic Site)."
General Comment	Open Space Reductions This implies that the Trust Land Use Plan will look at loss of all the land at the waterfront, and that is misleading.	The referenced language does not state that all of the waterfront land will be lost. It states that it will be affected by sea level rise, the extent of which will be examined in future planning efforts like the Waterfront Marina Trust Land Use Plan .
References to Elements	Also referral to the Public Safety Element is confusing to the public. This section also refers to the Land Use Element, which is confusing to the public. This section also refers to the Parks Element, which is confusing to the public.	Referrals to other elements is not confusing to the public, rather it assists the public in understanding that there are interrelationships between the elements.
Word Usage	<p>3.4 "...GOALS, POLICIES..." This is mostly toothless suggestions that do not define actual policies or set firm lines in the sand or protect the public in any way. Most use wishy-washy words like "where feasible...", "explore..." "encourage..." "support" "coordinate..." "ensure..." "consider..." "discourage..." "collaborate..." "discourage..." "continue to coordinate..." and more.</p> <p>Actual guidelines like "will..." "shall..." "require..." are few and far between. In 3.4, there are only eight "will..." "shall..." "require..." statements that have some teeth in them. There are seventeen wishy-washy ones.</p> <p>Look at our Current General Plan for specific changes that would make the draft GPU stronger and protect what we treasure in Martinez.</p>	The language of the goals and policies is purposely general in nature which is standard practice. More specific regulatory language is typically found in ordinances that implement the General Plan such as the Zoning Ordinance.
POPO Designation	The cross-hatching for POPO Designation I invisible on ALL maps where it appears. This includes the Figure 2.4 Land Use Map in Element 2.0 which is the most central map in the entire GPU. This is unacceptable. A picture is worth a thousand words, and to not have the Protected Open Space and Parkland shown on this and every other map in the GPU totally misleads the	The City acknowledges the map legibility can be improved upon. For this reason, the August 2022 GPU includes a higher-resolution versions the maps in each element.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>public and undermines this Initiative. Some way must be devised to make the POPO designation easily visible on all the maps in the GPU.</p> <p>Another map where this must be changed is Figure 3-1 Open Space Inventory. I cannot list all the maps where the POPO designation is invisible. The City must do that. They all must be corrected.</p> <p>I cannot express how damaging this omission is.</p>	
General Comment	Open Space Protection says “The properties subject to the POPO Designation are shown on the Land Use Map (Figure 2.4).” This is NOT TRUE and must be corrected.	See response above.
General Comment	OSC-P-1.11 says POPO is shown and explained in the Land Use Element, but does not say where. So the public has to hunt through the entire 60 pages of Element 2.0 to find out what POPO requires. Sections and page references and Goals/Policies/Implementation numbers should all be provided for the public.	Open Space & Conservation Policy OSC-P-1.11 has been revised to read as follows: “Maintain existing open space areas through implementation of the Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) designation as set forth in Section 2.5 of the General Plan Land Use Element.”
POPO Applicability	In the Land Use Designation section of Element 2.0, under each land use designation that is affected by POPO, note “Subject to POPO” to alert people reading the GPU for direction. Otherwise they will not be directed to those stipulations that apply to those land use designations.	The August 2022 GPU includes higher-resolution versions the maps in each element; therefore, this clarification is not required.
Measure I	<p>LU-P-1.2 Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay Initiative. Can you tell me how the stipulation in Section 5 Preamble has been followed in the GPU? “All General Plan provisions adopted or readopted through this Initiative shall be distinctively identified in the General Plan as having been adopted by initiative.”?</p> <p>First para. Change “Amendment” to “Clarifications”.</p> <p>Para. b Clarify lines three and four. Line three probably needs a period after “...designation.” Line four probably needs the word “Overlay” spelled out. Line 5 says the Initiative Exhibit A is attached, BUT IT IS NOT AND SHOULD BE. An Appendix C is stated as part of the element, but is not attached.</p> <p>This is very convoluted and hard to understand. Also it seems to want to bury this critical map in some Appendix. C. Additionally what I am told by Staff is Appendix C is the Reso. 115-19 which contains a black and white map that DEFEATS THE PURPOSE. Color is the way the parcels are identified, and the map must be in color.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that the Land Use Element policy regarding Measure I was hard to understand. To enhance clarity, the policy has been replaced with the following policy and implementation measures:</p> <p>“LU-P-1.2: Implement the provisions established by the Martinez Open Space and Park Protection Initiative (Measure I) for the properties in the Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) designation.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2a: For all property in the POPO designation, approval by Martinez voters shall be required to change the General Plan land use designations or allowable uses in effect on January 1, 2017, or to permit uses not consistent with the General Plan designation in effect on that date, except as otherwise provided for in Measure I. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(a) (Approval by Martinez Voters) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2b: The Martinez General Plan applies the POPO designation to all lands within the Martinez City Limits designated for open space, park, and outdoor recreation use as of January 1, 2017, with the exception of the areas of the Martinez marina and harbor waterfront governed by Senate Bill 1424</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>I think one way out of this confusion is to put Exhibit A after your para. I “Effect on Allowable Uses”. I would do the same for exhibits B and C. This would be clean and understandable, and would not conflict with any other parts of the GPU.</p> <p>It also would be in compliance with the section of the Initiative that says in Section 6 that “Section 5 of the Initiative shall be inserted into the General Plan...”</p> <p>Para. c The last sentence on no commercial or residential use stands alone, and is NOT part of subpara. ii.</p> <p>Para. h refers to Appendix A but no appendix attached. See note above about including Exhibit C to the end of this section, after Exhibit A and B.</p> <p>Para. i Attach to the end of this section as suggested for Exhibits A and C. Delete phrase about “...(a draft copy of which...) as this is not in the Initiative and is only potentially confusing.</p>	<p>(Statutes 2014, Chapter.628) and further described in Land Use Implementation Measure LU-1.2i. The POPO designation shall be automatically applied to any land later designated in the General Plan for open space, park, and outdoor recreation use. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(b) (Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay Established) of Measure I.</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2c: Allowable uses on open space lands designated POPO shall be as follows: 1) nature conservation or study; 2) ecosystem, habitat, and watershed preservation; 3) hiking trails and outdoor open space recreation; 4) agricultural use; 5) forestry use; 6) grazing lands; and 7) other similar uses consistent with the purpose and intent of Measure I. Allowable uses on park and recreation lands designed POPO shall be as follows: 1) park use; 2) outdoor recreation and sports uses – including but not limited to playing fields, outdoor swimming facilities, golf course, outdoor courts for sport use (e.g., tennis, basketball, bocce ball, pickleball, volleyball, etc.); 3) historic site preservation; 4) stables and riding facilities; 5) picnic areas; 6) playgrounds; 7) dog parks; 8) recreation trails; and 9) other similar uses consistent with the intent of Measure I. Except as provided for in Measure I, residential or commercial uses shall not be allowed on lands designated POPO. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(c) (Open Space, Park and Outdoor Recreation Uses) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2d: In addition to the uses allowable under LU-I-1.2c, other ancillary uses may be allowed on lands designated POPO, so long as the ancillary use is subsidiary and is customarily associated with a use allowed on the POPO designated land. Examples of ancillary uses that may be allowed on POPO designated land include: 1) rest rooms for open space, park, or outdoor recreation uses; 2) changing rooms, showers, vending machines and/or a snack bar or a small concessionaire structure in association with permitted park and outdoor recreation uses; 3) smaller indoor recreational facilities associated with a primarily outdoor recreation facility; 4) facilities for the processing, storage, or retail sale of agricultural products where necessary for agricultural use of contiguous open space land; 5) buildings or parking areas for storage of equipment or vehicles where the vehicles or equipment are intended for use in and/or in association with open space, park, and outdoor recreation use; and 6) administrative facilities if necessary for the associated open space, park, and outdoor recreation uses. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(d) (Ancillary Uses) of Measure I.”</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>“LU-I-1.3e: Uses on any one or more categories of open space, park and recreation land may be changed to allow more development-oriented uses and land use designations than those in LU-I-1.2d and LU-I-1.2e, including commercial and residential uses, but any such change of uses shall be approved by Martinez voters. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(e) (Development-Intensive Uses Allowed if Approved by Martinez Voters) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2f: If uses are currently legal and already existing or are vested on POPO designated land, but are not permitted under Measure I on POPO land when Measure I took effect, they may continue unaffected by the Measure I restrictions; but such uses may not be expanded except as allowed under Measure I. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subection 5(f) (Existing Legal Uses are Permitted) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2g: The City Council may further restrict, through zoning or other legal means, permitted uses on any category of POPO designated land. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(g) (City Council Can Increase Restrictions) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2h: Measure I did not change the amount of housing that is allowed on POPO designated land. The 1973 General Plan explicitly allowed a certain amount of residential development on privately owned open space. To maintain continuity and provide fairness to those private property owners, those allowances were re-adopted by Measure I. The requirements in the 1973 General Plan (as part of the Central Martinez Specific Area Plan, as incorporated into the General Plan) limiting environmental impacts of any such residential use in the Franklin Hills sub-area were also readopted by Measure I. Accordingly, the following provisions that were contained in the 1973 General Plan shall apply to lands designated POPO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Appropriate private open space uses include agricultural, grazing, open space recreational uses such as camp facilities, or residential uses where such uses and related facilities such as roads and parking areas constitute less than two percent of the entire land area where the balance of the land is retained in a natural state or agricultural state.2) On Open Space/Conservation Use or Environmentally Sensitive Lands within the Alhambra Creek Watershed, a density of 0 to 1 dwelling units/gross acre shall be allowed. The required site area per dwelling unit shall be 40,000 square feet per unit or greater with larger site are



