

Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
November 23, 2010
Martinez, CA

Commissioner Kelly asked for a moment of silence in memory of Bart Bisio, who contributed much to the City, as he passed away this afternoon.

CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Donna Allen called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Donna Allen, Vice Chair, AnaMarie Avila-Farias, Commissioner, Harriett Burt, Commissioner, Rachael Ford, Commissioner, Jeffrey Keller, Commissioner, Paul Kelly, Commissioner, and Michael Marchiano, Commissioner.

EXCUSED: Chair Lynette Busby.

ABSENT: None.

AGENDA CHANGES

Planning Manager Terry Blount noted that review of the Housing Element was continued to the meeting of December 14th.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CONSENT ITEMS

None.

REGULAR ITEMS

- I. North Pacheco Annexation Project GPA #10-03 Sub #7257
Location: The proposed North Pacheco annexation and related planning actions will impact an area located at the intersection of Interstate Highway 680 and Highway 4 and extends north along Pacheco Boulevard to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad which demarks its most northern boundary. The area is located within the northeastern portion in unincorporated Contra Costa County outside the eastern boundary of the City of Martinez but within the City's sphere of influence and County Urban Limit Line.
Existing Land Use Designations (Contra Costa County):
GENERAL PLAN: Multiple Family Residential-Low; Commercial; Public/Semi-Public
 1. Amend the Martinez General Plan (John Muir Parkway Specific Area Plan) Land Use Map to show the annexation area within the City limits and the new associated land use designations. (City)

2. *Amend the Zoning Ordinance to include new designation P-1 (Planned Unit Development) to allow for Contra Costa County's Planned Unit Development designation and approved Planned Developments to be incorporated into the City's Zoning Ordinance and Map. (City)*
3. *Amend the Zoning Map to show the annexation area within the City limits and the new Zoning Districts for the annexation area. (City)*
4. *Approve pre-zonings and General Plan Land Use designations for the properties to be annexed. (City)*
5. *Adopt a Negative Declaration. (City) (This item was continued from the September 28, 2010, meeting.) Applicant: City of Martinez (DT/MC/CS)*

Planning Manager Terry Blount introduced Dina Tasini, Project Planner, who presented the staff report, including a PowerPoint presentation. She reviewed the proposed boundaries, current uses, County zoning, suggested rezoning of the areas, General Plan designations, and environmental review process. She also discussed Council's initiation of this process, history, financial analysis, public neighborhood meetings, the staff recommendation, comment letters, and the proposed negative declaration.

Commissioner Burt asked why staff believes this is an excellent opportunity for the City. Ms. Tasini commented on the importance of the North Pacheco area as a gateway to the City, connecting one part of the City with another, and the future economic benefits.

Commissioner Burt commented that not every area proposed for annexation is currently controlled by the City.

Commissioner Ford asked about the condition of the infrastructure in that area - roads, etc. Mike Chandler, Senior Management Analyst explained there is a planned Measure J Strategic Plan project related to that area. Mr. Chandler discussed the assessment City staff did of the various public works requirements for the area, such as curbs, v-ditches, traffic markings, street sweeping, storm drains, and pot hole repair, and the plan to deal with each maintenance issue. Most of the maintenance impacts are minimal, with street sweeping two times per month, and traffic markings done once per year, as the most consistent maintenance requirements. He also discussed additional funding possibilities for the maintenance.

Commissioner Ford asked about widening of the road and Mr. Chandler reviewed details of the Measure J project plan (Phase 1 & 2), scheduled in 2014.

Commissioner Kelly asked about replacement of the railroad trestle, and why the area all the way to Pacheco Boulevard isn't being annexed at the same time. Ms.

Tasini explained that at one time Contra Costa County was considering realignment of Pacheco which would require a new bore below the railroad trestle. The County has abandoned these plans because of cost and lengthy negotiations with the railroad that would delay the project. Therefore there is no plan to realign Pacheco at this time. She noted that the boundaries where proposed by staff and the City Council several years ago and all subsequent analysis was based on those boundaries.

Commissioner Keller asked if the County does street sweeping. Mr. Chandler said yes. Commissioner Keller asked Commander Peterson about police calls in the area. Commander Peterson discussed service calls in the North Pacheco area as compared with the City's normal number and type of calls.

Chair Allen asked why this annexation is being considered at this time, rather than waiting for completion of the General Plan Update. Ms. Tasini said the annexation is Council-directed & General Plan issues are being considered at the same time. Mr. Blount added that the General Plan considerations were included in the process, and it would likely not be any different if it was done in a year or so as part of the General Plan Update process. Ms. Tasini noted that the property owners in the area are now anxious to expedite the process.

