

CALL TO ORDER - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - ROLL CALL

Mayor Schroder called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm with all members present.

He indicated that Public Comment would be postponed until later in the meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION WAIVING READING OF TEXT OF ALL RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES

1. Motion approving City Council Minutes April 26, 2006.

Councilmember Wainwright questioned the addition of new items to the agenda, and he asked that the minutes be carried over to the next meeting to allow adequate review.

The Council agreed by consensus to continue the minutes to the next meeting.

2. Motion approving Check Reconciliation Registers dated 06/01/06, 06/02/06, and 06/07/06.

Mayor Schroder opened and closed public comment on the Consent Calendar with no speakers.

On motion of J. Kennedy, seconded by M. Ross, the Council voted unanimously to approve Item 2 of the Consent Calendar.

Item #6 taken out of order.

CITY MANAGER

6. Redevelopment Financial Feasibility Study Progress Report (standing).

City Manager June Catalano reported that the study was on target for completion by July 5th. Economic Development Director Susan McCue agreed there were no problems foreseen with meeting the deadline.

Mayor Schroder opened public comment on the item.

Paul Wilson said he hoped a full impact analysis would be done, including staff time and all the money that will be spent on redevelopment areas. As the marina has no income at all since it is public property, he questioned whether it should be designated as blighted, or proposed for redevelopment. He also expressed that the City Council is responsible for the marina's poor condition.

Mike Alford asked whether the study will include the effects of the newly-discovered fault line, and its impacts on future construction in the City. Ms. Catalano said that would be an environmental issue to be considered on a project by project basis. Mr. Alford commented on the effects of the earthquake last week.

Item #4 taken out of order.

CITY COUNCIL

4. Railroad quiet zone update.

Community Development Director Richard Pearson gave an update, indicating it would not be possible for the City to qualify for self-certification, so only two locations (Berrellesa and Ferry) would be proposed for safety improvements. He reported on estimated costs to the City, as well as liability issues.

Vice Mayor DeLaney asked if there is any way to condition residential development in that area to provide for noise mitigation funds. Mr. Pearson said it could be researched. City Manager June Catalano said mitigation fees can be charged to capital improvements, and this would qualify as a capital improvement.

Mayor Schroder confirmed that the gates would have to be in place before certification could occur.

Councilmember Ross echoed Vice Mayor DeLaney and suggested pursuing grant funding or contacting the railroad again to lessen the volume, as has worked in the past.

Councilmember Wainwright said he was not in favor of a quiet zone; those who live near the railroad tracks appreciate the sound of the train. The cost seems high, and the benefits not worth it. Councilmember Ross noted it would also make the crossings safer.

Mayor Schroder opened public comment on the item.

Paul Wilson commented on the background report by Bradley Johnson on June 16, 2004, which said certification could be done without additional safety measures. He also noted that the trains are required to sound their horns when approaching and leaving the station, so total silencing of them is not possible. He asked if the \$250,000 was for Ferry Street alone or for Berrellesa as well. He indicated that Ferry Street is at the end of the platform, where the horn sounding is required. He noted that the train horn is necessary for public safety, especially for the hard of hearing.

Ann Mobley expressed frustration with the early meeting start time. She agreed with Councilmember Wainwright that the cost of these improvements and the potential for liability are too great for the City. She asked that the Council deny the proposal.

Mike Alford stated that the Council is ignoring the public again. Martinez is a train city and has been for many years. The train horn is necessary for safety. He questioned whether any California city with a train station has a quiet zone. He also stated that developers should pay for the safety barrier, and he suggested a retirement development for the area.

Dannie Brown questioned why someone would buy a house near a train track and then complain about the noise. She said the City has spent enough money foolishly.

Seeing no further speakers, Mayor Schroder closed public comment.

Councilmember Ross clarified with Mr. Pearson that this is the first step to make the crossings safer and to allow installation of a horn at the intersection itself. Mr. Pearson said no, the two issues are different. Installing a horn at the crossings is an alternative to the quiet zone and would localize the sound. Mr. Pearson also indicated that a quiet zone could be designated for night hours only (after 10 pm and before 6 am).