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>requirements typical of the zone, unless otherwise specified in a Specific Plan.</p> <p>3) On Open Space/Conservation Use or Environmentally Sensitive Lands outside the Alhambra Creek Watershed, a density of 0 to 2 dwelling units/gross acre shall be allowed. The required site area per dwelling unit shall be 20,000 square feet per unit or greater.</p> <p>4) The Franklin Hills sub-area, extending from the Carquinez Straits to California State Highway Route 4 between urban Martinez and the western edge of the area, are designated Environmentally Sensitive Lands or Public Permanent Open Space. In this area limited residential development on an individual site basis may be appropriate if certain environmental impacts can be mitigated. Each application for residential development shall be accompanied by the following items:</p> <p>a) Applications for rezoning and development plan approval shall be processed concurrently. Each application shall contain documentation by the appropriate professionals hired by the applicant that each and every significant environmental impact (including cumulative impacts) identified in the Franklin Hills Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been thoroughly investigated for the site in question and can be mitigated to an insignificant level. Site-specific and cumulative mitigation measures shall be designed in sufficient detail to allow preliminary cost estimates to be also included in the application.</p> <p>b) Prior to the acceptance of the application as complete, all portions of this application shall be reviewed for completeness and accuracy by City staff and appropriate City consultants. The cost of this review shall be paid by the applicant.</p> <p>c) No application shall be accepted for a proposal which exceeds a density of one unit per half-acre of land under 30% slope and under 350 ft. elevation, and one unit per ten acres over 350 feet elevation. A slope density map meeting Zoning Ordinance requirements shall be submitted with each application.</p> <p>d) No application shall be accepted for a site which does not have, or provide as part of the development proposal, access to a fully-improved public street meeting all City requirements including those relating to length and number of lots served by a cul-de-sac.</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(h) (Readoption of Historic 1973 General Plan Provisions) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2i: Notwithstanding any provision of Measure I, because a high level of protection is already mandated by State law, and because the City must have flexibility to prepare and submit a trust land use plan to the State Lands Commission no later than January 1, 2020 (a draft copy of which was sent by the City in November 2019 to the State Lands Commission), Measure I does not apply to the areas of the Martinez marina and harbor waterfront governed by the Public Trust. These areas of the Martinez marina and harbor waterfront are governed by Senate Bill 1424 (Statutes 2014, Chapter. 628) and are shown as the shaded areas marked as, “2A, 2B, 2C, and 2D” in Measure I. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(i) (Marina and Harbor Area Public Trust Lands Excluded) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2j: Development on POPO designated land for residential use shall be allowed to the extent it is specifically necessary to satisfy a residential development requirement under State law and on the condition that the requirements cannot otherwise be satisfied; provided, however, that such development shall only be allowed to the extent specifically required, and that the area involved in such development shall be the minimum so required. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(j) (Residential Use Required by State Housing Law) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2k: If a court of competent jurisdiction rules that the application of Measure I to a specific proposed use or project would deprive a person of Constitutional rights or privileges, or if the City Council makes the initial determination that application of Measure I to a specific proposed use or project would be contrary to Federal or State law, Measure I shall not apply to the extent required to allow that use or project. This explicit limitation on applicability is to make certain that the provisions do not infringe any person’s legal rights or privileges, violate the law in any respect, or subject the City to legal liability. This implementation measure addresses the provisions in Subsection 5(k) (Protection of Constitutional Rights) of Measure I.”</p> <p>“LU-I-1.2l: Nothing in Measure I, including but not limited to Subsections 5(a), or subsections 5(b), 5(c), 5(d) and 5(f), imposes any new limitation, restriction or voter approval requirement on the type or intensity of uses that were, as of January 1, 2017, permissible on lands now designated as POPO. Nor does Measure I remove any limitations or restrictions on the type or intensity of</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>uses that were applicable to such lands as of that date. Subsections 5(c) and 5(d) describe uses that the City Council may, without requiring a vote of the people, permit to occur on POPO designated lands (including through amendment of the General Plan). Subsection 5(f) allows the continuance of legal, but non-conforming, existing or vested uses as of the date of adoption of the Initiative (June 6, 2018). If a type or intensity of use was, as of the date of adoption of Measure I, permissible on land now designated as POPO, such type and intensity of use remains permissible irrespective of whether such use is existing or vested. This implementation measure addresses the provision in Subsection 5(l) (Effect on Allowable Uses) of the Measure I.”</p> <p>Additionally, the description for the POPO designation in the Land Use Element has been revised to read as follows:</p> <p>“The Martinez Open Space and Park Protection Initiative (Measure I) was passed by voters on June 5, 2018. According to the language in Measure I, the purpose of the initiative was to increase protections for open space, park and outdoor recreation land in the City by requiring approval by Martinez voters for any General Plan amendment to change allowable uses or land use designations for such land. The Initiative was also intended to help ensure that those lands and their valued uses are not changed to uses associated with more intensive development without approval by Martinez voters. The full text of Measure I is included as Land Use Element Appendix LU-A. On September 18, 2019, the City Council adopted Resolution 115-19 approving a General Plan amendment to clarify Measure I. A copy of Resolution 115-19 is included as Land Use Element Appendix LU-B. Land Use Element Figure 4-2 shows the properties where the POPO designation applies. Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2l apply to each property in the city with the POPO designation.”</p>
Tim Platt, 3/26/22 (1), Link to Full Comment		
	The GPU Land Use Map fails to show Measure I protected land. General Plan Comments.	The City acknowledges the map legibility can be improved upon. For this reason, the August 2022 GPU includes a higher-resolution versions the maps in each element.
	The inclusion of Measure I into the GPU, which is mandated by Measure I, is accomplished in certain respects, especially in LU-P-1.2---but IMPORTANT SECTIONS APPEAR TO BE TOTALLY LEFT OUT OF THE DRAFT GPU, including Exhibit A the color map showing all the protected lands; Exhibit B the exclusion of the Marina; and Exhibit C protections for CUL and ESL lands	See Land Use Element Appendix LU-A and LU-B of the August 2022 GPU.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	and the Franklin Hills subarea. I believe that is unacceptable and contrary to the law, and must be corrected.	
Tim Platt, 3/26/22 (2) , Link to Full Comment		
Park Acreage	<p>Element 3.0 Open Space General Plan Comments</p> <p>In at least two places, 3.1 and especially 3.3, the amount of open space in Martinez is lauded. But the GPU needs to be honest and admit to the reader that only a minority of that is open space owned by Martinez. The majority is owned by federal, state and regional organizations, not the City.</p> <p>3.3 states Martinez has over 2000 acres of open space, but City-owned open space is in the range of 430 acres according to the Park System Master Plan 2007-2012 which is the most recent survey of which I am aware. Certainly more may have been purchased since the Master Plan, but none that I am aware of. And no new parks have been purchased in over 20 years.</p> <p>It is important to not mislead people to think we have a lot of open space when that is not true. It leads them to make the wrong decisions when new open space becomes available. The idea “we have enough now” is wrong when we only have 430 acres, not 2000.</p>	See responses to Park Acreage comments made by Tim Platt on 12/18/22.
Waterfront Development	<p>Additionally, several specific goals, policies and implementations support this. For instance:</p> <p>OSC-G-1 “Maintain and enhance...natural environment and preservation of habitat.”</p> <p>OSC-P-1.8 “Ensure...riparian corridor preservation, protection, and restoration.”</p> <p>OSC-I-1.4b “...implement...plan for...conservation and restoration of riparian and wetland habitats.”</p> <p>3.2 states: “consider the effect of development...on natural resources located on public land.” The Element requires identification of lands that can accommodate stormwater management. It also covers areas that includes earthquake danger, unstable soils, floodplains which certainly describes the area of housing noted above.</p> <p>All of the above applies most directly to the DS and DG areas north of the railroad tracks that are being proposed for major housing/retail/commercial development (over 400 housing units appear to be possible) and are about</p>	Opinion noted. Whether or not to allow further housing development in the areas mentioned is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that the current 1973 General Plan designations and zoning already allow light industrial development on the properties in question. The General Plan Update is an opportunity for policymakers to determine whether existing densities throughout the city should be adjusted to meet future housing and economic development objectives. The City Council may determine that increased densities would, among other things, help the city meet its future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets; support current Amtrak service; support new ferry service; and increase demand for retail, office, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Staff will revise the General Plan densities as directed by City Council. The Zoning Ordinance and Map will be updated after the GPU is adopted to ensure consistency. Additionally, the Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>20 feet from storm surge absorbing wetlands and Alhambra Creek. Yet these areas appear to be just like those this section says not to develop.</p> <p>This appears to be a conflict within the General Plan and is not allowed. How do you justify this conflict? I believe it requires you change the land use designations of these areas.</p>	
Open Space Inventory	<p>3.2 Open Space Inventory There are two major deficiencies: (1) no appendix a is attached and (2) the referenced "Figure 3-1 Open Space Inventory" map does not show the Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO Overlay) land. The slanting lines are invisible. This is a major issue, as it undermines the effectiveness of Measure I and misleads the public.</p> <p>"Figure 2-4 LAND USE MAP" has the same deficiency. This is a major error and must be corrected.</p>	The City acknowledges the map legibility can be improved upon. For this reason, the August 2022 GPU includes a higher-resolution versions the maps in each element. The August 2022 GPU includes the referenced open space inventory as Figure 3-1.
Measure I	3.2 Open Space Protection. This section does a good job of giving some background on Measure I and POPO. And it makes reference to the key section in Element 2.0 that shows Measure I, LU-P-1.2 (although there are issues with that section---notably it leaves out three important sections of Measure I, Exhibits a, b and c).	Commented Noted. See Land Use Element Appendix LU-A and LU-B of the August 2022 GPU.
Measure I	<p>Measure I and POPO Overlay are discussed in other Elements (Element 5.0 Parks... for instance), and it should be the policy that those mentions are cross-referenced to both this section of Element 3.0 and the sections that this section references in Element 2.0. That is the only way a person would have a chance to be able to understand what Measure I means and how it works to protect open space and parks.</p> <p>It should not be a general reference like "Element 2.0", as that leaves the reader having to search through that entire Element to find the data, and there is no assurance that he has found all the data.</p> <p>There are other areas, including some in Element 2.0, where insufficient references are given, leaving the public unable to figure out what Measure I means and what protections it affords the public. Those areas should be identified and proper references given.</p>	The August 2022 GPU has added clearer references where needed.
Cross-referencing	3.3 Open Space Reductions This implies that the Trust Land Use Plan will look at loss of all the land at the waterfront, and that is misleading. It will only look at the loss in the marina lands. And that comprises a very small portion of the wetlands. Also referral to the Public Safety Element is confusing to the public without a specific reference.	The August 2022 GPU has added clearer references where needed.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>This section also refers to the Land Use Element in the last sentence. A specific reference should be given.</p> <p>This section also refers to the Parks Element, where a specific reference should be included.</p>	
Word Usage	<p>3.4 "...GOALS, POLICIES..."</p> <p>This section is mostly only suggestions that do not define actual limits or set firm lines in the sand or protect the public in any way. Most use wishy-washy words like "where feasible...", "explore..." "encourage..." "support" "coordinate..." "consider..." "collaborate..." "discourage..." "continue to coordinate..." and more.</p> <p>Actual guidelines like "will..." "shall..." "require..." are in the minority. In 3.4, there are only ten "will..." "shall..." "require..." statements that have some teeth in them. There are fourteen wishy-washy ones.</p> <p>It might be beneficial to look at our current General Plan for specific changes in wording that would make the draft GPU stronger and protect what we treasure in Martinez.</p>	The language of the goals and policies is purposely general in nature which is standard practice. More specific regulatory language is typically found in ordinances that implement the General Plan such as the Zoning Ordinance.
General Comment	<p>Ridgeline protection, major scenic routes, future park and trail sites, slope density, and other issues seem to be handled better in the current General Plan.</p> <p>I believe this analysis of firm goals/policies/implementations versus weak ones should be done throughout this GPU in all Elements and publicized to the public.</p>	Opinion noted.
Tim Platt, 3/31/22, Link to Full Comment		
Measure I	<p>Major Measure I Sections Missing from the GPU. Other Issues General Plan Comments.</p> <p>Although a good deal of effort has been put into incorporating Measure I into the GPU Policy LU-P-1.2, there are wo important errors in what has been done:</p> <p>1. Three major sections of Measure I have been completely left out of the major GPU section that deals with it, LU-P-1.2: Exhibit A---Main Map, Exhibit B---Marina, and Exhibit C---Franklin Hills/ESL/CUL Protections.</p>	See responses to Measure I comment made by Tim Platt on 3/14/22.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>2. The lettering system in LU-P-1.2 has been changed from the Initiative, so references in LUP-1.2 to other places in the Initiative do not make sense. For instance, in LU-P-1.2 b., it refers to “Section 5.i” and also “Exhibit A” and no such sections exist in LU-P-1.2</p> <p>There is a simple solution to both of these issues that also complies with the requirements of the Initiative: “...the General Plan Amendment included as Section 5 of the Initiative shall be inserted into the General Plan...”</p> <p>Include all three Exhibits (A, B, C) in this LU-P-1.2 policy section, as you have done with all the Section 5 paragraphs. (The map in Exhibit A must be in color. Otherwise it makes no sense.)</p> <p>Instead of the LU-P-1.2 paragraph labeling of a., b., etc., use the Measure I labeling for these paragraphs, i.e., SECTION 5. a., SECTION 5. b., Exhibit A, Exhibit C, etc. Now all internal references make sense.</p> <p>Alternately, using the “Section 5. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT “ as a header above the first paragraph “a” might suffice.</p> <p>I believe both of these changes will make the GPU agree with the Initiative requirement</p>	
Measure I	<p>Other issues:</p> <p>In the first paragraph starting “The following policy...”, the word “Amendments” should be “Clarifications”. The Initiative cannot be amended without voter approval, and clarifications are what were mutually agreed to.</p> <p>The statement from Section 5 Preamble of the Initiative that “All General Plan provisions adopted...through this Initiative shall be distinctively identified in the General Plan as having been adopted by Initiative” should be applied here (and in other pertinent areas in the GPU).</p> <p>Also it should be noted here that “This Initiative may be amended or repealed only by Martinez voters.” as noted in Section 9 of the Initiative.</p> <p>The words “...made part of...” should be changed to “inserted”.</p> <p>LU-P-1.2 Paragraph b. is hard to understand in part because of typos and missing paragraph break. In the second sentence, a period needs to be inserted after the word “designation”. In the next sentence, the word</p>	See responses to Measure I comment made by Tim Platt on 3/14/22.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>“Overlay” is not completely spelled out or the “O” needs to be dropped. At the end of that sentence after “...Permanent Open Space (PPOS).” there needs to be a paragraph break.</p> <p>Between these issues and the attempt in this paragraph to try to get the reader to go to Appendix C (which incredibly is not even attached to the Element) instead of Exhibit A as it’s called in the Initiative, this paragraph is basically indecipherable.</p> <p>The referral to Appendix C is not in accordance with the Initiative requirements for insertion of the Exhibits here, and is totally confusing to the reader because what staff has told me is supposed to be in Appendix C covers much more than Exhibit A and will leave the reader searching and confused.</p> <p>Additionally, staff sent me a copy of what was supposed to be in Appendix C. It was supposed to be Resolution 115-19. Three things are wrong with this. First, the copy I was sent showed this critical Exhibit A map in black and white when the entire basis of the map was the color of the different lands---so the map was useless. Second, referring the reader to this 10-15 pages of the Resolution leaves them to have to hunt to find Exhibit A which is very confusing. Third, the official copy of the Resolution I got from the City does not even include a copy of the Initiative (I think it should, but apparently it does not).</p> <p>LU-P-1.2 Paragraph h. The reference to Appendix A should be deleted, and Exhibit C of the Initiative added as noted above for all three Exhibits. Can you advise if there are other ways you have shown the effect of Measure I on these lands?</p> <p>LU-P-1.2 Paragraph i. Delete the sentence beginning “(a draft copy of which was sent....)”. This is not in the Initiative.</p> <p>I believe for the sake of clarity that, in 2.5 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS, all Land Use Designations covered by Measure I and the POPO Overlay need to note “Measure I and the Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) apply. See LU-P-1.2 for more information”. This should appear right beneath “Applicable Zoning Districts:...”</p> <p>I also believe a separate Attachment to Section 2.0 needs to include the Resolution 115-19 and separately a copy of the Initiative for the public to see. This is for public information, but not to be used to supplant showing that</p>	



