

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Schroder called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers with all the members present.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT (Comments are limited only to Closed Session items)**

Jaime Fox spoke in support of the Alhambra Highlands property and thanked the public for their support. He showed pictures of the hill and surrounding property known as Alhambra Highlands. Mr. Fox stated they have private support and public support, but it starts with the developer to provide an asking price. He urged the Council to do whatever needs to be done to get the developer to understand how important this is to the community.

Tim Platt indicated he was very pleased things are moving forward and believes the Alhambra Hills are the heart of Martinez. He spoke in favor of a bond measure to assist with the purchase of open space. He thought the cost of the bond would not be burdensome to the community.

Tom Griffith expressed that whatever the Council can do would be extremely appreciated. He agreed this piece of land is very important to the community.

Aimee Durphy urged the Council to do the right thing and preserve Alhambra Highlands.

Bill Nichols noted this is a unique opportunity to preserve the land owned by the person who did so much to preserve land that the City loves now, John Muir, and asked the Council to stay on course so this land can be enjoyed by generations to come.

Julian Frazer spoke about the disappointment of some Councilmembers who make the land more important for the developer. He felt this development should have been stopped a long time ago and negotiations started when the land cost less. Mr. Frazer commented that no one will remember the Council for approving developments, but they will be remembered if they preserve this land.

Timmon Phillips stated this was an opportunity for the Council to save John Muir's Legacy.

Mandy Maliman stated she was so proud to be in a place where John Muir lived, who supported the preservation of the Hills.

Mark Thomson stated many are in favor of saving the Hills and urged the Council to keep the City's best interests in mind and get the best deal possible.

Marie Got said she is in support of the preservation of the Hills. She added that this action not only affects Martinez, but everyone outside of Martinez.

There being no further speakers, the Council adjourned to Closed Session in the City Manager's Office.

### **III. CLOSED SESSION (Adjourn to City Manager's Office)**

- A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.8.

Property: Multiple parcels within the Alhambra Hills Specific Plan area (APNs: 164-010-019, 164-010-025, 164-010-026, 164-150-016, 164-150-022, 164-150-030, 366-010-007, and 366-060-007); Alhambra Highlands Project, Martinez.

Agency Negotiators: Jim Jakel, Interim City Manager; Alan Shear, Asst. City Manager, Jeff Walter/Veronica Nebb, City Attorney.

Negotiating Parties: Richfield Investment Corporation. Under Negotiation: Purchase price, and terms of payment.

### **IV. ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The meeting reconvened at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Mayor Schroder reported out from the Closed Session indicating direction was given to the City's property negotiators.

PRESENT: Lara DeLaney, Councilmember, Debbie M<sup>c</sup>Killop, Councilmember, Mark Ross, Councilmember, Anamarie Avila Farias, Vice Mayor, and Rob Schroder, Mayor.

EXCUSED: None.

ABSENT: None.

### **PRESENTATION(S)**

- A. Proclaiming March 9, 2016 as Arbor Day.

Mayor Schroder discussed the importance of Arbor Day and on behalf of the City Council, he read and presented a Proclamation proclaiming March 9th as *Arbor Day* to Recreation Coordinator Barbara Patchin. Ms. Patchin provided details on the activities held by the City at Susanna Park today for Arbor Day, including participation by the Historical Society. She also expressed appreciation for the improvements made at the Park and reviewed its history.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT (Comments are limited only to items listed on the agenda)**

Mayor Schroder stated public comment will be conducted after the Pine Meadow report is heard by Council.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

1. Public hearing to consider rescission of Call of Election and Entitlements relating to a 25.9 Acre Property Located at 451 Vine Hill Way (Pine Meadow) and possibly adopt the following: [V.Nebb/9.03.12]
- A. Resolution Rescinding Resolution 031-15, Calling and Giving Notice of the Holding of a General Municipal Election to be Held November 8, 2016 and Requesting the Board of Supervisors of the County of Contra Costa to Conduct Said Election; and Authorizing the City Clerk or His Duly authorized Officers and Agents to Carry Out All the Necessary Procedures for Said Election Submitting to the Voters an Election for a Referendum to Resolution No. 009-15.