Councilmember Ross asked the cost of installing a horn at the crossing, and Mr. Pearson discussed potential costs. Councilmember Ross said he would like to continue to pursue all the possibilities.

Vice Mayor DeLaney noted that the comments she gets from the community indicate displeasure at the noise from the train horns, so she is listening. She was surprised at the public and Councilmember Wainwright's reaction to the possible lessening of noise impacts in the City. She reiterated her suggestion that a mitigation fee be considered, as well as grant funding, to help pay for the improvements.

Councilmember Wainwright said more people in the town would rather keep the train noise as part of the ambiance of the town. He again said that the cost is too high. Vice Mayor DeLaney acknowledged that some noise would be inevitable, but lessening it would be an improvement.

Mayor Schroder commented on other train noise, and past history of complaints from the community. As safety is a prime concern, he would still like to pursue the possibilities. He was confident that some compromise could be reached.

Ms. Catalano confirmed that the Council would like staff to pursue establishment of a noise mitigation fee.

Councilmember Ross recused himself from the meeting at 6:28 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tim Platt offered suggestions about density standards for two areas of the Specific Plan— the Downtown Core and the Telfer area. He asked the City Council to do what is in the public's best interests. He noted that most high density development in the central county area is in the mid-20 range. He reminded the Council that setting reasonable limits does not preclude the developer from requesting or getting a higher density project with public amenities, and it would also help the parking situation.

Marta Van Loan commented on the parking requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit. She noted that current parking in the downtown is inadequate, and many households have more than one car, which would impact the situation further. Vice Mayor DeLaney pointed out that the Downtown Shoreline District has a 2-space requirement.

Ann Mobley asked the City Council not to go beyond 24 units per acre. She also agreed with Ms. Van Loan that the parking requirement was inadequate, and she asked that there be no new buildings over two stories in height.

Mike Alford said parking will be a problem. He asked again if a retirement community had been considered for the downtown/Telfer area as it would be appealing and bring more money into the City.

Roger Goodwin reported on free movies for the public on July 15th and 22nd at the amphitheatre and distributed flyers. He noted that allowing 33 units per acre density would not require developers to build to that density, and projects will be considered on case-by-case basis anyway. He clarified that 1.5 spaces per unit does provide more onsite parking than one space per unit would. He urged the Council to move forward with the Plan, noting that a senior development could always be proposed as a project later.

Paul Wilson discussed the 2.6 earthquake on a fault that the consultant had said did not exist, but was 5 miles deep and less than 2 miles from City Hall. He urged the Council to enact a mandatory earthquake retrofit ordinance before it is too late. Regarding the Downtown Specific Plan, he suggested the Council try living in the areas that are being proposed for redevelopment. He expressed concern about effects of the Specific Plan on the current residents. He also expressed the hope that someday citizens will take the City back and restore it to its previous character.

Maury Huguet, attorney, clarified that density and height numbers are *ranges* and would only be granted for superior projects that meet strict criteria. He asked the Council to allow the development community to design superior projects. An audience member asked him if he lives in Martinez, and Mr. Huguet said he was born in Martinez and lived here 46 years, but has since moved to Benicia because the housing type he desired was not available in Martinez.

There being no further speakers, Mayor Schroder closed public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING(S)

3. Public hearing to consider the following:
 - A) Consideration of the certified Environmental Impact Report for the Downtown Specific Plan and related actions; and
 - B) Consideration and possible action relating to text and map amendments to the Martinez General Plan (including the Central Martinez Specific Area Plan) related to the proposed Downtown Specific Plan; and
 - C) Consideration and possible action relating to the final adoption of the proposed Downtown Specific Plan; and

- D) Consideration and possible action relating to text and map amendments to the Martinez Zoning Ordinance to add three new zoning districts: Downtown Shoreline; Civic; and Historic Overlay.

The City Council may direct staff to bring back the formal adoption of resolutions and ordinances relating to the above at a future City Council meeting.