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>information in LU-P-1.2 The Exhibit A map MUST be in color, as it is meaningless in black and white and also is not a true replication of Measure I.</p> <p>The implementation of Measure I is critically important to the public that loves its open space and parks and to me personally. I would like to discuss this further with staff, if that is allowed.</p>	
Tim Platt, 4/10/22, Link to Full Comment		
Height and Density Restrictions	<p>HEIGHT AND DENSITY RESTRICTIONS NEED TO BE ADDED</p> <p>There are no height restrictions for any of the extensive housing and retail/commercial development specified in the Land Use Element 2.0 of the draft GPU.</p> <p>For instance, the Downtown Core Special district is authorized for four stories of retail/commercial topped by 43 housing units/acre without any height restrictions. That equates to a minimum of 5 stories and could be 6-7-8. Maybe higher. Other land in Downtown and the Waterfront are approved for three stories of retail/commercial topped by 43 housing units/acre, and they also having no height restrictions.</p> <p>There are also no restrictions for setbacks, viewscape protection, lot coverage and the likes.</p> <p>We need reasonable restrictions that would keep these developments from becoming massive buildings that would overshadow the town we love, block it from the connection to our hills and waterfront, and undermine our safe, historic, small-town character. (Attached is a partial Downtown/Waterfront land use map for reference.)</p> <p>These restrictions on height, setbacks, view protection, lot coverage, etc. need to be added to the Land Use Designations for those areas along with the density and FAR numbers. That will make them visible to all.</p> <p>Why has the City left these protections out of the draft General Plan Update? It does not make sense. Dense buildings of huge mass and height is not the future we want for our town and waterfront. The City needs to change the draft GPU to include reasonable (2-3 story/4 story for certain uses) height and other building parameters.</p>	<p>State General Plan law does not require height, setbacks, and lot coverage to be included in general plans as these are normally incorporated into the subsequent zoning code updates designed to implement an adopted general plan. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the importance of setting a height limitation for unique areas like the Downtown and other areas closer to the waterfront; therefore, the land use descriptions for the Downtown Core (DC), Downtown Government (DG), and Downtown Shoreline (DS) have been revised to include the height limitations listed below. It should be noted that these height limitations match what is already established by the Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p><u>Downtown Core (DC)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit.</p> <p><u>Downtown Government (DG)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p> <p><u>Downtown Shoreline (DS)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>I hope citizens will tell the City and our Council members just that.</p> <p>The City staff informally addressed this issue recently and that was appreciated (although I have not seen a public statement).</p>	
FAR	<p>The draft GPU clearly states that FAR (floor area ratio) specifies the number of stories of retail/commercial development allowed, and that any housing is added to that.</p> <p>So, for instance, the Land Use Designation for the Downtown Core Special district authorizes a FAR of 4.0 and housing of 43 units/acre, which equates to four stories of retail/commercial topped by 43 housing units/per acre. The development can cover the entire lot and there is no height restriction. From pgs. 23-24 of the Land Use Element 2.0: FAR--- (floor area ratio)</p> <p>“General Plans typically express non-residential intensities in terms of the highest gross floor area ratio (FAR) that can be developed on a particular piece of land...”</p> <p>“The ratio is determined by dividing the building area by parcel area. For example, if a 10,000 sq. ft. parcel has a FAR limit of 0.5, then the floor area on the parcel may not exceed 5,000 sq. ft...”</p> <p>“FAR does not dictate the height or shape of a building, or its location on a site...For mixed use projects, both Residential Density and Non-Residential Floor Area Ratio both apply.” (Underlines added)</p> <p>When some of us brought this to the attention of the City, they met with us and told us they had not given a clear explanation or made an error. They said the FAR was the total for both the housing and the retail/commercial development, even though the draft GPU said the opposite. More important, they explained the FAR actually meant the maximum number of stories if the entire lot was covered by a development. If less than the entire lot was covered, then the development could be proportionately higher, with no top limit.</p> <p>So for example, if we use the Downtown Core Special district with a FAR of 4, under this new explanation by staff, if the developer covered just half the lot with development, that development could be as high as 8 stories! So even under the City restatement (which we have no guarantee will appear in the draft GPU), we need height restrictions as part of all Land Use Designations.</p>	<p>Section 2.4 of the Land Use Element has been revised to read as follows in order to clarify how density and FAR will be applied to different types of development projects:</p> <p>“State law requires that land use designations be accompanied by standards that establish the density or intensity of development permitted within each general plan land use designation. For the purposes of this General Plan, development density and intensity shall be regulated and measured differently based on the type of development. The methods that shall be used for calculating density and intensity for residential, commercial and industrial, and mixed-use developments are described below.</p> <p><u>Residential Development</u></p> <p>Residential developments shall be regulated by an allowed density range measured in “dwelling units per acre.” The maximum possible residential density pursuant to this General Plan is to be calculated on the acreage of the parcel(s) at the time of development application submittal, not including existing adjacent public streets or drainage channels. Areas for newly proposed streets and/or private drives (within the parcel of the subject application) shall be counted toward the maximum permitted allowable density. The maximum allowable number of dwelling units shall be calculated by multiplying the project area size (as defined above) by the maximum allowable density for the applicable land use designation and rounding to the nearest whole number.</p> <p><u>Population Density</u></p> <p>In addition to residential density, State law requires the General Plan to include a statement of population density for the various land use categories. Population density is determined by multiplying the average household size, as determined by the latest decennial U.S. Census, by the number of dwelling units in a land use category. For example, the average household size in Martinez was 2.60 persons in 2019 (U.S. Census Estimate). The population density in the Residential Low (RL) land use designation (1.1 – 6.0 units per acre) is therefore 2.9 to 15.6 persons per acre.</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>(There are some height restrictions in the Downtown Specific Plan for some of the land in Martinez, but they should be mirrored in this critical Land Use Element 2.0. This Element should be the controlling document. It is what the public and developers alike will read first, and it covers all of Martinez, not just the Downtown.</p> <p>Additionally, leaving these critical restrictions to zoning ordinances does not solve the problem at all, as zoning ordinances can be easily changed with little significant public scrutiny or oversight. Changes to our General Plan receive much greater public attention.)</p> <p>These restrictions should be applied to all the high-rise development for our town, including high-density lots sprinkled throughout Martinez in all neighborhoods---most extensively on the entire length of Pacheco Blvd. Additionally, some blocks Downtown and elsewhere have been added to high-rise, high-density Land Use Designations, and the City needs to tell us which lots these are and why the development density and FAR have been increased.</p>	<p><u>Commercial and Industrial Development</u></p> <p>Commercial and industrial uses shall be regulated by a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) standard. FAR refers to the ratio of building floor space compared to the square footage of the site. FAR shall be calculated by dividing the floor area of all buildings on the site by the total square footage of the site. For example, a 12,500 square foot building on a 25,000 square foot site has a FAR of 0.5. The maximum FAR standard limits the overall size of development on a property. As an example, a maximum FAR of 0.75 would allow 75,000 square feet of building floor area on a 100,000 square foot lot. The 75,000 square feet could be provided in one building or divided between multiple buildings. When calculating FAR, the building square footage shall include finished interior spaces and exclude parking garages, structured parking levels, and exterior open space, such as courtyards, roof gardens, and balconies.</p> <p><u>Mixed-Use Development</u></p> <p>The density and intensity of mixed-use developments that include both commercial and residential uses are regulated by both the maximum residential density (dwelling units per acre) and the maximum FAR standard for the land use designation. As an example, a one-acre site containing 43,560 square feet with a maximum FAR of 1.0 and an allowed density range of 19 to 30 units per acre could be developed with 43,560 square feet of total building space. The 43,560 square feet could be divided into a combination of commercial space and residential space. Up to 30 units would be allowed within the 43,560 square feet."</p>
General Comment	NOTE: Including these restrictions in the Land Use Designations in no way affects our opposition to your proposed massive housing/retail/commercial development (approx. 400+ housing units alone) on the waterfront just yards north of the railroad tracks and right next to our wetlands and shoreline park.	Comment noted. It should also be noted that the GPU, itself, is not proposing any specific development. The GPU establishes goals and policies that future developments must be consistent with.
Environmental Impacts	<p>The dangers to potential residents and to the open space and parkland of this huge development is detailed in another General Plan comment I've sent to the City GPCComments website.</p> <p>Dangers including earthquake, flooding, noise levels, liquefaction, train accidents, train blockages of both RR crossings, destruction of historic housing, enhanced legal liability to the City, damage to our waterfront open space and parkland, and more are discussed in detail.</p>	Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Proximity to Marshland	<p>This proposed housing/retail/commercial development between the railroad tracks and the marshland is physically dangerous and should not be allowed at all. Not at any density or height. (Except for current housing zoning on Berrellesa. The rest of the area is zoned LI, Light Industrial, which is also probably appropriate.</p>	<p>The Land Use Element has been revised to include a new implementation measure which reads as follows: "LU-I-3.1d: No construction, development, structure, street, alley or landscaping shall be permitted within 100 feet of any marshlands or creeks within the Martinez Regional Shoreline. This marshland setback area shall be undisturbed and used as a vegetative buffer to the marshland. The setbacks shall be to the nearest marsh area and if the nearest marsh area is more than 100 feet from the property line then no set back shall be necessary."</p>
Parking Requirements	<p>PARKING REQUIREMENTS NEED TO BE ADDED</p> <p>This draft General Plan Update plans for huge housing and retail/commercial development in the Downtown/ Waterfront and in selected areas residential and commercial areas throughout Martinez. But I do not believe the GPU includes any plans to deal with the ramifications of this development, especially regarding increased parking needs.</p> <p>Parking in the Downtown/Waterfront will be impacted for two reasons. Parking requirements will be dramatically increased due to the large amount of residential and retail/commercial development planned. Additionally, existing parking areas are slated for housing and retail/commercial development. They will be lost for parking and will actually reducing the amount of available parking.</p> <p>Areas like the Ferry Street parking lot and the Amtrak lot across from the Amtrak station are slated for replacement with high density housing, indeed some of the 4-5-6 story structures discussed above. So we will lose existing parking at the same time we will be dramatically increasing the demand for more parking. And the supply is currently too small to boot.</p> <p>Yet there is no discussion of or plan for handling these parking impacts. Parking requirements need to be a part of the Land Use Designations for the areas Downtown and on the Waterfront, just like density and FAR. New development should not be allowed unless it provides the added parking it will necessitate.</p> <p>Parking is not only an issue in our Downtown/Waterfront. It is insufficient now in many of the neighborhoods surrounding Downtown were major streets like Pine, Castro and others are essentially dangerous one-lane-only streets for significant amounts of time when cars are parked on both sides of the street.</p> <p>This is of real concern with the significant added in-fill housing being proposed by the State and in this draft GPU for residential areas throughout</p>	<p>Parking standards are set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and the Downtown Specific Plan; however, Circulation Element has been revised to include a new policy regarding Downtown parking. The policy reads as follows: "C-P-1.5: Implement short and long-term recommendations set forth in the June 2022 Downtown Martinez Parking Study. Among other things, the study recommends adjusting parking rates and limits along the most popular streets in Downtown; improve parking wayfinding to guide drivers to "right-fit" parking options; explore expanding the supply of parking spaces via private-sector investments; deploy innovative meter technologies; expand bike and micro-mobility infrastructure and amenities; improve the pedestrian experience; consider the implementation of a local circulator and improvements to existing transit routes; and continue to expand city policies that support the use of parklets."</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>Martinez. To add more housing without addressing parking for that new housing is wrong and dangerous. Some accommodation for parking must be included in the Land Use Designations for those areas.</p> <p>Last, significant high-density, high-rise development is authorized all along Pacheco Blvd and sprinkled around a number of residential areas elsewhere in town. Land Use Designations for those areas should include requirements for parking that protect those neighborhoods from parking issues.</p>	
Housing Element Update	<p>It is illogical that the draft GPU process is not held up until it can include the updated Housing Element which is right in the middle of the update process now and had been for the last several months. The Housing Element gives us the baseline housing numbers that we have to plan to meet for housing in the City.</p> <p>How could we not complete the Housing Element before completing this draft GPU, the whole purpose of which is planning for future development? We have all talked about how out of date our current General Plan is. Yet here we are approving a replacement General Plan that will be out of date immediately it is passed because an updated Housing Element will not be included.</p> <p>This does not make sense. The draft GPU process should be held up so that the Housing Element can be completed and added into the draft GPU. Then the draft GPU will be based on up-to-date housing figures. And all can be reviewed by the public at one time and can go through the EIR process as one document.</p> <p>We have been waiting for 12 years to get our General Plan updated. Waiting a few extra months so that Housing Element can make our GPU a complete document just makes sense. Having the information the Housing Element includes about types and quantity of housing we must target will ensure we don't make assumptions or plans in the draft GPU that need to be changed when the Housing Element is updated.</p>	The Housing Element Update is underway, but on a later schedule. Housing and land use policies will be made consistent (if needed) when the Housing Element Update is adopted.
Tim Platt, 5/11/22, Link to Full Comment		
Park Acreage	<p>The totally inaccurate statement regarding the existing Martinez parks total acreage and acres/1000 residents ratio on pg. 5-2 and the conclusions drawn from it over the next 4 pages could have very bad repercussions for all of us. Not only is the information wrong, it could affect funding for future parks needed to meet the parkland needs of our growing populace. As it stands now, we are below our statutory ratio of park acreage/1000 residents, and</p>	Opinion noted. See response to Park Acreage comments made by Tim Platt on 12/18/21.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>need to be working to meet that ratio and more to accommodate the population increase the draft GPU is authorizing.</p> <p>The major error the City has made is that, for the first time ever, it is calling the Martinez Marina a "park". This is wrong.</p> <p>The marina s is not a park for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The marina has never been called a park. • The marina is not on the list of parks from the last Park System Master Plan, and no new park except Pine Meadow at 9 acres has been added to that park list. • It is a commercial venture providing commercial support to fishing and boating activities and commercial ventures like restaurants and lodging---this all is in the State charter for marina uses which encourages commercial maritime uses, as well as recreational and environmental uses. • It is not owned by the City and never will be. • It is funded separately as costs are much greater and more complicated than parks. • It requires long-term capital commitments that the park system cannot be involved in. • It's finances are separated from the City's and from the parks through it's own enterprise fund. • No other City that I know of calls their marina a park. 	
Tim Platt, 5/24/22, Link to Full Comment		
Measure I	It appears that certain requirements of Measure I do not appear in the Land Use Designations (LUD) protected by Measure I.	The commenter does not elaborate on which requirements he is referring to.
Measure I	And in other cases, stipulations that are not in the current General Plan have been added to some LUDs---for instance FAR limits, that I believe are not in the current General Plan, and, therefore, cannot be added without a vote of the people.	See responses below.
Measure I	For ESL, CUL and PPOS--- Measure I Section 5.h. and Exhibit C put clear restrictions on those lands, and these restrictions are not noted under those LUDs. Indeed, contradictory conditions are noted for all three of those LUDs. Stipulations in Measure I that relate to lot coverage, density, minimum lot size, number of units, application requirements, slope density limits are not shown.	<p>Measure I applies to the following land use designations: AV/OS, ESL, NP, OS, OS&R, OS-S, OS/P&R, OS-P, CUL, P&R, or PPOS.</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Alhambra Valley Open Space (AV-OS), the text "Non-Residential Floor Area Ratio: Up to 0.1" has been removed. The following text has been added "The Protected Open Space</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the AV-OS land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2l shall apply to lands within city limits designated AV-OS.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Environmentally Sensitive Land (ESL), the text “Residential Density: Minimum lot sizes 18,000 square feet or more. One single-family structure for up to 20 acres; two single family structures for parcels over 20 acres” has been removed. The following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the ESL land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2l shall apply to lands within city limits designated ESL.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Neighborhood Park (NP), the following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the NP land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2l shall apply to lands within city limits designated NP.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Open Space (OS), the text “Non-Residential Floor Area Ratio: Up to 0.1” has been removed. The following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the OS land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2l shall apply to lands within city limits designated OS.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Open Space and Recreation, Permanent (OS&R), the following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the OS&R land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2l shall apply to lands within city limits designated OS&R.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Open Space 30% Slopes (OS-S), the following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the OS-S land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2l shall apply to lands within city limits designated OS-S.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Open Space, Parks and Recreation (OS/P&R), the following text has been added “The Protected</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the OS/P&R land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2I shall apply to lands within city limits designated OS/P&R.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Open Space Private (OS-P), the following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the OS-P land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2I shall apply to lands within city limits designated OS-P.”</p> <p>With Regard to the land use description for Open Space Conservation Use Land (CUL), the following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the CUL land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2I shall apply to lands within city limits designated CUL.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Parks and Recreation (PR), the text “Non-Residential Floor Area Ratio: Up to 0.5” has been removed. The following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the P&R land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2I shall apply to lands within city limits designated P&R.”</p> <p>With regard to the land use description for Parks and Recreation, Public Permanent Open Space (PPOS), the following text has been added “The Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay (POPO) applies to the PPOS land use designation; therefore, Land Use Element Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2I shall apply to lands within city limits designated PPOS.”</p>
Measure I	Also OS and P&R have an inappropriate stipulation, the FAR. This stipulation does not appear in the current General Plan, to the best of my knowledge.	See response above.
Measure I	Additionally, the 2% coverage stipulation does not appear to be noted in the appropriate LUDs that cover private open space. Measure I Section 5.h. and Exhibit C specify a limit of 2% of total lot area can be used for residential uses including related facilities.	Each of the mentioned land use descriptions have been revised to indicate that the land use designation is subject to the POPO. Additional language has been added to each description indicating the designations are subject to Policy LU-1.2 and Implementation Measures LU-I-1.2a through LU-I-1.2I, which cover the stipulations mentioned by the commenter.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>All of these restrictions should logically appear in the appropriate LUDs. Please advise if there is some reason why the stipulations don't appear. Also please advise if there is any valid reason for the contradictory additions, and, if so, what the reason is.</p> <p>With regard to OS-S, where are the stipulations on density and lot sizes called out in the current General Plan and what are they? They should be the same for the draft GPU, and we need to make sure of that.</p>	
Measure I	I have also made this comment elsewhere, but believe it is worth repeating here. A statement such as: "This LUD is protected by Measure I. See Policy LU-P-1.2 for more information." should be added to all the LUDs protected by Measure I, just as you have added other pertinent information to other LUDs. This statement would be appropriate and help reduce any confusion on what Measure I protects.	See response above.
Measure I	Also under the POPO LUD, pg. 2-39, I believe you should note the LUDs that are covered by Measure I to reduce confusion. For instance add: "Land Use Designations that are protected by Measure I include: Alhambra Valley Open Space (AV/OS), Environmentally Sensitive Land (ESL), Neighborhood Park (NP), Open Space(OS), Open Space and Recreation Permanent (OS&R), Open Space 30% Slopes (OS-S), Open Space, Parks and Recreation (OS/P&R), Open Space Private (OSP), Open Space/Conservation Use Land (CUL), Parks and Recreation (P&R), and Permanent Open Space (PPOS)."	See response above.
Measure I	<p>Last, there are a few more typographical errors that can lead to misunderstandings in the future. Your list of LUDs on page 2-47 does not match the list on the Measure I map, Exhibit A, and also does not match the LUD names used on pgs. 2-36 through 2-39.</p> <p>Please clean that up and make them all match the LUDs on the Measure I map, Exhibit A. Most of the problem seems to be with your having added "Park and Recreation" into your Policy LU-P-1.2 paragraph b on pg. 2-47.</p>	This comment has been addressed with the revisions that have been made to the GPU.
Measure I	Also the "NP" has been left off of Neighborhood Park on pg 2-37.	The "(NP)" has been added at the end of the title for the land use description.
Tim Platt, 5/26/22, Link to Full Comment		
	<p>DO A COMPARISON</p> <p>The only sensible way for the public to comment on the draft GPU is to have knowledge about it. The best way to give the public that knowledge is to compare this draft GPU with the current General Plan we have now and have</p>	The 1973 General Plan and August 2022 GPU are on City website for comparison. The public review process is on-going to Fall 2022 and provides additional time for public input.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>lived under for decades. And the best ones to make that comparison are the City staff that has both developed the draft GPU and enforced the current General Plan for decades.</p> <p>Such a comparison would allow citizens to see the changes, ask questions about them and ultimately make meaningful comments.</p> <p>We've asked for that comparison for over 2 years, and the City has refused to do it.</p> <p>The obvious comparisons we should have are on density, height and building configuration, and parking---factors that have an immediate impact on our quality of life.</p> <p>But the people of Martinez are interested in not only their neighborhoods, but their Downtown and Waterfront and their town overall.</p> <p>The comparison should extend to all of Martinez and to the other issues covered by the plan---fire safety plans, plans for sea level change, economic development, slope density requirements, historic protection, open space and parks, and all the other parts of the draft GPU that will control our future.</p> <p>I believe the effort to get public comment on the draft GPU has been severely undermined by the City's refusal to do a comparison and tell us what changes they have made in the draft GPU and why they made them. This is a major reason why many don't trust the plan or the process.</p> <p>Please prepare and disseminate a comparison and open it to public questioning, or tell us why you are not doing that.</p> <p>Because the City would not provide comparison information, I made a layman's comparison of density increases throughout Martinez to try to give some information to the public about the extensive increases in density and height that are authorized by the draft GPU. It is admittedly based on limited knowledge and limited time. It essentially compares the current Land Use Map and to the new Land Use Map in the GPU.</p> <p>I have listed below some of the areas where increases in density are large. The list shows enough areas to be alarmed at the level of density increases the City is authorizing in the draft GPU. Admittedly some people will benefit from these large density increases, notably land owners and developers. But</p>	