- B. Resolution rescinding Resolution No. 009-15, Amending the General Plan (Hidden Lakes Specific Area Plan) Designation from Open Space and Recreation, Permanent to Residential 0-6 Acre for A 25 Acre Parcel and Text Amendment to Delete Language Pertaining to Golf Course Use on the Property Located at 451 Vine Hill Way (Pine Meadow) GPA 10-02.
- C. Resolution rescinding Resolution 008-15, Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act for a Development Project Consisting of: 1) General Plan Amendments to Amend the Hidden Lakes Specific Area Plan and to Amend Land Use Map 1 to Red-designate the Subject Property from Open Space and Recreation, Permanent to Residential 0-6 Units Per Acre; 2) a Zoning Map Amendment to Re-zone the Subject Property from M-OS/RF (Mixed Use Open Space Recreation) to a Combination of R-7.5/PUD Overlay (Single Family Residential: Minimum 7500 Square Feet per Dwelling Unit/Planned Unit Development Overlay) and Approve a Planned Unit Development Plan; 3) Vesting Tentative Map; and 4) Design Review, for Development of up to 99 Single Family Homes on a 25.9 Acre Parcel Located at 451 Vine Hill Way-APN 162-020-019 (Subject Property) - Pine Meadow Project 13 PLN-0029, Sub 9358 (Project).
- D. Resolution rescinding Resolution 010-15, A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Martinez Approving a Vesting Tentative Map for the Development of a Planned Unit Development with Up to 99 Single-Family Units ("Pine Meadow") on an Approximate 25.9 Site Located at 451 Vine Hill Way (APN: 162-020-019) Sub #9358.
- E. Introduce an Ordinance Repealing Ordinance 1383 C.S. Rezoning a 25.9 Acre Property Located at 451 Vine Hill Way from M-OS/RF (Mixed Use Open Space Recreation) to a Combination of R-7.5/PUD Overlay (Single Family Residential: Minimum 7,500 Square Feet Per Dwelling Unit/Planned Unit Development Overlay) and a PUD Plan to Allow Development of 99 Single Family Homes.

Senior City Attorney Veronica Nebb presented the staff report, reviewing the history of the property formerly known as Pine Meadow Golf Course, action taken by the Council last year, which resulted in a petition requesting a referendum against Resolution No. 009-15 was submitted and certified. The Petition specifically requested that the City Council "either rescind its approval of said resolution or submit same to the voters of Martinez for their adoption or rejection at an election.

Senior City Attorney Nebb stated that on December 10, 2015, the City Clerk received a letter from Civic Martinez, LLC, the owner of the property at 451 Vine Hill Way, Martinez CA ("Property") and DeNova Home, Inc., requesting the City repeal the Entitlements for the Pine Meadow project ("Project"). The owner and developer have clarified by subsequent letter that they no longer intend to proceed with development of the Project as originally proposed. Staff has considered the request and noted that in the event that the owner and developer do not intend to proceed with the proposed project, rescinding the entitlements seems the prudent course of action since it will save the City the cost of the election relating to the Project which is being abandoned by the owner and developer. Ms. Nebb indicated the substantive difference between the City Council repeal of the entitlements and the calling of the election is that if the City Council repeals the entitlements, the action is certain, the project cannot go forward as originally proposed at this time.

If the election is called, the outcome is less certain and the voters could vote to either repeal Resolution No. 009-15 or permit the project to proceed as originally proposed. Neither action results in a permanent general plan designation for the property as the City Council in either case retains the right to amend the general plan land use designation for the Property in the future.

Councilmember DeLaney asked whether it would be possible to cancel the election and repeal the entitlements or whether they were mutually exclusive. Ms. Nebb explained you can't call an election on something that has already been repealed. She acknowledged the other two could be rescinded and the election still go forward, but not the General Plan Amendment; however, if the Council chooses to rescind the others, then the General Plan designation and the zoning would not match.

Councilmember Ross asked if the challenge would constitute a regulatory taking of sorts. Ms. Nebb said that was unlikely because in that situation, the zoning would be rendered void. She further clarified that the election in that case could be decided by the courts with the final decision as to whether the Council needs to go back and make the zoning and General Plan designation match. In response to another question from Councilmember Ross, Ms. Nebb clarified that the zoning change was not part of the referendum, only the General Plan.