This is a continued item from the June 7, 2006 meeting. The public hearing of this item was closed on June 7, 2006.

Mayor Schroder summarized actions taken at the last meeting.

Councilmember Wainwright resumed his proposed amendments.

On Page 4-5, Development Standards for the Downtown Core, he recommended maintaining the current standard of 29 units per acre.

Vice Mayor DeLaney asked staff why the higher density of 43 units per acre was proposed. Mr. Pearson said the consultant proposed it, because they thought the Downtown Core should have a higher allowable density than the Downtown Shoreline District. He further explained that 43 was derived from dividing 1000 square feet (allowed in an R-1.0 district) into the number of square feet in an acre.

Vice Mayor DeLaney commented on the need to provide incentives for higher quality development and revitalization. She was not in favor of the amendment.

There was no second to Councilmember Wainwright's amendment.

Councilmember Wainwright commented on the potential for massive, monolithic design of similar density projects. He asked if the criteria for the higher density could be added to the DC Zone. Staff indicated they could have it by the end of the meeting.

On Page 4-7, under Density, he proposed 35 units per acre rather than 43.

On Page 6-3 Historic Overlay, 6.1.4 Additional Measures, line 2, Councilmember Wainwright recommended, "Therefore...no building constructed *more than 50 years before...*" rather than "before 1955."

Mayor Schroder said he would prefer to have a specific year. Councilmember Wainwright said the State standard for historic designation is 50 years. He clarified that the paragraph is specifically talking about demolition.

Vice Mayor DeLaney questioned what form the investigation of feasible methods for re-using the building would take, as well as who does the investigation and what form it will take. Mayor Schroder said the Historic Preservation Ordinance Subcommittee will establish criteria. Mr. Pearson agreed that an ordinance itself would establish criteria for preservation/demolition.

Councilmember Kennedy agreed 50 years is the standard for historic designation and the right thing to do. She seconded Councilmember Wainwright's recommendation. The Council agreed to the change.

Councilmember Wainwright also asked that "or removed from its site" be added to the next sentence. Councilmember Kennedy noted that sometimes moving a historic structure from its site is the best way to preserve it. Vice Mayor DeLaney agreed it might create new hurdles or obstacles to preservation. Mayor Schroder agreed with Councilmember Kennedy and Vice Mayor DeLaney.

Councilmember Wainwright expressed concern about old neighborhoods where the area is being transformed by demolition and replaced with high density, modern structures, changing the character of the neighborhood. Vice Mayor DeLaney said the design guidelines in the Specific Plan are intended to preserve the character of neighborhoods.

Councilmember Wainwright deferred to the rest of the Council.

Councilmember Wainwright asked that the next paragraph read, "The City should also update the 1983 Historic Resource Inventory *regularly*..." The Council agreed by consensus.

Councilmember Wainwright also recommended the last paragraph read, "All proposals for *demolition or* substantial modification of other structures..." Vice Mayor DeLaney seconded the amendment, Council agreed to the change.

Assistant City Attorney Veronica Nebb suggested adding a second paragraph under Section 4.5.3, "*In order to approve a density above the basic density, the Planning Commission would need to find that, in addition to meeting the minimum requirements of the District, the proposal is superior in terms of one or more of the following criteria: design and appearance, minimizing impacts on adjacent public lands, providing onsite amenities for future residents, preserving or creating view corridors, utilizing green building practices to the maximum extent feasible.*"

Councilmember Wainwright asked what "public lands" entails, and Ms. Nebb gave examples. Councilmember Wainwright said he thought it was more applicable to the Shoreline District than to the Downtown Core. Mayor Schroder asked if that would include provision of a public park in a mixed use development in the downtown. Ms. Nebb said it could, especially if one parcel is developed, and then someone wants to develop an adjacent parcel. She said another criterion could be added, "*or providing publicly-available open spaces or amenities.*"

Councilmember Wainwright asked how many criteria must be met. Ms. Nebb said as it is written, only one out of six must be met to have more than the basic density. Councilmember Wainwright said he thought that was too low a level.