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>much of the public will suffer the consequences. That is not fair, in my opinion.</p> <p>EXAMPLES WHERE DENSITIES DRASTICALLY INCREASED Escobar/Grandview 42% Green St./Arlington /Talbart 50% Waterfront---Embarcadero/Berrellesa/Sport Court Increases from no housing to up to 43 units/acre Pacheco east of Shell Ave.</p> <p>500% Arnold Dr./Midway Increases from no housing to 30 units/acre Haven/Pine 250% Castro/Brown/Jones 43% Morello by Viano Increases from no housing to up to 6 units/acre Alhambra Blvd/MacAlvey 50% Gilbert Ct. 100% Virginia Hills Dr/Las Animas 250% Downtown Core gets 4 stories of retail/commercial topped by 43 units/acre</p> <p>GIVE US SOME ANSWERS I do not claim this comparison is even close to professional or without error, but it is more than the City has provided the public. Please tell us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what the actual density increases are in all the Land Use Designations versus what is allowed now • why these density increases are being authorized • who decided to make them • what increases and changes are in the GPU for other important development factors, like building heights and configurations and parking demand <p>what changes have been made to other issues covered in the draft GPU, e.g., fire safety plans, plans for sea level change, economic development, slope density requirements, historic protection, open space and parks, etc.</p>	
	<p>WHAT IS OUR GOAL FOR NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT? One reason for increasing housing density may be the State-mandated number of housing units that the State requires us to plan to build. Increasing housing density is a major way to increase the number of housing units in a built-out town like Martinez.</p> <p>This magic number of new housing units mandated by the State and apportioned by ABAG is called the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). It is found in our Housing Element which is part of our General Plan.</p> <p>From our current Housing Element that was prepared in 2014 and which is a part of our General Plan, our RHNA appears to be 469 housing units (see pg. 94 of the Element).</p>	<p>The commenter is correct that RHNA is one of the several reasons for the density proposals throughout the GPU. The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Plan: San Francisco Bay Area, 2023-2031 identifies the following housing needs for Martinez during the upcoming 2023-2031 (see page 23 in the link above):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Low Income (<50% of Area Median Income): 350 • Low Income (50-80% of Area Median Income): 201 • Moderate Income (80-120% of Area Median Income): 221 • Above Moderate Income (>120% of Area Median Income): 573 • Total Martinez RHNA for 2023-2031: 1,345



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>This may be the goal the City is using to determine how many housing units the draft GPU must authorize. And housing density is the means to get to that number goal. Increasing housing density means increasing the number of new housing units.</p> <p>But something does not make sense in this explanation because the current housing densities allow for many more new housing units than the 469 mandated by the State.</p> <p>Just the number of housing units that could be built in our Downtown alone eclipses that number, it would seem.</p> <p>In the Downtown proper, there are about 28 blocks and the entire Telfer property that are authorized for between 30 and 43 housing units /acre--- probably well over a thousand housing units overall. (See the map below for some reference on the number of blocks of high-density development. One block is approximately one acre.)</p> <p>Add to that all the new housing being authorized all around our town, and the infill housing now allowed in our residential neighborhoods, and it looks like our town can meet even a much higher RHNA, if one is given us in the new round of Housing Element updates. Even if our RHNA were to double, we'd still have enough new housing units in the Downtown alone to meet the mandate.</p> <p>So it looks as though the State RHNA number should not be making all these huge density increases necessary.</p> <p>Once again, something does not add up.</p> <p>More density, more height, bigger buildings.</p> <p>We're giving all that away in the draft GPU with no return and for no reason. Why? Please tell us.</p> <p>And remember, once we increase the density or height (or loosen any development standards on building configuration or parking requirements)--- IT CAN NEVER GO DOWN because land owners and developers won't let it. Density and height only go up and with them the price of the land.</p>	



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>Yet the City won't tell us way they are authorizing big increases in density and height.</p> <p>NOTE: Rough calculations of the housing units being authorized for the Waterfront north of the railroad tracks show about 14 acres of land that is authorized for between 35 and 43 units/acre. Being very conservative, that would come out to about 450 housing units---enough to meet our RHNA number of 469 right there.</p> <p>But these figures have not been used in our calculations above because we firmly believe it is dangerous for both the future residents and for the open space/park to ever put housing here. Please see my 2/6/22 GPComment email for reasons why.)</p>	
Housing Element Update	<p>WAIT FOR THE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE BEFORE APPROVING THE GPU</p> <p>An important issue is that we are in the process right now of revising and updating our Housing Element. The update appears set for completion early next year. And we will be getting a new RHNA number.</p> <p>We have suggested several times to the City that the draft GPU be put off to let the updated Housing Element be a part of it, and the new RHNA can be known. That way we don't have to revise the General Plan then, if the RHNA is a lot higher.</p> <p>But the City is not interested in that. It seems illogical that we would take over 12 years updating the current General Plan, yet now we are rushing to get it approved so it can be immediately obsolete because the Housing Element is still being updated and isn't ready</p> <p>Shouldn't we wait a few months and have accurate RHNA data in an updated Housing Element before we rush to approve the draft GPU?</p>	The Housing Element Update is underway, but on a later schedule. Housing and land use policies will be made consistent (if needed) when the Housing Element Update is adopted.
Height and Density Restrictions; FAR	<p>HEIGHT IS A MAJOR ISSUE AND MUST BE LIMITED</p> <p>I've been told by staff that the FAR allowances have been added to the GPU and are not in our current General Plan. So they can easily be eliminated. They authorize more stories of retail/commercial development than the current plan.</p>	See responses to comments made by Tim Platt on 4/10/22.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	<p>I've also been told by staff that FAR convention authorizes unlimited height due to the fact that, as lot coverage decreases, height is allowed to increase under FAR. So, for instance, if the developer reduces lot coverage by 30%, he can increase height by 30%.</p> <p>Even if you end up allowing high-density housing all over town, we don't need to have the added stories of retail/commercial development the GPU authorizes under FAR in the Downtown ---up to 4 stories for retail/commercial alone in some Downtown blocks. And we certainly don't need the added height that reduced lot coverage allows.</p> <p>FAR is an entitlement that does not exist now, so there should be no issue in deleting it from the GPU.</p> <p>Limit the height and we will save some of the small-town, historic nature of our town and its connection to the hills and shoreline.</p> <p>I recommend all FAR be eliminated and firm height limits no greater than those currently allowed be permitted.</p>	
Environmental Impacts	<p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</p> <p>The sea level rise maps in the Public Safety Element are unreadable. Furthermore they offer little useful information. Sea level rise is a critical issue for our town. Clearer and more complete information letting people have a true grasp of where this issue will affect property in Martinez is required. Also a plan needs to be enunciated describing how we will react to that future.</p> <p>Furthermore, that map and the entire "plan" leave out any mention of periodic flooding which is more critical than complete flooding. Areas of periodic flooding need to be identified and addressed. A case in point is the area of the waterfront just north of the railroad tracks and just south of the marsh open space.</p> <p>We have shown the City information that shows that area periodically inundated/flooded multiple times per year, yet the City is authorizing high-density housing there. The GPU needs to include information and maps that shows the public issues like that and lays out a plan to address them.</p> <p>These issues were discussed at an early GPU meeting, but no response from the City has been forthcoming.</p>	<p>Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
Height and Density Restrictions; FAR	<p>Density ranges for some residential Land Use Designations are extreme and so are FAR allowances. They should be reviewed and tightened up to protect neighbors and neighborhoods.</p> <p>Many changes in this GPU give significant benefits to some, mostly land owners and developers. Is it right to ask for some public benefit in return for those changes and the affects they will have on the larger community? I believe that would be fair.</p> <p>Even if our RHNA were to double, we'd still have enough new housing units in the Downtown alone to meet the mandate.</p>	Opinion noted.
Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse	Please note that a potential salt marsh harvest mouse, an endangered species, has been found within about 100 yards of the proposed Waterfront development on Embarcadero. It is being tested for DNA confirmation now. Also, I understand that East Bay Regional Park District has evidence of the presence of this endangered species in the marsh area.	Comment noted.
Thousand Friends of Martinez, 11/30/21, Link to Full Comment		
General Comments		
1) Process	The process should be lengthened out, workshops held to include the public – including in-person meetings -- and get feedback, and then the draft General Plan should be revised.	<p>It has been nine months since the November 2021 GPU was released for public review. During that time the City has held the following meetings to review the GPU and accept public comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 1, 2021 - This City Council meeting covered the Introduction & Vision, Land Use, and Environmental Justice & Disadvantaged Communities elements of the Revised Draft General Plan 2035 document. December 15, 2021 – This City Council meeting covered the Open Space & Conservation and Noise & Air Quality elements of the Revised Draft General Plan 2035 document. January 12, 2022 – This City Council meeting covered the following elements of the Revised Draft General Plan 2035 document: Historical, Cultural, & Arts; Parks & Community Facilities; Circulation; and Public Safety. February 22, 2022 – This ARDPIE Task Force meeting provided an overview of the General Plan Update, the Environmental Justice &