Richard Mapplebeckpalmer expressed that the open space controversy reminds him of children who are unable to leave a blank space on a canvas. He added that he strongly believes the Pine Meadow space needs to be kept blank open space, with any plans for the site to be decided by the volunteers who protect the space.

Richard Verrilli commented on the great blessings that this country provides, which is the protection of individual rights, including protection of personal property rights. He thought the property owners should have the right to sell or develop their property. He also pointed out that Martinez has a lot of open space already and the City would have benefitted financially if the development had gone through. He added the Council is the elected representatives of the voters and should do what is best for the City as a whole, not a vocal minority.

Robert Aue agreed with Mr. Verrilli to a point, noting that more than ten percent of the people have said they want the matter to go to a public vote and the Council should support that. He also questioned the Council's loyalties, whether to the developer who contributed to the election of most of the Council or to the voters as a whole.

Eli Dominguez questioned the Council's protection of the trees within the City, especially in view of the recent Arbor Day activities, while killing trees elsewhere in the name of development. He also noted he would be running for Council in 2018.

Mike Benson said he represents the people who successfully referended the Council's actions on the property and urged the Council to allow the election to occur. He expressed concern that the developers intend to propose a new development after the rescindment is done, but he pointed out to the Council they would not be able to pass anything similar for the site of one year after the rescission is acted on.

Felix Sanchez commented on the impacts on the City if the development (or one similar) is allowed to go forward - impacts on the schools, on traffic, on the water system (especially in view of the current drought) and on emergency services.

Carol Taylor presented results of scientific studies on the psychological and physiological benefits of open space, and read sections out loud. Ms. Taylor also spoke on behalf of her daughter who grew up in Martinez and is now at the Naval Academy in Maryland, noting although the City can be proud of her accomplishments, it remains to be seen whether she can be proud of the City Council.

Julie Lopez expressed concern about traffic and safety impacts from the development. She noted the visionaries of their time enacted legislation to preserve the area currently known as Golden Gate Park, even though many residents opposed it. She encouraged the Council to be visionaries for the City and keep the property open space. She agreed it is ironic that the Arbor Day resolution was passed at the same meeting the Council is considering its actions on this development.

Kerry Kilmer discussed the Council's responsibilities to the voters who put them into office and cautioned them to remember how strongly they feel about their open spaces. She also expressed efforts to block the public's right to vote on this issue is shameful and underhanded. She asked them to consider the legacy they will leave behind.

Mark Thomson agreed the decision needs to be made by the people since so many had worked hard to get it on the ballot. He noted that it is unlikely the issue will be settled tonight, and the Council should consider how they can take a leadership role in settling the matter in a way that suits everyone.

Jean O'Neil was concerned about preserving the quality of life for residents, noting that all the new developments create impacts on schools, parking, traffic, and public safety. She echoed earlier comments on the Council's responsibility to represent the people who elected them.

Heather Ramamurthy observed that this is not a year of politics as usual and it is obvious the people are tired of letting special interests and corporations interfere with the will of the people. She added people across the country are asking for the return of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" and the Council should not stand in their way. She expressed appreciation to Councilmember DeLaney for her support and her willingness to ask relevant and thought-provoking questions.

Nancy Crawford discussed her reasons for moving to Martinez, particularly quality-of-life issues. She was concerned about recent changes; however, that detract from the benefits that Martinez used to represent. She asked the Council to allow the residents to have a voice in this matter, since it will have negative impacts on them.

Tim Platt noted his involvement in saving open space since the 1980s, including work to save the Franklin Hills. He comment on benefits to public health that result from open space and stated the public should have a vote on this issue considering Pine Meadow may be the last significant open space in the City. He also commented on serious issues with public records request made regarding the site and its development application and process. He asked the Council to suspend any actions related to the property until a blue-ribbon trustworthy panel can investigate further to ensure openness and transparency.

