Additional text amendments added for June 29, 2010 Planning Commission report highlighted.

LAND USE ELEMENT (1973)

21.7 ALHAMBRA VALLEY ~~USES~~

21.71 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Four types of land use designations are established for the Alhambra Valley Annexation, as shown in Figure F 21.7, *Land Use Policy*.)

21.711 Estate Residential – Very Low: This designation allows a maximum of 1 single family unit per gross acre. The primary land use envisioned in this designation is detached single-family homes on lots typically one acre or larger, with the keeping of a limited number of livestock, consistent with a rural or semi-rural lifestyle.

21.712 Estate Residential – Low: This designation allows a range of 1 to 2 single family units per gross acre. The primary land use envisioned in this designation is detached single-family homes on lots typically one-half acre or larger.

21.713 Agricultural Lands: This land use designation includes privately owned rural lands, generally in hilly areas that are used for grazing livestock or dry grain farming. The primary purposes of the Agricultural Lands designation is to: a) preserve and protect lands capable of and generally used for the production of food, fiber and plant materials; and b) provide opportunities for rural residential single family homes, at a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit per 5 gross acres.

21.714 Open Space: This General Plan designation includes publicly owned open space lands and includes, without limitation, areas of significant ecological resources or geologic hazards. The Open Space designation also includes privately owned properties for which future development rights have been deeded to a public or private agency. For example, significant open space areas within planned developments identified as being owned and maintained by a homeowners association fall under this designation. Also included are the steep, unbuildable portions of approved subdivisions which may be deeded to agencies such as the East Bay Regional Park District but which have not been developed as park facilities.

21.72 AGRICULTURAL LAND USE INTERFACE POLICES

The City acknowledges the rural residential character of Alhambra Valley and actively supports the continuation of agricultural activities within the portion of the Valley within the City's jurisdiction. The City fully encourages the retention and maintenance of existing agricultural uses as long as they prove to be viable

economic pursuits, while acknowledging potential land use conflicts with nearby or adjacent urban uses. The following goals and policies are indented to minimize and resolve conflicts between agricultural and urban uses.

GOAL – Encourage the preservation of existing agricultural businesses and minimize and resolve conflicts between agricultural and urban uses.

21.721 Agriculture shall be protected to maintain the semi-rural atmosphere and to retain a balance of land uses in Alhambra Valley.

22.722 Adopt and maintain regulations for new development that ensure its compatibility with agricultural uses.

21.723 Allow only development that is compatible with existing agricultural, residential and open spaces uses.

21.724 Require adequate (such as a minimum 60 foot) setback for structures located within or adjacent to cultivated agricultural areas.

21.725 Inform and educate perspective home buyers in or near agricultural areas regarding the nuisance and hazards associated with nearby agricultural practices.

21.726 Agriculture shall be protected from nuisance complaints from non-agricultural land uses.

21.73 RESOURCE PRESERVATION AND NEW DEVELOPMENT

Alhambra Valley is characterized by its natural creeks and hillsides, and the perception of the many scenic vistas and areas of significant topographic variation of the landscape seen throughout the Valley. Views of ridgelines and hills form the backdrop for most of the Valley. These views help reinforce the rural residential feeling of Alhambra Valley and provide an important balance between the rural atmosphere and low-density residential areas within and just outside the valley.

21.731 – GOAL: Preserve and enhance both the natural and man-made environmental in Alhambra Valley.

21.7311 Structures shall be designed to blend into, rather than dominate the natural setting, especially on ridgelines. The massing of new dwellings should be compatible with the natural setting.

21.7312 Only allow development which is sensitive to available natural resources and features. New development shall generally conform with natural contours and avoid excessive grading.

21.7313 Hilltop ridges, rock outcroppings, mature stands of trees and other natural features shall be preserved to the greatest extent possible in the design of new projects.

21.7314 Require development proposals to include an environmentally-superior design alternative as part of the environmental review process.

21.732 – GOAL: Restrict development in environmentally sensitive areas.

22.7321 Adopt and maintain flood safety regulations to protect floodplain environments and restrict development in flood area.

22.7322 Adopt and maintain hillside development regulations that reduce the environmental risks associated with the grading of steep slopes by reducing the maximum permitted density of sloping sites, and generally prohibiting new development on very steep sites, such those over 30%.

22.7323 Slope stability shall be a primary consideration in the ability of land to be developed. Allow no development in landslide areas unless the area is stabilized through high-quality engineering design and construction as approved by the City.