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>Disadvantaged Communities Element, and the General Plan Vision Statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 8, 2022 – This Planning Commission meeting provided an opportunity for additional review of the Land Use Element. March 22, 2022 – This Planning Commission/ARDPIE Task Force joint meeting provided an opportunity for further discussion on the Environmental Justice & Disadvantaged Communities Element and the General Plan Vision Statement. <p>The comment period on the November 2021 GPU began November 5, 2021 and ended May 27, 2022. In total, the public was provided with a 204-day comment period. The City received 59 comment letters. The comments are available for review on the GPU website.</p>
2) General Plan Webpage	<p>The General Plan webpage is a mess. Nothing describes how the documents relate to each other.</p> <p>a) There is not one single comprehensive draft General Plan to review.</p> <p>b) There is a set of chapters, that refer to other documents such as appendixes, but no appendixes.</p> <p>c) Then there are “Background Documents” including the “current 1973 General Plan, including General Plan Amendments to September 2013”, a Housing Element and some other documents.</p> <p>d) The 2016 draft EIR is out of date and should be redone.</p>	<p>The website has been upgraded. The Introduction Element 1.0 describes the interrelationships of the elements. a) All of the GPU elements are available on the website. They are in individual documents as combining them into one would make the time required for download extremely long; b) The missing appendices have been added to the August 2022 GPU; c) correct; d) The GPU EIR has been updated and released together with the August 2022 GPU.</p>
3) Housing Development	<p>The draft General Plan is basically meant to okay a lot of housing development throughout the city, but it lacks consistency because it fails to update the Housing Element at the same time.</p>	<p>The Housing Element Update is underway, but on a later schedule. Housing and land use policies will be made consistent (if needed) when the Housing Element Update is adopted.</p>
4) Economic Development	<p>It makes no attempt at all at encouraging economic development or job creation.</p>	<p>The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C). If adopted, these policies would apply to citywide decision-making.</p>
5) Environmental Impacts	<p>It largely defers future planning related to climate change and increasing numbers of extreme climate-related events by not updating the Housing Element or considering existing information about the waterfront by proposing housing there.</p>	<p>Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.</p>
6) Goals and Policies	<p>Policies and goals are so vague as to be meaningless let alone enforceable</p>	<p>The language of the goals and policies is purposely general in nature which is standard practice. More specific regulatory language is typically found in ordinances that implement the General Plan such as the Zoning Ordinance.</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
7) General Comment	A few things were studied in a little more depth and as a result, the document wanders aimlessly from “too detailed” to “way too vague.”	This comment is too vague to respond to. There is not enough detail to suggest language changes to specific policies.
8) Specific Area Plans	What Specific Area Plans are legally included as part of the revision and where are they found? For a coherent document they should be integrated in or at least included as appendixes.	As mentioned in Section 1.1 of the Introduction chapter, “Upon adoption by the City Council, the maps, goals, policies, programs, diagrams, and figures contained within this General Plan document will supersede and update those now contained in the different elements and area plans adopted since the early 1970s. The Downtown Specific Plan and the Alhambra Hills Specific Plan will remain in effect as specific plans pursuant to Government Code §65450 et seq.”
9) GPU EIR	It's not clear whether there's a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this current draft or if the City hopes to rely on the 2015 draft EIR. What's the intent relative to environmental review of the General Plan Update?	The GPU EIR has been updated and released together with the August 2022 GPU.
10)Cross-Referencing	Entries should be cross referenced so that, for example, if an area in the Land Use Element category for increased density triggers mitigation in the Circulation Element, etc. that they are cross-referenced to each other to make the document easier to read and less cumbersome to navigate.	Interrelationships between elements are noted in the text where appropriate.
11)Economic Development	Since the overwhelming proportion of General Fund revenue is based on land use – property tax, sales tax, use tax – it's critical that the General Plan address the fiscal impact of land use. Does the General Plan reflect a substantive, focused economic development plan?	The August 2022 GPU has areas designated for commercial uses that will support businesses and jobs. It also includes new economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C of this document) based on their peer review of the November 2021 GPU.
12)Economic Development	What are the City's plans for economic development?	See response to comment #11 above.
13)Economic Development	How will the General Plan be used to achieve them?	See response to comment #11 above.
14)Economic Development	Economic Development needs to be part of the goals of most of the Elements/Chapters.	See response to comment #11 above.
15)Housing Element Update	Where is the Housing Element, one of the most important parts of the General Plan? There is no discussion about why it's not part of the Revised Draft General Plan Update. It is absurd that the Housing Element is not being considered as part of this rewrite of the General Plan.	The Housing Element Update is underway, but on a later schedule. Housing and land use policies will be made consistent (if needed) when the Housing Element Update is adopted.
16)Housing Element Update	Are we simply relying on the previous Housing Element? It should nonetheless be included as a coherent part of the draft documents provided to the public.	See response to comment #15 above. The most recent Housing Element is available on the General Plan website .
17)Housing Element Update	Yet, Housing Densities have been drastically increased throughout the city as part of the Land Use section. This immediately threatens to make the Update internally inconsistent. The draft Plan needs to coordinate with the Housing Element to be internally consistent.	See response to comment #15 above.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
18)Comparison	Without clear information and the comparison of the existing General Plan with the proposed General Plan that we've repeatedly requested, it's difficult for the public to analyze proposed changes.	The 1973 General Plan and August 2022 GPU are on City website for comparison.
19)Comparison	For example: If you live on Susana Street, your housing density will increase from 12 to 17 units/acre---AN INCREASE OF 42%. Will your streets be safer with the additional traffic, and the additional demand on street parking? Your new maximum density will be 17 units/acre AND 40% commercial building coverage. You can't drive two way now on that street. Added density will be a killer.	The density changes will only affect vacant and underutilized parcels of land. The majority of Martinez is already built-out and will therefore not be affected. It should be noted that SB 9 (California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency Act) currently allows a homeowner to subdivide their property in order to create up to four units. This represents a potential density increase of 300%.
20)Comparison	This Plan proposes to up zone (increase densities) throughout the city but especially in the downtown area. Developers and big Landowners will get a big gift. What's in it for existing residents? Is up-zoning just free to the Developers and Landowners, and the effect on us is not compensated for?	Permitted densities are recommended to increase primarily in the Downtown area to address the need for economic development. This new economic activity will bring enhanced revenues to the City's General Fund to pay for services that will benefit the residents such as police, fire protection, recreation and street maintenance. Increased housing densities are recommended in the Downtown adjacent to the train station to comply with State and regional housing production requirements, and to encourage transit-oriented development that will increase transit usage, which will lower greenhouse gas production, thereby benefiting residents with cleaner air and reduced hazards from sea level rise.
21)Mitigation Measures	What mitigation policies will be used to balance increased impacts with additional public benefits?	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
22)Housing Laws; Density Bonus	Where's the discussion of state housing laws and related density bonuses? And what's the effect on our zoning and what might actually get built.	Housing laws and density bonuses are discussed in the current Housing Element . These will be addressed again as part of the Housing Element Update. If needed, the Zoning Ordinance will be revised to make it consistent with the adopted Housing Element Update.
23)Comparison	We've asked multiple times for a comparison of the current General Plan and the draft Update. What has been added and what has been left out in the current GP?	The 1973 General Plan and August 2022 GPU are on City website for comparison.
24)Comparison	How has the density and commercial building coverage (FAR) been increased or decreased from the current GP to the Revision. Where have the designation areas been increased or decreased?	See response above.
25)Application of Density and FAR	Do both density and FAR apply? For instance, on Downtown Core (DC), it appears that commercial building of 4 times the lot size is allowed. Is the residential density of 43 housing units ADDED to that commercial building allowance? Is there any General Plan limit on the height of the resultant	Section 2.4 of the Land Use Element has been revised to read as follows in order to clarify how density and FAR will be applied to different types of development projects:



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	buildings, or on parking requirements or setback or viewscape incursion? Does this suggest 4 stories of commercial and 43 units of housing above, with no height limit and no parking?	<p>“State law requires that land use designations be accompanied by standards that establish the density or intensity of development permitted within each general plan land use designation. For the purposes of this General Plan, development density and intensity shall be regulated and measured differently based on the type of development. The methods that shall be used for calculating density and intensity for residential, commercial and industrial, and mixed-use developments are described below.</p> <p><u>Residential Development</u></p> <p>Residential developments shall be regulated by an allowed density range measured in “dwelling units per acre.” The maximum possible residential density pursuant to this General Plan is to be calculated on the acreage of the parcel(s) at the time of development application submittal, not including existing adjacent public streets or drainage channels. Areas for newly proposed streets and/or private drives (within the parcel of the subject application) shall be counted toward the maximum permitted allowable density. The maximum allowable number of dwelling units shall be calculated by multiplying the project area size (as defined above) by the maximum allowable density for the applicable land use designation and rounding to the nearest whole number.</p> <p><u>Population Density</u></p> <p>In addition to residential density, State law requires the General Plan to include a statement of population density for the various land use categories. Population density is determined by multiplying the average household size, as determined by the latest decennial U.S. Census, by the number of dwelling units in a land use category. For example, the average household size in Martinez was 2.60 persons in 2019 (U.S. Census Estimate). The population density in the Residential Low (RL) land use designation (1.1 – 6.0 units per acre) is therefore 2.9 to 15.6 persons per acre.</p> <p><u>Commercial and Industrial Development</u></p> <p>Commercial and industrial uses shall be regulated by a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) standard. FAR refers to the ratio of building floor space compared to the square footage of the site. FAR shall be calculated by dividing the floor area of all buildings on the site by the total square footage of the site. For example, a 12,500 square foot building on a 25,000 square foot site has a FAR of 0.5. The maximum FAR standard limits the overall size of development on a property. As an example, a maximum FAR of 0.75 would</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<p>allow 75,000 square feet of building floor area on a 100,000 square foot lot. The 75,000 square feet could be provided in one building or divided between multiple buildings. When calculating FAR, the building square footage shall include finished interior spaces and exclude parking garages, structured parking levels, and exterior open space, such as courtyards, roof gardens, and balconies.</p> <p><u>Mixed-Use Development</u></p> <p>The density and intensity of mixed-use developments that include both commercial and residential uses are regulated by both the maximum residential density (dwelling units per acre) and the maximum FAR standard for the land use designation. As an example, a one-acre site containing 43,560 square feet with a maximum FAR of 1.0 and an allowed density range of 19 to 30 units per acre could be developed with 43,560 square feet of total building space. The 43,560 square feet could be divided into a combination of commercial space and residential space. Up to 30 units would be allowed within the 43,560 square feet.”</p>
26)Application of Density and FAR	For instance, the coverage area for both Downtown Government DG and Downtown Shoreline DS categories appear to have been increased. Same with Downtown Transition DT. All three appear to extend higher density and commercial coverage to new parts of town. The city should be discussing these proposed changes with residents, explaining the changes in boundaries of the areas, and illustrating changes in number of housing units and increased commercial square footage.	See response to comment #25 above.
27)Application of Density and FAR	Where are the definitions of density and commercial coverage (FAR) for all the designation on the current General Plan Map? When you add in the lack of data, it's not just unfair, it's also a farce.	See response to comment #25 above.
28)Land Use Designation Boundaries	How can we determine if the designation boundaries have been changed? Some seem to have been, like DC, DG and Dt, to name a few.	The public can use the interactive web map available on the GPU website to facilitate a comparison between existing and proposed land use designation boundaries. Once the user finds a property of interest, they can toggle the layers “2035 General Plan Land Use Designations” and “Current General Plan Land Use Designations” to compare the changes in designations and boundaries. The data layer list can be accessed from the upper right corner of the interactive web map.
29)Land Use Designation Boundaries	Page 26 compares land use designations, but not density and commercial building coverage (FAR). Also Pg. 26 does not say whether the new designations cover different areas than on the current General Plan. Knowing	A FAR/density summary table has been added to the August 2022 GPU (see 2.0 Land Use Element, Section 2.5 – Land Use Designations). See response to comment #28 above regarding boundary changes.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	boundary changes is critical. The City should provide overlays of the old maps old and the new maps.	
30)Land Use Designation Boundaries	All of this info should be laid out in an easy-to-use format (like a spreadsheet) for the public to see how this new Revision affects their neighborhoods.	See response to comment #28-29 above.
31)Waterfront Housing	High density Housing is being proposed for the Waterfront north of Railroad Station including along Embarcadero Street ---a flooded area with impact on sensitive surrounding lands within yards of the railroad tracks. These areas are unsafe and sometimes inaccessible (such as the two-hour period on November 16th when no one could get out of EITHER exit because of train breakdown).	Whether or not to allow further housing development in the areas mentioned is a policy question that will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process; however, it should be noted that the current 1973 General Plan designations and zoning already allow light industrial development on the properties in question. Additionally, the Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
32)Waterfront Housing	No housing should be proposed north of the downtown railroad tracks.	See response to comment #31 above.
33)Land Use on Freitas Property	Has any of the Freitas Open Space been proposed for conversion to housing? That was threatened in a White Paper, and we're not able to determine from the Map.	The referenced property is affected by the POPO designation which retains the 1973 General Plan land use designations.
34)Development Standards	There are no height/setback/lot coverage/parking/overhang/viewscape polices. This is a big deal especially in the downtown where overdevelopment will undermine our small-town atmosphere and sense of safety, and our status as an historic small town, which is a big draw for our visitors. We have the option of including these criteria.	<p>State General Plan law does not require height, setbacks, and lot coverage to be included in general plans as these are normally incorporated into the subsequent zoning code updates designed to implement an adopted general plan. Nevertheless, the City recognizes the importance of setting a height limitation for unique areas like the Downtown and other areas closer to the waterfront; therefore, the land use descriptions for the Downtown Core (DC), Downtown Government (DG), and Downtown Shoreline (DS) have been revised to include the height limitations listed below. It should be noted that these height limitations match what is already established by the Downtown Specific Plan.</p> <p><u>Downtown Core (DC)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit.</p> <p><u>Downtown Government (DG)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.</p>



