

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Tim Platt <tim_mart2001@yahoo.com>

To: ROB SCHRODER <rschroder@cityofmartinez.org>; dmckillop@cityofmartinez.org <dmckillop@cityofmartinez.org>; MARK ROSS <mross@cityofmartinez.org>; LARA DELANEY <ladelaney@cityofmartinez.org>; Brianne Zorn <bzorn@cityofmartinez.org>; mikechandler031612 <mchandler@cityofmartinez.org>; Hector J. Rojas <hrojas@cityofmartinez.org>

Cc: Tim Platt <tim_mart2001@yahoo.com>; strambley@gmail.com <strambley@gmail.com>; 'Jonathan Bash' Sierra <jonathan.t.bash@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, August 26, 2022 at 01:18:10 PM PDT

Subject: Extend the GPU/DEIR review deadline

Mayor, Councilmembers and City Staff,

The deadline for the end of the 45-day period to review the current draft of the General Plan Update (GPU) is fast approaching. It needs to be extended beyond 9/22/22.

No one can review all the changes in the current GPU draft, look at and respond to the comments made on public input, and in any way understand/review/comment on the 824 page Draft Environmental Impact Report in the 45 day period.---in total over 1000 pages of new data and reports.

It is unfair to put both the public and public officials under this impossible deadline. The deadline needs to be extended.

This review period is also adversely affected by my understanding that our Planning Manager, Hector Rojas' is leaving (and possibly other personnel). Hector has been at the very heart of the of this effort and is irreplaceable. So meaningful interaction that is producing results will be lost.

I personally appreciate some of the incorporation in this current draft GPU of some important changes the public has suggested. And there are discussions of possible additional changes.

That is encouraging, but is undermined by an unrealistic deadline to review and comment on this 1000+ pages of essentially new data.

Please keep the spirit of collaboration with the public in place and extend that deadline now. I know I have spent probably 40 hours so far in just trying to understand the changes in the Land Use Element 2 and develop reasonable changes. I can imagine the pressure the deadline puts on other concerned citizens and our elected and appointed officials.

We are producing a better General Plan in this joint effort. Please support that by extending the deadline.

The second issue I wanted to address is the critical need for a density comparison of the draft GPU to our existing General Plan. We did an amateur comparison of densities city-wide that was based simply on comparing the densities in the draft GPU against the densities that could be gleaned from the current General Plan Land Use map. That was done months ago because the City had ignored repeated requests to do this.

We knew our effort was not definitive, but it underlined the issue of the need for a City staff comparison of current densities versus those proposed in the draft GPU, and an explanation of the differences. We have been asking the City for such a comparison for over a year now, but none has been forthcoming.

This inaction on the part of the City made many suspicious of why the City has not done this. But it is possible that the density increases will make sense to the public, and the fears that the GPU is surreptitiously raising them are unfounded. Or that what appear as density increases have already been put in place by the Council in previous General Plan amendments and Specific Plans.

But the key issue is the City needs to provide that information to the public and explain any increases. That need became more critical with the pending 8/31/22 City Council/Planning Commission meeting to discuss only densities.

I have been told that a density comparison has just been issued by the City. I have not had an opportunity to see it yet, but hope it provides the public and elected officials with the information we've requested. It is good the City is providing this information, although it may be difficult to disseminate it to the public fast enough to help them form opinions. and respond by the 9/2/22 deadline. (Extending the comment deadline would help make that possible.)

This density comparison needs to extend to the other issues covered by the General Plan, i.e., what has been left out of the draft GPU that is now in the current General Plan and why; what has been added and why. For instance, have Specific Plans been dropped, having housing requirements been changed, have open space/park provisions been revised, etc.

Please extend the deadline and extend the comparison the City staff has started.

Thank you,

Tim Platt