Gary Freitas spoke in support of property owners' rights and expressed support for the work done by the Council and its efforts to do what is best for whole City. He noted that those in attendance tonight represent only a small segment of the City population. He also pointed out that a majority of the Planning Commission and a majority of the Council voted in favor of the project, and the Councilmembers themselves were elected by a majority of the citizens. He indicated as well that some who signed the petition in favor of the referendum said they felt misled by those collecting signatures and wish they could now take their names off the petition.

Jennifer Dean, granddaughter of the original golf owner, objected to the contention that the property was zoned permanent open space, clarifying between that designation and the actual open space recreational. She expressed frustration as to why people want to vote on plans for a development that has already been withdrawn, as well as the misleading information that has been given out to gain support for the referendum.

Dana Tsubota, vice president and legal counsel for Denova Homes, the owner/developer for the withdrawn project, commented on false information spread about Denova, the project, and future plans for the property. She noted she met with Mark Thomson, a member of Friends of Pine Meadow, who said that because they had not been able to verify the information it had regarding Denova, they were forced to "infer" the information was true. She explained because Denova is no longer planning to do the project, there was no longer a need for the approvals granted by the City, and no more need for the previous approvals, the City has the option to rescind them and to cancel the public vote on the referendum. She discussed the goals and strategies of the Friends of Pine Meadow to force the City to designate the property as permanent open space.

Ralph Hinderhank, environmental lawyer and resident of Martinez, gave a brief rebuttal to comments made by Mr. Freitas, Ms. Dean and Ms. Tsubota. He focused, however, on the public records requests, details of the records that were received from Councilmember DeLaney that led to the conclusion that significant City and staff resources were used to help Denova with its proposals, and that unnoticed private meetings were held and not reported on. He also commented on the records request that was not complied with.

Christine Coward Dean discussed the unfairness of a group of people dictating to a private property owner what she can do with her property, who it can be sold to, what the prices should be and who can buy it. She didn't think they would like it if the roles were reversed. She also questioned the fiscal responsibility of the City paying for election costs on a question that has been settled since the developer has withdrawn the application.

Nancy Nunen said that in observing the Councilmembers, she believes this is an exercise in futility because it appears to her that the Council has already made up their minds what they are going to do. As a native San Franciscan, she indicated she values open space, but she also thinks the political process is to be valued. She was disappointed that the Council does not seem to be open-minded about the options.

Sharon Hicks discussed her past involvement with the preservation of the Franklin Hills ridgeline. She expressed that the City should allow the vote to go ahead, since a General Plan amendment was under consideration, which is why people signed the petition for the referendum. She expressed support for keeping the property as open space recreational.

Sally Sweetzer stated there is a simple solution if people want to keep this property as open space recreational, which is to purchase it. She noted this has been an ongoing issue, so she questioned why no money has been raised for that purpose. She also added there are other things the City should spend their money on rather than the election, such as streets.

Julie Lopez expressed confusion as to what the options and possibilities really are - what will happen to the property under each option? Mayor Schroder said the City Attorney will explain that all again after the public hearing.

Beth Rainsford clarified that the main issue is the change of the General Plan designation; no one is talking about taking property from another - only that it should stay open space recreation permanent.

Harlan Strickland said he hoped the property could remain open space, and there should be funding sources available. He also noted that the current zoning ordinance and General Plan are applicable to all properties. He questioned whether pulling the project means they can't apply for another similar project with the recently approved zoning and General Plan designation. He asked how the General Plan update affects or will be affected by the referendum and/or the public vote. He noted that the cost of the election item is small compared to the City's overall budget and General Fund.

Julian Frazer made comparisons with the Franklin Hills process, noting it was similar land with similar issues. He also reviewed different components of the General Plan. He referred to the Action Minutes of the February 17th meeting, under public comment, and asked that they be added to the public record of this meeting. He clarified that the zoning for the property when it was annexed from the county allowed for "open space recreation" since that was the current use, and the "residential" allowance was for one house on the property, not multiple houses. He also indicated that there are funding options for the purchase and preservation of the land, as has been mentioned by Mr. Platt.

Guy Cooper said he thought it was settled a year ago that there would be a public referendum on the zoning and use of this land. He clarified that private property or not, all land in the City is subject to the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan, and proposed uses must comply with them. He thought it was obvious that the developers were given special access to the Council to help develop a strategy to get around the referendum. He reminded the audience that the developer had contributed to four out of five of the Council's election campaigns, the exception being Councilmember DeLaney.