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
		<u>Downtown Shoreline (DS)</u> Height: Up to 40 feet, or 3 stories on properties south of the UP Railroad. Up to 30 feet, or two stories on properties north of the UP Railroad. Taller buildings may be approved by the Planning Commission with a use permit for properties south of the UP Railroad.
35)Marina Ownership	The Marina is NOT City owned. It's owned by the state. The draft document misstates that more than once.	Land use control of the Marina area has been granted by the State Lands Commission to the City per state legislation. This is discussed in the Waterfront and Marina Land Use Designation subsection of the Land Use Element.
Chapter 1 - Vision		
36)Economic Development	1.1 There is no mention of jobs or job creation in most of the document. Not in the Vision. Once in the Land Use Element but simply as part of what the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) does. Twice in the Circulation Element in reference to Priority Development Areas, but no actual goals for job creation. Where are there General Plan policies about balancing housing with job creation? Without them, all the residents moving into new housing will commute elsewhere, increasing commutes, pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.	The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics (including economic development) and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE. The August 2022 GPU includes economic development policies recommended by the Greenwood Group (see Attachment C). If adopted, these policies would apply to citywide decision-making.
37)Prior Resident Input	1-6, 1-7 are false and misleading: the General Plan Update Task Force GPUTF was disbanded before it was able to create any documents; the current General Plan Update was entirely created by consultants, staff and officials largely behind closed doors	Opinion noted.
38)Vision Statement	1-8: There's no better argument for throwing out what's been done and starting over, than these three flaccid, going-nowhere paragraphs of fluff. Former City Manager Brad Kilger was right – Martinez needs to work on its "vision-thing." The General Plan Process needs to better capture Martinez's vision for the future. Vibrant Economy? Nothing in this Vision Statement or Draft General Plan suggests let alone guarantees how that will happen.	Opinion noted.
39) Spelling	1.8 - Vision – "Carquinez Strait" (sic) is spelled wrong	The misspelling has been corrected.
40)Vision Statement	1.8 Suggestion: <u>Martinez's natural setting is secured with public lands including the John Muir National Monument and four surrounding regional parks – Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline and the Carquinez Strait to the north; Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline and the Franklin Hills to the west; Briones Regional Park to the south; and, Waterbird Regional Preserve to the east.</u> "The temperate climate, the Carquinez Strait, Alhambra Creek and its tributaries, and especially the open hillsides surrounding the existing urban areas, frame our physical identity."	Suggestion noted. The August 2022 GPU includes the revised vision statement in Attachment A, which incorporates all the topics (including economic development) and text changes suggested by the CC, PC, and ARDPIE.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
41)Regional Park Names	The document misnames these regional parks and various geographic features throughout. It suggests a lack of local knowledge and of public input.	Staff has updated the references to these parks throughout the GPU.
Chapter 2 – Land Use Element		
42)Land Use Map	The maps are difficult to use and confusing – we need a way to select a category and highlight the areas. There are too few significantly different colors for all the categories.	The City has added an interactive land use map and user guide to the GPU website. The interactive map allows the user to search for an address or parcel to clearly identify the proposed land use designation for that property. Each map figure in the August 2022 GPU has been updated to include a link to higher-resolution maps.
43)Land Use Designation Boundaries	We need to know which parcels have changed use.	The public can use the interactive web map available on the GPU website to facilitate a comparison between existing and proposed land use designation boundaries. Once the user finds a property of interest, they can toggle the layers “2035 General Plan Land Use Designations” and “Current General Plan Land Use Designations” to compare the changes in designations and boundaries. The data layer list can be accessed from the upper right corner of the interactive web map.
44)Economic Development	We need to know projected economic impact of changed use.	The GPU will allow for expanded economic growth, in that it promotes a greater mix of uses at higher densities and intensities in focal areas. A quantitative analysis of the GPU’s economic impact is not available currently.
45)Budgetary Projections	We need to have discussion of budgetary projections generally – they should inform land use decisions	Comment noted.
46)Housing Element Update	The draft Plan needs to coordinate with the Housing Element to be internally consistent.	The Housing Element Update is underway, but on a later schedule. Housing and land use policies will be made consistent (if needed) when the Housing Element Update is adopted.
47)Map Legibility	The single most important page in the draft General Plan is the Land Use Map. In this draft document the Land Use Map is unreadable. You literally can’t read the land use designations. Imagine the most important map in the entire General Plan with just two geographic labels (upper left corner) that are readable: “City of Benicia” and “Carquinez Strait.”	The City acknowledges the map legibility can be improved upon. For this reason, the August 2022 GPU includes a higher-resolution versions the maps in each element.
48)Map Legibility	2.41 -The map’s illegibility makes it impossible for the public to understand the proposed changes. Specific parcels and areas would be upzoned and allow more development. The consultants must have these elements in a GIS program in order to calculate housing numbers and increases. They can be shown graphically in lots of ways including more detailed maps and tables showing neighborhood or zoning category proposed changes.	See response to comment #47 above.
49)Map Legibility	Regardless of whether cartographic services are needed, this is the single-most important page of the document. California Environmental Quality Act	Comment noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	(CEQA) analysis will require a comparison between the existing Land Use changes and the proposed ones so this problem should be solved immediately.	
50)Land Use Map Data	Designations on the Map don't show density or FAR. It's very cumbersome to have to go back to report.	Comment noted; however, adding this information to the map would further decrease its legibility.
51)Regional Parks	Impossible in this Plan to locate any of our four surrounding regional parks. Or the John Muir National Historic Site. Or the Franklin Hills. Or the Alhambra Valley.	The Parks & Community Facilities Element has been revised to include a map showing the location of parks maintained by the City and surrounding regional parks.
52)Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline	2.3 The Radke Martinez Regional Shoreline name has been changed from the former Martinez Regional Shoreline. That should be reflected in the document and map.	Staff has updated the reference to this park throughout the GPU.
53)Regional Agencies	<p>Pg. 2.7 Local Documents and Organizations –</p> <p>a. as stated in the vision comment, Martinez is surrounded by four regional parks. The Master Plan for East Bay Regional Park District is an important supporting document.</p> <p>b. Martinez receives water from the Contra Costa Water District – its planning documents are germane.</p> <p>c. The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) includes Martinez in its area, regulates filling of shoreline areas and does planning for sea level rise and community vulnerability – all issues which affect the Martinez waterfront and land use planning.</p>	These regional agencies are cited under the regulatory section of each GPU element.
54)Land Use Setting	2.14 – “Natural topographic features” fails to note that the city is surrounded on all four sides by water and four regional parks	The first paragraph of the “Natural Topographic Features” subsection in Section 2.3 of the Land Use Element has been revised to read as follows: “The City is surrounded on all four sides by water and four regional parks. In various areas of the City, although most prominently to the west, there are defining hillsides, major open space areas and visually significant lands. The unique topography of natural and naturalistic hillsides defines the community and provides the visual frame for the more urbanized areas of the community.”
55)Flood Prone Areas	[Page] 2.14 – Flood prone areas relate not just to precipitation and sea level rise but also to high tides. Sunny day flooding from sea level rise will have an increasing impact. All these reasons plus potential toxic spills from trains are why downtown residential development should be limited to the area south of the railroad tracks. The General Plan should relate to BCDC's sea level rise	See response to comment #31.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	planning, and to FEMA mapping, since both are important and extreme weather events will become more common.	
56)Land Use for former Italian Village	2.18 – Granger’s Wharf – no additional residential uses should be contemplated north of the railroad tracks.	The residential properties along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks have been redesignated as CRL-B (Central Residential Low – B) in the August 2022 GPU.
57)Pacheco Corridor	2.21 – Although much of Pacheco Boulevard corridor is unincorporated, it’s one of the most significant gateways to Martinez. The city should work with the County to improve its appearance.	This suggestion will be folded into the City’s discussions with the County regarding annexation of this area.
58)Infrastructure	2.22 – Although Contra Costa Water District, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District and Mt. View Sanitary District are mentioned, there’s very little discussions of sewer and water and no maps of their systems. But on page 2-22, for example, the document states: “Systemwide, aging infrastructure is of far greater concern than increased demands due to population growth. Pipes are routinely damaged by vegetation root intrusion, grease buildup, and structural deterioration. In coming years, the single most significant project will be CCCSD’s replacement of nearly 2,000 feet of pipeline along Alhambra Avenue that is, at peak usage time, reaching 130% capacity. Additionally, MVSD plans to replace several hundred miles of pipeline and retrofit infrastructure to better withstand seismic activity.” Aging infrastructure is clearly a problem. But a sewer system segment reaching 130% of capacity seems to be a pretty big problem too—and directly related to increased infill development.	The ability of the existing infrastructure to serve future development under the GPU is addressed in the Revised Draft EIR.
59)Infrastructure	2.22 - Maps of Utility systems should be included including sewer and water. What capacity are they at now? What will be the effect of new development on these systems?	Detailed maps of the infrastructure provided by regional service providers are available on their respective websites.
60)Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative	2.22 – Heavy industrial areas provide among the best opportunities for economic development and job creation. There is no mention of Contra Costa County’s Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative—including seven partner cities including Martinez from Hercules east to Brentwood—and its goals of using diverse transportation modes in areas along the Northern Waterfront with industrial zoning in order to generate jobs. All we can tell from this draft document is that Martinez wants houses, not jobs.	The element has been revised to include a new policy, which read as follows: “LU-P-11.4 – Continue collaborating with regional partners to implement the Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan envisions building an environmentally sustainable regional economy and communities with equitable access to quality job opportunities and economic participation for all residents. The Strategic Plan identifies five goals addressing: 1) Business Environment & Competitiveness, 2) Talent Development, 3) Business Vitality/Cluster Development, 4) Entrepreneurship & Innovation, and 5) Target Industry Attraction.”
61)Waterfront Housing	2.25 – Downtown Government and Downtown Shoreline - no residential use should be allowed north of the railroad tracks given flooding, sea level rise and park and resource issues.	See response to comment #31.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
62)Measure I	2.39 Measure I Protected Open Space and Parks Overlay Designation – should be labeled “Measure I. “This designation is especially illegible on the Land Use Map. It should be illustrated in a useful way. 1. 2.46 - POPO hatch lines/ cross hatching are invisible 2. Measure I should be included in toto as an appendix.	The name of the overlay designation per Measure I is “Protected Open Space and Parks” (POPO), not “Measure I”. Measure I is mentioned in the text of the Land Use Element as the origin of the POPO designation. The City added an interactive land use map and user guide to the GPU website. The interactive map allows the user to search for an address or parcel to clearly identify the proposed land use designation for that property. It also allows the user to determine whether that property is in the POPO designation. The August 2022 GPU also includes a higher-resolution version of the land use map to improve map legibility.
63)Urban Limit Line	Urban Limit Line – There is no map showing the city’s Urban Limit Line, in the Growth Management chapter, or in the Land Use Element of this General Plan shown on Land Use Map 1. One should be included.	See Figure 2-1b which shows the City’s ULL.
64)Energy Efficiency	2.51 – LU-P-1.2 and LU-I-1.2 – For energy efficiency, the city should require more than simple compliance with California Green Building standards. In the time of the Climate Crisis, a General Plan should be aspirational. As more people call for action against climate change, more than 500 cities worldwide have established low-carbon and net-zero carbon goals intended to substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the coming decades.	Language has been added to the Vision Statement regarding reduction of greenhouse gasses. The City’s Climate Action Plan has additional policies for energy efficiency and is referenced in the GP.
65)Creek Setback Standards	2.53 - Policy LU-P-3.1 – Now is the time to create creek development standards and setbacks. These measures are not adequate mitigation for creek development, the impacts of which must be analyzed.	Land Use Implementation Measure LU-I-3.1b addresses the development of creek setbacks: “Consider the formulation of regulations to include required setbacks from the streams, creeks, and watercourses to protect the resource, habitat, and any recreation value associated therewith.” This measure will be implemented as part of the comprehensive zoning update subsequent to adoption of the GPU.
66)Flood Safety	2.53 – 2.54 – Flood Safety - Policy LU-P-3.2 and implementation measures – this measure is vague and the General Plan process is the time to develop appropriate flood and sea level rise mitigations.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
67)Ridgeline Policy	2.60 - LU-P-9.5 – Alhambra Valley - “The construction of new structures on the top of scenic ridges or within 50 feet of the ridgeline shall be discouraged.” Good idea though minimalist. What and where are these designated ridges? A figure should show these geographic features.	Open space policy OSC-I-1.1a supports the “establishment of standards for in the Zoning Ordinance and adopted design guidelines to minimize visual impact to ridgelines from potential development.” Definition of the location of ridgelines can be accomplished when this Zoning Ordinance amendment is undertaken.
Chapter 3 – Open Space & Conservation Element		
68)Open Space Inventory	3.4 – “Open Space Inventory - An open space inventory is provided in Appendix A.” – where is Appendix A?	The August 2022 GPU includes the referenced open space inventory as Appendix OSC-A.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
69)City and Regional Parks	3.5 – The Open Space Inventory map is relatively useless to the public. It doesn't include labels for even the most obvious of city and regional parks and open spaces to help locate yourself. John Muir National Monument? Regional Parks? City Parks? Hidden Valley? Golden Hills? – Not a single park or open space is labeled, let alone geographic features which are mentioned (like the Franklin Hills). it's simply the land use plan map open space layer without additional information. Maybe the maps is in the Parks element? No, not there either. Provide a map which is labeled and actually informative.	The Parks & Community Facilities Element has been revised to include a map showing the location of parks maintained by the City and surrounding regional parks (see Figure 5-2).
70) Riparian Conservation Zones	3.9 - OSC-P-1.4 "Protect and enhance riparian vegetation along the drainage channels designated as Riparian Conservation Zones." Where are these Riparian Conservation Zones?	Open Space & Conservation Element Policy OSC-P-1.4 has been revised to read as follows: "Protect and enhance vegetation along the drainage channels of riparian zones. A riparian zone refers to the land area that encompasses the river channel and its current or potential floodplain."
71)John Muir Land Trust	3.9 - OSC-P-1.5 "Support open space acquisition efforts by the East Bay Regional Parks District, the Martinez Land Trust, and other organizations." The "Martinez Land Trust" hasn't been called that in years.	The policy and implementation measure have been revised to address the error.
72)Ridgeline Policy	3.9 - OSC-P-1.6 "Preserve the visual quality of ridgelines by limiting or prohibiting development on or near ridgelines." Where are these ridgelines? Without a map or a definition, or a minimum horizontal or vertical setback, this policy is useless.	See response to comment #67 above.
73)Transfer of Development Rights	3.10 – "OSC-I-1.10a Support programs to preserve open space lands." – The city should have a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program with designated goals and recipient sites to help with this effort.	Open Space & Conservation Element Implementation Measure OSC-I-1.10a has been revised to read as follows: "Support programs to preserve open space lands. Consider a variety of methods to pursue public ownership and/or public use of open space lands, including fee simple purchase, secured options for the future purchase of land, installment contracts, purchase and lease-back, purchase (or acquire) less-than-fee interests, easements, transfer of development rights, rights of entry, land trades, or assistance by a land trust."
74)Viano Vineyard	3.12 – Viano Vineyard – "The General Plan DEIR has determined that residential development of this land would create a significant and unavoidable impact to the City's agricultural resources." Where is this General Plan DEIR?	The General Plan Draft EIR referenced in this policy is located here .
75)Delta Proximity	3-14 – Martinez might be <i>near</i> the Sacramento-"San Joaquin Delta" – but generally it's considered to be adjacent to the Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay.	Comment noted.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
76)Habitat Surveys	3-16 - OSC-I-4.1a “Prior to development within identified sensitive habitat areas...” – this development/wildlife policies are not just wrong, they’re meaningless. This is not the protocol for development where there are special status species or their habitat. And there’s no discussion of the regulatory framework including state and federal endangered species laws which guide such policies.	This policy requires a survey of habitat which will include protocols and applicable regulations as part of the survey report for the proposed development.
77)Energy Efficiency	3-18 – Energy – Rather than dated summaries of energy patterns, and suggesting we look at the Climate Action Plan, there should be a discussion of Martinez’s related goals and policies.	See response to comment #64 above. Additional policy language regarding energy efficiency can be added at the suggestion of Planning Commission and City Council.
78)Solar Power and Windmills	3-19 – “OSC-P-6.6 Support the use of solar power by streamlining the permitting process.” – rooftop and decentralized solar is a good thing. We understand that’s where the majority of local solar is coming from. Maybe the same with school parking lots. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where is solar allowed in Martinez? Where is it prohibited? Is solar allowed on open space parcels or in parks? The General Plan should tell us what’s intended. 2. Same for windmills. Are wind power sites allowed in the marina, for example? 3. What about cell towers? 	Installation of these power sources on private property is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance and Building Code, and is generally permissible throughout the City. Public installations are not specified. Proposals for public installations would require an appropriation in the Capital Improvement Program.
79)Trails Map	3-30 – “ OSC-G-15 and OSC-P-15.1- Provide a network of trails linking people to open space and recreation opportunities.” – see Chapter 5 comments. An adequate Trails Map is the first step and it needs to show existing parks and open space and existing and proposed trails.	See Parks & Community Facilities Element Figure 5-1, Trails Map. Local trails have been added to this map as well as existing/proposed bikeways from the Countywide Bike Network.
80)Parks System Master Plan	3-30 – “ Encourage and coordinate efforts with the EBRPD, CCWD and the Contra Costa County Flood and Water Conservation District for the implementation of trails as shown on the adopted Parks Master Plan.” – Where is the Parks Master Plan? It should be included as an Appendix, and at least maps and summary information should be included in the General Plan.	The 2007-2012 Parks System Master Plan is on the City’s website. The August 2022 GPU includes hyperlinks to the Parks System Master Plan and other key reference documents.
81)Climate Action Plan	Pg 3-32 – The General Plan should reference and summarize the Climate Action Plan.	The August 2022 GPU includes hyperlinks to the Climate Action Plan and other key reference documents.
Chapter 4 – Historical, Cultural & Arts Element		
82)1903 Jail	4.6 – National Register Table: The Finance Building block should mention the 1903 Jail.	Table 4-2 of the Historic, Cultural & Arts Element has been revised to reflect only those resources actually listed on the National Register of Historic Places.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
83)1982 Historic Resource Inventory	4.7 - Historic Resource Inventory: This is mentioned as only being updated in 1982 – is that true? When will it be updated so this element can be appropriately reviewed?	The City agrees that the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory is very outdated. This is why Implementation Measure HCA-I-1.1d has been revised to read as follows: “Prepare a historic context for Downtown Martinez and other historic areas of the City like the former Italian Fishing Village along Berrellesa Street north of the railroad tracks. Utilize the contexts to update the 1982 Historic Resource Inventory and develop surveys for areas outside of the Downtown. Use the surveys to identify structures that may be eligible for local, state and national historic resource designation.”
Chapter 5 – Parks & Community Facilities Element		
84)Parks System Master Plan	5.1 – Where is the Parks Master Plan? It should be included as an Appendix, and at least maps and summary information should be included in the General Plan.	The 2007-2012 Parks System Master Plan is on the City’s website. The August 2022 GPU includes hyperlinks to the Parks System Master Plan and other key reference documents.
85)Parks Map	5.2 – a labeled map of Parks should be included.	The Parks & Community Facilities Element has been revised to include a map showing the location of parks maintained by the City and surrounding regional parks (see Figure 5-2).
86)Trails Map	5.10 - The Trails Map is bad. It doesn’t show parks, or open spaces, and shows some existing trails but fails to include proposed trails. Martinez is defined by water and parks on all four sides. This map could be significant as part of the Economic Development planning for the city as a recreational destination. d. Neighboring City and Regional Park and open spaces should be shown. e. For example, East Bay Regional Park District has plans to extend the Iron Horse Trail from Marsh Road in Concord to the Martinez-Benicia bridge. That alignment could have easily been shown. f. The Contra Costa Canal Trail ends near Highway 4, but the canal right of way continues across Highway 4 and almost to downtown Martinez at the Martinez reservoir. That alignment could have easily been shown. g. Alhambra Hills trail connections should be shown.	See Parks & Community Facilities Element Figure 5-1, Trails Map. Local trails have been added to this map. Other improvements have been made.
Chapter 6 – Circulation Element		
87)Roadway Improvements	2.60 - Government Code §65302(b)1 (6.2 of Circulation Element pg 3) requires Circulation Element to be correlated to the General Plan Land Use Element to ensure “adequate roadway capacity to accommodate travel demands generated by future planned development. This integration helps to promote walking, cycling, and transit used for shorter trips to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.” Per the Draft GPU, it is found that fewer cars are owned in the downtown area than in other areas of Martinez, yet it is also, per the 2020 Census, determined that most people use cars for transportation including the downtown area. Infrastructure improvements	Roadway improvements are included where they are needed. The Circulation Element has policies to increase non-vehicular modes of transit. The Downtown area is the most transit rich area of the City and is served by multiple bus lines and commuter train service, diminishing the need for road improvements, including stoplights.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	recommended as part of the Draft General Plan are to widen roads, add roads, as well as additional lights on major corridors. None of the projected road improvement plans include any streets in the downtown area of Martinez where much of the intensified housing is proposed (Granger Wharf/Embarcadero area).	
88)Light Improvement	Only one light improvement was offered – adding a light on Berrellesa at Green Street. The projected area of development is the furthest from freeways yet census statistics state that most of the residents in Martinez commute to work, and that their commute has increased in time spent on the road.	See response to comment #88 above.
89)Mitigations	If the stated goal of the Circulation Element is to decrease Greenhouse Gas emissions the plan does not include any mitigations to make this happen.	See Circulation Element Policies in sections 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9 regarding the support of alternative modes of transit (pedestrian, bikes and transit) which will reduce greenhouse gasses by decreasing automobile trips. See also City Climate Action Plan for additional GHG reduction policies. The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
90)Waterfront Housing	Housing would be allowed north of the railroad tracks making access to shopping, recreation, work, and home frustrated by long waits at a railroad crossing which would increase greenhouse gas emissions as cars sit and wait to come and go.	Opinion noted.
91)BNSF Trestle Modifications	6.34 – The document mentions widening the BNSF train trestle over Morello Avenue and Pacheco Boulevard to make way for multimodal and/or roadway improvements on those streets – but no discussion about the feasibility of doing so, given the rights of the railroad.	Trestle modifications would need to be negotiated with BSNF. This is cited as a constraint to road modifications.
92)Bicycle Lands; Walking Paths	There is no mention of improving bicycling lanes or walking paths as part of the downtown plan.	See Section 6.10 of the Circulation Element which has numerous policies for increasing pedestrian and bicycle modes of transit for the entire City, including the Downtown.
93)Road Improvements	Road improvements include Pacheco Blvd from City Limits to Sunset which is a very small.	Comment noted.
94)Scenic Corridor	Draft GPU refers to Alhambra Valley Rd from where it starts at Alhambra Ave to I80 as a scenic corridor – Alhambra Valley Rd. does not meet I80.	The referenced text under the “Scenic Roadways” subsection of Section 6.4 in the Circulation Element has been revised to read as follows: “Alhambra Valley Road from its junction with Alhambra Avenue westward toward I-80.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
95)Alhambra Avenue	Alhambra Ave south of Hwy 4 is considered a minor artery compared to north of Hwy 4 yet Alhambra Ave is the only artery serving housing south of Hwy 4 other than those subdivisions closer to Center Ave.	This comment is correct.
96)Pacheco Boulevard	Pacheco Blvd from I680 to the downtown area is the other artery serving Martinez along with Alhambra Ave. north of Hwy 4 yet it is also called a minor artery.	This comment is correct.
97)Alhambra Avenue Widening	Re Table 6-3: Widening Alhambra Ave. between Franklin Canyon Rd. and Alhambra Hills Drive should more accurately read Lindsey Dr. This would run Alhambra above about half the homes in Forest Hills on “lower” Likins Dr (northern half) and push Alhambra almost against Forest Hills fence lines on all of the east side of Likins Dr. Some areas don't even look feasible because of how the road narrows at the south end of the subdivision next to Lindsey Dr. The comments indicated that they would include adding bike lanes – there are already bike lanes on both sides of Alhambra. It also discussed creating bus turnouts. Most of the bus stops have turnouts that aren't marked but room allows for the buses to stop and not interfere with traffic.	Staff is checking this information with the Engineering Division. If appropriate, a revision will be included to this language as part of the Final Draft GPU.
98)Center Street	Under Class II Bikeways – the document references Center St between Howe Rd and Hidden Lakes Drive – Howe does not meet Center St, it connects to Pine St., which ultimately becomes Center.	The referenced street is actually Center Avenue not Center Street as stated in the comment. “Center Avenue (Howe Road to Hidden Lakes Drive)”. Staff confirmed that Center Avenue does connect between Howe Road to Hidden Lakes Drive.
99)Bike Lanes South of Hwy. 4	There is no mention of existing bike lanes on Alhambra Ave, south of Hwy 4.	This is incorrect. The section listing Class II bikeways includes “Alhambra Avenue (Marina Vista Avenue to Haven and Berrellesa Street to Paso Nogal Road)”. To help clarify, this has been rewritten to break the listing into two: “Alhambra Avenue (Marina Vista to Haven Street); Alhambra Avenue (Berrellesa Street to Paso Nogal Road)”.
Chapter 8 – Public Safety Element		
100) Duplicate Text	8.4 – duplicate text - “The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act went into effect in 1973 and has been amended several times.” The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act went into effect in 1973 and has been amended several times.”	The first sentence under the “Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act” subsection of Section 8.3 in the Public Safety Element has been revised to read: “The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act went into effect in 1973 and has been amended several times.”
101) Fire Service	8.14 – “In the event of a fire emergency, fire services are provided to the Martinez area by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, and much of the City is served by the Martinez Water Department, which takes into account fire flow needs when determining storage. Contra Costa Fire Stations 9, 12, 13 and 14 serve Martinez and are shown in Figure 8.5.” Is that enough fire service? Are these stations fully staffed? What’s response time in Martinez?	Response time information is included in the Revised Draft EIR released together with the August 2022 GPU.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
102) Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone	8-15 suggests “Figure 8-5 shows the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones within the Martinez Local Responsibility Area as recommended by Cal Fire. The Contra Costa County Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies 943 buildings and approximately 2,758 people living in this very high fire hazard severity zone. Critical facilities located in this zone include Contra Costa Regional Medical Center, Martinez City Hall, and Alhambra High School.” But the map suggests Contra Costa Regional Medical Center, Martinez City Hall, and Alhambra High School and presumably some of the other structures are in the “high fire hazard area, not the “very high fire hazard” area.	This is incorrect. The Figure 8-5 shows that the buildings referenced in the comment are in the “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” mapped by CAL FIRE”.
103) Streets with One Access in Very High Hazard Areas	8-16 – “Table 8-2. Streets with One Access in Very High Hazard Areas (This table will be added to the General Plan once generated by Planning Division staff)” – The draft General Plan lacks coherence and repeatedly refers to appendixes or other documents which aren’t included. Here’s another example. Why was the document released with missing pieces?	The August 2022 GPU now includes the table as Appendix PS-A.
104) Mapping	8.21 – Road names/ Map labels and the city limits are invisible until expanded about 250-500% - boundaries and labels should be increased in size to make the map useful in understanding fire hazard areas. When you print this document at normal scale, maps and labels should be readable.	Each map figure in the August 2022 GPU has been updated to include a link to higher-resolution maps. Other improvements have been made to enhance each map’s legibility.
105) Mapping	8.21 - The two Very High categories in the map key don’t make sense. “High Hazard” is misspelled. In the map key, the pink fourth color “very high fire hazard Severity Zones” doesn’t seem to make sense or appear on the map otherwise.	Figure 8-4 inadvertently included the category “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones”, but that category pertains to Figure 8-5 not 8-4. This category has been deleted from Figure 8-5 and the misspelling has been corrected for “High Hazard”.
106) Climate Change	8.21 - However, how are these hazard zones and fire policies being reassessed given climate change and increasing, heat, drought, and extreme weather events?	The City’s Climate Action Plan , adopted in 2009, contains actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which cause more frequent and severe wildfires. Climate Action Plan Chapter 2, Section D sets forth transportation; energy; solid waste and recycling; water conservation; and adaptation and carbon sequestration strategies to target emissions from the sources identified in the 2005 baseline inventory of GHG emissions.
107) Flooding from High Tides	8-24 – “Most of flooding in Martinez is caused by heavy rainfall and subsequent runoff that cannot be adequately conveyed by the existing storm drainage system combined with surface water bodies.” And high tides, and too much pavement and impervious surfaces in the lower watershed, and increasingly in the future by sea level rise.	The Revised Draft EIR released with the August 2022 GPU addresses potential environmental impacts from the land use designations in the GPU. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the information in the Draft EIR as part of the GPU adoption process.
108) Sea Level Rise	8-40 – “The next update of the Housing Element will include information of sea level rise and its potential impact on housing opportunity sites. The planned Marina Waterfront Master Plan will require analysis of sea level rise on potential new buildings and park/recreation improvements.” The last	The commenter is correct. The latest sea level rise data is available from the Adapting to Rising Tides website . Whether or not to allow further housing development in the Downtown and waterfront is a policy question that will be