21.733 – GOAL: Enhance watercourses and associated riparian habitat to their natural state to restore water quality, wildlife diversity, aesthetic values and recreation opportunities.

22.7331 Require a creek setback for any development proposal along a creek or natural watercourse.

22.7332 Require new development proposed along a creek or natural watercourse to prepare and implement a creek preservation plan.

21.734 – GOAL: Minimize air, water noise and soil pollution in Alhambra Valley.

22.7341 Protect perennial and intermittent streams from pollution caused by dumping, sewage seepage, laundry water or siltation.

22.7342 Encourage the energy efficient features in new development.

21.735 – GOAL: Ensure that new public service facilities, which are needed to provide adequate levels of service within Alhambra Valley, are sensitive to the natural setting.

22.7351 Dedication of public roads in unstable hillside areas shall not be accepted by the City.

22.7351 Require new development to provide on-site storm eater and drainage facilities which accommodate full buildout and consider a range of design alternatives.

22.7352 Control erosion in natural watercourses where creek capacity and bank stability necessitate, as per applicable creek preservation and improvement plan.

21.736 – GOAL: Preserve areas of high scenic value and the rural-residential atmosphere in the area.

22.7361 Adopt and maintain regulations and design standards for new residential development and which maintain the rural residential atmosphere in Alhambra Valley

21.7362 To the extent feasible, scenic features should be protected or maintained, either through land dedication to a public agency or through the granting of scenic or conservation easements.

21.7363 High quality engineering of slopes shall be required to avoid soil erosion, downstream flooding, slope failure, loss of vegetative cover, high maintenance costs, property damage and damage to visual quality.

21.7364 In order to conserve the scenic beauty of Alhambra Valley, developers shall generally be required to restore the natural contours and vegetation of the land after grading and other land disturbances. Public and private projects shall be designed to minimize damage to significant trees and other visual landmarks.

21.7365 Extreme topographic modification, such as filling in canyons or removing hilltops shall be avoided. Clustering and planned development approaches to development shall be encouraged. All future development plans, whether large-scale or small-scale, shall be based on identifying safe and suitable sites for buildings, roads and driveways.

21.7366 The construction of new structures on the top of scenic ridges or within 50 feet of the ridgeline shall be discouraged.

21.7367 Enhance and protect access to established scenic routes through the development of trails and other facilities.

21.7368 New projects shall be designed to blend in with the rural setting of Alhambra Valley as much as possible. The use of fire resistant materials shall be encouraged.

21.7369 New buildings which are proposed in highly visible areas, such as on hillsides, shall be sited, designed and landscaped so that supporting columns, piers and building undersides are not visually dominant.

21.73610 The use of scenic easements shall be encouraged to protect agricultural and park lands which abut land with urban land use designations.

22.73611 Preserve the visually open character of Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads by adopting and maintaining regulations that restrict the use of solid fencing and encourage the use of low, open rail type fencing.

22.73612 New development should complement the existing environment in terms of form. Scale and physical appearance. Structures should complement the existing topography to the greatest extent possible while reducing visual impacts of such development through the use of landscaping and sitting techniques.

SCENIC ROADWAYS ELEMENT (1973)

27.2 SCENIC ROADWAYS

(27.21-27.25 unchanged, with Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads currently listed as Scenic Roadways)

27.26 As shown in Figure F 27.1, *Scenic Roadways and Valley Gateways*, additional scenic roadways in Alhambra Valley include: Vaca Creek Road from its junction with Alhambra Valley Road through its junction with Stonehurst Drive and a portion of Stonehurst Drive from its junction with Vaca Creek Road westward. The visual quality of these roadways should be preserved with special regard to the scenic unity of the Alhambra Valley.

27.28 Two intersections in Alhambra Valley are designated as Valley Gateways and the existing views from these gateways should be preserved. As shown in Figure F 27.1, *Scenic Roadways and Valley Gateways*, these gateway intersections are Alhambra Valley Road at Reliez Valley Road and Alhambra Valley Road at Vaca Creek Road.

27.3 POLICIES - GENERAL

(27.31-27.36 unchanged)

27.4 POLICIES – ALHAMBRA VALLEY

27.41 To the extent possible, improve and maintain the aesthetic views from and natural features which occur along scenic corridors.

27.42 To the extent practical, enhance public access from scenic routes to parks, trails and other public attractions.

27.43 Enhance views from designated Alhambra Valley Gateways, which include Alhambra Avenue at Alhambra Valley Road; Alhambra Valley Road at Reliez Valley Road; and Alhambra Valley Road at Vaca Creek Crossing.