Commissioner Avila asked if there is a timing issue with LAFCO. Ms. Tasini explained that the application process with LAFCO would take at least 6 months, and about 10 to 12 months for the annexation to be completed. Commissioner Avila said by that time the General Plan Update should be finished.

Commissioner Ford asked about the potential economic impact. She asked how much of the economic projections were based on the possibility of a big box store relocating there, which would have a significant impact, or whether they were based on current businesses. Ms. Tasini responded that any new businesses relocating there would have to meet the same development standards as anywhere else in the City. Mr. Chandler noted that retail uses would not be limited to big box stores, but could be a business park, retail stores, restaurants or light industrial uses, and that the economic projections did not include an expectation of big box retail in the area.

Ms. Burt asked Commander Peterson about a net drain on city services, as discussed with the Alhambra Valley annexation. Commander Peterson discussed the analysis that was done, which seemed to indicate potentially one additional call for service per day, including traffic stops and violations.

Commissioner Burt talked about budgets approved in the past that were based on future revenue, which didn't always work out. Mr. Chandler noted that staff was very conservative when estimating future revenues.

Commissioner Burt asked if the fiscal analysis considered the costs that will be incurred before full build-out is accomplished. Mr. Chandler stated that the projected numbers were conservative and residential developers with projects currently in process are anxious to resume building which will generate property tax revenue for the City.

Commissioner Kelly commented that was why he asked why not go further north on Pacheco Boulevard, because there are some successful businesses already there, and the City could benefit from the sales tax revenue. Mr. Chandler noted that most of the commercial area is along the 680/4 corridor, but he couldn't say why the Council chose

the boundaries it did, and he acknowledged that the area north of the trestle was worthy of future consideration.

Commissioner Kelly asked about the areas that would need additional maintenance, which Ms. Tasini provided.

Commissioner Ford asked what property values were used to estimate the potential revenues for the City. Mr. Chandler acknowledged that property values have changed, and he said staff has already asked the consultant to take a second look at the numbers. Commissioner Ford expressed concern that the projections not be based solely on the property tax revenue, and Mr. Chandler reiterated that property tax revenues were only a small part of the projected revenue.

Commissioner Burt asked if the City is ready to analyze and market the area for economic development. She thought a proactive approach was necessary. City Manager Phil Vince discussed input he has had from property owners, business owners, the County, and real estate brokers who are anxious to improve the area. He noted that the time is right for the City to take this action, and he discussed benefits to the residents and businesses in the area as well as benefits to the City from the annexation. Commissioner Burt expressed appreciation for the thoughts and efforts being made to improve the economic outlook of the City.

Commissioner Burt asked about community concerns that this is a way to introduce redevelopment, not only in that area but throughout the City. Mr. Vince acknowledged that could be another tool to be used to improve the area, and it is a consideration. He confirmed, however, that the potential income from redevelopment is not factored into the revenue projections from the annexation. He also commented on the important work of the California Center for Delta Research and Education (CCDRE) as an example that shows that staff promotes more than redevelopment as a solution for the City.

Commissioner Ford expressed appreciation for the support for CCDRE, although she thought an overall approach to economic development in the City should be carefully considered. City Manager Vince was confident that the annexation would provide multiple financial benefits for the City.

Commissioner Marchiano said he thought this annexation made much more sense to him than the Alhambra Valley annexation that was discussed recently - he thought the area seems to naturally fit within City limits and the economic benefit was clear.

Commissioner Avila said she wanted to hear the public's viewpoint on the issue.

Chair Allen asked staff about the requirements and allowances with a planned unit development, which Ms. Nebb reviewed.

Chair Allen opened public comment on the item.

TIM PLATT expressed appreciation for the questions and discussion between the Planning Commission and staff. He noted that the reality is that much of the fiscal outcome is unknown. He also stated that he had submitted a letter regarding the likelihood of redevelopment in the area, and he questioned whether the negative declaration was sufficient in considering the economic and cumulative impacts. He commented on increased density, required police services, and whether the cost projections were accurate, especially given consultant costs etc. Mr. Blount noted that Mr. Platt's letter was included in the Planning Commission packet. He also clarified that a formal reply to comments is not required with a Negative Declaration, as with other environmental documents, but that comment letters are reviewed by staff and efforts made to address the issues raised.