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
	General Plan was completed in 1973. There's no telling how long it will be before this one might be updated. Sea level rise data is available now, and analysis relative to the Housing Element and the Marina should be included in this General Plan.	considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the GPU adoption process.
109) Flood Maps	8-41, 8-42 - While sea level rise maps are important, how are they coordinated with flood maps?	Not sure what is meant by "how are they coordinated?". The sea level rise and flood maps have different purposes. While the former shows areas affected by 12" and 36" sea level rise, the latter shows areas that would be affected by storm surges.
110) Hazardous Materials	8-50 – Hazardous Materials – The Martinez area has a high risk of future hazardous materials incidents. Surrounded by a heavy concentration of petroleum and chemical processing plants (some of which are located within or adjacent to the Concord-Green Valley Fault), the Martinez area may be subject to the occurrence of accidental releases of dangerous substances from a variety of sources. Further, hazardous chemicals are transported into and out of the area on a daily basis utilizing various transportation routes and systems. These transportation routes and systems include: Interstate 680, Highway 4, some City and Contra Costa County streets; the Union Pacific and BNSF Railroads; access through San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Straits, and Suisun Bay; Buchanan Field; and petroleum and natural gas pipelines and pump stations.	Comment noted.
111) Hazardous Materials	8-50 - "PS-P-12.1 Encourage adequate separation between areas that contain hazardous materials and sensitive receptors." – This is one of the reasons that housing should not be added north of the waterfront railroad tracks.	Opinion noted.
Chapter 11 – Growth Management		
112) Urban Limit Line	11.3 – Urban Limit Line – In fact, there is no map showing the city's Urban Limit Line, in this chapter, or in the Land Use Element of this General Plan shown on Land Use Map 1. One should be included.	This comment refers to the Growth Management Element which is not being updated as part of the current GP update process. This element will be updated when the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority updates the County-wide plan, and these comments will be considered at that time.
113) Measure J	It should be referenced that both CCTA Measure J in 2004 and the County Measure L in 2006 required that, with some exceptions, changes to the ULL must be approved by voters.	See response to comment #113 above.
114) Urban Limit Line	11-4 - GM-G-1 - "The ULL can only be amended by a subsequent vote of the electorate; minor adjustments of less than 30 acres may be approved by the City Council as provided for by the Measure J GMP." The process for such limited adjustments should be described.	See response to comment #113 above.



