

Friends and neighbors,

This letter to the [Planning Commission](#) underlines the clear intent of this City Council to form a Redevelopment Agency in the Pacheco Annexation area, if it is annexed. The Redevelopment Agency will then spread to the rest of Martinez --the Council's "backdoor RDA" strategy.

This strategy is one reason to oppose the annexation. The financial implications are another.

Tim

Timothy Platt

**843 Pinon Drive
Martinez, CA 94553
(925) 372-8517
FAX (925) 229-3446**

September 7, 2010

City of Martinez
[Community Development Department](#) via e-mail
525 Henrietta Street
Martinez CA 94553
Attn.: Dina Tasini, Laura Austin

Reference: North Pacheco Annexation Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Tasini,

The primary issue with the Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration is they fail to recognize the clear intent of this City Council to form a Redevelopment Agency in North Pacheco with the resultant heavy housing and commercial development . The intent to form a Redevelopment Agency in the North Pacheco Annexation area is clear.

- The mayor has discussed and supported this in [City Council meetings](#) and in the press.
- [City Council members](#) have discussed and supported this in City Council meetings
- The City Manager has discussed this with property owners in the annexation area, and suggested it as a way to repay development costs they might incur
- City Manager has discussed and supported this in City Council meetings
- The City Council Redevelopment Agency Subcommittee has proposed a Redevelopment Agency for this area
- The [CH2M Hill](#) "Preliminary Initial Study Checklist" discusses a Redevelopment Agency in the annexation area

- The draft LAFCO application discusses a Redevelopment Agency in the annexation area
- The Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. “Annexation Analysis of North Pacheco Area” draft report discusses a Redevelopment Agency, including the very telling statement “...if a redevelopment area is created, growth in [property tax revenues](#) to the City from the area would be reduced compared to the estimates shown...”

The Initial Study states “The majority of the annexation area is fully developed...”. But a Redevelopment Agency in the area would increase that development with resultant impacts that should be analyzed. Cumulative impacts could be particularly important.

The impacts on development that a Redevelopment Agency would have are supplemented by the City Council’s continuing efforts in recent years to increase development density in the City overall.

The City Council has:

- Approved a [housing development](#) increasing density from 9 units to 46 units, and allowing tandem parking.
- Reduced PUD requirements to apply to lots of 7,000 sq ft.
- Reduced green space requirements by approximately 50%
- Increased housing density very significantly at several locations throughout Martinez under the aegis of the Housing Element.
- Extended increased density to several projects in the Downtown area, including Haven Street and [Vista del Sol apartments](#)
- Approved a [housing project](#) the size of a small WalMart in a neighborhood of primarily single-story, owner-occupied historic homes
- Approved converting Open Space to lots for housing development

The support for a Redevelopment Agency in North Pacheco Annexation area combined with continuing City Council actions to implement higher density development underline the incremental development that the annexation area will see when annexed, and should be addressed in the Initial Study.

Increased housing and commercial development will affect several categories of the Initial Study, including Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems, and Cumulative Impacts.

[Greenhouse gas production](#) may be a significant affect, as could pressure on the water supply, and pressure on public services. These services may well be underfunded by using the Redevelopment Agency mechanism, as the consultant states.

The cumulative affects and displacement of existing residents are of particular importance to me.

From the land use and zoning perspective, it appears that current use for northern portion from about Arnold Drive north is for low-density residential, predominantly R-7 and P-1, with small parcels of a variety of densities. Lot density generally becomes denser under the City

plan. Several of the smaller parcels change to higher densities, from R-6, D-1 and R-7 to R-3.5. An enclave of Mixed Use/Commercial is carved out of R-7 area in the northeast corner.

In the central portion of the area, a large section loses its R-7 designation to become Mixed Use/Commercial.

In the southern portion approximately south of Arnold Drive , some residential designation is lost on both Blum Rd. and Pacheco Blvd. The PS strip is undesignated on the city map.

The proposed land use and zoning changes appear to be of more significance than the report suggests, potentially resulting in impacts that may be more significant.

The amendment to the [John Muir](#) Specific Plan to allow reduction of an Open Space area is unclear. The report states that open space will be reduced by 50%, but both the location and the reasoning are unclear to me. Further explanation is requested to understand this change.

Sincerely,

Tim Platt