MARTIN LYSONS, Gagen McCoy representing the O'Brien Group (who has two projects in the affected area), reviewed a letter he sent primarily in support of the annexation, as well as concerns they had with the transition from County to City jurisdiction. He also responded to Chair Allen's questions about tentative map requirements and approvals.

JAMIE FINEGOLD, representing the property owners of the RV storage lot, commented on the history of the property and future goals for its use.

Seeing no further speakers, Chair Allen closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Avila confirmed that the existing entitlements and approvals (such as with the O'Brien Group) will remain as set by the County. Ms. Nebb clarified that by state law, existing subdivision entitlements carry through with annexation, as are automatic extensions, but any discretionary extensions would need to go through a public hearing process. She also indicated that fee rates, etc. would be for the Council to decide, not staff or the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ford asked about the historic pipeline mentioned in a letter from Chevron, and whether the City would be responsible for future remediation. Ms. Tasini noted that the pipeline is outside the area of the annexation, so additional analysis of soils in the area to the North of the trestle was not conducted. Ms. Nebb added that the property owner would be responsible for any contamination in the area of the pipeline, but the City would be responsible if the city undertakes ownership or construction activity in the area and prior to any activity or ownership taking place the current property owners would be responsible for remediation of the property prior to transfer.

Commissioner Burt explained what was in Mr. Platt's letter about impacts on open space, and she asked about potential sites for parks or open space in the annexed area, which Ms. Tasini discussed.

Chair Allen stated she has been a proponent of annexation of this whole area since 1980. She discussed the need to have things in place and ready to entice businesses to the area, noting that the City did a good job on the financial implications of the annexation. She

expressed the hope that neighboring areas will be annexed as well.

Commissioner Burt said she will always ask the hard economic questions because of past experiences as a City decision-maker. She agreed with Mr. Platt that it would be better if additional areas were considered also, but she indicated that the county is probably not willing to let them go. She expressed appreciation for the fact that business owners, developers and residents are supportive of the proposed annexation, and that Commander Peterson was confident that the Police Department can cover the additional area with little difficulty. She was supportive of the proposal.

Commissioner Avila expressed appreciation to staff for the staff report and related analysis. She was disappointed that the area proposed for annexation was not larger, but she was confident it will happen in the future. She was also supportive of the concept.

Commissioner Keller agreed that the annexation makes sense, especially the potential economic benefits from the 680/4 corridor. He was confident that the annexation will be good for the City, and he commended staff for their work.

Commissioner Ford agreed with Commissioner Keller regarding the potential for businesses along the 680/4 corridor. She expressed appreciation for staff's patience with the Commission. She was supportive of the annexation, but her concerns were whether now was the best time for it.

Chair Allen agreed staff had done an excellent job, especially considering there were no residents opposing the annexation. She noted that any General Plan issues that come up can be addressed in the future.

On motion by Michael Marchiano, Commissioner, seconded by Paul Kelly, Commissioner, the Commission voted to approve Resolution 10-08, recommending that the Council approve the proposed Pacheco annexation (Chair Lynette Busby absent.)

Chair Allen asked that the City Council staff report mention that several Planning Commissioners thought that more areas of Pacheco should be annexed.

COMMISSION ITEMS

- II. *Housing Element (2009-2014) of the General Plan GPA #10-04 Public hearing to review the Draft Housing Element and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the adoption of the Draft. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has reviewed the City's Draft Housing Element and has indicated that, with the revisions requested, the document meets the State's statutory requirements. (This item is continued to the December 14, 2010, meeting.)*
Applicant: City of Martinez (TB)

On motion by Harriett Burt, Commissioner, seconded by Paul Kelly, Commissioner, voted to postpone the public hearing for the Housing Element (2009-2014) of the General

Plan, GPA #10-04, to the next regular meeting, December 14, 2010 (Chair Busby absent.).

COMMISSION ITEMS

Commissioner Burt asked about the Commission calendar for December and January, which Mr. Blount reviewed.

Commissioner Burt also asked about the status of the Alhambra Valley annexation, and Mr. Blount confirmed it was going to Council on December 1st.

Commissioner Marchiano commended Commander Peterson on his promotion to Chief of Police.

STAFF ITEMS

None.

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

On motion by Harriett Burt, Commissioner, seconded by Paul Kelly, Commissioner, the Commission voted to adjourn in memory of Bart Bisio, to the next regular meeting, December 14, 2010 (Chair Busby absent).

Respectfully Submitted,

Approved by the Planning Commission
Vice Chairperson

Transcribed by Mary Hougey

Donna Allen