Response to Comments on November 2021 General Plan Update

City of Martinez Community Development Department, August 2022

Source, Date, Link, Comment Area:	Abbreviated Comment:	City Response:
115) Measure J	11.9 - GM-P-6.2 “Adopt and maintain in place a development mitigation program to ensure new growth is paying its share of the costs associated with that growth.” This policy has been required since CCTA Measure J 2004.	See response to comment #113 above.

ATTACHMENT A

Recommend Revised Vision Statement

(Revised per comments made at CC, PC and ARDPIE Task Force Meetings; additions in ***bold italics***, deletions in ~~strikeout~~)

“***The City of*** Martinez, including ***the communities within its sphere of influence***, will retain a unique, small-town character within its larger suburban context of Central Costa County. Martinez’s identity will be largely based on its vibrant, eclectic downtown, set within pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods, that are ***easy to bike and walk in***, and ~~in~~ ***are*** made up of varied and traditionally designed homes. The temperate climate, the Carquinez Strait, Alhambra Creek and its tributaries, ***the Marina and waterfront***, and especially the open hillsides surrounding existing urban areas, frame our physical identity.

Visitors will continue to be attracted to Martinez because of its ***historic*** ~~unique small-town~~ character, shops, restaurants, waterfront recreation, surrounding natural beauty, and role as the County seat. Martinez residents know that the City also provides a strong ***and inclusive*** sense of belonging for its residents. It contains a broad array of 19th and early 20th century buildings that form multi-faceted streetscapes and neighborhoods and support an economically diverse community. ~~Newer~~ Neighborhoods will retain their livable mix of quality and varied housing opportunities, ***including affordable workforce housing***, convenient and appropriately scaled commercial areas, and plentiful parks and open spaces, ***and strong pedestrian and bicycle connections between them***.

Martinez will retain its qualities for future generations by providing ***quality education facilities***, a vibrant economy ***that emphasizes economic development, job creation, and a balance of jobs and housing***; that is linked to a community social structure ***which promotes social equity, racial and environmental justice; that conserves energy and natural resources and reduces greenhouse gas production***; and ~~by conserving~~ ***through conservation preserves*** the ecosystem, including ***open spaces, creeks, and habitat***, and ***the*** built environment that supports it. Martinez is and will remain, a ***safe*** community, ***that promotes a diversity of people and businesses***, in which its residents can take pride.”

ATTACHMENT B
PRMCC Recommended Revisions to Historic, Cultural & Arts and Parks Community Facilities Elements
(Recommended text revisions in ***Bold***)

Historic, Cultural and Arts Element

HCA-P-1.1: Promote and ***provide outreach for*** community and visitor appreciation for the history of Martinez.

HCA-P-1.3: Encourage relocation of older buildings for preservation and restoration, rather than demolition, ***pursuant to the California Historical Building Code (Section 18950 of the Health and Safety Code)***. [Note: The Commission asked for County codes to be cited, but County building codes only apply to unincorporated areas].

HCA-P-1.4: Recognize the importance of protecting significant historic and archaeological resources by identifying, when possible, ***historic and*** archaeological resources and potential impacts on such resources, ***by consulting the Martinez Historical Society and their Historic Resource Inventory, and the State Office of Historic Preservation's California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS)***. [Responds to Commission question on how someone undertaking a project would know whether there are historic or archeological resources]

HCA-P-1.11: Coordinate ***and encourage*** historic preservation activities and historic preservation groups, community groups, non-profits, and grass roots efforts to educate the community and visitors through tours, special events, and commemorative art.

HCA-I-1.1g b): If human remains are discovered during any ground disturbing activity, work shall stop until the City and the Contra Costa County Coroner have been contacted and, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, ***consult with*** the State of California Native American Heritage Commission ***for State laws and codes, including identifying*** the most likely descendants ***for consultation on appropriate measures and special circumstances***. have been consulted. Work may only resume when appropriate measures have been taken and approved by the City.

HCA-P-2.1: Continue to support and increase the promotion of the arts and cultural activities throughout the City for the benefit of visitors, tourists, and residents, ***visitors and tourists***.

HCA-P-2.2: Encourage the formation of relationships between the public, artists, ***schools***, and private entities to create and preserve art for the benefit of the community.

HCA-P-2.5: Continue to host, ***promote, enhance,*** and coordinate ***community cultural and arts components and*** public events like Earth Day, Children’s Light Parade, and the 4th of July Parade & Celebration throughout the year, as appropriate and as funding permits.

Parks Community Facilities Element

PCU-P-1.1: Continue to ***enhance and*** maintain existing facilities.

PCU-P-1.5: Partner with local and regional, state, and federal agencies to create new park facilities. [New policy]

PCU-P-1.6: Promote the use of recycled water and drought resistant, native, and climate resilient plants for City parks and civic spaces. [New policy]

PCU-P-2.3: ***Annually*** review priorities, standards and ***guidelines for park facilities,*** and revise as necessary to reflect any changes in ***standards, guidelines,*** community trends, and or needs.

PCU-P-3.1: ***Partner with local and regional agencies*** to improve trail connections within and beyond the City limits and coordinate funding for trail acquisition, construction and maintenance, whenever feasible.

PCU-P-3.2: Improve trail utilization and experience through installation of wayfinding signage to locate trails, and educational signage along trails regarding biological resources. [New policy]

PCU-P-3.6: Work with the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD), Contra Costa Water District, Contra Costa County, adjacent cities, regional trail groups, and other public agencies on trail planning issues, such as ***including*** trail development and linkages, ***and promotion of connections to the San Francisco Bay Water Trail.***

PCU-P-3.8: Locate new trails, and ***promote existing trails,*** with an emphasis on scenic qualities, ***accessibility for persons with disabilities,*** and making connections with local and regional open space areas, parks, points of interest and community facilities.

PCU-P-4.1: Continue to provide, ***reimagine, innovate, and expand*** an array of recreational programs to the public.

PCU-5.1a: Encourage the Martinez Unified School District and ***Mount Diablo Unified School District*** to open facilities ***(including playgrounds and courts)*** to the public, particularly during the summer months.

PCU-P-6.1: Continue to work with the Martinez Unified School District and ***the Mount Diablo Unified School District*** to assist in obtaining funds from state and federal sources to improve school facilities and performance.

PCU-I-1.6a: Reduce water consumption where possible through the use of artificial turf, ***native plants***, drought-tolerant landscaping, water conservation technology (***such as efficient timers, and water heads***), and possible use of recycled water in parks and recreation facilities.

PCU-I-1.6b: Proactively work with the Contra Costa Water District for the installation of recycled water distribution infrastructure. [New implementation measure]

ATTACHMENT C
Recommended Economic Development Policies
(Per Alex Greenwood Economic Development Peer Review of the General Plan)

Goal

LU-G-11 – Promote retention of existing businesses and attract new businesses.

Policies

LU-P-11.1 – Promote business assistance services, including seminars, linking local businesses to financial and technical resources, supporting local business promotion, and networking.

LU-P-11.2 – Promote City marketing and branding efforts and support similar coordinated private business efforts.

LU-P-11.3 – Target marketing to key industries and trade associations. Include the following industries and business types for targeted marketing: Advanced materials & manufacturing Biomedical; Child Day Care; Clean Tech; Construction; Support Electrical/Plumbing/Mechanical Energy/Chemical Food/Beverage Manufacturing Government/Public Health/Legal Health Care; Hospitality; Personal Care & Fitness Restaurants; and Visual & Performing Arts.

LU-P-11.4 – Continue collaborating with regional partners to implement the Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan envisions building an environmentally sustainable regional economy and communities with equitable access to quality job opportunities and economic participation for all residents. The Strategic Plan identifies five goals addressing: 1) Business Environment & Competitiveness, 2) Talent Development, 3) Business Vitality/Cluster Development, 4) Entrepreneurship & Innovation, and 5) Target Industry Attraction.

Implementation Measures

LU-I-11.1a – Continue to work with the Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown property owners on Downtown events, marketing materials for promotion of the City and its attractions, and dissemination of information to businesses about access to State and Federal technical assistance and funding sources for business loans and workforce development.

LU-I-11.1b – Support local businesses with permit assistance and access to high functioning infrastructure including fiber optic cable.

LU-I-11.3a – Add to a future Zoning Code update, ministerial approval of targeted industries in the appropriate zoning districts, and review the development requirements for the target industries to ensure there are no conflicts with the revised Zoning Ordinance.

Goal

LU-G-12 – Promote activities and development for a vibrant Downtown area.

Policies

LU-P-12.1 - Build Downtown's image and identity as a center for dining, craft beverages, arts, crafts, and culture in a historic, authentic architectural district.

LU-P-12.2 - Focus infill development on the east and west edges of the Downtown including the Downtown Core, Downtown Government and Downtown Shoreline areas, utilizing the County offices and the Amtrak Station as anchors that support fine-grained rehabilitation and small retail and restaurant business attraction, on the central shopping streets in between.

LU-P-12.3 – Attract an upscale hotel to the Downtown or waterfront area.

LU-P-12.4 – Establish the Downtown area as a premier location for remote work.

LU-P-12.5 – Identify appropriate parcels and support mixed use residential development with ground floor retail where feasible, to build customers for the small retail and restaurants on the central shopping streets.

LU-P-12.6 – Develop a plan for pedestrian connections in the Downtown such as plazas and paseos.

Goal

LU-G-13 – Support transformation and revitalization of key commercial corridors and industrial areas.

Policies

LU-P-13.1 – Consider preparing a specific plan for the Alhambra Avenue corridor (State Route 4 to F Street), including commercial and residential land use and economic analysis, business attraction, and streetscape improvements to evolve the area into a vibrant mixed-use district.

LU-P-13.2 – Support modernization and repositioning of the Shell/Mococo lands as a regional center for renewable energy and technology.

LU-P-13.3 – Support retail attraction and repositioning of key shopping centers, including physical improvements and new tenants.

LU-P-13.4 – Promote Biomedical, CleanTech, Advanced Materials and other emerging industries along the Pacheco Commercial/Industrial Corridor.