Vice Mayor DeLaney said Page 9-5 seems to have a discrepancy in terms of the criteria that would have to be achieved, when compared to Page 9-4. Staff said one refers to projects above the base density, and the other refers to projects at the highest end of the density range.

Councilmember Wainwright suggested three or more conditions should be met for projects in the Downtown Core, since there are six listed, and four or more for the Shoreline District since there are eight listed. Ms. Nebb said there could be difficulties with requiring a specific number of criteria to be met, since some might not apply to every project. After further Council discussion, Ms. Nebb discussed the possibility of a “sliding scale” from the low to the top end of the density range, at the discretion of the Planning Commission. Councilmember Wainwright asked for more time to consider other criteria.

Mayor Schroder agreed that the wording in Chapter 9 could be adapted for this section. At the request of Councilmember Wainwright, Ms. Nebb reviewed the criteria. Councilmember Wainwright suggested an additional criterion, “fitting with neighborhood character.”

Vice Mayor DeLaney expressed support for language similar to Chapter 9, as proposed by Ms. Nebb. The Council agreed by consensus.

Councilmember Wainwright suggested 12-29 units per acre, rather than 35, as more appropriate for the downtown.

After brief discussion, Councilmember Kennedy suggested having a range of densities and specific criteria for each level of density in the downtown neighborhood, similar to the section in Chapter 9. Mr. Pearson said the downtown neighborhood does not have a density range like that, since the existing zoning districts will remain. Additional density could be achieved through rezoning when needed for a particular project.

Councilmember Wainwright said he would like to take out the R-1.5 zoning from the Downtown Neighborhood District, as it results in smaller units. Councilmember Kennedy cautioned that if the minimum size is too large, it could rule out some senior development.

Councilmember Wainwright echoed Mr. Platt’s statement that the higher densities proposed do not match that of other cities in the central county. Councilmember Kennedy disagreed.

Vice Mayor DeLaney asked how the 35-unit limit was reached; Mr. Pearson said the existing Downtown Overlay District allows an increase to that density from R-1.5 (29 per acre) with a use permit. Vice Mayor DeLaney asked, and Mr. Pearson confirmed that the action taken on this item will not change the existing zoning densities in the Downtown. Ms. Nebb further clarified that although it changes the maximum density allowable, the zoning would need to be changed on a parcel by parcel basis to allow the upper density range.

Councilmember Wainwright asked whether the Specific Plan should state that the allowable density depends on the zoning of a parcel. Mr. Pearson clarified further how zoning affects the allowable density within a range stated in the General Plan.

There was no support for Councilmember Wainwright’s amendment to lower the maximum density.

Regarding Section 9.5.3 under the Downtown Shoreline, the Plan states: “In the Downtown Shoreline District, the maximum building height should be 40 feet or 3 stories for development approved at R-1.5 density and 30’ or two stories for development at R-2.5.” Councilmember

Wainwright suggested additional text: “Nevertheless, for locations within 200 feet of existing residences, only 25’ feet or 2 stories shall be permitted.” He also suggested “In some areas, such as transition areas near existing single family residential areas, a two-story maximum height may be determined to be appropriate by the Planning Commission” be deleted.

Councilmember Kennedy questioned whether that would limit design alternatives. She believed the current language provides enough protection through Planning Commission review. After brief discussion, there was no second for Councilmember Wainwright’s amendment.

Regarding Section 9.5.4, Density, Councilmember Wainwright suggested the first paragraph be amended to say “up to a maximum of 35 units per acre.” The Council did not agree.

For the next paragraph Councilmember Wainwright suggested “the proposal is superior in terms of *four* or more of the following criteria.” Vice Mayor DeLaney suggested two or more. Mayor Schroder and Councilmember Kennedy said they would rather leave it as it is. After further discussion the Council agreed to change it to say two or more.

Councilmember Wainwright suggested adding a 3rd criterion in Section 9.6.3, Architecture: “In projects of more than six units or two separate residential structures, the design should be varied, not uniform or monolithic.”