Vic (last name inaudible) acknowledged he was a property owner too, but he recognized that owning the property doesn't mean he can do whatever he wants with it. He expressed that if the Council allows this rezoning, they should allow all property owners to do the same.

David Sanson, Denova Homes, said yes, they did meet with Councilmembers and staff following approval of the referendum, but there were no underhanded, backroom deals made — they were looking for the best way to proceed for the benefit of all parties. He discussed the process prior to the last Council action, noting that no one can explain how the property got the designation of open space. He also pointed out that changes to the General Plan and zoning are done all the time to allow for development, and if the City's General Plan hadn't changed since John Muir lived

here, none of those protesting this change would even be able to live in Martinez. He maintained that his company tried to do the right thing by letting the City know they wouldn't be proceeding with their approved project so there was no need for the referendum and thereby the City could save the costs for the election item. He expressed that it would be better to poll all the residents of the City and see whether they would want to pay more in taxes to fund the purchasing of private property for parklands.

Seeing no further speakers, Mayor Schroder closed the public hearing and invited Mr. Sanson to answer any questions from Council.

Councilmember Ross expressed appreciation to Mr. Sanson for willing to sell the property to the City for designation as public open space. He asked Mr. Sanson if he would meet with Mr. Thomson, Mr. Platt, the Deans, and others to further discuss the possibility. Mr. Sanson said not unless they have funding in place to make the purchase.

Councilmember Ross said if Denova Homes is willing to share information on their second development proposal, there may be a way to work with the community and the Council to find a middle ground, where there is still open space, but a smaller number of homes. He also acknowledged the irony that if a year ago the Council had withdrawn its approvals before the referendum, the open space advocates would have been pleased, but now they perceive the same action as taking away their rights. Mr. Sanson reiterated that if a funding source has been identified, they would be happy to sit down and discuss future options.

Councilmember Ross commented that the amount his campaign received from Denova was not very large. Mr. Sanson agreed and noted that as a business owner, he has always supported the Council and believes he has contributed even to Councilmember DeLaney's campaign. Councilmember DeLaney said there was one check for one campaign, but she never cashed it, and anyone was welcome to look at her statements to confirm that.

At the request of Mayor Schroder, Ms. Nebb reviewed the referendum process, the options before the Council and the actions that it can take in regard to the previous approvals and the November election. She also discussed how the one-year time limit (prohibiting consideration of a substantially similar project) would apply under each scenario, including if the Council had rescinded its earlier approvals a year ago when presented with the petition.

Mayor Schroder clarified that if the referendum remains on the ballot and passes at the election, all it will do is rescind the General Plan Amendment, not the other entitlements approved by the Council; however, if the Council acts tonight it will rescind all of the earlier approvals. Ms. Nebb agreed.

Mayor Schroder asked, and Ms. Nebb confirmed that if the referendum goes to the vote and passes, it will not establish that property as open space in perpetuity. She also confirmed that if the Council acts to rescind the earlier approvals, it also will not mean that the property zoning and General Plan designation can never be changed. Ms. Nebb added that if the Council takes any action other than the rescission of all its earlier actions and cancellation of the election, the zoning and General Plan will be consistent; under any of the other options, the zoning and General Plan designation will not be in agreement with each other.

Mayor Schroder commented on the planning process for Measure H, at which time the Parks & Recreation Commission met with the Council to create a Parks Master Plan, and acquisition of the golf course property was discussed because it was large enough to make another park. However, during the very public planning process for Measure H, the decision was made that the bond money would not be used to buy any land for more parks, but invest in the existing parks instead.

Mayor Schroder also discussed his role as a LAFCO Board member and the goals of the agency, specifically to discourage urban sprawl, make recommendations on any annexations, and encourage the development of vacant urban land rather than open space development; it is his opinion the Pine Meadow property meets the criteria for vacant urban land, as defined by LAFCO. He strongly supported the rescission of the earlier approvals/entitlements granted to the developer, as well as the repeal of the election item and urged his colleagues to do the same. He noted that the City has limited funds and while there is still some consideration being given to a half-cent sales tax to help pay for street repairs, he noted that many voters are becoming resistant to the continued request for more taxes.