27.44 Acknowledge that the existing trees along Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads significantly contribute to these scenic corridors and all efforts shall be made to preserve them.

27.45 For that portion of Alhambra Valley Road which is between Reliez Valley Road and Alhambra Creek Road, and which is under the City's jurisdiction, prior to the construction of any major City funded improvements, a scenic corridor improvement plan shall be developed by the City. The improvement plan shall conform to the General Plan's Transportation Element and will:

- provide an inventory indentifying mature trees and other significant vegetation which could be affected by future road improvements. This inventory should be used to develop the overall scenic corridor improvement plan.

- provide a plan to underground aerial transmission lines.

- provide an opportunity for neighborhood groups and Contra Costa County to comment on the proposal prior to the commencement of construction activity)

PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT (1973)

23.2 POLICIES

(23.21-23.30 unchanged)

23.31 Trails in Alhambra Valley. A public trail system which ties into proposed trails should be developed and maintained, as shown in Figure F 23.1, *Public Trails and Historic Sites*. Trails provide a linear corridor that is primarily intended for pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle use.

23.32 Historic structures in Alhambra Valley should be protected. These structures include the Altamarino Adobe, as shown in Figure F 23.1, *Public Trails and Historic Sites.* Any development proposals which are processed adjacent to this facility shall be designed to provide for the enhancement and preservation of this resource.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT (1992)

Amending CHAPTER 3, BIKEWAYS, Bikeway Plan, Connections to Regional System with addition of the following:

Alhambra Valley Road: This proposed Class III bike path will connect with the Reliez Valley Road bike path westward to Bear Creek Road and Castro Ranch Road, as shown in Figure F 23.1, *Public Trails and Historic Sites.*

Amending *CHAPTER 4, PROPOSED STREET PLAN, Street Locations and Cross-Sections* with addition of the following:

Alhambra Valley Annexation Area

Alhambra Valley Road Improvements. The road width for the northern leg of Alhambra Valley Road and Reliez Road shall generally be 32 feet in width. Road improvement priority should be given to the continuous segment of Alhambra Valley Road and Alhambra Avenue from the Reliez Valley Road intersection to the Santa Fe Railroad Trestle. In areas which ware already developed, it may not be feasible to acquire an 80 foot right-of-way. In these instances, the right-of-way may be as narrow as 60 feet and provide those improvements which are shown in Figure 4-3, Road Improvements, Alhambra Valley Annexation Area.

The improvements include travel lanes and shoulders, trails and drainage facilities. The right-of-way for Alhambra Valley Road (both north and west legs) shall generally be 80 feet in width. Right-of-way shall be preserved and acquired as necessary. There are many heritage quality trees along Alhambra Valley Road. All road improvements shall attempt to preserve these resources.

Reliez Valley Road Improvements. Reliez Valley Road represents the eastern section of the primary travel corridor through the planning area. The right-of-way width for the segment of Reliez Valley Road within Alhambra Valley Annexation shall be approximately 84 feet. Safety and related improvements to these roadways shall be made which preserve the rural-residential character of the corridor. Proposed improvements include construction of drainage; road shoulders; separated trail improvements; turning lanes; repaving/reconstruction of the existing roadbed as necessary; and landscape improvements. Like Alhambra Valley Road, Reliez Valley Road contains many heritage quality trees. All efforts shall be made to preserve them.

In these instances, the right-of-way may be as narrow as 60 feet and provide those improvements which are shown in Figure 4-3, Road Improvements, Alhambra Valley Annexation Area. The improvements include travel lane and shoulders, trails and drainage facilities.

Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads – Safety

Limitations on Number of Access Points. Access points and driveways onto Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads shall be minimized.

Limitations and Restrictions on Construction Traffic. Construction activity associated with development projects shall be regulated as follows:

- Use of Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads by load-bearing construction trucks shall be minimized;
- Damage to Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads which is caused by construction activity shall be mitigated; and
- Noise and dust impacts generated by construction activity shall be mitigated.

Limitations on Travel Speeds. Road signs shall maintain safe travel speeds and discourage through traffic from using the local streets adjacent to Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads.

Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley Roads – Scenic Corridor Improvement Plan. Prior to construction of any major City funded improvement, a scenic corridor improvement plan shall be developed by the City. Neighborhood groups and the County of Contra Costa shall be provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed improvement plan prior to the commencement of any construction activity. Development proposals within the Alhambra Valley Annexation Area may be required to pay a fee which would be used to develop and implement the scenic corridor improvement plan.