Assistant City Attorney Nebb said the same goal could be achieved by façade articulation. Mayor Schroder commented on a project near Pleasant Hill BART as an example.

Vice Mayor DeLaney noted that chapter 10 (Section 10.5.4) addresses the issue as well. Ms. Nebb agreed, noting that adding it under the Design Guidelines in Section 9.6.3 would make it mandatory.

City Manager June Catalano suggested replacing “monolithic” with “monotonous.” Councilmember Wainwright was agreeable to the change. The Council approved the amendment suggested by Councilmember Wainwright, with the change proposed by City Manager Catalano.

Community Development Director Pearson asked about the change made to Page 9-4, under Section 9.5.4, Density, in response to comments at the last meeting. Councilmember Wainwright asked about removing “where feasible.” After further discussion, the Council agreed to the change made by staff.

Councilmember Wainwright asked whether Section 12.3 should be *Parking Standards* or *Strategies* because it was different in the Chapter Summary than it was later in the chapter. Staff said it should be strategies.

Councilmember Wainwright asked, and staff confirmed that Section 12.1.2 would have added language about parking in-lieu fees.

On Page 14-9, Pacheco Corridor, Councilmember Wainwright suggested “Construct a pedestrian-bike-emergency vehicle bridge (*or underpass*) over (*or under*).” The Council agreed to the change.

Councilmember Wainwright asked for clarification on whether the Downtown Overlay District guidelines applied to the Downtown Shoreline District. Mr. Pearson confirmed they did not. Councilmember Wainwright asked, and Mr. Pearson confirmed there was no density bonus proposed for the Downtown Shoreline District.

Councilmember Wainwright said he would like to propose a rule that any new construction (other than conversion to housing in the Downtown Core or Civic District) require two parking spaces per unit. Vice Mayor DeLaney and Councilmember Kennedy mentioned that fewer vehicles would be needed in a transit-oriented or senior housing development. Councilmember Wainwright said at least the Downtown Neighborhood should require two covered garages per unit, even for multi-family.

Vice Mayor DeLaney said she would like to encourage condo developments and/or homeownership, but would rather discourage dependence on automobiles. Councilmember Wainwright expressed doubt that people would be willing to change their driving habits, and requiring fewer parking spaces on-site would result in more cars parked on the streets. There was no second on Councilmember Wainwright's amendment.

Councilmember Wainwright suggested a general principle for density, "in transition areas near existing single-family residential areas, or residential areas with less existing density than in the proposed project area, only the lowest permitted density for the district may be used," in order to provide an obligatory transition area from the new neighborhood to the old. Assistant City Attorney Nebb said such protection was already built into the Plan through the use permit process and the requirement for neighborhood compatibility. There was no support for Councilmember Wainwright's suggestion.

Councilmember Wainwright expressed support for the Planning Commission's recommendation for lower height limits: "With the exception of the Downtown Shoreline District, the maximum building height throughout the City will be 30' or 2 stories." He suggested adding, "*In the Downtown Shoreline District, the maximum building height should be 40' or 3 stories, with a use permit required to go higher.*"

Mayor Schroder said 40' is an appropriate height in the downtown, as some buildings in the downtown are already 40' or higher. Vice Mayor DeLaney and Councilmember Kennedy were not supportive of the change.

Regarding the Historic Overlay District, Councilmember Wainwright suggested a bonus for building preservation and renovation in accordance with the Secretary of Interior standards and the State historical building code, even possibly forgiveness of all City fees. Ms. Nebb said such a policy was not practical because of prevailing wage requirements. Mayor Schroder suggested that is a topic for the Historic Preservation Subcommittee to consider.

Councilmember Kennedy discussed other incentives that could be offered, but said they should be offered on the project level, not made a part of the Specific Plan.

Councilmember Wainwright said he was finished with his amendments to the Specific Plan.

Vice Mayor DeLaney suggested the following changes:

Section 1.5, Applicability and Conformity with the Specific Plan, should read “No construction, *demolition*, substantial modification, addition, placement or installation of any building structure...”