Vice Mayor Avila Farias asked for a show of hands from the audience of those who understand the actions before the Council tonight, as explained by Ms. Nebb. She was concerned by how many do not understand. She discussed the different input she has received from the public on this issue. She also clarified that the members of the Council all care deeply about the City and want to do what is best on every level. She strongly disagreed with comments made that the Council had already made up its minds before the meeting tonight.

Vice Mayor Avila Farias also reviewed the options described by Ms. Nebb in simpler terms, as well as a summary of previous Council actions and implications for the future. She asked whether the applicant could bring in a new application for development of the site. Ms. Nebb clarified that they could, but only if it is not substantially the same as the earlier one. She also explained that either the Council's rescission or the voter referendum both will stop the approval of the current proposal for a period of time, but not permanently. She also reiterated that any project and/or any attempt to change the General Plan land use designation will be prohibited for the period of one year from the action taken. It will be a one-year moratorium for any project that is substantially similar to the same as this one.

After further discussion, Vice Mayor Avila Farias again asked the audience regarding their understanding and still a majority did not. Ms. Nebb clarified that whether the Council rescinds their approvals/entitlements or the voters do, the result is the same; the one-year moratorium is the same, and the land use designation will not be permanent under either circumstance.

Councilmember M<sup>c</sup>Killop thanked everyone for coming and expressed appreciation for the support of open space, indicating she does as well. She agreed there is much confusion as to the purpose of this hearing, as well as what the Council can and should do. She explained her understanding as to what the Council is considering; noting if the Council approves the five actions, the zoning and General Plan designation for the golf course would go back to what they were a year ago. She also discussed the possibility of an initiative to find funding to purchase the property and preserve it as open space, which she would support.

Councilmember Ross discussed past efforts to acquire or preserve open space which he had participated in and indicated he still supports protecting open space when possible. He questioned the advisability of going forward with the referendum once the entitlements have been rescinded, noting some might vote against it just as a protest. Councilmember Ross expressed enthusiasm at the possibilities that could come forth if the developer works with the community and the City to come up with an alternative project. He noted that the Council taking action tonight would result in a cleaner slate than if the referendum is approved on the November ballot. He also commented on the amount of money that a half-cent sales tax would rise annually on behalf of the City.

Councilmember DeLaney expressed agreement with Councilmember Ross that a clean sweep is best, followed by discussion of other possible development scenarios. She was not opposed to development, nor Denova Homes. She also thought that the vote in November would be irrelevant if Council acts tonight and agreed that starting over with a new project that would benefit the community and involving the community in the process, could result in a winning solution for everyone.

Vice Mayor Avila Farias suggested that the Council add another item to the agenda, which is to establish an initiative for the City to vote on in November regarding the possibility of acquiring private property for parkland, particularly Pine Meadow. She acknowledged that until the General Plan is update is completed, difficulties with inconsistencies and spot zoning will continue, but she indicated she would be willing to work with the community and the developer in that regard. Mayor Schroder said that would be best considered and discussed at another meeting.

On motion by Mark Ross, Councilmember, seconded by Debbie M<sup>c</sup>Killop, Councilmember, to approve Resolution No. 009-16 rescinding **Resolution No. 031-15**, Calling and Giving Notice of the Holding of a General Municipal Election to be Held November 8, 2016 and Requesting the Board of Supervisors of the County of Contra Costa to Conduct Said Election; and authorizing the City Clerk or His Duly authorized Officers and Agents to Carry Out All the Necessary Procedures for Said Election Submitting to the Voters an Election for a Referendum to Resolution No. 009-15. Motion passed 3 - 2. Yes: Debbie M<sup>c</sup>Killop, Councilmember; Mark Ross, Councilmember; Rob Schroder, Mayor. No: Lara DeLaney, Councilmember; Anamarie Avila Farias, Vice Mayor.