Public Comments from the Planning Commission meeting of May 25, 2010

1. Ernest Lompa – Feels the City would be taking agricultural rights and freedom away. Feels the City is taking the Valley and turning it into a city. Doesn't see strong need to annex. City would be double dipping on water. Feels he doesn't have a voice (that needs to be heard) because of the deferred annexation agreement. Thinks the City is greedy.

2. Nancy McMarrow – Doesn't think roads will be taken care of if the Valley is annexed. County currently takes care of Alhambra Valley Rd and it's very nice vs. Reliez Valley Rd which is in disrepair.

3. Marell Jones – Concerned about police coverage. Police Dept is not as good as Sheriff's Dept. Sheriff's Dept has more resources.

4. Joan Holmoi – Concerned about increase in traffic and less police services. Will lose (CHP) helicopter service. Sees losing on every aspect if brought into the City.

5. Marie Olson – Argues that in the staff report it talks about government jurisdiction policies – annexing for the tax equity and neighborhood cohesiveness which is exactly what they are afraid of. They have one jurisdiction, one tax code they follow…completely separate from the City of Martinez. Park/Pool/Library Bond Issue – Valley residents will not use Martinez Park/Pool/Library facilities.

6. Hal Olson – City will raise taxes which they did not vote for. City has already violated specific plans at will lately. Road maintenance – city road maintenance is terrible (Reliez Valley Rd). Police services - far less police than in the County and they would lose Highway Patrol services. Land use allows bigger 2nd units. City seems to be trying to make it less rural by increasing population density (thinks the City is allowing larger unit for more taxes paid to the City). Agricultural area – city would allow businesses (like firewood sales/golf & tennis clubs) which isn't allowed now, that would increase traffic.

7. Mike Weymouth – Is concerned about law enforcement issues.

8. Brian Mulry, Gagen McCoy Attorneys – Creating a gerrymandered area – doesn't meet any of the (LAFCO) factors. Contrary to the Cortese-Knox Act – policies and goals left out. CEQA issues that could create an environmental impact.

9. Jim Hein – Proposed annexation area isolates three or four people because City Council moved urban limit line. LAFCO says not to create islands, which is exactly what has been done. Wants to put a couple houses on his property.

10. Jan Griffin – Concerned about keeping Alhambra Valley rural. Concerned about Police Dept response. Martinez Police Dept never responds.

11. Mark Rolandelli – Spent $350,000 to find out he was outside urban limit line…no one ever told him. Wants to build two houses on his 10 acres, gave him water line and permit to run lines to his property and now won't give him a water meter. City and County not being up front.

12. Todd Kilbourn – Doesn't want to have lifestyle change.

13. Marie Hoffman – Unhappy about map.

14. Ken Jordan – Concerned about police services. Only house on Oakbridge Ln that would be annexed (Police Dept will think he's in the County). Wants to see Valley stay as it is.

15. Gene Ross – Concerned about existing uses – things that are legal won't be legal with the new plan (setbacks, creek access, proximity to creek, structures already built, RVs on property). What will property owner have to do to show they have a legal non-conforming or grandfathered structure.

16. Jim Hartney – Who will have jurisdiction over the roads (in Alhambra Valley).

17. Frank Dunphy – Concerned about the politics, says once it gets to the City Council all the work that was done could go out the window….Council could change everything.

18. Jennifer Garbarino – Wants Alhambra Valley to stay like it is. Moved to Alhambra Valley to get out of City limits. Doesn't want Alhambra Valley to be like the City.

19. James Rosenquist – Feels it will cost the City too much money for a period of time. Police Dept services not as good as Sheriff's. Opposes it also because it doesn't include the entire Valley.

20. Jim Hatchell – No specific concerns or issues.

21. Marelou Johnson – Concerned about who will take care of roadways. Feels the City won't be able to take care of them out there.

22. Forest Rosengren – Doesn't get the urban limit line. Feels parts of the Valley were specifically excluded because otherwise annexation would be voted down.

23. Scott Busby – Gave clarification on sewer system special district…formation only approved by Central Contra Costa Sanitary District as one of their special districts….funded and paid for by residents of Stonehurst development. Developer built and funded water system and signed deferred annexation agreements. Feels the whole Valley from John Swett Elementary School to Fries Ranch should be annexed when the time is right.

24. Tom Griffin – Concerned about Police Dept response.