On Page 1-5, Acknowledgements, add Donna Allen and Fred Korbmacher to the list of Planning Commissioners.

On Page 2-3, policy LU1-3, “encourage mixed-use *and transit-oriented* development.”

On Page 2-4, Goal H-1 “encourage *transit and pedestrian-oriented* housing in areas in addition to the ...”

For Policy H-1-5, “encourage and promote *transit and pedestrian-oriented* residential projects.”

The Council agreed to Vice Mayor DeLaney’s amendments.

Regarding Page 2-3, policy LU1-7, Vice Mayor DeLaney suggested changing “small-scale industrial” to “small-scale service commercial. The Council agreed to the change.

Vice Mayor DeLaney noted that Policy ED1-3, Page 2-4, Economic Development goals and policies mentions “row homes” but gives no definition. Community Development Director Pearson suggested changing to “townhouses.” Ms. Nebb clarified that townhouses and row homes are two different types and gave examples of each. The Council decided to keep row homes, add townhomes, and include a definition of row homes.

Regarding Page 2-6, policy C-1-4, regarding street closure limitations, Vice Mayor DeLaney expressed concern that it might prevent opportunities for the creation of a pedestrian mall. She suggested it be deleted. Mr. Pearson discussed the rationale for the policy, and suggested including an exception for pedestrian malls.

Mayor Schroder asked about the earlier suggestion for re-aligning streets near the corporation yard, and whether that policy would affect it. Mr. Pearson said no, not in the Downtown Core. Mr. Pearson suggested changing “downtown area” to Downtown Core. The Council agreed to the change.

Vice Mayor DeLaney suggested that Goal P-1 delete “while avoiding an oversupply of parking.” The Council agreed to the change.

Regarding Section 4.1, Purpose of the Downtown Core District, Vice Mayor DeLaney asked to have some mention of the City’s desire for a theatre for the downtown. Councilmember Wainwright suggested, “The intent of this Specific Plan *in the Downtown Core* is to create and encourage opportunities for a variety of commercial, residential, and cultural and *entertainment* uses, including...” The Council agreed to the change.

Regarding p. 4-5, Development Standards for the Downtown Core, Vice Mayor DeLaney asked whether the Council should consider the same kind of requirement for the multiple family residential structures to have the condominium standards and the subdivision map requirements in this area as well as the Downtown Shoreline District. She suggested “All new multiple development in this area shall be processed concurrently with a subdivision map, so that individual units can be offered for sale, and shall meet the requirements for new condominium units as contained in Chapter 21.54 of the Municipal Code.”

Mr. Pearson reviewed why the Council did not want to include similar languages in January (although it was split on the matter). Vice Mayor DeLaney commented on the need to encourage homeownership opportunities. Councilmember Kennedy commented on impacts from apartment-to-condo conversions.

Councilmember Wainwright and Vice Mayor DeLaney expressed concern about the high percentage of rental housing already in the Downtown Core. Councilmember Kennedy clarified that ownership housing is currently allowed.

Ms. Nebb said the Council may want to consider the interplay between housing policies and the need to meet housing goals. Vice Mayor DeLaney said affordable housing goals can be met through ownership opportunities.

Councilmember Wainwright seconded Vice Mayor DeLaney’s motion. Councilmember Kennedy and Mayor Schroder said they could not support it, especially in view of upcoming housing issues facing the City.

Vice Mayor DeLaney said she had some editorial comments that she would give to staff separately. Regarding Section 9-6, 9.6.1 Character Defining Statement, she suggested the following amendment: “Large industrial uses are encouraged to relocate out of the District, but smaller, self-contained *service commercial* ~~light industrial~~ uses may coexist with existing and new residential uses.” The Council agreed.

Councilmember Wainwright asked whether service commercial uses are allowed in the Downtown Shoreline District. Mr. Pearson said the Zoning Ordinance should be changed to match the Specific Plan.

Vice Mayor DeLaney asked why the townhouses and rowhouses are not allowed in the Grandview District (according to the table). Mr. Pearson agreed they should be added to the table.