On motion by Mark Ross, Councilmember, seconded by Debbie M<sup>c</sup>Killop, Councilmember, to approve Resolution No. 010-16 rescinding **Resolution No. 009-15**, Amending the General Plan (Hidden Lakes Specific Area Plan) Designation from Open Space and Recreation, Permanent to Residential 0-6 Acre for A 25 Acre Parcel and Text Amendment to Delete Language Pertaining to Golf Course Use on the Property Located at 451 Vine Hill Way (Pine Meadow) GPA 10-02; and rescinding Resolution No. 008-15, Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act for a Development Project Consisting of: 1) General Plan Amendments to Amend the Hidden Lakes Specific Area Plan and to Amend Land Use Map 1 to Re-designate the Subject Property from Open Space and Recreation, Permanent to Residential 0-6 Units Per Acre; 2) a Zoning Map Amendment to Re-rezone the Subject Property from M-OS/RF (Mixed Use Open Space Recreation) to a Combination of R-7.5/PUD Overlay (Single Family Residential:

Minimum 7500 Square Feet per Dwelling Unit/Planned Unit Development Overlay) and Approve a Planned Unit Development Plan; 3) Vesting Tentative Map; and 4) Design Review, for Development of up to 99 Single Family Homes on a 25.9 Acre Parcel Located at 451 Vine Hill Way-APN 162-020-019 (Subject Property) - Pine Meadow Project 13 PLN-0029, Sub 9358 (Project); and rescinding **Resolution No. 008-15**, Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act for a Development Project Consisting of: 1) General Plan Amendments to Amend the Hidden Lakes Specific Area Plan and to Amend Land Use Map 1 to Red-designate the Subject Property from Open Space and Recreation, Permanent to Residential 0-6 Units Per Acre; 2) a Zoning Map Amendment to Re-zone the Subject Property from M-OS/RF (Mixed Use Open Space Recreation) to a Combination of R-7.5/PUD Overlay (Single Family Residential: Minimum 7500 Square Feet per Dwelling Unit/Planned Unit Development Overlay) and Approve a Planned Unit Development Plan; 3) Vesting Tentative Map; and 4) Design Review, for Development of up to 99 Single Family Homes on a 25.9 Acre Parcel Located at 451 Vine Hill Way-APN 162-020-019 (Subject Property) - Pine Meadow Project 13 PLN-0029, Sub 9358 (Project); and rescinding **Resolution No. 010-15**, A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Martinez Approving a Vesting Tentative Map for the Development of a Planned Unit Development with Up to 99 Single-Family Units ("Pine Meadow") on an Approximate 25.9 Site Located at 451 Vine Hill Way (APN: 162-020-019) Sub #9358. Motion unanimously passed 5 - 0. Yes: Lara DeLaney, Councilmember; Debbie M<sup>c</sup>Killop, Councilmember; Mark Ross, Councilmember; Anamarie Avila Farias, Vice Mayor; Rob Schroder, Mayor.

On motion by Mark Ross, Councilmember, seconded by Debbie M<sup>c</sup>Killop, Councilmember, introduce an Ordinance repealing **Ordinance 1383 C.S.** Rezoning a 25.9 Acre Property Located at 451 Vine Hill Way from M-OS/RF (Mixed Use Open Space Recreation) to a Combination of R-7.5/PUD Overlay (Single Family Residential: Minimum 7,500 Square Feet Per Dwelling Unit/Planned Unit Development Overlay) and a PUD Plan to allow Development of 99 Single Family Homes. Motion unanimously passed 5 - 0. Yes: Lara DeLaney, Councilmember; Debbie M<sup>c</sup>Killop, Councilmember; Mark Ross, Councilmember; Anamarie Avila Farias, Vice Mayor; Rob Schroder, Mayor.

Senior City Attorney Veronica Nebb explained the second reading of the Ordinance will occur at the next meeting, since two readings are required for approval.

## **CITY COUNCIL**

### **2. City Council Comments/City Manager Comments.**

Interim City Manager Jim Jakel commented on the sales tax calculation, the math was correct in the one percent \$48,000, but the one percent sales tax is the full one percent is \$4.7 million so a half percent is \$2,350,000 is the City's share of the 9 percent.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 9:33 p.m. to a Regular City Council Meeting March 16, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 525 Henrietta Street, Martinez California.

Approved by the City Council,



Rob Schroder, Mayor

Mercy G. Cabral, Deputy City Clerk – 04/06/16