Regarding Section 10.6.6, Occupancy and Employees, Vice Mayor DeLaney suggested removing the restriction requiring residency onsite by at least one worker. Ms. Nebb said that is the definition of live-work, as opposed to mixed use. The amendment was not supported by the rest of the Council.

Councilmember Wainwright said that Page 13-3, Pedestrian-priority streets, “Two-way traffic is encouraged on pedestrian-priority streets in order to maximize retail visibility,” seems contradictory. Mr. Pearson clarified that traffic on one-way streets usually travels at a faster rate of speed.

Councilmember Wainwright noted that two streets listed as pedestrian-priority streets are one-way currently. Mr. Pearson said the Plan recommends elsewhere that they return to two-way again.

Vice Mayor DeLaney said she was in support of an in-lieu parking fee. She was disappointed that the area north of the tracks was not being included in the Plan. She also said that encouraging green building standards and practices was not mentioned frequently enough.

The Council voted unanimously to direct staff to prepare a resolution on the adoption of the Specific Plan with the changes provided by the Council.

The Council recessed from 8:35 – 8:45 p.m.

3.d. Consideration of Text and Map Amendments to the Martinez Zoning Ordinance

On motion of L. DeLaney, seconded by J. Kennedy, the Council voted unanimously to direct staff to bring back the formal adoption of resolutions and ordinances relating to the above at a future City Council meeting, including amendments.

Amendments

Councilmember Wainwright noted that the numbering is off in the Downtown Shoreline District section. Staff agreed to correct it.

Councilmember Wainwright also suggested that the purpose be amended to say, “respect and complement the largely single-family home neighborhood immediately to the south...” The Council agreed.

Councilmember Wainwright suggested that theatres and community centers be added under conditionally permitted uses. The Council agreed.

Vice Mayor DeLaney suggested changing “smaller self-contained light industrial uses” to “smaller self-contained service commercial uses.”

Councilmember Wainwright suggested adding “all new development shall be designed to ...” to paragraph A, General under Development Uses. Mr. Pearson said the language should match that of the Specific Plan, although it is mentioned under C, Density.

Councilmember Wainwright suggested for Chapter 22.27, Historic Overlay, under purposes, add to b “district, *with particular focus on buildings listed in the county and on City of Martinez Historical Resource Inventories*, and.” Mayor Schroder suggested it be delegated to the Historic Ordinance subcommittee for consideration.

Vice Mayor DeLaney indicated she could support it, since the guidelines are advisory. Ms. Nebb cautioned that the Council has not reviewed the County list, so she would not recommend including it here. The Council agreed to add the City’s list, but not the County’s at this point.

Councilmember Wainwright said the language in Section 22.27.040, Administration, and Section 22.16.200, Height of Structures should be amended to match the Specific Plan. Staff agreed.

Councilmember Wainwright asked if there should be some reference to the parking in-lieu fee. Mr. Pearson said the Council had decided to study the possibility of a parking in-lieu fee ordinance, and that would be mentioned in the Specific Plan, but not in the Zoning Ordinance. The City Council agreed.

Vice Mayor DeLaney confirmed deletion of the last sentence too. Staff said yes.

7. City Manager comments

None.

5. City Council comments

Councilmember Kennedy reported on the work of the Flood Committee, noting they should have something to report in a month or so.

Vice Mayor DeLaney mentioned there will be a special City Council meeting Saturday, June 17 at 10:00 a.m. (10:30 for the public) regarding the marina lease.

Councilmember Wainwright asked the Council's consensus on consideration of an ordinance that would address the potential problem of an open seat on the Council following the next election. Mayor Schroder said it could be put on the agenda for discussion. The other Councilmembers agreed.

Ms. Nebb said the Council would need to consider State law provisions also.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at **9:14 p.m.** to an Adjourned Regular City Council Meeting on June 17, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. in the Council Chambers, 525 Henrietta Street, Martinez, California.

Approved by the City Council,

Rob Schroder, Mayor

Mercy G. Cabral, Deputy City Clerk - 7/5/06